



**Transportation Commission Meeting  
Council Chambers  
311 Vernon Street  
May 19, 2015 – 7:00 p.m.  
Agenda**

---

**1. Call to Order**

**2. Welcome – Roll Call**

- Tracy Mendonsa, *Chair*
- David Nelson, *Vice-Chair*
- Rita Brohman
- Joe Horton
- Chinnaian Jawahar
- Ryan Schrader
- Jeff Short
- Ethan Silver, *Youth Commissioner*

**3. Pledge of Allegiance**

**4. Meeting Minutes**

- a. March 17, 2015

**5. Oral Communication (Time Limitation Five (5) Minutes)** *Anyone wishing to address the Commission on matters not on the Agenda please stand, come to the podium and state NAME and ADDRESS for the record.*

**6. Consent Calendar**

None

**7. Special Presentations/Reports**

- a. Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Goal for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2015-2017
- b. Transit Performance Report for 3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Fiscal Year 2015

**8. Staff and/or Commission Reports/Comments**

- a. Alternative Transportation Division Update

**9. Pending Agenda**

None

**10. Adjournment**

*Note: If you plan to use audio/visual materials during your presentation, they must be submitted to the City of Roseville 72 hours in advance. All public meetings are broadcast live on Comcast Channel 14 or Surewest Channel 73 and replayed the following morning beginning at 9:00 a.m. Meetings are also replayed on weekends.*



# Transportation Commission Meeting

## March 17, 2015 – 7:00 p.m.

### Draft Minutes

---

#### 1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Commissioner Mendonsa.

#### 2. Roll Call

##### Commissioners Present

Tracy Mendonsa, *Chair*  
David Nelson, *Vice-Chair*  
Rita Brohman  
Joseph Horton  
Chinnaian Jawahar  
Jeff Short  
Ethan Silver, *Youth Commissioner*

##### Staff Present

Eileen Bruggeman, Alternative Transportation Analyst  
Mike Dour, Alternative Transportation Analyst  
Scott Gandler, Senior Civil Engineer  
Lupe Nelson, Recording Secretary

##### Commissioners Absent

Ryan Schrader, *Absent Excused*

#### 3. Pledge of Allegiance

Commissioner Mendonsa led those in attendance in the Pledge of Allegiance.

#### 4. Meeting Minutes

##### a. November 18, 2014 – Action Required

##### MOTION:

Commissioner Horton made the motion, which was seconded by Commissioner Nelson, to approve the meeting minutes of November 18, 2014.

Commissioner Nelson requested an update on ribbon cutting ceremony for the Oak Street roundabout.

Ayes: Horton, Jawhar, Mendonsa, Nelson,  
Noes: None  
Abstain: Brohman, Short, Silver  
Absent: Schrader

##### b. February 17, 2015 – Action Required

##### MOTION:

Commissioner Jawahar made the motion, which was seconded by Commissioner Horton, to approve the meeting minutes of February 17, 2015.

Ayes: Horton, Jawhar, Mendonsa, Nelson, Short, Silver  
Noes: None  
Abstain: Brohman  
Absent: Schrader

## 5. Oral Communications

Commissioner Mendonsa opened the Public Comment period.

Mr. Aaron Silver addressed the Commission with safety concerns on the widening of westbound Blue Oaks Boulevard and Foothills Boulevard.

Mr. Mike Barnbaum, addressed the Commission on transit and legislative happenings.

Commissioner Mendonsa closed the Public Comment period.

## 6. Consent Calendar

None

## 7. Special Presentation/Reports

### a. Transportation System Capital Improvement Program and Traffic Mitigation Fee Update – *Action Required*

Scott Gandler gave a PowerPoint presentation on the Transportation System Capital Improvement Program and Traffic Mitigation Fee Update.

Commissioner Mendonsa opened the public comment period.

Mr. Barnbaum asked if fees collected could be used for bus purchases, to replace older buses or any transit needs.

Mr. Silver asked if collected fees go into one fund or are the funds distributed by a percentage to different areas.

Commissioner Mendonsa closed the public comment period

Discussion between staff and Commissioners ensued.

### **MOTION**

Commissioner Horton made the motion, seconded by Commissioner Brohman, to accept and forward public comments received at the Transportation Commission meeting, including the BIA's comments to the City Council and recommend the approval of the Roseville Transportation System Capital Improvement Program Update and Traffic Mitigation Fees update

Ayes: Brohman, Horton, Jawahar, Mendonsa, Short, Silver

Noes: Nelson

Abstain: None

Absent: Schrader

## 8. Staff and/or Commission Reports/Comments

### a. Alternative Transportation Division Update

1. Celebrate the Earth Festival
2. Free Smart Cycling & Basic Bicycle Maintenance Clinics
3. May is Bike Month
4. Bike with the Mayor
5. May is Bike Month Energizer Station
6. Legislative Update

Mike Dour made the presentation.

A question and answer session between staff and the Commission ensued.

Commissioner Nelson requested that an update on the I-80/Highway 65 project be presented by Placer County Transportation Planning Agency in the near future.

Commissioner Mendonsa requested that a representative from the City Attorney's department be present at Transportation Commission meetings.

Staff provided this report as informational only. No action required.

## **9. Pending Agenda**

None

## **10. Adjournment**

### ***MOTION***

Commissioner Jawahar made the motion, which was seconded by Commissioner Horton, to adjourn the meeting.

Ayes: Brohman, Horton, Jawahar, Mendonsa, Nelson, Short, Silver

Noes: None

Abstain: None

Absent: Schrader

The meeting was adjourned at 8:19 p.m.

---

Tracy Mendonsa, Chair

---

Lupe Nelson, Recording Secretary



# Transportation Commission Meeting

## May 19, 2015 – 7:00 p.m.

### Special Presentations/Reports

---

#### **Item 7a. Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Goal for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2015-2017**

**Staff:** Eileen Bruggeman, Alternative Transportation Analyst

#### **Recommendation**

Staff recommends that the Transportation Commission:

- Open the public hearing and accept public comments; and
- Recommend the City Council approve the proposed Overall Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) Goal of 6.7% for U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Transit Administration (FTA) assisted projects during the period of Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2015 through 2017, as outlined in this report.

Adoption of an Overall DBE Goal is a requirement of any project, program or service receiving federal financial assistance.

