

179 Cross Street, Suite A San Luis Obispo, CA. 93401 Phone: (805)781-4472 Fax: (805)781-1291

# **BOARD AGENDA**

Wednesday, October 17, 2012 CITY OF ARROYO GRANDE, CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS 215 E. Branch Street. Arroyo Grande, California 3:30 – 5:00 P.M. (Ending time is approximate)

Chairperson: Jim Guthrie Director: Shelly Higginbotham Vice Chairperson: John Shoals Director: Paul Teixeira

Individuals wishing accessibility accommodations at this meeting under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) may request such accommodations to aid hearing, visual, or mobility impairment by contacting the SCAT offices at 781-1338. Please note that 48 hours advance notice will be necessary to honor a request. **NOTE:** Arroyo Grande City Offices are served hourly by SCAT Route 24.

Please call 541-2228 for more information.

## CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:** This portion of the agenda is reserved for any members of the public to directly address the South County Area Transit Board on any items not on the agenda and within the jurisdiction of the Board. Comments are limited to three minutes per speaker. The Board will listen to all communication, but in compliance with the Brown Act, will not take any action on items that are not on the agenda.

## A. INFORMATION AGENDA

- A-1 Executive Director's Report (Receive)
- A-2 Summer Youth Ride Free and Beach Trolley Results (Receive)

## B. ACTION AGENDA

B-1 Authorize Executive Director to Renegotiate Facility Lease to Permit Bus Washing (Action)

- B-2 Resolution to Appoint Geoff Straw as Administrator of SCAT to serve on CalTIP Board (Action)
- B-3 Call for Special Meeting to Adopt MOU for Planning and Programming of FTA funds (Action)
- C. CONSENT AGENDA: (Roll Call Vote) the following items are considered routine and non-controversial by staff and will be approved by one motion if no member of the South County Area Transit Board or public wishes an item be removed. If discussion is desired by anyone, the item will be removed from the consent agenda and will be considered separately. Questions of clarification may be made by South County Area Transit Board members, without the removal of the item from the Consent Agenda. Staff recommendations for each item are noted following the item.
  - C-1 SCAT Minutes of July 18, 2012 (Approve by Roll Call Vote)

## D. DIRECTORS' COMMENTS

## E. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBERS' COMMENTS

#### ADJOURNMENT

Next South County Area Transit Board <u>SPECIAL</u> meeting November 14, 2012 Next South County Area Transit Board <u>REGULAR</u> meeting January 16, 2013

## SOUTH COUNTY AREA TRANSIT October 17, 2012 STAFF REPORT

| AGENDA ITEM:          | A-1                         |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------|
| TOPIC:                | Executive Director's Report |
| PRESENTED BY:         | Geoff Straw                 |
| STAFF RECOMMENDATION: | Information                 |

## BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION:

## **Operations:**

As reported in previous SCAT meetings, staff has been working with Arroyo Grande and SLO County staff to develop an alternative method to wash SCAT buses. Currently, SCAT staff members drive buses to a coin-operated wash system in Grover Beach. On September 27, staff submitted a Conditional Use Permit amendment request to Arroyo Grande to allow SCAT to wash up to one bus per calendar day at its operating facility at 800 Rodeo Drive. It is expected that this request will be considered by the Arroyo Grande Planning Commission in November. See Item B-1 for details on this effort.

Staff is still looking to improve operations at the Pismo Premium Outlets transfer facility. Currently, up to five buses (two SCAT and two RTA buses, and the Beach Trolley on Thursdays and Fridays) "pulse" at this facility every hour, which causes the last bus in the queue to slightly block the northern access from the Outlets facility onto Five Cities Drive. We will continue to work with Outlets and City of Pismo Beach staff to develop feasible alternatives.

Staff worked with Arroyo Grande public works to implement a revised bus stop in front of the council chambers, as well as to slightly revise the traffic striping on El Camino at Grand. Staff appreciates the professionalism and creativity of Arroyo Grande staff members that helped us develop and implement optimal solutions to our operating challenges in those two areas.

As reported at the July 2012 SCAT Board meeting, RTA implemented a Courtesy Stops program throughout its service area, including within SCAT service area. This program permits drivers – at their discretion – to drop off passengers at safe locations between established bus stops under certain circumstances. We are still evaluating this program and will report its benefits and challenges at an upcoming SCAT Board meeting to determine if SCAT might consider implementing a similar program.

## Service Planning:

The region recently wrapped up both the Summer Youth Ride Free and Beach Trolley programs. Details of the operating and financial results for those two programs are provided in Item A-2.

SLOCOG has recommended the award to RTA a total of \$10,000 in State Transit Assistance funds to plan for the eventual operation of an express service that would link the Five Cities area to downtown San Luis Obispo via State Route 227. Staff will keep your Board apprised as the stakeholder committee is assembled, and as service and capital alternatives are developed.

## Marketing:

Since the July SCAT Board meeting, staff worked primarily on marketing the Summer Youth Ride Free and Beach Trolley programs. In addition, staff worked on marketing the SCAT program to school age riders for the return to school in August/September. It should be noted that SCAT added a morning Route 25 trip to meet the revised bell-times at Arroyo Grande High School.

Current campaigns are focused on October Rideshare Month, which includes Fare Free Tuesdays on all fixed routes in the county. There are five Tuesdays in October, so staff is anticipating a small increase in boardings in October, which we will report at a future SCAT Board meeting.

## Finance and Administration:

As mentioned at the last SCAT Board meeting, the SCAT service area has been designated as a federally-recognized Urbanized Area (UZA). With this designation, SCAT will soon be required to achieve a 20% farebox recovery ratio (FRR). Based on the preliminary SCAT Annual Fiscal and Compliance Audit, SCAT achieved an 18.10% FRR in FY12. In comparison, the FY11 FRR was 17.03%. In the coming months, staff will develop and evaluate alternatives to increase the FRR to the mandated 20% level, which must be achieved by the end of FY17 in order to avoid TDA penalties. Staff met with representatives from SLOCOG, SLO County and officials from Arroyo Grande, Grover Beach and Pismo Beach, to begin discussions on how additional Federal Transit Administration Urbanized Area funding can be planned and used, and what implications that might have on the use of TDA funds in the 5 Cities area. SLOCOG has developed a draft Memorandum of Understanding –similar to the one developed for the Atascadero-Paso UZA – that will be discussed as Item B-3.

As discussed at the July SCAT Board meeting, SCAT must designate an authorized representative to serve on the California Transit Insurance Pool (CalTIP) Board, which has provided insurance to SCAT since July 2002. After consulting with County Counsel and CalTIP, we have determined that the existing SCAT Joint Powers Agreement identifies an "Administrator" as a duly authorized representative. Item B-2 of the October agenda presents staff's recommendation to appoint the RTA Executive Director as the SCAT Administrator.

SCAT has completed contract negotiations to purchase three replacement 35-foot buses from the Gillig Corporation. Staff will conduct a bus pre-build meeting at the Gillig manufacturing plant in Hayward on October 22-23. Staff will be providing final comments as part of its "desk review" prior to the on-site meeting in mid-October. It appears that there is no local support to pursue 40-foot buses – like those used by RTA – for the SCAT service area, so staff will continue to assume that your Board supports the need for 35-foot buses. Staff continues to work on securing additional funding to replace the rest of the SCAT fleet, as the remaining fleet is quickly reaching the end of their FTA-defined economically useful life.

During the preceding quarter, staff worked closely with our auditors to complete our Annual Fiscal and Compliance Audit, which is attached to this report. Overall, financial results were below budget projections – annual expenditures came in at 91.2% of budgeted figures (\$902,842 actual vs. \$989,908 budgeted). In terms of revenues, your Board budgeted \$987,960 although SCAT received an actual amount of \$1,018,675. In all respects, it was a successful year in terms of financial management and oversight, and the auditors affirmed the information reported is fairly stated in all material respects in relation to the financial statements as a whole. It should be noted that this audit was completed earlier than any other audit in memory. Kudos to Tania Arnold, who led the audit effort, as well as Omar McPherson and Trena Wilson, both of whom assisted in completing the process quickly and efficiently.

Preliminary July and August 2012 financials are included in the attached report. As shown, year-to-date operating expenses totaled 13.48% of the annual budget, yet we completed 16.67% of the year. Staff continues to closely monitor fuel expenses, which have experienced significant swings in per-gallon prices over the past few months.

Fixed route ridership continues to remain strong with 52,612 passenger boardings through August 2012 in comparison to 40,029 in 2011, representing a year-over-year increase of 31.4%. It should be noted that the 2012 figure includes the ridership boost experienced on both the Beach Trolley and Summer Youth Ride Free programs.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Accept this as an information item.

