

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR
1120 N STREET
P. O. BOX 942873
SACRAMENTO, CA 94273-0001
PHONE (916) 654-2397
FAX (916) 654-4358
TTY 711



*Flex your power!
Be energy efficient!*

February 22, 2010

Ms. Diane Boyer-Vine
Legislative Counsel
State Capitol, Room 3021
Sacramento, CA 95814

The Honorable Alan Lowenthal
Senate Transportation and Housing Committee
State Capitol, Room 2209
Sacramento, CA 95814

Mr. Gregory Schmidt
Secretary of the Senate
State Capitol, Room 3044
Sacramento, CA 95814

The Honorable Mike Eng
Assembly Transportation Committee
1020 N Street, Room 112
Sacramento, CA 95814

Mr. E. Dotson Wilson
Chief Clerk of the Assembly
State Capitol, Room 3196
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Senator Lowenthal, Assembly Member Eng, Ms. Boyer-Vine and Messrs. Schmidt and Wilson:

I am pleased to transmit the California Department of Transportation's report entitled "Amtrak Thruway Bus Service from Sacramento to South Lake Tahoe." This report was prepared pursuant to Government Code Section 14035.55.

The Department has made distribution to the Legislature pursuant to Government Code Section 9795. This report can be found at www.dot.ca.gov/reports-legislature.htm.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Richard A. Harmon".

RICHARD A. HARMON
Assistant Deputy Director
Division of Legislative and
Local Government Affairs

Enclosure

AGRICULTURAL WORKER TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM

Final Report

Due to Legislature
January 1, 2010



Executive Summary

Senate Bill (SB) 1135 (Statutes of 2006, Public Utilities Code 99320) created the Agricultural Worker Transportation Program (AWTP) and named the California Department of Transportation (Department) as the administering agency. SB 1135 also established an AWTP Steering Committee (Committee). The Committee members are listed in Attachment 1. This Committee assisted the Department in developing program guidelines. It also reviewed and recommended potential projects to the Department.

SB 1135 requires the Department to submit an AWTP progress report to the Legislature by January 1, 2010. This document constitutes that Report. The AWTP will sunset on January 1, 2011.

Background and Other Funding

The Budget Act of 2006 identified \$20 million from the Public Transportation Account (PTA) for the AWTP. Over the last three years, the Department awarded the entire \$20 million appropriation. Other local and federal funding sources contributed significantly to the total project cost of each awarded AWTP grant.

The AWTP is funding vanpool operations fashioned after those identified under the Agricultural Industries Transportation Services (AITS) program established in the Southern San Joaquin Valley. The AITS program was funded through an \$8 million grant (50% federal/50% State) in fiscal year (FY) 2001/02 and was managed by the Kings County Area Public Transit Agency (KCAPTA). The AWTP funding will only provide funding through June 30, 2011. Local agencies that want to continue services or start similar service can now do so with Transportation Development Act (TDA) funding pursuant to SB 716 or other federal, State, or local funding sources identified in the future.

AWTP Grant Types

The Committee identified two uses for the AWTP grant funds – planning and service implementation. They set aside \$1 million of the \$20 million appropriation for planning grants. These grants were capped at \$70,000. The remaining resources were used for service implementation. There were no caps imposed on service implementation grants. A detail for each of the grant types is included in this report.

Grant Program Detail

Planning Grants

Most of the planning grant projects were conducted early in the AWTP's legislative timeframe. These projects were used to gather information on the feasibility of implementing vanpools for farm workers in a given region/community. Nine planning grants were awarded totaling \$605,552. Planning grant recipients and the status of their grants are listed in the table on pages 2 and 3.

Note: Since only \$605,552 was requested and awarded for planning grants, the remaining planning grant set-aside went to service implementation grants. Therefore, \$19,394,448 ended up funding direct service implementation. For purposes of clarity, the planning grants in the table below are shown as they were awarded; however, one grant – City of Santa Maria – ended up funding service implementation. The funding for this grant was ultimately shifted to the Santa Barbara County Department of Public Works as shown in the "AWTP – PTA Expenditures to Date" table (see Attachment II). The \$70,000 planning grant plus the \$3,094,265 service implementation grant equals \$3,164,265 total for service implementation.

The criteria for awarding the planning grants were:

- **Project Type and Justification, Including Community Outreach:** Did the applicant have a strong planning focus, including community outreach?
- **Project Need and Effectiveness:** Did the applicant provide a comprehensive discussion of agricultural worker transit service needs and sufficient support documentation?
- **Project Deliverability:** Did the applicant's proposal include a project delivery timeframe of 18 months?

