

TO: James L. App, City Manager  
FROM: Mike Compton, Director of Administrative Service  
SUBJECT: State Transit Assistance Applications for Transit Projects  
DATE: January 16, 2007

---

NEEDS:

For the City Council to adopt a resolution approving various applications for State Transit Assistance (STA) funding.

FACTS:

1. The City was advised in September that STA funds distributed by State would significantly exceed original estimates by over \$1.7 million, \$226,000 in Section 99314 funds and \$1.518 million in Section 99313 funds.
2. The Council of Governments (COG) approved the full allocation of the \$226,000 in Section 99314 funds with Paso's share being \$8,000. COG approved an initial allocation of Section 99313 funds in the amount of \$379,500 with Paso's share being \$42,000.
3. COG has now determined that the balance of the STA Section 99313 funds will be distributed on a "rated" application process.
4. On December 13, 2006, the City received official notification of the application process and application forms. The deadline for submission of applications is January 4, 2007.
5. The application requires that the Council approve the project applications by resolution. Preparation of applications due to the holidays and short timeline provided by COG did not provide the Council an opportunity to approve project applications prior to submission to COG.
6. COG will accept applications as complete so long as they are followed shortly thereafter with Council resolution approving the project applications.

ANALYSIS &  
CONCLUSION:

City has prepared various project applications for STA funds. These projects are identified as follows:

1. Access improvements (sidewalk) to bus stop on Creston Road in front of Food4Less Center - \$18,000
2. Access improvements (sidewalk) to bus stop on Niblick Road in front of Albertson Center.
3. Construction of restrooms at the Transit Center for after hours use by Greyhound Bus and Amtrak customers.
4. Marketing plan implementation including new guide, new bus stops, re-painting existing bus fleet, and re-painting existing bus stop infrastructure.
5. Installation of additional bus shelters w/benches and trash receptacles and new benches w/trash receptacles.

The applications request a total of \$444,000 for the five projects noted above. It is proposed that the City provide a match of 10% from either gas tax or transportation development act funds to improve project ratings.

FISCAL  
IMPACT:

Depending upon which if any projects receive funding, the City match will have a minor impact upon the availability of gas tax and/or transportation development act funds. Without project application approval, it is highly unlikely that projects #1, 2, 3 or 5 will be funded from other resources in the short-term. Additionally, many components of project #4 will require multi-year, long-term funding to be achieved.

OPTIONS:

- a. Adopt Resolution No. 06-xxx affirming support for the State Transit Assistance funding applications previously submitted by Paso Robles staff; or
- b. Amend, modify or reject above option.

RESOLUTION NO. 07-XXX

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PASO ROBLES  
AFFIRMING ITS SUPPORT FOR THE STATE TRANSIT ASSISTANCE  
FUNDING APPLICATIONS PREVIOUSLY SUBMITTED BY THE  
DIRECTOR OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES TO MEET  
THE APPLICATION DEADLINE OF JANUARY 4, 2007

---

WHEREAS, the San Luis Obispo Council of Governments has received notification that the allocation of State Transit Assistance funds will significantly exceed original estimates; and

WHEREAS, after making an initial distribution of these “windfall” State Transit Assistance funds, the San Luis Obispo Council of Governments has determined that the balance of funds, approximately \$1.5 million will be distributed based upon a competitive application basis; and

WHEREAS, the January 4, 2007 application deadline date did not provide sufficient for formal Council approval of project application submissions prior to the deadline; and

WHEREAS, the San Luis Obispo Council of Governments will accept said approval post application deadline given the tight timeline.