#### SOUTH COUNTY AREA TRANSIT 2012-13 Budget vs. Actual (unaudited)

FY 12/13 Percent Year July 2012 August 2012 Year to Date Adopted to Date Use of Resources Administrative Expenditures Insurance \$ 49,895 \$ 4,523 \$ 4,523 \$ 9,045 18.13% 21,600 1,785 1,785 3,570 16.53% Rent Utilities 6,000 340 721 1,060 17.67% Radio Expense 2,300 0.00% ---Legal Services 500 \_ -0.00% \_ 3,750 13.31% Payroll Processing 124 376 499 Administration 63,500 5,292 5,292 10,583 16.67% Finance 14,000 1,167 1,167 2,333 16.67% 6,250 Office Expense/Miscellaneous 45 45 0.72% -3,000 0.00% Audit \_ -Marketing/Community Relations/Printing 15,730 44 44 0.28% Uniforms/Laundry/Physicals/Ads 5,500 197 443 640 11.64% **Operating Expenditures** Salaries/Benefits \$ 426,250 \$ 31,813 \$ 31,653 \$ 63,467 14.89% 164,385 Maintenance 4,935 5,821 10,756 6.54% Dispatch 18,500 1,542 1,542 3,083 16.67% Sign Maintenance 3,000 0.00% SCAT Bus Fuel 210,104 15,015 18,598 33,614 16.00% 15,000 0.00% Contingency --\$ 1,029,264 9 Total Operating Expenditures \$ 66,776 \$ 71,963 \$ 138,740 13.48% Capital Service Computer Upgrade \$ 1,000 0.00% \$ \_ \$ -\$ \_ Vehicles (Three Buses) 1,275,000 0.00% --\_ Driver Seats and Large Vehicle Repairs 0.00% 25,000 --\_ **Total Capital Service** \$ 1,301,000 \$ \$ 0.00% \$ \_ --Increase Capital Reserves \$ 21,380 \$ \$ -\$ \$ --\_ **Total Use of Resources** \$ 2,351,644 66,776 71,963 138,740 5.90% 10 \$ \$ \$

## JULY 01, 2012 - JULY 31, 2012

## PORTABLE DATA SYSTEM 1 - SOUTH COUNTY AREA TRANSIT AUTHORITY (SCAT)

#### **Revenue and Ridership By Route**

| Route | Current<br>Revenue | Unclassified<br>Revenue | Dump<br>Count | Preset | Token<br>Count | Ticket<br>Count | Pass<br>Count | Bill<br>Count | Ridership |
|-------|--------------------|-------------------------|---------------|--------|----------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------|-----------|
| 21    | 3,519.47           | 71.85                   | 73            | 0      | 0              | 0               | 3,142         | 1,881         | 9,188     |
| 22    | 1,537.43           | 18.06                   | 22            | 0      | 0              | 0               | 988           | 863           | 3,269     |
| 23    | 970.93             | 19.00                   | 24            | 0      | 0              | 0               | 1,626         | 487           | 4,441     |
| 24    | 2,749.51           | 51.82                   | 59            | 0      | 0              | 0               | 2,543         | 1,415         | 7,312     |
| TOTAL | 8,777.34           | 160.73                  | 178           | 0      | 0              | 0               | 8,299         | 4,646         | 24,210    |

#### JULY 01, 2012 - JULY 31, 2012

## PORTABLE DATA SYSTEM 1 - SOUTH COUNTY AREA TRANSIT AUTHORITY (SCAT)

**Revenue By Route** 





## JULY 01, 2012 - JULY 31, 2012

## PORTABLE DATA SYSTEM 1 - SOUTH COUNTY AREA TRANSIT AUTHORITY (SCAT)

# **Ridership By Route**



## AUGUST 01, 2012 - AUGUST 31, 2012

## PORTABLE DATA SYSTEM 1 - SOUTH COUNTY AREA TRANSIT AUTHORITY (SCAT)

#### **Revenue and Ridership By Route**

| Route | Current<br>Revenue | Unclassified<br>Revenue | Dump<br>Count | Preset | Token<br>Count | Ticket<br>Count | Pass<br>Count | Bill<br>Count | Ridership |
|-------|--------------------|-------------------------|---------------|--------|----------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------|-----------|
| 21    | 3,642.62           | 58.17                   | 55            | 0      | 0              | 0               | 3,284         | 1,916         | 8,182     |
| 22    | 1,819.68           | 29.40                   | 33            | 0      | 0              | 0               | 1,000         | 1,055         | 3,308     |
| 23    | 1,228.93           | 29.94                   | 32            | 0      | 0              | 0               | 1,751         | 610           | 4,494     |
| 24    | 2,919.48           | 46.97                   | 57            | 0      | 0              | 0               | 2,812         | 1,563         | 7,004     |
| 25    | 1.25               | 0.00                    | 0             | 0      | 0              | 0               | 0             | 0             | 558       |
| TOTAL | 9,611.96           | 164.48                  | 177           | 0      | 0              | 0               | 8,847         | 5,144         | 23,546    |

#### AUGUST 01, 2012 - AUGUST 31, 2012

## PORTABLE DATA SYSTEM 1 - SOUTH COUNTY AREA TRANSIT AUTHORITY (SCAT)







## AUGUST 01, 2012 - AUGUST 31, 2012

## PORTABLE DATA SYSTEM 1 - SOUTH COUNTY AREA TRANSIT AUTHORITY (SCAT)

# **Ridership By Route**





#### SOUTH COUNTY AREA TRANSIT OPERATING STATEMENT BY ROUTE - WEEKDAY YEAR TO DATE THRU AUGUST 2012

|                        | RT 21<br>PISMO &<br>SHELL<br>BEACH | RT 22<br>OCEANO &<br>GRAND<br>AVENUE | RT 23<br>A.G. VILLAGE,<br>A.G. H.S. &<br>GRANDE AVE | RT 24<br>GROVER B.<br>A.G. VILLAGE,<br>PISMO & A.G. | RT 25<br>ROUTE 23<br>PM TRIPPER | TOTAL<br>WEEKDAY<br>SERVICE |
|------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|
|                        |                                    |                                      |                                                     |                                                     |                                 |                             |
| REVENUES:              |                                    |                                      |                                                     |                                                     |                                 |                             |
| FARES                  | 6,423                              | 2,898                                | 2,093                                               | 5,397                                               | 1                               | 16,812                      |
| TOTAL ROUTE REVENUES   | 6,423                              | 2,898                                | 2,093                                               | 5,397                                               | 1                               | 16,812                      |
| EXPENDITURES:          |                                    |                                      |                                                     |                                                     |                                 |                             |
| ADMINISTRATION         | 3,189                              | 1,228                                | 1,657                                               | 3,182                                               | 94                              | 9,350                       |
| MARKETING              | 11                                 | 4                                    | 6                                                   | 11                                                  | 1                               | 33                          |
| OPERATIONS/CONTINGENCY | 19,517                             | 7,517                                | 10,144                                              | 19,472                                              | 576                             | 57,226                      |
| FUEL                   | 6,920                              | 3,567                                | 4,230                                               | 7,582                                               | 82                              | 22,381                      |
| INSURANCE              | 1,932                              | 996                                  | 1,181                                               | 2,117                                               | 20                              | 6,247                       |
| TOTAL EXPENDITURES     | 31,570                             | 13,314                               | 17,218                                              | 32,363                                              | 772                             | 95,237                      |
| FAREBOX RATIO          | 20.34%                             | 21.77%                               | 12.16%                                              | 16.67%                                              | 0.17%                           | 17.65%                      |
| RIDERSHIP              | 14,652                             | 5,319                                | 7,747                                               | 11,781                                              | 558                             | 40,057                      |
| SERVICE MILES          | 7,915.20                           | 4,081.00                             | 4,838.90                                            | 8,671.80                                            | 84.00                           | 25,590.90                   |
| SERVICE HOURS          | 579.85                             | 223.34                               | 301.36                                              | 578.50                                              | 17.04                           | 1,700.09                    |
| RIDERS PER MILE        | 1.85                               | 1.30                                 | 1.60                                                | 1.36                                                | 6.64                            | 1.57                        |
| RIDERS PER HOUR        | 25.27                              | 23.82                                | 25.71                                               | 20.36                                               | 32.75                           | 23.56                       |
| COST PER PASSENGER     | 2.15                               | 2.50                                 | 2.22                                                | 2.75                                                | 1.38                            | 2.38                        |
| SUBSIDY PER PASSENGER  | 1.72                               | 1.96                                 | 1.95                                                | 2.29                                                | 1.38                            | 1.96                        |