#### **Background**

Recipients of Department of Transportation (DOT) Federal Transit Administration (FTA) financial assistance for contracts are required to develop and submit an Overall Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) Goal for those contracts. The DOT regulations related to DBE are intended to ensure that certified small firms, owned and controlled by a socially and economically disadvantaged individuals are afforded the opportunity to compete fairly for DOT-assisted contracts, improve the flexibility and efficiency of the DBE program, and reduce burdens on small business.

The current Overall DBE Goal for Federal Fiscal Years 2012 through 2014 of 4.47% expired September 30, 2014. In accordance with DBE regulations, the City of Roseville has established an Overall DBE Goal of 6.7% for Federal Fiscal Years (FFY) 2015 – 2017 (covering the period of October 1, 2014 through September 30, 2017), to ensure full compliance with relevant regulatory requirements.

As proposed, the only project included in the calculation of the Overall DBE Goal for this time period is the Louis Orlando Transfer Point (LOTP) Project. The Library Bridge Replacement project will receive federal financial assistance; a portion of the funding will be administered by FTA, however, the majority of the federal funds will be administered through the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), making the project subject to the DBE requirements of the State Master Agreement. Thus, it will have its own project level DBE Goal developed at a later time. If in the future additional projects, programs or services are awarded FTA financial assistance, the Overall DBE Goal of 6.7% will be updated to incorporate those additional contracts and the FTA notified of the subsequent new Overall DBE Goal for FTA assisted projects.

## **Discussion**

The proposed Overall DBE Goal of 6.7% was developed in conformance with the federally prescribed two-step methodology process. Step 1 of the process established a Base Figure of the relative availability of DBEs to all comparable firms (DBE and Non-DBE) available to bid or propose on the LOTP project. The Base Figure was established by assessing the California Unified Certification Program (CUCP) DBE Database of Certified Firms and the 2012 U.S. Census Bureau County Business Patterns Database within the City's market area (defined as Placer and Sacramento Counties) for each of the categories of work defined for the LOTP project.

Review of contracts anticipated to be awarded during FFY2015-2017 and receive FTA assistance identified the Louis Orlando Transfer Point (LOTP) project as the only project which has viable subcontracting possibilities and corresponding availability of DBEs, a required criterion for Overall DBE Goal consideration. The LOTP project is anticipated to include eight (8) work categories; the resultant Base Figure is 6.7%.

The second step of the methodology assessed other information to determine what additional adjustments, if any, were needed to narrowly tailor the Base Figure to the City of Roseville's market area. Factors considered in the adjustment of the Base Figure include the historical and current capacity of DBEs measured by actual attainments on similar projects. No further adjustments were found to be warranted at this time, resulting in the proposed Goal of 6.7%.

Public Notice of the proposed goal was published in area publications, making the document available following March 27, 2015 for review and comment. Public Outreach included mailing letters that indicated the proposed goal to a list of interested parties, DBEs and community groups. As of the date of this report no public comments have been received.

As mentioned above projects in the future are awarded FTA funds, staff will update the Overall DBE Goal. The same methodology will be applied to establish the Overall DBE Goal, including public outreach and holding another public hearing to receive public comments.

### **Attachment:**

1. Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Overall DBE Goal-Setting Methodology for FFY 2015-2017 Goal Period



Federal Transit Administration  
(FTA) Overall DBE  
Goal-Setting Methodology

For

FFY 2015-2017  
Goal Period

Submitted in fulfillment of:

Title 49 Code of Federal Regulations Part 26



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION .....	3
II.	BACKGROUND .....	3
III.	FTA-ASSISTED CONTRACTING PROGRAM FOR FFY 2015-2017 .....	3
IV.	GOAL METHODOLOGY .....	4
	<i>Step 1: Determination of a Base Figure (26.45)</i> .....	4
	<i>Step 2: Adjusting the Base Figure</i> .....	5
	A. Past DBE Goal Attainments .....	5
	B. Bidders List.....	5
	C. Disparity Study.....	6
	D. Other Available Evidence.....	6
V.	PROPOSED OVERALL DBE GOAL .....	6
VI.	RACE-NEUTRAL IMPLEMENTATION MEASURES.....	6
VII.	PUBLIC PARTICIPATION AND FACILITATION .....	7



# DBE GOAL METHODOLOGY

## I. INTRODUCTION

The City of Roseville (City) herein sets forth its Overall Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) Goal and corresponding federally prescribed goal-setting methodology for the three-year Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) goal period of 2015-2017 (October 1, 2014 through September 30, 2017), pursuant to Title 49 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 26 “Participation by Disadvantaged Business Enterprises in U.S. Department of Transportation Programs.” The purpose of the DBE goal-setting process is to level the playing field so that DBEs can compete fairly for Department of Transportation-assisted contracts, however, the program must be narrowly tailored in accordance with applicable law.

## II. BACKGROUND

The City is a recipient of U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT), Federal Transit Administration (FTA), funding. As a condition of receiving this assistance, the City signed an assurance that it will comply with FTA’s DBE requirements. In accordance with Title 49 CFR Part 26 provisions: Participation by DBEs in USDOT Programs, the City is required to develop and submit a Triennial Overall DBE Goal for its FTA-assisted projects.

The City presents its Overall DBE Goal Methodology for FFY 2015-2017.

## III. FTA-ASSISTED CONTRACTING PROGRAM FOR FFY 2015-2017

Table 1 represents the City’s FTA-assisted contracting program, which consists of one project considered in preparing this goal methodology.

**Table 1**

PROJECT NAME/DESCRIPTION	TOTAL ESTIMATED PROJECT COST
Louis Orlando Transfer Point Construction Project	2,235,000

Table 2 provides a summary of the categories of work with estimated cost breakdown for each. Categories of work are groups utilizing comparable North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) codes for purposes of weighting the categories of work based on the engineer’s estimates.

**Table 2:**

CATEGORY OF WORK	NAICS CODES	ESTIMATED % BY NAICS	ESTIMATED FEDERAL \$ BY NAICS
Water Supply and Irrigation Systems	221310	4.4%	99,000
Highway, Street and Bridge Construction	237310	44.4%	993,000
Poured Concrete Foundation and Structure Contractors	238110	3.8%	86,000
Structural Steel and Precast Concrete Contractors	238120	3.4%	75,000
Electrical Contractors and Other Wiring Installation Contractors	238210	24.2%	540,000



Plumbing, Heating, and Air-Conditioning Contractors	238220	1.7%	38,000
Site Preparation Contractors	238910	10.1%	226,000
Landscaping Services	561730	8.0%	178,000
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>2,235,000</b>

#### IV. GOAL METHODOLOGY

##### Step 1: Determination of a Base Figure (26.45)<sup>1</sup>

To establish the City’s Base Figure of the relative availability of DBEs to all comparable firms (DBE and Non-DBE) available to bid or propose on City FTA-assisted contracting opportunities projected to be solicited during the triennial goal period, the City followed the prescribed federal methodology to determine relative availability. This was accomplished by assessing the *California Unified Certification Program (CUCP) DBE Database of Certified Firms* and the *2012 U.S. Census Bureau County Business Patterns Database* within the City’s market area (defined as Placer and Sacramento Counties) for each of the categories of work defined in Table 2.