THEREFORE, BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED that the City Council of the City of El Paso de Robles affirms its support and approval for the State Transit Assistance project applications (copies attached) previously submitted by the Director of Administrative Services.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the City Council of the City of El Paso de Robles at a regular meeting of said Council held on the 16th day of January 2007 by the following vote:

AYES:  
NOES:  
ABSTAIN:  
ABSENT:

---

Frank R. Mecham, Mayor

ATTEST:

---

Deborah Robinson, Deputy City Clerk

**FY 2006/2007**  
**State Transit Assistance Project Application**

1. **Name and Contact:**  
Name of Project: [Bus Stop Sidewalk Improvements #1 – Creston Rd @ Food 4 Less](#)  
Contact Person: [Mike Compton](#) Phone #: [237-3999](#)
  
2. **Threshold Criteria (please explain):**
  - a) **Board Approval:** Is the project supported by your agency's Governing Board? (Please attach approval resolution, meeting minutes, or the date approval is expected) [Project approval is expected to be granted at the City Council meeting of January 16, 2007](#)
  - b) **Increase Transit:** Does the project result in increased transit capital or operations without replacing existing transit funds? (i.e. it does not supplant existing transit funds, but increases public transportation) [Yes, this project is for non-budgeted, non-funded transit capital improvements and will NOT supplant existing transit funds.](#)
  - c) **Plan Consistency:** Is the project consistent with local and regional plans? (Short Range Transit Plan, Regional Transportation Plan) [This proposed improvement was mentioned on numerous occasions during the preparation of the City's recently adopted SRTP. However, this project is not specifically mentioned in the SRTP nor other local or regional plans.](#)
  
3. **Project Description (please provide project schedule with milestones by quarter):**  
[It is proposed, subject to owner approval, to install ADA compliant sidewalk on the south side of the Creston Road entrance to the center. Said sidewalk improvement would extend to and match up with the existing sidewalk fronting Creston Road near the bus stop location. Assuming project approval on or before 3/31/07, project bid specifications would be prepared, distributed and bid awarded on or before 6/30/07. Project construction would commence and be completed by the end of the third calendar quarter. Estimated cost of project is \\$18,000.](#)
  
4. **Evaluation Criteria (60 Points):**
  - a) **Please Describe the Need for the Project:** 15 points
    - i. [There is no safe access to the existing bus stop on Creston Road in front of the Food 4 Less center from the shopping center parking lot. To reach the bus stop, riders must walk into oncoming vehicular traffic at the Creston Road driveway entrance to reach the bus stop. It is a very unsafe condition. No other options have been identified to improve rider safety to access existing bus stop. Relocation of bus stop is not an option as this unsafe condition exists all along Creston Road at this shopping center location.](#)
  - b) **Cost-Effectiveness of the Project:** 15 points
    - i. [For operating projects please estimate or include any other indicators you feel adds merit to the project. \(i.e. operating cost per passenger, operating cost per passenger mile, and farebox recovery\) It is believed that establishing much safer access to bus stop at this location will improve use of public transit to and from this location but it is impossible to estimate the exact improvement.](#)
    - ii. [For capital projects please describe how the project meets industry standards. Is the project economical? \(i.e. cost unit for capital\) This is one of two such improvements for which application is being made. All both projects, should they be approved, will be consolidated for the purpose of preparing bid specifications and construction award to enhance cost efficiency. Improvements will be designed to meet existing ADA standards.](#)

- c) **Sustainability:** 10 points
- i. For operating funds: Will funding (& ridership) be available to continue the service? [Not Applicable.](#)
  - ii. For capital funds: Do maintenance costs and life-cycle costs indicate it is a wise capital investment or should other options be pursued? [The nature of the sidewalk access improvement requires little or no maintenance and is expected to last 50 years. No other options have been identified to improve rider safety to access existing bus stop. Relocation of bus stop is not an option as this unsafe condition exists all along Creston Road at this shopping center location.](#)
- d) **Safety and Security Improvements:** 10 points  
Does the project mitigate an existing safety and/or security deficiency? [Yes as noted above.](#)
- e) **Local Match/Leverage:** 10 points  
**Identify source of matching funds if applicable. [Gas Tax funds @ 10%.](#)**  
To what degree are other funding resources complementing the project? 100% = 10 points, 50% = 5 points, <50% = up to 4 points.
5. **Additional Criteria (0 Points):**  
SLOCOG will use additional criteria for funding consideration once scoring is complete.
- a) **Equitability:** Does it provide an equitable distribution of funds? Is it fair to all concerned? If not, modify to ensure a fair distribution of funding.
  - b) **Funding Suitability:** Is the project better suited for Proposition 1B capital funding?