#### SOUTH COUNTY AREA TRANSIT OPERATING STATEMENT BY ROUTE - WEEKEND, TROLLEY, AND TOTAL YEAR TO DATE THRU AUGUST 2012

|                        | RT 21 - SAT<br>PISMO &<br>SHELL<br>BEACH | RT 21 - SUN<br>PISMO &<br>SHELL<br>BEACH | RT 22 - SAT<br>OCEANO &<br>GRAND<br>AVENUE | RT 22 - SUN<br>OCEANO &<br>GRAND<br>AVENUE | RT 23 - SAT<br>A.G. VILLAGE,<br>A.G. H.S. &<br>GRANDE AVE | RT 23 - SUN<br>A.G. VILLAGE,<br>A.G. H.S. &<br>GRANDE AVE | RT 24 - SAT<br>GROVER B.<br>A.G. VILLAGE,<br>PISMO & A.G. | RT 24 - SUN<br>GROVER B.<br>A.G. VILLAGE,<br>PISMO & A.G. | TOTAL<br>WEEKEND<br>SERVICE | AVILA<br>BEACH<br>TROLLEY | TOTAL<br>SCAT<br>SERVICE |
|------------------------|------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| REVENUES:              |                                          |                                          |                                            |                                            |                                                           |                                                           |                                                           |                                                           |                             |                           |                          |
| FARES                  | 759                                      | 770                                      | 410                                        | 401                                        | 188                                                       | 193                                                       | 816                                                       | 591                                                       | 4,127                       | 1,314                     | 22,253                   |
| TOTAL ROUTE REVENUES   | 759                                      | 770                                      | 410                                        | 401                                        | 188                                                       | 193                                                       | 816                                                       | 591                                                       | 4,127                       | 1,314                     | 22,253                   |
| EXPENDITURES:          |                                          |                                          |                                            |                                            |                                                           |                                                           |                                                           |                                                           |                             |                           |                          |
| ADMINISTRATION         | 525                                      | 541                                      | 202                                        | 186                                        | 273                                                       | 281                                                       | 524                                                       | 539                                                       | 3,070                       | 1,040                     | 13,461                   |
| MARKETING              | 2                                        | 2                                        | 1                                          | 1                                          | 1                                                         | 1                                                         | 2                                                         | 2                                                         | 10                          | -                         | 44                       |
| OPERATIONS/CONTINGENCY | 3,212                                    | 3,309                                    | 1,239                                      | 1,136                                      | 1,669                                                     | 1,720                                                     | 3,204                                                     | 3,300                                                     | 18,790                      | 6,561                     | 82,576                   |
| FUEL                   | 1,043                                    | 1,053                                    | 586                                        | 537                                        | 694                                                       | 707                                                       | 1,143                                                     | 1,154                                                     | 6,918                       | 4,316                     | 33,614                   |
| INSURANCE              | 292                                      | 299                                      | 164                                        | 150                                        | 195                                                       | 201                                                       | 320                                                       | 328                                                       | 1,949                       | 850                       | 9,045                    |
| TOTAL EXPENDITURES     | 5,074                                    | 5,204                                    | 2,191                                      | 2,010                                      | 2,832                                                     | 2,910                                                     | 5,192                                                     | 5,323                                                     | 30,737                      | 12,766                    | 138,740                  |
| FAREBOX RATIO          | 14.97%                                   | 14.80%                                   | 18.70%                                     | 19.95%                                     | 6.63%                                                     | 6.63%                                                     | 15.71%                                                    | 11.10%                                                    | 13.43%                      | 10.29%                    | 41.37%                   |
| RIDERSHIP              | 1,315                                    | 1,403                                    | 667                                        | 591                                        | 605                                                       | 583                                                       | 1,385                                                     | 1,150                                                     | 7,699                       | 4,859                     | 52,615                   |
| SERVICE MILES          | 1,196.80                                 | 1,224.00                                 | 672.00                                     | 616.00                                     | 796.80                                                    | 821.70                                                    | 1,311.20                                                  | 1,341.00                                                  | 7,979.50                    | 3,479.40                  | 37,049.80                |
| SERVICE HOURS          | 95.44                                    | 98.37                                    | 36.80                                      | 33.76                                      | 49.60                                                     | 51.12                                                     | 95.20                                                     | 98.10                                                     | 558.39                      | 189.18                    | 2,447.66                 |
| RIDERS PER MILE        | 1.10                                     | 1.15                                     | 0.99                                       | 0.96                                       | 0.76                                                      | 0.71                                                      | 1.06                                                      | 0.86                                                      | 0.96                        | 1.40                      | 1.42                     |
| RIDERS PER HOUR        | 13.78                                    | 14.26                                    | 18.13                                      | 17.51                                      | 12.20                                                     | 11.40                                                     | 14.55                                                     | 11.72                                                     | 13.79                       | 25.68                     | 21.50                    |
| COST PER PASSENGER     | 3.86                                     | 3.71                                     | 3.29                                       | 3.40                                       | 4.68                                                      | 4.99                                                      | 3.75                                                      | 4.63                                                      | 3.99                        | 2.63                      | 2.64                     |
| SUBSIDY PER PASSENGER  | 3.28                                     | 3.16                                     | 2.67                                       | 2.72                                       | 4.37                                                      | 4.66                                                      | 3.16                                                      | 4.11                                                      | 3.46                        | 2.36                      | 2.21                     |

## SOUTH COUNTY AREA TRANSIT October 17, 2012 STAFF REPORT

| AGENDA ITEM:  | A-2                                                                 |
|---------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|
| TOPIC:        | Analysis of Summer 2012 Beach Trolley & Youth Ride<br>Free programs |
| ACTION:       | Information                                                         |
| PRESENTED BY: | Geoff Straw                                                         |

## **BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION:**

This report will provide a summary of the successes and challenges of the two recentlyadjusted services operated by SCAT: the Beach Trolley, and SCAT's participation in the countywide summer Youth Ride Free program. Details of each program are provided below, followed by a review of performance measures based on evaluation criteria presented at the July 2012 SCAT Board meeting. In short, staff believes both the Beach Trolley and the Summer Youth Ride Free programs achieved favorable results and should be considered for reinstatement next summer.

#### Beach Trolley

Beginning in April 2012, the Beach Trolley service was adjusted to provide Thursday through Sunday service during the summer months only (Memorial Day through Labor Day); previously it was operated year-round on weekends as well as on Fridays during the summer months.

Based on the discussion at the July 2012 SCAT Board meeting, two performance criteria were selected for evaluating the success of the Beach Trolley by comparing 2011 and 2012 results:

- 1. Passenger boardings per vehicle hour of service.
- 2. Average boardings by day of week.

In addition, the Board suggested that we chronicle unusual circumstances that impact ridership (special event, inclement weather, etc.) so that refinements could be implemented for the following summer.

Ridership on the Beach Trolley from June 2011 through August 2011 totaled 4,704, while summer 2012 ridership totaled 7,334 – an increase of 2,630 (56%). Below are tabular and graphical representations of Beach Trolley ridership from July 2009 through the end of August 2012.

| Beach Trolley Ridership History |         |         |         |         |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|---------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Month                           | FY09-10 | FY10-11 | FY11-12 | FY12-13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| July                            | 1,104   | 1,163   | 2,013   | 2,579   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| August                          | 1,111   | 917     | 1,138   | 2,280   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| September                       | 652     | 645     | 985     |         |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| October                         | 487     | 263     | 572     |         |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| November                        | 492     | 357     | 314     |         |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| December                        | 272     | 168     | 242     |         |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| January                         | 500     | 495     | 320     |         |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| February                        | 339     | 484     | 425     |         |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| March                           | 477     | 254     | 283     |         |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| April                           | 466     | 1,115   | 670     |         |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| May                             | 778     | 1,204   | 1,062   |         |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| June                            | 661     | 1,553   | 2,475   |         |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total                           | 7,339   | 8,618   | 10,499  | 4,859   |  |  |  |  |  |  |



It is clear that ridership patterns are similar over the years, where summer ridership was higher than in the off-season months. It is also clear that June 2012 through August 2012 Beach Trolley ridership set monthly records. However, it should be noted that when the ~600 boardings that were experienced on Saturday June 16, 2012, are removed, the monthly ridership is in-line with that experienced in previous years (the Classic at Pismo Beach Car Show surely boosted ridership considerably). It should also be noted that the Beach Trolley was operated on July 4<sup>th</sup> (Wednesday) and boarded 84 passengers, so the July total ridership figure was slightly boosted – although that figure is lower than the overall average daily ridership (which is discussed below).

The results of a performance analysis are presented below. As depicted, the passenger boardings per vehicle hour of service (commonly referred to as "productivity") in

summer 2012 was 15.1. In comparison, the productivity in summer 2011 was 16.5. It should be noted that Trolley Beach ridership appears to be impacted by a large number of factors, including weather, hotel occupancy and special events in the area. Interestingly, average daily ridership in summer 2012 was highest on Fridays (178 boardings), followed by Saturdays (159). In summer 2011, the highest average daily ridership was experienced on Saturdays (166), followed by Sundays (97).

|                   | 2012<br>7,334<br>484.2<br>15.1<br>N/A    |
|-------------------|------------------------------------------|
| 704<br>5.7<br>5.5 | 7,334<br>484.2<br>15.1                   |
| 5.7<br>6.5        | 484.2<br>15.1                            |
| 5.5               | 15.1                                     |
|                   | -                                        |
| 80                | N/A                                      |
| 80                | N/A                                      |
|                   |                                          |
| /A                | N/A                                      |
| /A                | 84                                       |
| /A                | 79                                       |
| 4                 | 178                                      |
| 56                | 159                                      |
| 7                 | 128                                      |
|                   | /A / |

As discussed above, the Beach Trolley was operated on Wednesday July 4<sup>th</sup>, which is consistent with service plans on previous Independence Days. In 2012, 84 passengers boarded, representing 59% of the average boardings in July 2012. In comparison, the Monday July 4<sup>th</sup> ridership in 2011 represented 143% of the monthly average. However, staff believes the fact that 2011's Independence Day occurring on a 3-day weekend contributed to higher overall tourism activity, which contributed to this higher level of ridership. Assuming the SCAT Board agrees with staff that operating Thursday through Sunday during the summer months is a better alternative than only on weekends throughout the year, the decision on whether or not special Independence Day service should be operated would be a moot point – at least until Monday July 4, 2016.