Status/Outcome of Planning Grants

Agency	Status	Amount
Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (City of Greenfield)	Study completed. Service started with a service implementation grant.	\$70,000
Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (Regional Plan)	Study currently underway and will conclude in March 2010.	\$70,000
City of Calexico (Imperial County)	Study completed. No service implementation grant requested. Service may commence with other funds.	\$70,000
City of Santa Maria (Santa Barbara County)	Funds not utilized for planning. Used for service implementation instead. Service started November 2007.	\$70,000*
Mendocino County Planning Team	Study completed. Awarded grant funds for service implementation. Project began July 2009.	\$45,552
Napa County Transportation Planning Agency	Study completed. Awarded grant funds for service implementation. Pending.	\$70,000

Agency	Status	Amount
Sacramento Area Council of Governments	Study completed. Awarded grant funds for service implementation. Pending.	\$70,000
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission	Study completed. Pilot vanpools recommended, but all AWTP funds allocated at time of request. Alternative funding being sought.	\$70,000
Ventura County Transportation Commission	Study completed. Awarded grant funds for service implementation. Pending.	\$70,000
Total		\$605,552

* = Funding ultimately used for service implementation.

Service Implementation Grants

Service implementation grants are being used to purchase 285 vans (many already purchased). Vans purchased with AWTP funds are procured under contracts that have 24-36 month durations (most procurements will be fulfilled/delivered in FY 2011 after the program sunsets). The table on page 4 shows which agencies were awarded service implementation grants. It also displays the potential fleet capacity (number of vans and seats) each agency leveraged. For purposes of clarity, the service implementation grants are shown as they were awarded; however, two grants – City of Greenfield and Ventura County Transportation Commission – ultimately transferred their award, or a portion of it, to the KCAPTA as shown in Attachment II.

The criteria for awarding service implementation grants were:

- **Project Type and Justification:** How well did the applicant describe the proposed service, including: the area to be served (potential worksites), days and hours of service, capacity, proposed fare rates, and projected annual ridership and revenue?
- **Project Need and Effectiveness:** Did the applicant demonstrate an overwhelming transit service need relative to agricultural workers and provide acceptable documentation from a quality plan?
- **Benefits – Safety, Improved Air Quality, and Health Benefits:** Did the applicant demonstrate safety, air quality, and health benefits for both the public and agricultural workers?
- **Project Deliverability:** Did the applicant's proposal include a project delivery timeframe of 18 months?

Status/Outcome of Service Implementation Grants

Agency	Number of Vans (15 passenger capacity)	Fleet Capacity	Amount
City of Greenfield (Monterey County)	10	150	\$832,500*
Kings County Area Public Transit Agency/Service to Fresno, Kern, Kings, Madera, Tulare counties	166	2,490	\$9,091,227
Mendocino Transit Authority	5	75	\$310,840
Napa County Transportation Planning Agency	10	150	\$572,250
Sacramento Council of Governments	25	375	\$2,033,625
San Luis Obispo Council of Governments	8	120	\$456,997
Santa Barbara County - Department of Public Works	31	465	\$3,094,265
Ventura County Transportation Commission	30	450	\$3,002,744*
Total	285	4,275	\$19,394,448

* = Total, or a portion of awarded dollars transferred to KCAPTA

Local and Federal Funding Contributions for the AWTP

Beginning in FY 2006/07 and over three grant cycles, the full \$20 million PTA appropriation for AWTP was awarded to local agencies. Local agencies also contributed \$6,628,500 in their own matching funds. Federal sources accounted for \$109,014 (see Attachment III).

Future Funding Prospects

State

- On October 11, 2009, SB 716 amended the TDA allowing regions to use Local Transportation Funds for farm worker transportation capital expenditure.
- No effort is underway to seek an additional appropriation from the PTA for expansion or continuation of the AWTP.

Federal

Federal policymakers and environmentalists are seeking federal funding sources for projects that model the KCAPTA/AITS model. On April 23, 2009, in Washington, D.C., Secretary of Transportation Ray LaHood highlighted the KCAPTA/AITS as one of five projects of 11 transit innovations mentioned at a press conference of policymakers in Congress, including House Transportation Committee Chairman James Oberstar. The AITS project was the impetus for California's AWTP, which is viewed by the federal government as a program model to seed agricultural worker transportation services in other states.