The City’s local market area consists of the geographic area where a substantial majority of contracting dollars are expended and/or where the substantial majority of contractor and subcontractor bids or quotes are located.

In accordance with the formula below, the Base Figure is derived by dividing the number of ready, willing and able DBE firms identified for each work category by the number of all firms identified for each corresponding work category (relative availability), weighting the relative availability for each work category by the corresponding work category weight from Table 2 (weighted ratio), and adding the weighted ratio figures together.

$$\text{Base Figure} = \sum \frac{(\text{Number of Ready, Willing and Able DBEs})}{\text{Number of All Ready, Willing and Able Firms}} \times \text{weight} \times 100$$

- ⇒ For the numerator: CUCP DBE Database of Certified Firms
- ⇒ For the denominator: 2012 U.S. Census Bureau’s Business Patterns Database

A concerted effort was made to ensure that the scope of businesses included in the numerator was as close as possible to the scope included in the denominator.

The result of the Base Figure calculation is 6.7%, as shown in Table 3 as follows:

**Table 3**

CATEGORY OF WORK	DBES	ALL FIRMS	CATEGORY WEIGHT	WEIGHTED RATIO
Water Supply and Irrigation Systems	0	17	4.4%	0.0%

<sup>1</sup> 26.45 represents Title 49 CFR Part 26 regulatory goal setting methodology reference.

Highway, Street and Bridge Construction	6	47	44.4%	5.7%
Poured Concrete Foundation and Structure Contractors	8	95	3.8%	0.3%
Structural Steel and Precast Concrete Contractors	1	22	3.4%	0.2%
Electrical Contractors and Other Wiring Installation Contractors	3	372	24.2%	0.2%
Plumbing, Heating, and Air-Conditioning Contractors	2	426	1.7%	0.0%
Site Preparation Contractors	4	134	10.1%	0.3%
Landscaping Services	4	447	8.0%	0.1%
<b>BASE FIGURE</b>				
<b>Base Figure (i.e., Sum of Weighted Ratios for all Work Categories)</b>				<b>6.7%</b>

### Step 2: Adjusting the Base Figure

Upon establishing the Base Figure, the City reviewed and assessed other known evidence potentially impacting the relative availability of DBEs within the market area, in accordance with prescribed narrow tailoring provisions set forth under 49 CFR Part 26.45: Step 2; DBE Goal Adjustment guidelines.

Evidence considered in making an adjustment to the Base Figure included Past DBE Goal Attainments and Other Evidence, as follows:

#### A. Past DBE Goal Attainments

As historical DBE participation attainments provide demonstrable evidence of DBE availability and capacity to perform, the City proceeded to calculate past DBE participation attainments for the three (3) federal fiscal years, for which DBE attainment data is available. The table below reflects the demonstrated capacity of DBEs (measured by actual historical DBE participation attainments) on FTA-assisted contracts awarded by the City within the last three (3) federal fiscal years.

**Table 4**

FEDERAL FISCAL YEAR (FFY)	FTA DBE GOAL ATTAINMENT %
2011/12	0.0%
2012/13	0.0%
2013/14	0.0%

The City considered an adjustment to the Base Figure based on recent DBE goal attainments, however, the data does not warrant an adjustment at this time.

#### B. Bidders List

The City's bidders list does not provide sufficient data to date to justify an adjustment to the Base Figure. Bidders List information will continue to be collected on future procurements for the potential use in future DBE goal determinations.

**C. Disparity Study**

The City is not aware of any current disparity studies within their jurisdiction and/or market area to consider in this step of the goal setting analysis.

**D. Other Available Evidence**

The City is not in possession of other information that would have an impact on the DBE goal assessment.

**V. PROPOSED OVERALL DBE GOAL**

The City is currently operating a strictly race-neutral DBE Program. As such, the City will meet the maximum feasible portion of its overall goal by using race-neutral means of facilitating DBE participation.

**The Final Proposed Overall DBE Goal for FFY 2015-2017 for the City’s FTA-assisted contracts is 6.7%.** As a part of the prescribed goal-setting methodology, the City must project the percentage of its Proposed Overall DBE Goal that can be met utilizing race-neutral and race-conscious measures.

**Race-Conscious & Race-Neutral Projection**

The City intends to continue to use race-neutral methods to meet the overall DBE goal of 6.7% for FFY 2015-2017 in accordance with Title 49 CFR Part 26.51.

RACE-CONSCIOUS & RACE-NEUTRAL PROJECTIONS	
DBE Adjusted Base Figure	6.7%
Race-Conscious Component	0.0%
Race-Neutral Component	6.7%

In order to ensure that the City’s DBE program will be narrowly tailored to overcome the effects of discrimination, if we use contract goals we will adjust the estimated breakout of race-neutral and race-conscious participation as needed to reflect actual DBE participation (see 26.51(f)) and we will track and report race-neutral and race conscious participation separately.

**VI. RACE-NEUTRAL IMPLEMENTATION MEASURES**

The City is currently implementing a number of race- and gender-neutral remedies to outreach and promote the participation of DBEs and small businesses in the City’s FTA-assisted contracting program. The City plans to continue or implement the following race-neutral measures for FFY 2015-2017 and will continue to explore other options for consideration based on the City’s success in meeting its overall DBE goals based on these efforts. The City will:

- Arrange timely solicitation, times for the presentation of bids, quantities, specifications, and deliver schedules in ways that facilitate DBEs and other small business firms’ participation.

- Unbundle large contracts to make them more accessible to small businesses, requiring or encouraging prime contractors to subcontract portions of work that they might otherwise perform with their own forces.
- Provide technical assistance and other services to small businesses, including DBE firms.
- Provide information and communication programs on contracting procedures and specific contract opportunities.
- Provide assistance to small businesses in overcoming limitations in obtaining bonding, lines of credit and building financing capital.
- Compile a City database of all firms who attend pre-bid/pre-proposal meetings, whether they elect to bid/propose on a project or not. The City will then use that database to further their Outreach efforts on future projects and related events.