## Summer Youth Ride Free

SCAT worked with Regional Rideshare and RTA to implement the summer 2012 Youth Ride Free program, which permitted all K-12 students to board without having to purchase a pass or pay a cash fare – the rider merely needed to provide proof (school identification card or other identification) that he or she is eligible for the program. The

2012 Youth Ride Free program was operated from June 1 through August 31. In previous summer periods, youth could purchase a deeply discounted Summer Break Pass that was valid between Memorial Day and Labor Day.

It should be noted that staff participated with Regional Rideshare to promote the Youth Ride Free program at Earth Day events (April 22<sup>nd</sup> at El Chorro Park), at Bike Month events in May, and at the 2012 Mid-State Fair. In addition, we sought feedback from riders using the on-bus poster attached to this report. In that poster, RTA and SCAT launched a text-specific phone number that targets younger riders in a novel way to solicit input. Despite these efforts to get feedback in a "youth friendly way," only five responses were received via text. Not surprisingly, all were favorable to continuing the program. Staff did not maintain precise records on costs in terms of time and materials needed to administer this year's program or for those of years past. Nonetheless, staff is confident that overall costs were reduced in administering the 2012 Youth Ride Free program in comparison to marketing and selling Summer Break Passes in previous years.

At its July 2012 meeting, the SCAT Board suggested that staff track the total net revenue lost on a per-passenger basis. In addition, the Board asked staff to track unusual circumstances that impacted normal transit operations. Per the table below, overall ridership increased from 59,283 in summer 2011 to 70,412 in summer 2012, a change of 118%. Youth ridership increased from 6,086 to 19,657 during the same period, a change of 323%. However, it should be noted that these figures are based solely on the number of "PROMO" key entries by drivers in 2012 vs. the number of Summer Break Pass boardings in 2011. However, the 2011 figure is certainly underrepresented somewhat, because some youth riders paid the cash fare in 2011 instead of purchasing a summer-long pass.

| SCAT Summer Youth Ride Free Results |              |                         |            |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|                                     | Jun-Aug 2011 | Jun-Aug 2012            | Difference |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Passenger Boardings                 |              |                         |            |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total                               | 59,283       | 70,412                  | 11,129     |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Youth                               | 6,086        | 19,657                  | 13,571     |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Passenger Revenue                   | \$27,979.46  | \$27,979.46 \$27,190.95 |            |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Net Imp                             | (\$0.07)     |                         |            |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Overall fare revenues decreased from \$27,979.46 in summer 2011 to \$27,190.95 in summer 2012. When the change in passenger revenue is divided by the change in overall passenger boardings, the net revenue lost per passenger is \$0.07. Another way to look at these results is to consider that SCAT spent less than \$800 to gain more than 11,000 riders. Staff believes that should be considered money well spent, based on both the relatively low cost of the program, as well as the anecdotal feedback received from most riders and some families that provided input to us.

In terms of challenges, it appears that SCAT faced the same ones encountered by other transit agencies throughout the county, mainly contending with overcrowding caused by group trips. This challenge became evident pretty early on in the campaign when YMCA and other youth groups sometimes overwhelmed the capacity of buses. RTA and SCAT contacted the group leaders and requested that they preplan the trips with our dispatchers in advance so that we could both ensure a large bus was available (when possible), and to split up the groups when needed. This communication seemed to alleviate some of the problems, but transit agencies throughout the county sometimes had to turn away passengers due to overcrowding. There were also instances where behavior of some youth (particularly the large groups) became loud and/or distracting to the driver or other passengers, so drivers sometimes had to remind the youth to be respectful. Drivers also sometimes had to deal with conflicts regarding the age of the rider and whether the rider should be eligible to ride for free - particularly those youth that are home-schooled and did not have a student identification card or otherwise did not have proof of their age. Staff urged drivers to err on the side of accepting the rider's assertion that he or she was under 18 years of age to avoid delays that would affect other riders.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Accept this as an information item.

# Summer Youth Ride Free Program Students, we need your help. Want to Ride Free again next summer? **TELL US!**

# What were your favorite places to go? Who did you go with and what did you do? Text us at: 305-9315

or email info@slorta.org







## SAN LUIS OBISPO REGIONAL TRANSIT AUTHORITY October 17, 2012 STAFF REPORT

AGENDA ITEM:

B-1

| TOPIC:        | Renegotiate lease for SCAT facility |
|---------------|-------------------------------------|
| PRESENTED BY: | Geoff Straw                         |

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Authorize the Executive Director to renegotiate and enter into a lease agreement amendment with the County of San Luis Obispo for the SCAT facility at 800 Rodeo Drive in Arroyo Grande.

**BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION:** In July 2011, SCAT moved its operations yard from Grover Beach to its current County-owned facility at 800 Rodeo Drive in Arroyo Grande. At that time, SCAT agreed to wash its vehicles off-site, which was included as part of the Arroyo Grande Conditional Use Permit 11-002, and was included in the lease with the County. However, upon further analysis, staff believes this limitation incurs significant additional operating costs (staff shuttling time, fuel, etc.) than would be incurred if sufficient measures are undertaken to suitably wash the vehicles on-site.

SCAT currently must employ a commercial vehicle licensed driver to shuttle the buses between the operations yard and at a coin-operated facility located approximately 2.5 miles from the operations yard. This remote location results in staff inefficiencies and wasted fuel / increased vehicle emissions. Staff worked with staff from the County to develop an operating plan that would suitably protect the environment through a number of means, including methods to conserve water, directing wastewater to an interceptor, using biodegradable soap, training staff to meet County Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan requirements, and monitoring the intercept device as part semi-annual reporting.

Staff worked closely with the County's Real Property Services Department officials to submit a proposal to the City of Arroyo Grande to amend the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) on September 28 and hopes to present this proposal to the Arroyo Grande Planning Commission in November. If the City of Arroyo Grande accepts our proposal to amend the CUP, SCAT would need to amend its lease with the County to permit washing of one bus per day.

## Staff Recommendation

Authorize the Executive Director to seek an amendment to the City of Arroyo Grande Conditional Use Permit 11-002 that would permit washing of one bus per day on-site, and to negotiate an amendment to the lease agreement with the County of San Luis Obispo reflecting this change.

#### SOUTH COUNTY AREA TRANSIT October 17, 2012 STAFF REPORT

| AGENDA ITEM:          | B-2                                                                |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|
| TOPIC:                | Title change of representative to the CaITIP<br>Board of Directors |
| ACTION:               | Approve Staff Recommendation                                       |
| PRESENTED BY:         | Geoff Straw                                                        |
| STAFF RECOMMENDATION: | Approve                                                            |

## BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION:

Physical Damage and Liability insurance for SCAT is provided by the California Transit Insurance Pool (CalTIP). Membership in the CalTIP consortium provides RTA with competitive and stable insurance rates, as well as focused training opportunities. Additionally, unlike commercial insurance carriers, membership in CalTIP provides retroactive rate adjustments depending on each entity's loss record and the loss history of CalTIP as a whole. SCAT has benefited greatly from this practice each year since joining the consortium.

CalTIP requires that members of its Board of Directors be current employees within their respective agency. Since SCAT contracts with RTA for management services, SCAT must appoint an individual to represent the agency for all deliberations regarding CalTIP Board of Directors business. Staff consulted with SCAT Counsel on both CalTIP's procedures and SCAT's abilities to appoint a representative, and Counsel is confident the JPA permits such an appointment through resolution. Specifically, Article II Section 4 of the SCAT JPA states:

"The Board may in its discretion, appoint an Administrator of the transit system, to serve at the pleasure of the Board, and to have the power to certify agency documents as required by law and to assume such duties and responsibilities as the Board may direct."

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends the SCAT Board resolve to appoint the RTA Executive Director as the SCAT Administrator for the sole purpose of serving as SCAT's representative on the CalTIP Board of Directors. Staff also recommends the SCAT Board resolve to appoint the SCAT Administrator as the Board Member to the CalTIP Board of Directors on behalf of the South County Area Transit, rescinding the previous resolution.