Conclusion/Measures of Program Effectiveness

The AWTP has extended a successful agricultural worker transportation services model in California – the AITS pilot project started in 2001. In its infancy, this project only operated in four counties (Fresno, Kern, Kings, and Tulare). Encouraging other similar projects, the AWTP has successfully awarded planning and implementation grants that are and will continue to service farm workers in the southern San Joaquin, Salinas, and Napa valleys as well as in Ventura, Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo, Mendocino, Yolo, Sacramento, and Sutter counties. Soon, farm worker vanpools will operate in about 21 counties because of the funding provided under SB 1135 for AWTP.

This Program has had significant benefits for farm workers, local communities and the State. These are measures of effectiveness that are also pieces of the solutions needed to help resolve several issues currently facing California. Approximately 1,100 agricultural workers are utilizing agriculture vanpools. This number is projected to rise as more vans are procured. This use of the AWTP vans contributes to reductions in private vehicle miles of travel (VMT). Reductions in VMT are in turn reducing the potential for auto collisions and reducing air emissions. The use of AWTP vans also saves agriculture workers earned income by reducing their commute costs.

**Agricultural Worker Transportation Program
Steering Committee Members**

Name	Agency/Address
Martha Guzman-Aceves, State Attorney	California Rural Legal Assistance Foundation Sacramento, California
Sgt. Pete Caram ¹	California Highway Patrol Commercial Highway Patrol Sacramento, California
Manuel Cunha, Jr., President	Nisei Farmers League Fresno, California
Jesse Garcia, Community Outreach	Proteus, Inc. Dinuba, California
Sgt. Jose Gutierrez	California Highway Patrol Central Division Fresno, California
Jennifer Hernandez, Community Outreach ²	California Rural Legal Assistance Foundation Sacramento, California
Frank Herrera, Manager	Esparza Enterprises, Inc. Bakersfield, California
Ron Hughes, Executive Director	Kings County Area Public Transportation Agency Hanford, California
Kristo Kaups, MD, Clinical Professor of Surgery	Community Regional Medical Center Department of Surgery Fresno, California
Kelly McKechnie, Government Affairs Assistant ³	Western Growers Association Sacramento, California
Dave Puglia, Vice President, State Government Affairs	Western Growers Association Sacramento, California
Moses Stites, Chairperson	Fresno County Economic Opportunities Commission Fresno, California
Lt. Alfredo Vasquez	California Highway Patrol Central Division Fresno, California
Jeff Webster, General Manager	Fresno County Rural Transit Agency Fresno, California

¹ Succeeded Lt. Vasquez and Sgt. Gutierrez who contributed to the AWTP guidelines

² Coordinated community outreach and met with political, governmental, and agricultural leaders

³ Succeeded Dave Puglia in 2008 as WGA representative

AWTP - PTA Expenditures to Date

Agency Name	Project Period	Allocated	Expended	Balance	Expended
Mendocino County Planning Team	06/30/07-03/01/09	\$45,552	\$45,552	\$0	100.00%
Ventura County Transportation Commission	04/15/07-09/07/07	\$70,000	\$69,943	\$57	99.92%
City of Calceon	11/01/07-05/01/08	\$70,000	\$60,477	\$9,523	86.40%
Kings County Area Public Transit Agency	04/01/07-06/30/11	\$5,000,000	\$3,223,898	\$1,776,102	64.48%
Cycle 1 Subtotal:		\$5,185,552	\$3,399,870	\$1,785,682	65.54%
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission	07/01/08-08/31/09	\$70,000	\$0	\$70,000	0.00%
Sacramento Area Council of Governments	03/01/08-10/01/08	\$70,000	\$35,468	\$34,532	50.67%
Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments	01/31/08-01/31/09	\$70,000	\$51,345	\$18,655	73.35%
Napa County Transportation Planning Agency	01/01/08-08/15/08	\$70,000	\$69,999	\$1	99.99%
City of Greenfield*	01/01/08-12/31/10	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
Santa Barbara County Department of Public Works**	11/01/07-06/30/11	\$3,164,265	\$838,123	\$2,326,142	26.49%
San Luis Obispo Council of Governments	03/01/08-06/30/11	\$456,997	\$114,586	\$342,411	31.64%
Ventura County Transportation Commission*	01/01/08-12/31/10	\$7,903	\$7,902	\$1	99.99%
Kings County Area Public Transit Agency	01/01/08-12/31/10	\$6,230,341	\$1,450,573	\$4,779,768	23.28%
Cycle 2 Subtotal:		\$10,139,506	\$2,597,996	\$7,541,510	25.62%
Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments	05/01/09-03/30/10	\$70,000	\$1,400	\$68,600	2.00%
Mendocino Transit Authority	07/01/09-06/30/11	\$310,840	\$0	\$310,840	0.00%
Kings County Area Public Transit Agency	12/01/08-06/30/11	\$1,688,227	\$0	\$1,688,227	0.00%
Sacramento Area Council of Governments	03/01/09-06/30/11	\$2,033,625	\$0	\$2,033,625	0.00%
Napa County Transportation Planning Agency	01/01/09-06/30/11	\$572,250	\$12,235	\$560,015	2.14%
Cycle 3 Subtotal:		\$4,674,942	\$13,635	\$4,661,307	0.29%
Cycles 1, 2, and 3 - TOTAL:		\$20,000,000	\$6,011,501	\$13,988,499	30.06%