### **Fostering Small Business Participation<sup>2</sup>**

The City has incorporated a small business element into the DBE Program. An important part of the City's small business element is its outreach activities. These outreach efforts include active, effective steps to increase small business participation, such as soliciting bids/proposals from DBEs and small businesses, responding to requests for information, participating at pre-bid and pre-proposals meets, and participating at outreach and training events for DBEs and small businesses. The City will collaborate with regional resources by pooling resources and/or creating joint programs for review and approval by FTA.

## **VII. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION AND FACILITATION**

In accordance with Public Participation Regulatory Requirements of Title 49 CFR Part 26, minority, women, local business associations, and community organizations within the market area were consulted and provided an opportunity to review the triennial goal analysis and provide input.

The City issued a Public Notice in general circulation media and minority focused media publishing the Draft Proposed FTA Overall DBE Goal-Setting Methodology for FFY 2015-FFY 2017. The notice informed the public that the proposed goal and rationale were available for inspection at the City's principal office during normal business hours for 45 days following the date of the Public Notice.

---

<sup>2</sup> See Title 49 CFR Part 26 Section 26.39 "Fostering Small Business Participation."



# Transportation Commission Meeting

## May 19, 2015 – 7:00 p.m.

### Special Presentations/Reports

---

#### **Item 7b. Transit Performance Report for 3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Fiscal Year 2015**

**Staff** Eileen Bruggeman, Alternative Transportation Analyst

#### **Recommendation**

Staff requests that the Transportation Commission accept the Transit Performance Report for the 3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter for Fiscal Year 2015 (FY15).

#### **Background**

The City Council adopted a series of performance standards as part of the Short Range Transit Plan adopted in February 2005. These goals and standards are a method for the Council, the Transportation Commission, and staff to evaluate the performance of the City's transit services each quarter, and at the end of each fiscal year.

#### **Discussion**

Staff has attached transit data as measurements towards achieving the established performance criteria for the overall system and each service. The performance criteria are categorized into areas of service efficiency, service effectiveness, and service quality.

The service overall is holding steady and maintaining the exemplary levels achieved during the prior fiscal year. Please refer to Attachment 1 (Quarterly Performance Report FY15 3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter).

To date FY15 is retaining a farebox recovery ratio in excess of 21%, exceeding the 15% performance standard. Operational expenses are very similar between the current and prior fiscal year (1% higher in FY15). The amount of subsidy for all service trips and total ridership are both very close to what they were at this same time year to date last fiscal year.

Passenger trips per vehicle revenue hour (VRH) hovers close to the performance standard of eight (8) passengers per hour, while preventable accidents per service mile, all accidents per service mile, and miles between road calls all exceed their respective performance standards.

Goal 1 – Service Efficiency: Service efficiency is typically rated by farebox recovery and cost per passenger (a.k.a. the subsidy per trip) for the overall system and for each service type.

**Farebox Recovery Ratio:** The farebox recovery ratio provides a means of evaluating the overall costs to the fare revenues for all services provided, as well as for each service individually.

Overall, systemwide the fare recovery ratio for the year to date is 21.7%, which is holding very steady in comparison to last year with a slight increase of 0.2% in comparison to the year-to-date farebox recovery ratio a year ago.

The fare recovery ratio for Dial-A-Ride (DAR) services year to date the ratio is 8.4% which is higher than it was a year ago at 7.3%. DAR ridership continues to increase, which directly affects the farebox recovery ratio; in the third quarter DAR ridership is 4.7% higher than it was at the end of the same quarter last year.

The Commuter service farebox recovery ratio is down slightly from what it was the same quarter in the previous year (decreasing from 82.1% to 81.0%); however, year to date the ratio is higher now than it was at this same time in FY14 increasing from 76.5% to 82.4% in FY15.

Extra service was added to both the AM and PM Commuter service at the end of January 2015. Ridership in the 3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter 2015 is higher than it was in the same quarter the prior fiscal year, however, staff has received comments from Commuter passengers indicating the extra service could potentially be more beneficial if the departure times were moved to earlier times. Staff is planning to adjust the AM extra service to depart at 6:45 a.m. (current departure time is 7:05 a.m.) and the PM extra service to depart from downtown at 3:30 p.m. (current time is 3:40 p.m.). If these minor time adjustments are more successful, they will become normalized and incorporated into the next Commuter Service Guide scheduled for printing in Fall, 2015.

The farebox recovery ratio for Local services increased in the current quarter from 11.4% same quarter last year to 13.0% this quarter. Even though there had been a decrease in the farebox recovery ratio the first two quarters of FY15, with the improvement in the current quarter the year to date farebox recovery ratio is very close to what it was a year ago (12.3% in FY15 compared to 12.5% in FY14).

Ridership on Local routes is down 3.7% from the same quarter the prior fiscal year, but overall year to date the ridership is similar to the total ridership of last year to date (177,320 in FY15, in comparison to 179,636 in FY14). The evening Sierra College shuttle was discontinued with the ending of the Fall semester in December, 2014 and modifications to Route C, E, F and G were implemented in the 3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter at the end of January 2015. Ridership is preliminary at this time and is still adjusting. These route will continue to be monitored.

**Subsidy per Trip:** The total subsidy for all service trips provides yet another means to measure service efficiency and the effectiveness. Subsidy per trip is calculated based on operational expenses, less fare revenue, and divided by ridership. Not only do costs impact the subsidy calculations, overall ridership is a key factor. If ridership is up and costs are fixed when compared to the previous quarter or fiscal year, then the subsidy per trip will be lower.

The FY15 Quarterly Performance Report provides the average amount of subsidy per trip by type of service. Overall the average subsidy per trip is very similar to what it was this same time last year (\$10.05 per trip, increased by \$0.03).

The subsidy per trip is increased for DAR year to date by \$0.29, but is decreased for Commuter from \$1.42 to \$1.01 per trip, and for Local Fixed Route increased slightly from \$11.46 to \$11.50 year to date.

The Local Route average subsidy per trip is one method of assessing the health of each route (Attachment 2). As noted previously Local route changes were implemented on January 26, 2015 to Routes C and G that include providing service to the Sierra College campus in Rocklin, and the Sierra College evening shuttle was discontinued in December 2014 at the end of the fall semester. These changes were implemented to better meet passenger transportation needs. It is anticipated these changes will result in higher ridership and a lower average subsidy per trip on Local services.