## RESOLUTION NO.

## A RESOLUTION OF THE GOVERNING BOARD OF THE SOUTH COUNTY AREA TRANSIT, A CALIFORNIA JOINT POWERS AGENCY, APPOINTING THE RTA EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR AS SCAT ADMINISTRATOR IN ORDER TO SERVE ON THE (CaITIP) BOARD OF DIRECTORS

WHEREAS, on October 19, 2011, the South County Area Transit Board of Directors amended its agreement with the California Transit Systems Joint Powers Insurance Authority (hereinafter CalTIP) for the purpose of jointly funding tort liabilities and other losses and providing risk management services to reduce such losses;

WHEREAS, CalTIP has provided South County Area Transit (SCAT) coverage for such liabilities including losses to vehicles at stable and overall cost-effective pricing;

WHEREAS, the joint powers agreement of CaITIP has retained its original form as drafted in 1987, and there have changes in laws and the operations of CaITIP since that time;

WHEREAS, the SCAT Board of Directors must appoint a duly authorized representative to serve on the CaITIP Board of Directors; and

WHEREAS, the SCAT Joint Powers Agreement expressly permits appointment of an Administrator of the transit system;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the SCAT Board of Directors herein appoints Geoff Straw, the RTA Executive Director, to serve as SCAT Administrator.

Upon motion of Director \_\_\_\_\_\_, seconded by Director \_\_\_\_\_\_, and on the following roll call, to wit:

AYES: NOES: ABSTAIN: ABSENT:

The foregoing resolution is hereby adopted this 17th day of October, 2012.

Jim Guthrie, Chairperson South County Area Transit

## ATTEST:

Geoff Straw, Executive Director San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority

## APPROVED AS BY FORM AND LEGAL EFFECT:

By: \_\_\_\_\_ Tim McNulty, Counsel San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority

Date:

## RESOLUTION NO.

## A RESOLUTION OF THE GOVERNING BOARD OF THE SOUTH COUNTY AREA TRANSIT RESCINDING RESOLUTION NO. 10-01 WITH IMMEDIATE EFFECT AND APPOINTING A DIRECTOR AND AN ALTERNATE TO THE CALIFORNIA TRANSIT SYSTEMS JOINT POWERS AUTHORITY (CALTIP) BOARD OF DIRECTORS

BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

- 1. Resolution No. 10-01 authorizing the execution of the Joint Powers Agreement of the California Transit Insurance Pool (CalTIP) and Appointing Director and Alternate is hereby rescinded.
- 2. The position of Administrator is hereby appointed as the Board Member to the CaITIP Board of Directors on behalf of the South County Area Transit.

Upon motion of Director \_\_\_\_\_\_, seconded by Director \_\_\_\_\_\_, and on the following roll call, to wit:

AYES: NOES: ABSTAIN: ABSENT:

The foregoing resolution is hereby adopted this 17th day of October, 2012.

Jim Guthrie, Chairperson South County Area Transit

## ATTEST:

Geoff Straw, Administrator South County Area Transit

## APPROVED AS BY FORM AND LEGAL EFFECT:

By: \_

Tim McNulty, Counsel South County Area Transit

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## SAN LUIS OBISPO REGIONAL TRANSIT AUTHORITY October 17, 2012 STAFF REPORT

AGENDA ITEM:

B-3

TOPIC:

Consider MOU for FTA Planning & Programming in AG-GB UZA

PRESENTED BY: Geoff Straw

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Adopt the Memorandum of Understanding with RTA and SLOCOG to cooperatively plan and program Federal Transit Administration funds apportioned to the Arroyo Grande-Grover Beach Urbanized Area.

**BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION:** As a result of the 2010 U.S. Census, the Arroyo Grande-Grover Beach area was designated as an Urbanized Area (UZA). The UZA boundary is depicted below in yellow, and it includes the populated areas in the Cities of Arroyo Grande, Grover Beach, Pismo Beach and unincorporated portions of San Luis Obispo County.

Public transportation operators that serve the UZA are eligible to apply for Federal receive Transit and Administration (FTA) funds through the San Luis Obispo Council of Governments (SLOCOG), which is the governor-designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for San Luis Obispo County and its three UZAs. SLOCOG is also the governordesignated recipient of FTA funds in the county.

As a result of the 2010 Census UZA designation, public transportation operators can apply as grantees for FTA Section 5307 for operating or



capital purposes and FTA Section 5339 funds for capital purposes. Section 5307 funds can be used to provide a maximum of 50% FTA contribution for eligible operating purposes (total operating costs minus fare revenues), and both Section 5307 and Section 5339 funds can be used to provide up to 80% for eligible capital purposes.

Based on estimates provided by the FTA, the UZA will be apportioned approximately \$1,154,000 of FTA Section 5307 funds and roughly \$86,000 of FTA Section 5339 funds in Federal Fiscal Year 2012-13 (October 1, 2012 through September 30, 2013). In all cases, FTA funds are provided on a reimbursement basis, so eligible public transportation operators must be capable of "fronting" funds for federally-funded projects until the grant is approved by FTA and the funds are available to the grantee. In order for these Federal Fiscal Year 2012-13 funds to be used as reimbursement of SCAT's July 1, 2012 through June 30, 2013, fiscal year expenses, a Program of Projects (POP) for the UZA must be adopted in time for applications to be submitted in February 2013. That means that the POP must be adopted by the SLOCOG Board at its December 5, 2012 meeting. Even with those deadlines, the FTA reimbursement likely will not be available until approximately September 2013.

On September 12, 2012, SLOCOG convened a meeting of officials from the Cities of Arroyo Grande, Grover Beach and Pismo Beach, as well as officials from San Luis Obispo County and RTA, in order to develop a draft POP. As was explained during that meeting, RTA typically plans and programs up 45% of eligible operating costs using FTA funds so that there is "wiggle room" in case actual farebox revenues are lower than budgeted and/or actual operating expenses are lower than budgeted. In the case of South County Area Transit, that equates to approximately \$400,000 in FTA funds that could be used for operations reimbursement. The group also recognized that a portion of the annual Section 5307 funding apportionment – approximately \$400,000 – includes Small Transit Intensive Cities (STIC) funding that are earned solely due to the high productivity of RTA Route 10 services within the UZA. The group agreed that STIC funds should be directly planned/programmed for RTA's needs, since RTA "earned" these funds. The group also agreed that two other SCAT capital projects should be planned and programmed, and all four projects are presented below:

| AGENCY | DESCRIPTION                                  |      | FTA       |     | MATCH     | TOTAL           | RATIO | RATIO | MATCH   |
|--------|----------------------------------------------|------|-----------|-----|-----------|-----------------|-------|-------|---------|
| SCAT   | FIXED ROUTE OPERATIONS*                      | \$   | 400,000   | \$  | 480,000   | \$<br>880,000   | 50/50 | 45/55 | TDA     |
| SCAT   | BUS STOP AMENITIES*                          | \$   | 14,400    | \$  | 3,600     | \$<br>18,000    | 80/20 | 80/20 | TDA     |
| SCAT   | ONE 35' BUS REPLACEMENT*                     | \$   | 340,000   | \$  | 85,000    | \$<br>425,000   | 80/20 | 80/20 | TDA     |
| RTA    | FTA SHARE ON 2 VEHICLES ORDERED WITH PROP 1B | \$   | 400,000   | \$  | 550,000   | \$<br>950,000   | 80/20 | 42/58 | PROP 1B |
|        |                                              | \$ · | 1,154,400 | \$´ | 1,118,600 | \$<br>2,273,000 |       |       |         |

The Fixed Route Operations funds can be used to reduce the use of Transportation Development Act (TDA) funds programmed by each city and the county for SCAT. Based on the table above, approximately \$311,400 will available to reduce the use of FY12-13 TDA funds for transit purposes (reimbursement of \$400,000 for operations, less \$3,600 local match for the Bus Stop Amenities project and less \$85,000 for the One 35' Bus Replacement project). By definition, those unused TDA funds can be used for streets and roads purposes within each jurisdiction – assuming no unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet exist. The SCAT FY12-13 budget assumed that each entity contributes TDA funds according to the table below. That table also presents the relative amount of TDA funds committed to SCAT in FY12-13, and the resulting reduction by entity.

| FY12-13 TDA Commitments for SCAT Services:               |           | % Total TDA |  |
|----------------------------------------------------------|-----------|-------------|--|
| Arroyo Grande                                            | \$258,237 | 38.1%       |  |
| Grover Beach                                             | \$196,559 | 29.0%       |  |
| Pismo Beach                                              | \$114,546 | 16.9%       |  |
| SLO County                                               | \$108,446 | 16.0%       |  |
| Subtotal TDA Commitment                                  | \$677,788 | 100%        |  |
| FY12-13 Reduction in use of TDA funds for SCAT Services: |           |             |  |
| Arroyo Grande                                            | \$118,643 |             |  |
| Grover Beach                                             | \$90,306  |             |  |
| Pismo Beach                                              | \$52,627  |             |  |
| SLO County                                               | \$49,824  |             |  |
| Total Reimbursement                                      | \$311,400 |             |  |

It should be noted that the total amount of Section 5307 and Section 5339 funds presented in this staff report represent estimates. It is anticipated that the final numbers will be provided by the end of October 2012. Nonetheless, the relative amount of TDA reimbursement to each entity should be provided based on the percentages in the table above.

The attached Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) is based closely on the MOU's used for planning and programming FTA funds in the San Luis Obispo UZA and the Paso Robles-Atascadero UZA. In all material respects, the MOUs for all three UZAs in the county would be uniform and consistent. This MOU was reviewed by Counsel, as well as the City Managers during the October 9 Executive Committee meeting. RTA staff agreed to present the MOU to each City Council in October and November.