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: [January 4, 2007](#)

Please fill out a separate form for each project and return to SLOCOG via Email to [tgillham@slocog.org](mailto:tgillham@slocog.org) by **Thursday January 4<sup>th</sup> 2007 at 4:00 p.m.**

## FY 2006/2007 State Transit Assistance Project Application

1. **Name and Contact:**  
Name of Project: [Bus Stop Access Improvements #2 – Creston Rd @ Albertson's Center](#)  
Contact Person: [Mike Compton](#) Phone #:237-3999
  
2. **Threshold Criteria (please explain):**
  - a) **Board Approval:** Is the project supported by your agency's Governing Board? (Please attach approval resolution, meeting minutes, or the date approval is expected) [Project approval is expected to be granted at the City Council meeting of January 16, 2007](#)
  - b) **Increase Transit:** Does the project result in increased transit capital or operations without replacing existing transit funds? (i.e. it does not supplant existing transit funds, but increases public transportation) [Yes, this project is for non-budgeted, non-funded transit capital improvements and will NOT supplant existing transit funds.](#)
  - c) **Plan Consistency:** Is the project consistent with local and regional plans? (Short Range Transit Plan, Regional Transportation Plan) [This proposed improvement was mentioned on numerous occasions during the preparation of the City's recently adopted SRTP. However, this project is not specifically mentioned in the SRTP nor other local or regional plans.](#)
  
3. **Project Description (please provide project schedule with milestones by quarter):**  
[It is proposed, subject to owner approval, to install ADA compliant sidewalk access on the northwest side of the Niblick Road entrance to the center to provide safe access from the parking lot to the bus stop. Estimated cost is \\$30,000. Assuming project approval on or before 3/31/07, project bid specifications would be prepared, distributed and bid awarded on or before 6/30/07. Project construction would commence and be completed by the end of the third calendar quarter.](#)
  
4. **Evaluation Criteria (60 Points):**
  - a) **Please Describe the Need for the Project:** 15 points
    - i. [There is a significant the grade difference between the parking lot and the bus stop location on Niblick Road. The only access from the parking lot is walk in the roadway entrance to the center from Niblick Road or traverse the landscaping on the uphill slope. This project is intended to install ADA compliant sidewalk access to the bus stop from the parking lot. No other options have been identified to improve rider safety to access existing bus stop. There is no sidewalk on either side of the driveway entrance to the center from Niblick Road. Relocation of bus stop is not an option as this unsafe condition exists all along Niblick Road at this shopping center location.](#)
  - b) **Cost-Effectiveness of the Project:** 15 points
    - i. [For operating projects please estimate or include any other indicators you feel adds merit to the project. \(i.e. operating cost per passenger, operating cost per passenger mile, and farebox recovery\) It is believed that establishing much safer access to bus stop at this location will improve use of public transit to and from this location but it is impossible to estimate the exact improvement.](#)
    - ii. [For capital projects please describe how the project meets industry standards. Is the project economical? \(i.e. cost unit for capital\) This is one of two such improvements for which application is being made. Both projects, should they be approved, will be consolidated for the purpose of preparing bid specifications and construction award to enhance cost efficiency. Improvements will be designed to meet existing ADA standards.](#)
  - c) **Sustainability:** 10 points

- i. For operating funds: Will funding (& ridership) be available to continue the service? [Not Applicable.](#)
- ii. For capital funds: Do maintenance costs and life-cycle costs indicate it is a wise capital investment or should other options be pursued? [The nature of the sidewalk access improvement requires little or no maintenance and is expected to last 50 years. No other options have been identified to improve rider safety to access existing bus stop. Relocation of bus stop is not an option as this "grade differential" condition exists all along Niblick Road at this shopping center location.](#)

d) **Safety and Security Improvements:** 10 points

Does the project mitigate an existing safety and/or security deficiency? [Yes as noted above.](#)

e) **Local Match/Leverage:** 10 points

**Identify source of matching funds if applicable.** [Gas Tax funds @ 10%.](#)

To what degree are other funding resources complementing the project? 100% = 10 points, 50% = 5 points, <50% = up to 4 points.