Goal 2 - Service Effectiveness – Service effectiveness is rated by total ridership and the number of passengers trips provided for each vehicle revenue hour (PTVRH). The PTRVH measurement remained relatively consistent when compared with the previous fiscal year. Overall, to date Roseville Transit carried 7.9 passengers per revenue hour in FY15.

Goal 3 - Service Quality – Service quality is measured by the number of preventable and non-preventable accidents per 1,000 miles traveled, on-time performance, the number of passenger complaints per trip provided, and the number of road calls per mile traveled.

The average number of all accidents (preventable and non-preventable) and number of road calls between miles for the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> quarters met and well exceeded the standards established for Roseville Transit.

Average on-time performance data for Commuter and Local services is lower than typical and the data is not considered accurate for this period. The primary cause for the decrease in on time performance in Commuter and Local service is a technical conflict between GPS units upgraded by our vendor around June 2015 and our performance tracking software. After identification that there was inaccurate data being collected and trying for several months to isolate and correct the conflict, it was determined a different type of GPS unit needed to be installed to provide accurate data. Initially Fleet Maintenance anticipated all buses would have received the replacement GPS units sometime in February 2015, however, the final revenue vehicles received the GPS units in May with a few light duty vehicles/vans waiting to be completed shortly.

DAR on time performance is tracked based on actual time communication between Drivers and Dispatch, making the report of 98.8% average on-time performance for that service accurate. The number of passenger complaints received also meets the established standards for each service type. Overall, service quality remains good as measured against the established standards.

**Attachments:**

1. FY15 Performance Report 3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter
2. Local Service Average Subsidy by Route FY15

	1st Quarter	2nd Quarter	3rd Quarter	4th Quarter	Year To Date
<b>Farebox Ratio for All Services</b>					
Total Expenses - All Services	\$1,322,614	\$1,236,856	\$1,271,539		\$3,831,010
Total Fares - All Services	\$284,458	\$271,552	\$275,028		\$831,039
<b>FY14/15 Combined Farebox Ratio for All Services</b>	<b>21.5%</b>	<b>22.0%</b>	<b>21.6%</b>		<b>21.7%</b>
<b>FY13/14 Combined Farebox Ratio for All Services</b>	<b>22.3%</b>	<b>20.8%</b>	<b>21.4%</b>		<b>21.5%</b>
<b>Percent Difference</b>	<b>-0.8%</b>	<b>1.2%</b>	<b>0.2%</b>		<b>0.2%</b>

<b>Subsidy per Trip (All Services)</b>					
Total Expenses - All Services	\$1,322,614	\$1,236,856	\$1,271,539		\$3,831,010
Less Fares (All Services)	\$284,458	\$271,552	\$275,028		\$831,039
Divided by Ridership (All Services)	\$1,038,156	\$965,304	\$996,511		\$2,999,971
	103,479	97,419	97,615		298,513
<b>FY14/15 Total Subsidy for All Service Trips</b>	<b>\$10.03</b>	<b>\$9.91</b>	<b>\$10.21</b>		<b>\$10.05</b>
<b>FY13/14 Total Subsidy for All Service Trips</b>	<b>\$9.70</b>	<b>\$10.31</b>	<b>\$10.05</b>		<b>\$10.02</b>
<b>Subsidy Increase/Decrease from Previous Year</b>	<b>\$0.33</b>	<b>-\$0.40</b>	<b>\$0.16</b>		<b>\$0.03</b>

<b>Total Ridership for All Services</b>					
<b>FY14/15 Quarter</b>	103,479	97,419	97,615		298,513
<b>FY13/14 Quarter</b>	100,531	98,031	99,002		297,564
<b>Total Ridership Increase/Decrease</b>	<b>2.9%</b>	<b>-0.6%</b>	<b>-1.4%</b>		<b>0.3%</b>

<b>Passenger Trips per VRH (All Services) Standard 8/VRH</b>					
Total Ridership	103,479	97,419	97,615		298,513
Divided by Total Vehicle Revenue Hours (VRH)	12,753	12,659	12,530		37,942
<b>Total Passenger Trips per Vehicle Revenue Hour</b>	<b>8.1</b>	<b>7.7</b>	<b>7.8</b>		<b>7.9</b>

<b>Preventable Accident Standard &lt;1/50,000</b>					
Total Service Miles (All Services)	214,771	213,950	214,697		643,418
Divided by Total Preventable Accidents	0	2	2		4
<b>Total Service Miles per Preventable Accident</b>	<b>214,771</b>	<b>106,975</b>	<b>107,348</b>		<b>160,854</b>

<b>All Accidents Standard &lt; 1/25,000</b>					
Total Service Miles (All Services)	214,771	213,950	214,697		643,418
Divided by Total Accidents	4	2	4		10
<b>Total Service Miles per Accident</b>	<b>53,693</b>	<b>106,975</b>	<b>53,674</b>		<b>64,342</b>

<b>Maintenance Standard &gt; 1/10,000 miles between Road Calls</b>					
Total Service Miles (All Services)	214,771	213,950	214,697		643,418
Divided by All Road Calls	7	19	12		38
<b>Total Service Miles per Road Calls</b>	<b>30,682</b>	<b>11,261</b>	<b>17,891</b>		<b>16,932</b>

Report prepared based on data available as of the date presented to Transportation Commission.  
Minor modifications may occur as revised financial or ridership data becomes available.

	1st Quarter	2nd Quarter	3rd Quarter	4th Quarter	Year To Date
<b>DAR Farebox &gt;15%</b>					
Total Expenses - All Services	\$1,322,614	\$1,236,856	\$1,271,539		\$3,831,010
Percentage of DAR Service Hours to Total Contract Service Hours	24.74%	25.40%	25.22%		25.12%
Total Expenses - DAR Service	\$316,526	\$307,536	\$315,498		\$939,561
DAR Fare Revenue	\$28,560	\$27,664	\$22,264		\$78,488
<b>FY14/15 DAR Farebox Ratio</b>	<b>9.0%</b>	<b>9.0%</b>	<b>7.1%</b>		<b>8.4%</b>
<b>FY13/14 DAR Farebox Ratio</b>	<b>7.9%</b>	<b>6.8%</b>	<b>8.7%</b>		<b>7.3%</b>