#### Staff Recommendation

Support RTA staff presenting the MOU to each City Council in October and November, and direct staff to provide a summary of input received. Schedule a special SCAT Board meeting in November 2012 to consider adoption of the MOU.

#### MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

#### BETWEEN THE SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

#### AND THE REGIONAL TRANSIT AUTHORITY

#### AND THE SOUTH COUNTY AREA TRANSIT

#### "Regarding the Coordination of On Going Transit Planning and Programming Federal Transit Funds that Support the On Going and Future Deployment of Transit Services in the South County"

This Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) is entered into between the SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS (SLOCOG), the REGIONAL TRANSIT AUTHORITY (RTA) and SOUTH COUNTY AREA TRANSIT (SCAT). Both RTA and SCAT are hereinafter referred to as "Public Transportation Providers" as of this 17 day of October 2012. The purpose of this MOU is to:

- 1. Foster a cooperative and mutually beneficial working relationship between noted agencies for the provision of comprehensive, effective and coordinated transit planning on behalf of South County public mass transportation systems; and
- 2. Identify the transit planning responsibilities in coordination with the State of California for the purpose of programming Federal transit funds within the SLOCOG Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP).

#### WITNESSES THAT:

**WHEREAS**, the major populations of the Cities of Arroyo Grande, Grover Beach, Pismo Beach and less populated south county portions of San Luis Obispo County are newly designated as an urbanized area by the 2010 Census; and

**WHEREAS**, the Public Transportation Providers are eligible to apply for and receive Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5307 funding for capital, operating and planning assistance as well as FTA Section 5339 for capital-only purposes for the delivery of public mass transportation; and

**WHEREAS**, SLOCOG is a Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) and a Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for San Luis Obispo County; and

WHEREAS, the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (MAP-21) Act requires MPO'S to work cooperatively with public transit operators to develop Regional Transportation Plans (RTP's) and Transportation Improvement Programs (TIP's) for urbanized areas. These plans and programs are intended to further the national interest to encourage and promote the safe and efficient management, operation, and development of surface transportation systems. These systems should serve the mobility of people and freight, and foster economic growth and development within and through urbanized areas, while minimizing transportation-related fuel consumption and air pollution; and

**WHEREAS**, SLOCOG and Public Transportation Providers rely upon a cooperative relationship to foster comprehensive regional transit planning which feeds directly into State and national planning; and

**WHEREAS**, the need for continued open communication is amplified due to the recent designation as an urbanized planning area.

**NOW, THEREFORE**, in consideration of the mutual benefits of the parties hereto, and in consideration of the covenants and conditions herein contained, the parties agree as follows:

#### SECTION 1: <u>Responsibilities of SLOCOG and the Public Transportation Providers</u>

#### 1.1 Communication

A critical component of this relationship involves open and productive communication, which leads to setting project priorities and federal funding needs. SLOCOG is required to update the FTIP every even numbered year. The need to ensure responsive communication between the three parties is imperative in order to meet this federal programming mandate.

#### 1.2 Governance

The Public Transportation Providers, individually and jointly, will cooperate with SLOCOG in the development and implementation of a committee structure to assure the application for and use of FTA Sections 5307 and 5339 funding that is consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan and Regional and Federal Transportation Improvement Program.

#### SECTION 2: Transit Planning

#### 2.1 Overall Work Program

In accordance with state and federal requirements, SLOCOG annually prepares, adopts, and updates an Overall Work Program (OWP) describing regional planning activities. The OWP relates regionally significant planning activities of the State, transit operators, local governments, and SLOCOG in an integrated, comprehensive program document. Public Transportation Providers agree to annually prepare a list of regionally significant transit related planning studies for the future fiscal year to be completed by Public Transportation Providers and submitted to SLOCOG according to the following schedule:

- a) A brief description of said studies by December 1<sup>st</sup> of each year
- b) A detailed description of said studies by January 14<sup>th</sup> of the following year

#### 2.2 Short Range Transit Plans

In accordance with metropolitan planning regulations and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) guidance, the Public Transportation Providers are required to prepare a five (5) years short-range transit plan to support sound financial and operations decision-making in transit planning and programming. In the development of future SRTP's, the Public Transportation Providers will provide a draft list of projects for FTA funding. The list shall:

- a) Identify and describe the scope of the specific projects and services, which address on going and increased transit demands. These projects and services are to include provisions for meeting requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)
- b) Provide qualitatively and quantitative analysis showing how the project addresses transit needs
- c) Identify the amount and type of federal and non-federal funds required supporting the projects for each year represented in the plan. In addition, identify anticipated discretionary funding estimates for the FTIP

#### 2.3 Long Range Transit Plan

In accordance with metropolitan planning regulations and FTA guidance, SLOCOG in coordination with the Public Transportation Providers will develop the Long Range Transit Plan (LRTP). The LRTP will assess the transportation needs of the public and set forth improvements necessary to address those needs over a twenty (20) year period and updated every five (5) years consistent with Short Range Transit Plans.

#### 2.4 Planning Assistance

SLOCOG will provide input into the development of transit planning documents produced by Public Transportation Providers. An example of the type of transit planning document includes the Short Range Transit Plan. In addition, SLOCOG will work cooperatively and assist the Public Transportation Providers in their efforts to generate planning and forecasting information needed to establish and maintain the Short and Long Range Transit Plans. The type of assistance provided by SLOCOG includes, but is not limited to, the following:

- a) Obtain and analyze data from various sources to develop concrete demographic, growth and use assumptions for the purpose of transit forecasting and development (such as trip generation tables, census information, maps)
- b) Assist in securing funds to conduct transit demand studies and in-depth analysis (such as researching funding options and writing grants)
- c) Assist in obtaining state and federal funding of projects consistent with the SLOCOG Regional Transportation Plan (such as completing paper work, facilitating FTIP amendments)

#### 2.5 FTIP Programming Criteria

As part of the FTIP updating process, federally funded projects are programmed by SLOCOG on behalf of all transit providers receiving federal funds through the FTIP. For proposed transit projects, the criterion used for the programming of federal funds within the SLOCOG's FTIP is essential. SLOCOG and the Public Transportation Providers will employ the following selection criteria to establish priorities for transit funding:

- 1) Project purpose and need
- 2) Anticipated benefits
- 3) Degree to which a project will improve transit availability
- 4) Degree to which a project will improve level of service performance standards
- 5) Air quality benefits
- 6) Overall cost effectiveness
- 7) Leveraging other funding sources

#### 2.6 Regional Planning

SLOCOG will provide a forum that will foster partnerships wherein the development of public transit services throughout southern San Luis Obispo County will be accomplished. As part of the coordinated regional transportation system, SLOCOG will expand the continuing, cooperative, and consistent planning of the transportation systems operated by the Public Transportation Providers and such relationship with the regional and interregional transit network.

SLOCOG will be responsible for the development of regional planning documents such as the Regional Transportation Plan, the Long Range Transit Plan, and the analysis and determination of Unmet Transit Needs for the region. The Public Transportation Providers will have the opportunity to provide technical advice during the development of these regional planning documents through the SLOCOG committee structure. As a part of the regional planning process, the Public Transportation Providers will assist SLOCOG with efforts to achieve regional goals including the requirement to assist in the attainment of state and federal air quality **s**tandards.

#### 2.7 Application for Transit Funding

The Regional Transit Authority as the designated grantee for FTA monies shall prepare and submit an application to the FTA for Federal transit funding. With the assistance of SLOCOG, the designated recipient for such Federal funds, the designated grantee will submit draft grant applications to SLOCOG prior to submittal to FTA. SLOCOG will review the accuracy of the application, consistency of projects with FTIP programming, and prepare a letter of concurrence if the information is accurate. The grant applications for Federal funding shall be consistent with SLOCOG Regional Transportation Plan as required by federal guidelines. RTA shall work with SLOCOG to develop consistent funding requests from all potential transit funding sources in order to prevent funding delays.

#### 2.8 Program of Projects

By October 30<sup>th</sup> of each year, the Public Transportation Providers in coordination with the South County Transit Technical Committee shall prepare and adopt a "Program of Projects" (POP) consistent with the requirements of Title 49 U.S.C Section 5307 (c) (1) thru (7).

#### 2.9 Incorporation or Rejection in the FTIP

SLOCOG will include all POP projects nominated from the annual urbanized area allocation in its entirety in the FTIP unless SLOCOG finds that a) the POP is inconsistent with the planning and programming process in this agreement b) there are insufficient funds to implement the POP based on the federal allocation c) the POP is inconsistent with the RTP and/or adopted local transit plans.

If SLOCOG proposes to reject the POP, it will provide notice to the Public Transportation Providers not later than 10 days after it receives the proposed POP from the South County Transit Technical Committee. SLOCOG's Executive Director may provide notice by letter; the notice does not require formal Board action. The SLOCOG Board will act on the proposed rejection of a POP in a public hearing no later than November 15<sup>th</sup>. Whenever SLOCOG rejects the POP, the South County Transit Policy Committee shall convene, and the Public Transportation Providers shall resubmit the POP. Unless the new POP is rejected in the same manner, it will be incorporated into the FTIP as an FTIP amendment. This amendment will not require a separate 30-day public notice if the new POP is limited to projects considered in the FTIP public hearing on the proposed POP rejection.