FY 2006/07 Total AWTP-PTA Appropriation
 Total AWTP Funds Awarded to Date
 Percentage of AWTP Funds Expended to Date

\$20,000,000
 \$20,000,000
 30.06%

Planning Grant
 Service Implementation Grant

* = Total or a portion of awarded dollars transferred to RCAFPA

** = \$70,000 added from City of Santa Maria planning grant

Figures Updated 11/09/2009

Local and Federal Funding Contributions for the AWTF

Agency Name	PTA Allocated	Local Funds	Federal Funds	Project Total
Mendocino County Planning Team	\$45,552	\$0	\$52,350	\$97,902
Ventura County Transportation Commission	\$70,000	\$7,000	\$0	\$77,000
City of Calexico	\$70,000	\$0	\$0	\$70,000
Kings County Area Public Transit Agency	\$5,000,000	\$2,707,000	\$0	\$2,707,000
Cycle 1 Subtotal:	\$5,185,552	\$2,707,000	\$52,350	
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission	\$70,000	\$7,000	\$0	\$77,000
Sacramento Area Council of Governments	\$70,000	\$9,000	\$0	\$79,000
Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments	\$70,000	\$5,000	\$0	\$75,000
Napa County Transportation Planning Agency	\$70,000	\$49,500	\$0	\$119,500
City of Greenfield*	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Santa Barbara County Department of Public Works**	\$3,164,265	\$150,000	\$0	\$3,314,265
San Luis Obispo Council of Governments	\$456,997	\$115,000	\$0	\$571,997
Ventura County Transportation Commission*	\$7,903	\$0	\$0	\$7,903
Kings County Area Public Transit Agency	\$6,230,341	\$3,486,000	\$0	\$9,716,341
Cycle 2 Subtotal:	\$10,139,506	\$3,821,500	\$0	
Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments	\$70,000	\$0	\$0	\$70,000
Mendocino Transit Authority	\$310,840	\$0	\$0	\$310,840
Kings County Area Public Transit Agency	\$1,688,227	\$0	\$0	\$1,688,227
Sacramento Area Council of Governments	\$2,033,625	\$100,000	\$0	\$2,133,625
Napa County Transportation Planning Agency	\$572,250	\$0	\$56,664	\$628,914
Cycle 3 Subtotal:	\$4,674,942	\$100,000	\$56,664	
Cycles 1, 2, and 3 - TOTAL:	\$20,000,000	\$6,628,500	\$109,014	

Italics = Projected expenditure

* = \$ transferred to KCAPTA

** = \$ transferred from the City of Santa Maria planning grant

Report to the Legislature Amtrak Thruway Bus Service from Sacramento to South Lake Tahoe

Introduction

Senate Bill (SB) 684, Chapter 200, Statutes of 2007, amended California Government Code section 14035.55 and requires that the California Department of Transportation (Department):

“...shall undertake a two-year study of patronage on the bus service operated between the City of Sacramento and the City of South Lake Tahoe and intermediate points pursuant to subdivision (g), identifying the number of passengers who are transferring to an Amtrak rail service and those who are traveling solely on the bus service. The study shall identify the revenue from each category of passengers and include other pertinent ridership information. The report shall be submitted to the transportation policy committees of the Legislature no later than March 1, 2010.”

Under Government Code section 14035.55, Amtrak Thruway bus service can be provided only to passengers who also have an Amtrak intercity rail ticket. For example, a potential passenger attempting to travel from Chico to Red Bluff would not be able to use Amtrak, as no train is included in this Amtrak Thruway bus-only trip. There are a few exceptions to this requirement.

SB 684, which went into effect January 1, 2008, adds an additional exception. The bill allows Amtrak Thruway bus passengers traveling to points between and including Sacramento and South Lake Tahoe to travel on the bus without possessing a through ticket to connect to a train. Under the law, this service could only be implemented if no private intercity bus company provides service between Sacramento and South Lake Tahoe. The option to allow passengers to purchase local bus tickets without a rail ticket was implemented in November 2008.