<b>DAR Subsidy</b>					
Total Expenses - DAR Service	\$316,526	\$307,536	\$315,498		\$939,561
Less DAR Fare Revenue	\$28,560	\$27,664	\$22,264		\$78,488
Total Subsidy	\$287,966	\$279,872	\$293,235		\$861,073
Divided by DAR Ridership	7,665	7,623	7,356		22,644
<b>Subsidy per DAR Passenger</b>	<b>\$37.57</b>	<b>\$36.71</b>	<b>\$39.86</b>		<b>\$38.03</b>
<b>Last Year Quarter</b>	<b>\$36.58</b>	<b>\$38.93</b>	<b>\$37.83</b>		<b>\$37.74</b>
<b>Subsidy Increase/Decrease from Previous Year</b>	<b>\$0.99</b>	<b>-\$2.22</b>	<b>\$2.03</b>		<b>\$0.29</b>

<b>DAR Ridership</b>					
FY14/15 RIDERSHIP	7,665	7,623	7,356		22,644
FY13/14 RIDERSHIP	7,125	6,953	7,025		21,103
<b>Ridership % Increase/Decrease</b>	<b>7.6%</b>	<b>9.6%</b>	<b>4.7%</b>		<b>7.3%</b>

<b>DAR Passenger Trips per VRH Standard &gt;3.0</b>					
DAR Ridership	7,665	7,665	7,356		22,686
Divided by DAR Vehicle Revenue Hours (VRH)	2,958	2,963	3,054		8,975
<b>DAR Passenger Trips per Vehicle Revenue Hour</b>	<b>2.6</b>	<b>2.6</b>	<b>2.4</b>		<b>2.5</b>
<b>Last Year Quarter</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>2.6</b>		<b>2.7</b>

<b>DAR Ridership per DAR Complaint Standard &lt;1/3000</b>					
DAR Ridership	7,665	7,623	7,356		22,644
Number of Complaints	6	3	5		14
Divided by Substantiated Complaints	1	1	2		4
<b>DAR Ridership per Substantiated Complaint</b>	<b>7,665</b>	<b>7,623</b>	<b>3,678</b>		<b>5,661</b>
<b>Last Year Quarter</b>	<b>7,125</b>	<b>6,953</b>	<b>7,025</b>		<b>14,078</b>

<b>DAR On Time Performance</b>					
1st Month of Quarter	98.3%	97.5%	99.5%		98.4%
2nd Month of Quarter	99.0%	98.7%	98.8%		98.8%
3rd Month of Quarter	98.7%	98.9%	98.1%		98.5%
<b>Avg On-Time Performance (%)</b>	<b>98.7%</b>	<b>98.3%</b>	<b>98.8%</b>		<b>98.6%</b>
<b>Last Year Quarter</b>	<b>98.8%</b>	<b>98.4%</b>	<b>98.9%</b>		<b>98.7%</b>

Report prepared based on data available as of the date presented to Transportation Commission.  
Minor modifications may occur as revised financial or ridership data becomes available.

	1st Quarter	2nd Quarter	3rd Quarter	4th Quarter	Year To Date
<b>Commuter Farebox Standard &gt;75%</b>					
Total Expenses - All Services	\$1,322,614	\$1,236,856	\$1,271,539		\$3,831,010
Percentage of Commuter Service Hours to Total Contract Service Hours	14.41%	13.67%	14.61%		14.23%
Total Expenses - Commuter Service	\$203,538	\$172,690	\$189,633		\$565,862
Commuter Fare Revenue	\$160,117	\$152,643	\$153,524		\$466,284
<b>FY14/15 Farebox Ratio</b>	<b>78.7%</b>	<b>88.4%</b>	<b>81.0%</b>		<b>82.4%</b>
<b>FY13/14 Farebox Ratio</b>	79.6%	73.2%	82.1%		76.5%

<b>Commuter Subsidy Standard &lt;\$3.00 per trip</b>					
Total Expenses - Commuter Service	\$203,538	\$172,690	\$189,633		\$565,862
Less Commuter Fare Revenue	\$160,117	\$152,643	\$153,524		\$466,284
Total Subsidy	\$43,422	\$20,047	\$36,110		\$99,578
Divided by Commuter Ridership	34,323	31,523	32,712		98,558
<b>Subsidy per Commuter Trip</b>	<b>\$1.27</b>	<b>\$0.64</b>	<b>\$1.10</b>		<b>\$1.01</b>
<b>Last Year Quarter</b>	\$1.21	\$1.65	\$1.06		\$1.42

<b>Commuter Ridership Standard &gt; 2% Increase</b>					
Current Quarter	34,323	31,523	32,712		98,558
<b>Last Year Quarter</b>	33,399	31,193	32,233		96,825
<b>Ridership Increase/Decrease</b>	2.8%	1.1%	1.5%		1.8%

<b>Commuter Passenger Trips per VRH Standard &gt; 8.0</b>					
Commuter Ridership	34,323	31,523	32,712		98,558
Divided by Commuter Vehicle Revenue Hours (VRH)	1,467	1,394	1,431		4,292
<b>Commuter Passenger Trips per Vehicle Revenue Hour</b>	<b>23.4</b>	<b>22.6</b>	<b>22.9</b>		<b>23.0</b>
<b>Last Year Quarter</b>	22.8	22.5	24.1		23.1

<b>Comm. Ridership per Comm. Complaint Standard &lt;1/5000</b>					
Commuter Ridership	34,323	31,523	32,712		98,558
Number of Complaints	8	9	6		23
Divided by Substantiated Complaints	2	6	4		12
<b>Commuter Ridership per Substantiated Complaint</b>	<b>17,162</b>	<b>5,254</b>	<b>8,178</b>		<b>8,213</b>
<b>Last Year Quarter</b>	11,133	6,239	7,025		8,074

<b>Commuter On Time Performance</b>					
1st Month of Quarter	89.0%	79.1%	76.9%		81.7%
2nd Month of Quarter	81.8%	79.9%	84.8%		82.2%
3rd Month of Quarter	77.1%	78.9%	89.8%		82.0%
<b>Avg On-Time Performance (%)</b>	<b>82.7%</b>	<b>79.3%</b>	<b>83.8%</b>		<b>81.9%</b>
<b>Last Year Quarter</b>	100.0%	100.0%	98.2%		99.4%

Report prepared based on data available as of the date presented to Transportation Commission.  
Minor modifications may occur as revised financial or ridership data becomes available.