#### 2.10 Committees

The following committees are established through this agreement as illustrated in Exhibit A

a) The South County Transit Technical Committee made of five (5) voting staff members: One (1) from the City of Grover Beach; One (1) from the City of Arroyo Grande; One (1) from the City of Pismo Beach; One from the County of San Luis Obispo; One (1) from the Regional Transit Authority. Three non voting staff members shall include one (1) representative from SLOCOG, one (1) representative from the Air Pollution Control District and one (1) representative from Caltrans District 5 as ex-officio members.

b) The South County Transit Policy Sub Committee made of five (5) voting members: One elected representative on the SLOCOG Board from each of the three (3) Cities in the South County Area Transit service area and two (2) elected representatives from the San Luis Obispo Council of Governments Board representing the County of San Luis Obispo in the South County area (Districts 3&4). The Sub Committee need only meet if there is a vote on the POP that is not unanimous. The Sub Committee may also be convened if requested by signatories in this agreement for other planning and coordination issues.

#### 2.11 Disputes

If a dispute regarding the allocation of funds arises between SLOCOG and the Public Transportation Operators, the agencies shall negotiate in good faith to resolve the dispute. If such negotiation does not result in resolving the differences, the issue shall be forwarded to the South County Transit Policy Sub Committee for review and recommendation. The recommendation of this Sub Committee shall be forwarded to SLOCOG for review and potential revision of the urban area POP. SLOCOG shall consider the recommendations of the committee and make a final determination of the POP. Its decision shall be final.

#### SECTION 3: FTIP Project Monitoring and Maintenance

#### 3.1 Progress Reporting

The SLOCOG shall be responsible for tracking the overall progress of all projects in the FTIP. SLOCOG will prepare a mid-year report for the SLOCOG Board of Directors to review that identifies those transit projects that have been programmed, and their status of completion (e.g., on schedule, behind schedule, or completed). In addition, per federal guidelines, SLOCOG is required to produce an annual list of projects for which federal funds have been obligated in the preceding year and will ensure that it is made available for public review.

The Public Transportation Providers will assist SLOCOG's effort to track the overall progress of FTIP projects by submitting quarterly reports that address the status of each project receiving federal funds. At a minimum, the quarterly report will include:

- a) Identify and correlate the documentation of projects to individual categories as identified in the FTIP (e.g., Operations, Capital Purchase, Facility Maintenance, Planning).
- b) Document the stage of project implementation.
- c) If project is behind schedule, give the reasons for the delay.
- d) Status of amount of federal funding obligated, received and used to support projects.
- e) Identify the need for FTIP amendment.

In addition to providing the above supporting documents, the Public Transportation Providers will forward to SLOCOG a final copy of all planning documents produced as a result of receiving Federal funding. This will assist SLOCOG in overall transit planning as well as ensure that FTA Section 5307 funds were used accordingly for planning purposes as per FTA's requirements.

#### 3.2 FTIP Amendments

SLOCOG's Executive Director will exercise the authority delegated by the SLOCOG Board to process minor administrative amendments, involving , for instance, changes in the project scope, shifting of funds between project phases within the triennial element of the FTIP.

As part of the quarterly progress report, or sooner if required, the Public Transportation Providers will alert SLOCOG of the need for amending the FTIP. In general reasons for FTIP amendments include, for example, funding shortfalls, delays in project implementation and/or new projects that need to be amended into the document.

#### SECTION 4: MOU Amendment

This MOU may be amended by the written consent of all parties.

#### SECTION 5: MOU Termination

Either party upon thirty (30) days of written notification to the other may terminate this MOU.

#### SECTION 6: <u>Authorization of MOU</u>

By signature, we agree that the responsibilities outlined in this MOU foster healthy collaboration for the purpose of fostering transit planning and programming federal funds within the SLOCOG Federal Transportation Improvement Program.

Fred Strong, President

San Luis Obispo Council of Governments & San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority Date: \_\_\_\_\_

#### Jim Guthrie, Board Chairman

South County Area Transit

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

APPROVE AS TO FORM AND LEGAL EFFECT:

Tim McNulty, Legal Counsel

San Luis Obispo Council of Governments South County Area Transit San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority Date: \_\_\_\_\_



# SOUTH COUNTY AREA TRANSIT MINUTES OF JULY 18, 2012 BOARD MEETING ARROYO GRANDE CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

#### C-1

| Directors Present: | Jim Guthrie, Chairperson | City Council Member, Arroyo Grande                  |
|--------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|
|                    | Shelly Higginbotham      | Mayor, Pismo Beach                                  |
|                    | John Shoals              | Mayor, Grover Beach                                 |
| Directors Absent:  | Paul Teixeira            | County Supervisor, District 4                       |
| Staff Present:     | Bob Perrault             | City Manager, Grover Beach                          |
|                    | Dwayne Chisam            | Acting City Manager, Pismo Beach                    |
|                    | Geoff Straw              | Executive Director                                  |
|                    | Tania Arnold             | Chief Financial Officer, Director of Administration |
|                    | Coleen Kubel             | SCAT Lead Operations Supervisor                     |
|                    | Terry Berkeley           | SCAT Operations Supervisor                          |
|                    | Phil Moores              | RTA Operations Manager                              |
|                    |                          |                                                     |

**<u>CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL</u>**: Chairperson Jim Guthrie called the meeting to order at 3:32 p.m. Roll call was taken; a quorum was present.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** Ms. Phyllis Molnar, City Council Member, Grover Beach, commented regarding a large group of youth waiting for the SCAT Route 21 along West Branch Street across from the library in Arroyo Grande shortly before the SCAT Board meeting began. The area is rocky and unsafe for large groups of youth and it should be paved or alternative locations should be selected for safer travel for groups using the stop. Ms. Molnar also commented about the Grover Beach City Council Meeting on July 16, 2012 and raised concerns about the oil deposits at the Ramona Transit Center where the vehicles are parking and requested that the area be cleaned. Ms. Coleen Kubel noted that if they are provided advance notice, the SCAT bus will pull up into the library parking lot to avoid having groups stand in the rocky area on the other side of West Branch Street. Advance notice was not provided today.

#### **BOARD ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS:**

#### **INFORMATION AGENDA:**

<u>A-1 Executive Directors Report:</u> Mr. Geoff Straw updated the Board on the status of the Halcyon Park and Ride improvement project, completed in June. Staff is working with Caltrans and City staff to make sure it is safe. Vehicle counts are being conducted by Pismo Outlets staff to determine what impact the reopening of the Halcyon Park and Ride has on usage at the Pismo Premium Outlet Park and Ride. Alternatives are still be evaluated with staff and County officials for washing SCAT vehicles. Mr. Straw also mentioned staff is still looking to improve the Pismo Premium Outlet transfer facility to try and find solutions for the vehicles blocking access from the Outlets onto Five Cities Drive. Staff has worked with the City of Arroyo Grande and the Traffic Commission to move the Arroyo Grande City Hall stop to the east and move the two parking spots west, putting

them in front of the bus stop instead of behind the stop, allowing the bus to use the driveway space for easier access.

A new courtesy stop program has been implemented at RTA, **Mr. Straw** stated, and staff may bring it to SCAT as well. If someone is in need they can be dropped off at an area that is not a bus stop for passenger safety, giving the driver the discretion to make the stop or not.

The "Gas Grouch" marketing campaign has been launched and **Mr. Straw** stated that staff is really looking for feedback. The campaign was a lot of work to develop the program and willing to look at it again if it is something that the community supports.

**Mr. Straw** discussed the preliminary Federal funding levels for the newly designated Arroyo Grande – Grover Beach urbanized area. The projected funding levels are higher than expected at \$880,000 in the first year and \$890,000 in the second year. One of the interesting things that will be a challenge to both RTA and SCAT is the former FTA Section 5309 program for capital needs will now be formula based instead of earmarked or allocated on a competitive/needs process, and will need to be reviewed as part of the long range capital plans. Staff is developing ideas on ways to increase the farebox recovery ratio and will be bringing them back to the SCAT Board for review.

In reviewing the SCAT 1978 Joint Powers Agreement, **Mr. Straw** discovered there is a provision for naming an Administrator. Staff will bring back to the next SCAT meeting a resolution naming Mr. Straw as the Administrator for the purposes of representing SCAT on the CalTIP Board.

In other great news, **Mr. Straw** announced that the contract for three SCAT buses was awarded to Gillig and the buses should arrive in late June or the first part of July 2013. Passengers will likely see them in service beginning in August. As pictures of the buses being built become available, staff will share those with the Board.