This report provides information on the impact of allowing local passengers on the Sacramento-South Lake Tahoe bus route. Route 20c has one daily round-trip from the Sacramento Amtrak station, with an intermediate stop in Placerville, to three South Lake Tahoe stops (Tahoe Wye, Stateline Transit Center, and Stateline – Kingsbury). This bus route has guaranteed connections with the Capitol Corridor train service (San Jose-Sacramento and Auburn), San Joaquin Route (Bakersfield – Sacramento and Oakland) passengers and Amtrak long distance passengers on the Coast Starlight (Seattle - Los Angeles) also can make a guaranteed connection with bus Route 20c in Sacramento.

This report finds the implementation of local bus service on the Sacramento-South Lake Tahoe Amtrak Thruway bus route in November 2008 has improved ridership. Therefore, it is recommended that local bus service on the route be continued.

Analysis

The Department obtained from Amtrak bus ridership on bus Route 20c for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2009 (October 2008-September 2009). Table 1 below summarizes the bus ridership and revenue data for bus Route 20c for FFY 2009. This year of data includes less than ten months that include bus service because the service was implemented in November of 2008. Therefore, the data will undercount the true annual impact of allowing local bus passengers on this route. Local passengers are defined as those that do not use a train during their trip, traveling only on the bus.

Connecting Train Route	Ridership	Revenue	Ridership Share
Coast Starlight	135	\$1,740	3 %
San Joaquin	964	\$11,111	19 %
Capitol Corridor	3,102	\$45,674	60 %
Total Connecting	4,201	\$58,525	81 %
Bus	992	\$29,467	19 %
Total FFY 2009	5,193	\$87,992	100 %

Table 1 shows that local ridership is approximately 19 percent of total ridership on Route 20c. Bus riders connecting to train routes total 81 percent of total bus ridership. Sixty percent of the bus ridership connects to the Capitol Corridor, 19 percent connects to the San Joaquin Route, and three percent connects to the Amtrak Coast Starlight, an interstate service of the national system. In rounded numbers, the average bus carries seven passengers, six of which transfer to a train and one of which is a local bus passenger.

Table 1 also provides information about Route 20c bus revenue. The total recorded revenue for this route was almost \$88,000 for FFY 2009. Bus revenue from passengers connecting to a train was just under \$60,000, while revenue from local bus passengers was almost \$30,000.

However, the bus revenue attributed to passengers connecting to a train is significantly undercounted. This is because of a temporary change in the Amtrak revenue accounting system during a portion of the first half of calendar year 2009. During this time, Amtrak's revenue accounting system credited all Amtrak Thruway bus revenue to the rail portion of a ticket, and no revenue was credited to the bus portion of a ticket. Amtrak is unable to provide corrected revenue data for the first half of 2009.

Though exact numbers are difficult to quantify, analysis of actual bus and train fares suggests that actual bus revenue from Route 20c on through train/bus tickets in FFY 2009 may be in the range of \$95,000 rather than \$60,000. Using the adjusted figures, the average revenue per passenger for a local bus ticket was about \$30.25 and the average bus revenue for a bus ticket where the rider connected to a train was about \$22.60.

The adjusted average revenue per passenger for the bus portion of a train/bus ticket is lower than for a local bus ticket. This is because the rail and bus segments are both discounted on through train/bus tickets. This pricing methodology encourages the purchase of through train/bus tickets.

State law requires the calculation of profitability of Amtrak Thruway bus routes considers the revenue contributed from the train portion of through tickets to state-supported services. Based on Amtrak data, the average train revenue per passenger in FFY 2009 on the Capitol Corridor was \$13.81, and on the San Joaquin Route the average was \$22.11. Using these averages as a rough estimate, the total contributing train revenue for the route for FFY 2009 is approximately \$66,000. When contributed train revenue is combined with bus revenue, total revenue for bus Route 20c is approximately \$154,000, of which \$29,000 (19 percent) is from local bus revenue alone.

Conclusion

The implementation of local bus service on the Sacramento-South Lake Tahoe Amtrak Thruway bus route in November 2008 has improved ridership. Local bus ridership accounted for about 20 percent of the total ridership on the route in FFY 2009. The cost effectiveness of the bus route also improved as the result of the addition of local bus service, as there is no additional expense associated with the local bus ridership. Therefore, it is recommended that local bus service on the route be continued.