FY14/15 Local Fixed Route Quarterly Performance Report

	1st Quarter	2nd Quarter	3rd Quarter	4th Quarter	Year To Date
<b>Local Fixed Route Farebox Standard &gt;15%</b>					
Total Expenses - All Services	\$1,322,614	\$1,236,856	\$1,271,539		\$3,831,010
Percentage of FR Service Hours to Total Contract Service Hours	<b>60.85%</b>	<b>60.93%</b>	<b>60.17%</b>		<b>60.7%</b>
Total Expenses - Fixed Route Services	\$802,550	\$756,630	\$766,408		\$2,325,588
Local Fixed Route Fare Revenue	\$95,768	\$91,383	\$99,328		\$286,479
<b>Fixed Route Farebox Ratio</b>	<b>11.9%</b>	<b>12.1%</b>	<b>13.0%</b>		<b>12.3%</b>
<b>Last Year Quarter</b>	<b>12.9%</b>	<b>13.3%</b>	<b>11.4%</b>		<b>12.5%</b>

<b>Local Fixed Route Subsidy Standard &lt;\$5.00 per trip</b>					
Total Expenses - Fixed Route Services	\$802,550	\$756,630	\$766,408		\$2,325,588
Less Local Fixed Route Fare Revenue	\$95,768	\$91,383	\$99,328		\$286,479
Total Subsidy	\$706,781	\$665,247	\$667,080		\$2,039,108
Divided by Fixed Route Ridership	61,491	58,282	57,547		177,320
<b>Subsidy per Fixed Route Trip</b>	<b>\$11.49</b>	<b>\$11.41</b>	<b>\$11.59</b>		<b>\$11.50</b>
<b>Last Year Quarter</b>	<b>\$11.24</b>	<b>\$11.50</b>	<b>\$11.63</b>		<b>\$11.46</b>

<b>Local Fixed Route Ridership Standard &gt; 2% Increase</b>					
Current Quarter	61,491	58,282	57,547		177,320
<b>Last Year Quarter</b>	<b>60,007</b>	<b>59,885</b>	<b>59,744</b>		<b>179,636</b>
<b>Ridership Increase/Decrease</b>	<b>2.5%</b>	<b>-2.7%</b>	<b>-3.7%</b>		<b>-1.3%</b>

<b>Local Fixed Route Passenger Trips Per VRH Standard &gt; 8.0</b>					
Local Fixed Route Ridership	61,491	58,282	57,547		177,320
Divided by FR Vehicle Revenue Hours (VRH)	8,328	8,302	8,045		24,675
<b>FR Passenger Trips per Vehicle Revenue Hour</b>	<b>7.4</b>	<b>7.0</b>	<b>7.2</b>		<b>7.2</b>
<b>Last Year Quarter</b>	<b>7.3</b>	<b>7.3</b>	<b>7.3</b>		<b>7.3</b>

<b>Local FR Ridership per FR Complaint Standard &lt;1/5000</b>					
Local Fixed Route Ridership	61,491	58,282	57,547		177,320
Number of Complaints	6	6	4		16
Divided by Substantiated Complaints	0	4	3		7
<b>Fixed Route Ridership per Substantiated Complaint</b>	<b>61,491</b>	<b>14,571</b>	<b>19,182</b>		<b>25,331</b>
<b>Last Year Quarter</b>	<b>10,001</b>	<b>59,885</b>	<b>14,936</b>		<b>19,982</b>

<b>Local Fixed Route On Time Performance</b>					
1st Month of Quarter	82.6%	85.0%	87.5%		85.0%
2nd Month of Quarter	81.7%	85.4%	87.4%		84.8%
3rd Month of Quarter	77.7%	85.2%	88.7%		83.9%
<b>Avg On-Time Performance (%)</b>	<b>80.7%</b>	<b>85.2%</b>	<b>87.9%</b>		<b>84.6%</b>
<b>Last Year Quarter</b>	<b>96.3%</b>	<b>91.3%</b>	<b>92.6%</b>		<b>93.4%</b>

Report prepared based on data available as of the date presented to Transportation Commission.  
Minor modifications may occur as revised financial or ridership data becomes available.

**SUBSIDY PER LOCAL ROUTE (WEEKDAYS+SAT) - FY15 TO DATE**

<b>14/15</b>	<b>A1</b>	<b>A2</b>	<b>B1</b>	<b>B2</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>
<b>AVG PAX/MO</b>	6,692	3,542	3,828	6,378	666	1,545	282	276
<b>AVG PAX/DAY</b>	139.7	73.6	79.7	131.8	14.3	32.5	8	8
<b>AVG FARE</b>	\$1.62	\$1.62	\$1.62	\$1.62	\$1.62	\$1.62	\$1.62	\$1.62
<b>FARE/RTE</b>	\$226	\$119	\$129	\$214	\$23	\$53	\$13	\$13
<b>HRS/RTE</b>	16.1	12	12.1	15	3.1	6.3	3.1	3.1
<b>SYSTEM AVG COST/HR</b>	\$93	\$93	\$93	\$93	\$93	\$93	\$93	\$93
<b>AVG COST/RTE</b>	\$1,498	\$1,119	\$1,129	\$1,402	\$289	\$588	\$289	\$289
<b>AVG SUBSIDY/TRIP</b>	<b>\$9.11</b>	<b>\$13.59</b>	<b>\$12.55</b>	<b>\$9.02</b>	<b>\$18.59</b>	<b>\$16.46</b>	<b>\$34.31</b>	<b>\$34.39</b>

<b>14/15</b>	<b>G</b>	<b>I</b>	<b>L</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>R AM</b>	<b>R PM</b>	<b>S</b>
<b>AVG PAX/MO</b>	803	1,608	2,886	6,218	773	926	619
<b>AVG PAX/DAY</b>	17.4	33.4	59.4	128.7	19.7	23	16.1
<b>AVG FARE</b>	\$1.62	\$1.62	\$1.62	\$1.62	\$1.62	\$1.62	\$1.62
<b>FARE/RTE</b>	\$28	\$54	\$96	\$209	\$32	\$37	\$26
<b>HRS/RTE</b>	3.1	6.3	11.8	15.8	1.5	1.5	6.4
<b>SYSTEM AVG COST/HR</b>	\$93	\$93	\$93	\$93	\$93	\$93	\$93
<b>AVG COST/RTE</b>	\$289	\$588	\$1,104	\$1,477	\$135	\$135	\$599
<b>AVG SUBSIDY/TRIP</b>	<b>\$14.96</b>	<b>\$15.96</b>	<b>\$16.96</b>	<b>\$9.86</b>	<b>\$5.24</b>	<b>\$4.25</b>	<b>\$35.58</b>

# Transportation Commission Meeting

## May 19, 2015 – 7:00 p.m.

### Reports and Updates

---

#### **Item 8a. Alternative Transportation Division Update**

**Staff:** Michael Wixon, Alternative Transportation Manager

#### **Recommendation**

This item is provided to update the Transportation Commission on the activities of the Alternative Transportation Division and other transportation related items of the region, no action is needed.