Included in the packet are May 2012 financials and **Mr. Straw** discussed that expenditures have come in at 83.5%, which is less than what was budgeted (91.67% of the year elapsed). Staff continues to monitor cost overruns closely but continue to anticipate coming in under budget for the year. Fixed route ridership is incredibly strong, almost 22% higher than last year, leading to a slightly higher than anticipated farebox recovery ratio. **Mr. Straw** complimented staff on handling the extra ridership.

Mr. Straw concluded his Director's report.

**Director Shelly Higginbotham** inquired as to why staff is proposing adding courtesy stops and if it has to be on route but just not a designated stop. **Mr. Straw** discussed how it is done at various transit agencies across the country to provide a higher level of service for riders. It is similar to a guaranteed ride program and it gives control to the driver; the driver can make decisions based on their knowledge of the area being requested and any potential safety hazards. The fall back is always to deny the request. **Mr. Straw** also discussed how it could be viewed as an issue of equity when one driver might allow it and another says no. **Mr. Straw** confirmed that any courtesy stops would be on the established route but not at a designated bus stop.

**Director John Shoals** asked about the development of criteria used to evaluate when a courtesy stop will be allowed. **Mr. Straw** mentioned a few of the criteria such as that the courtesy stop will not impede traffic, it is safe, and does not delay the schedule.

**Director Shoals** expressed his concern for the farebox ratio requirement and would like to see a direct marketing effort to major employers, smaller employers, and potential residences. **Mr. Straw** confirmed that the marketing efforts will have to be boosted and focused. There is no one thing that will help SCAT reach the required farebox recovery ratio. One item that staff has discussed is RTA Route 10 that goes through the area and can share some of the farebox recovery ratio that it has. Staff will be evaluating options, including using a third party marketing firm for direct marketing and will bring those options back to the Board for a focused effort.

**Director Shoals** asked for additional clarification on the impact resulting from the loss of funding from the 5309 program. **Mr. Straw** discussed that it is now based on population and population density, and approximately \$110,000 will be allocated annually to the Arroyo Grande – Grover Beach UZA.

**Chairperson Guthrie** asked if money could be used for capital set-asides. Additional clarification is needed regarding how operating costs factor into the 20% farebox ratio requirement or if capital costs factor in as well. Information on where the increase in ridership is coming from would be helpful in making decision moving forward. **Mr. Straw** confirmed that it is just operating costs that are used in calculating the farebox recovery ratio. Staff will work to provided information on where the increased ridership is coming from and provide that to the Board prior to the next Board meeting.

<u>A-2 Report on YTD FY 11-12 SCAT Wage Analysis:</u> Mr. Straw commented that this is something that was discussed at the last Board meeting. City staff requested additional information and it was provided to them before the end of the fiscal year. The information was broken out into three main areas: the total number of paid hours, the mistake made by RTA staff regarding the implementation of the wage increase, and moving to the new facility increasing the deadhead costs. No changes to the budget are needed this year and it has been accounted for in the FY13 budget that was adopted at the last meeting. Staff is monitoring this on a more continual basis and if something does come up it will be given to the City staff earlier, rather than at the end of the year.

**Director Higginbotham** wanted to know if it is an issue not having a full time supervisor other than Coleen to service the South County region. **Mr. Straw** will continue to monitor staffing levels and if the need is there, staff will bring recommendations for additional full time positions to the Board.

<u>A-3 Reporting Criteria for Summer Youth and Avila Trolley:</u> Mr. Straw discussed what evaluation criteria can be used to judge the success of the programs. The Avila Trolley has been operated for many years and ridership graphs have been provided in the agenda packet. Mr. Straw noted there is a pattern. In June 2012, the spike is related to using a trolley to provide extra service during the Classic at Pismo Beach Car Show, incorporating it into regular service and saving some money. A few ideas on what to look at include passenger boarding per vehicle service hour and set a target of what that service should hit. Another indicator that would be good to look at is the average passenger boardings by day of the week, especially with the service change to see if the addition of Thursday service is working out. Other circumstances such as events, crashes, or other items that limit the service will also be included in the evaluation.

**Mr. Straw** mentioned the lack of formal strategic planning for the Avila Trolley to say what is successful and what is not as far as ridership per hour. Staff can work with City staff on creating those criteria.

**Chairperson Guthrie** mentioned that the Avila Trolley is more of a loop rather than a destination to destination. Would like to see how the trolley is really being used. Is it used to get from Avila back to Avila, or Avila to the Outlets, or are they getting off and on along Price Street.

**Director Shoals** commented that it is critical to track the circumstances that impact ridership. **Mr. Straw** advised that staff will be working City staff and bring that back

**Mr. Bob Perrault** suggested altering the service a bit more during the Pismo Beach car show. In Grover Beach at the end of Grand Avenue traffic was significantly impacted with people parking at that end and may have been made easier if that was included as a trolley stop. **Ms. Coleen Kubel** spoke about the service that was provided using the trolley and not having a safe location to turn the trolley around and the time limitations. **Mr. Straw** asked about the planning for the event and that staff would be happy to participate as options are evaluated. **Director Higginbotham** would appreciate if staff would assist in the planning for getting visitors to and from the Car Show. **Ms. Kubel** confirmed that the trolley did run the regular route down with the exception of two stops on Price Street. The regular SCAT routes had to be re-aligned inorder to minimize the impact on the rest of the ridership except in Pismo Beach. The extra trolley is added to serve Mattie Road and Shelly Beach Road since the service can't go through the streets in Pismo due to closed roads and traffic congestion. Then the Avila trolley is operated as normal except the two last stops before the Outlets.

Mr. Straw spoke about the Youth Ride Free Program that is taking place this summer. In the past, the program offered deeply discounted passes, but for summer 2012 no pre-purchased pass is necessary. The ridership was high last year, but with the Youth Ride Free program it has gone up 234%. It has gone up significantly but parameters for judging its success need to be set as well. The number of youth riders this year may also be overrepresented in comparison to past years; there may have been youth that rode in the past that did not have a discounted summer pass and paid the cash fare, which would not be available for comparison purposes. The real question is what does that do to the rest of the service. Does it impact in terms of overcrowding? Are nonyouth riders being turned away because the buses are full of youth groups? Staff is working with the youth programs to stagger when they go and to not put large groups on all at once. Mr. Straw will be looking at the subsidy per passenger trip and what the net cost in comparison to last year's total program cost. Items such as what Regional Rideshare has spent as well as what the agencies spent on marketing and determining what the per passenger net impact is. Again, unusual circumstances will be evaluated, such as graffiti or other damage to buses/equipment. Mr. Phil Moores added that staff is photographing graffiti to provide documentation to local law enforcement agencies to add to the files for investigation purposes. Ms. Kubel spoke about cases in which vandals have been caught and they have been arrested. Mr. Straw mentioned that the new vehicles will have camera systems to monitor misbehavior as well.

**Chairperson Guthrie** asked how to measure what kind of residual is achieved with the Youth Ride Free Program. How many would buy a discounted pass during the school year? How many continue to ride? Trying to promote that the bus is a good thing and provides independence. Would it be possible to pull out a focus group to find out what they think? Find out how the program can be made better next year but also how to help them continue to ride all year.

**Director Shoals** would advise staff to use focus groups to determine where they are going and work with them on changing habits, using the bus for commute purposes and not just recreation. **Chairperson Guthrie** also suggested capturing that same group later in the school year and see what their ridership trends are.

**Ms. Kubel** stated that the school bus system provides school to home transportation for the younger students, but once they reach high school they don't. That attracts a lot of students onto the South County Area Transit system. **Mr. Straw** stated that significant changes may happen to school bus funding in the coming year, which will greatly impact the ridership on the public transit systems in the area.

#### B. ACTION AGENDA: B-1 None

**<u>C. CONSENT AGENDA</u>**: Consent agenda items were approved upon a motion by **Director Higginbotham** and seconded by **Chairperson Guthrie**. The motion carried on a roll call vote with Director Shoal abstaining and Vice Chairperson Paul Teixeira absent.

**D. DIRECTORS' COMMENTS:** Director Shoals discussed the maintenance program for bus stops such as at Ramona and the Outlets and find out if the City of San Luis Obispo has a program that could be adopted. Director Shoals also requested a review of bus stop shelters to ensure that passenger amenities, including shelters, are properly located and if additions are needed, to seek funding from the urbanized funding coming to the region.

**Director Higginbotham** wanted to say thank you to a Route 21 driver on Monday at 12:30 p.m. on Price Street that was so nice. She was trying to back out of a parking spot and was not being let out until a South County Area Transit driver let her out. She is very grateful.

**E. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBERS' COMMENTS: Mr. Perrault** updated the Board and staff regarding action taken by the Grover Beach City Council to eliminate smoking in the Ramona Park area, which will include the South County Area Transit passenger facility. Second reading will occur on August 6<sup>th</sup> and it will take effect 30 days after that. Signage should be going up by the effective date.

**Mr. Chisam** advised that the on-going cleaning of bus stalls and bus stops will be required to meet new storm water regulations. Also, in the long term, grease and oil interceptors may be needed to protect water resources.

**F. ADJOURNMENT:** The meeting was adjourned at 4:15 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Tania Arnold, Chief Financial Officer, Director of Administration