---

#### **TSM Quarterly Training**

On Wednesday, April 15 staff hosted the TSM Quarterly Training where an update on the Bucks for Bike program was presented. There were 32 applicants and 19 of those were funded for new commuter bikes. Also at that meeting, staff kicked off May is Bike Month to approximately 25 employee transportation coordinators, representing over 30 businesses in Roseville.



#### **Celebrate the Earth Festival**

Alternative transportation participated in the citywide Celebrate the Earth Festival on Saturday, April 18, 10 a.m. – 3 p.m. at Mahany Park. Free secure bike parking was available, along with free Roseville Transit Local service all day. We parked 110 bikes and 59 people rode transit to the festival. There was a 46% increase in average Saturday ridership for the day due to the free Roseville Transit fare promotion in celebration of Earth Day. Booths shared information with the public about ways to improve air quality and use the car less by using transit, biking, walking, and sharing rides. Also, kids were able to see the effects of pedal power with our bicycle-operated smoothie machine, serving more than 1,000 smoothies.

City staff also participated in Kaiser Permanente and Hewlett-Packard's earth day events.

#### **Free Smart Cycling & Basic Bicycle Maintenance Clinics**

Introductory instruction on skills to bicycle safely and predictably on the road, as well as basic bicycle maintenance, were offered by the City of Roseville in partnership with the Placer County Transportation Planning Agency. We participated in four public clinics in April with a total of approximately 50 attendees. Roseville is hosting two more clinics for Kaiser Permanente and Sutter Health employees.



#### **May is Bike Month**

It's time to get in gear for the Sacramento region's May is Bike Month. The goal is to encourage the public to collectively log more than 2 million miles for commuting, errands, or recreation. Cyclists have the opportunity to win prizes by logging miles. Roseville is participating and there are several upcoming events to engage and educate the public. As of May 13, there are 671 employees in Roseville who are registered and 483 residents, already exceeding participant numbers for 2014.



### **Bike with the Mayor**

The public joined in on a bike ride with Mayor Carol Garcia on Saturday, May 2 at 9 a.m. About 60 bicyclists rode from Veterans Memorial Park North to Dugan Park, approximately 3 miles round trip. This event also highlighted the City's involvement with healthy communities programs and the benefits of open space.

### **May is Bike Month Energizer Station**

Roseville hosted an Energizer Station at Sculpture Park on the Miner's Ravine Trail on Wednesday, May 6, 4 – 7 p.m. The public had their photo taken, signed up to participate in

May is Bike Month, and enjoyed a snack on their ride. About 50 bicyclists and 6 walkers stopped by. The event was supported by the City of Roseville and Sacramento Area Council of Governments.

City staff will be hosting an employer energizer station on Thursday, May 21 from 6:30 – 8:30 a.m. on northbound Foothills Boulevard in front of FedEx Ground (8501 Foothills Blvd.).

### **Legislative Update**

Congressional houses are scheduled to leave town for the Memorial Day recess and are not expected to return to session until June 1, a day after the May 31 expiration of the current authorization for the Highway Trust Fund, which provides funding for federal highway and transit programs. There is no clear path at this time for what we might expect going forward.

Adding to this dilemma with congress is unwillingness of FTA to approve grant applications in California based upon the recent actions regarding the Public Employee Pension Reform Act (PEPRA) by the Governor. In a letter of explanation from the California Transit Association to its members, it had this to offer:

*"On September 12, 2012, the Governor of California signed the Public Employee's Pension Reform Act of 2013 (PEPRA), AB 340 (Furutani) [Chapter 296, Statutes of 2012]. At that time, the US DOL reviewed the objections received by the Amalgamated Transit Union (ATU), United Transportation Union (UTU) and the Teamsters concerning the newly enacted PEPRA. The Department subsequently determined that PEPRA:*

- 1. Constitutes a change in legal or factual circumstances that may materially affect the rights or interests of employees represented by the ATU;*
- 2. Appears to have removed mandatory and/or traditional subjects of collective bargaining from the consideration of the parties; and,*
- 3. May prevent transit operators in the state of California from continuing the collective bargaining rights of employees, as required by Section 13(c)(2) of the Federal Transit Act (commonly referred to as the 13(c) protections).*

*As a result of this determination, all transit agencies in the state of California with workers represented by the ATU, UTU and Teamsters were subject to suffering billions of dollars in federal capital and/or operating funding withheld because of the implementation of PEPRA. Subsequently, federal grants for the Sacramento Regional Transit District and Caltrans were officially decertified in September of 2013. In response, the California Legislature passed and the Governor signed legislation, AB 1222 (Bloom / Dickinson) [Chapter 527, Statutes of 2013], temporarily exempting public*

*transit workers from PEPRAs through December 31, 2014, and then AB 1783 (Jones-Sawyer) [Chapter 724, Statutes of 2014], extending the temporary exemption through December 31, 2015. This temporary exemption was in place while a lawsuit, filed by the State of California and Sacramento Regional Transit District against the US DOL, was to resolve the matter from the Federal court's perspective.*

*On December 30, 2014, the United States Eastern District Court (California) ruled for the State of California (and Sacramento Regional Transit District) against the US DOL on the litigation over whether California's PEPRAs violate the labor protections of Federal 13(c) transit law. It is our understanding that the court, by granting summary judgment to the State on two of its key arguments, found that USDOL acted in violation of the federal Administrative Procedures Act in its application of 13(c) to PEPRAs (i.e., when it first denied Sacramento RTD's federal transit grant).*

*It is also the Association's understanding that by operation of existing California law (i.e. AB 1222 and AB 1783), PEPRAs now apply to employees of public transit systems otherwise subject to 13(c).*

*In late February of 2015, the US DOL filed a notice with the Federal courts that the Department intends to appeal the Eastern District Court's decision."*

Staff is continuing to work through its legislative channels to allow the FTA funding to continue to flow to local agencies while the federal government pursues its options to file appeal papers or not.