5. **Additional Criteria (0 Points):**

SLOCOG will use additional criteria for funding consideration once scoring is complete.

- a) **Equitability:** Does it provide an equitable distribution of funds? Is it fair to all concerned? If not, modify to ensure a fair distribution of funding.
- b) **Funding Suitability:** Is the project better suited for Proposition 1B capital funding?

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: [January 4, 2007](#)

Please fill out a separate form for each project and return to SLOCOG via Email to [tgillham@slocog.org](mailto:tgillham@slocog.org) by **Thursday January 4<sup>th</sup> 2007 at 4:00 p.m.**

**FY 2006/2007**  
**State Transit Assistance Project Application**

1. **Name and Contact:**  
Name of Project: [Transit Center Restroom Improvements](#)  
Contact Person: [Mike Compton](#) Phone #: [237-3999](#)
  
2. **Threshold Criteria (please explain):**
  - a) **Board Approval:** Is the project supported by your agency's Governing Board? (Please attach approval resolution, meeting minutes, or the date approval is expected) [Project approval is expected to be granted at the City Council meeting of January 16, 2007](#)
  - b) **Increase Transit:** Does the project result in increased transit capital or operations without replacing existing transit funds? (i.e. it does not supplant existing transit funds, but increases public transportation) [This project will not supplant existing transit funds.](#)
  - c) **Plan Consistency:** Is the project consistent with local and regional plans? (Short Range Transit Plan, Regional Transportation Plan) [Numerous complaints have been received from Greyhound Bus Line and Amtrak passengers regarding the lack of access to public restrooms. However, this project has not been identified in any plan or study.](#)
  
3. **Project Description (please provide project schedule with milestones by quarter):**  
[Project proposes to construct public restrooms that may be accessed by Greyhound Bus Line and Amtrak passengers after hours \(without entering the primary building\). Estimated cost is \\$146,000. Assuming project approval on or before 3/31/07, preparation of construction bid documents and bid award would be completed by 9/30/07. Construction would be completed by March 31, 2008.](#)
  
4. **Evaluation Criteria (60 Points):**
  - a) **Please Describe the Need for the Project:** 15 points
    - i. [Due to the location of restrooms inside of the Transit Center building \(multi-modal facility\), public access to restrooms is limited to operational hours of the facility. Greyhound Bus Line and Amtrak passengers arriving after hours have no access to restrooms. This has resulted in considerable maintenance effort by city staff to check and/or clean up the area adjacent to the building walls. City has installed portable restrooms but this is seen as only a temporary solution.](#)
  - b) **Cost-Effectiveness of the Project:** 15 points
    - i. For operating projects please estimate or include any other indicators you feel adds merit to the project. (i.e. operating cost per passenger, operating cost per passenger mile, and farebox recovery) [Not applicable.](#)
    - ii. For capital projects please describe how the project meets industry standards. Is the project economical? (i.e. cost unit for capital) [The restrooms would be built in accordance with current building codes and would be ADA compliant.](#)
  - c) **Sustainability:** 10 points
    - i. For operating funds: Will funding (& ridership) be available to continue the service? [Not applicable.](#)
    - ii. For capital funds: Do maintenance costs and life-cycle costs indicate it is a wise capital investment or should other options be pursued? [No other options short of continuing the use of portable restrooms is available. The long-term use of portable restrooms is contrary to City policy and is an unsightly addition to the City's multi-modal facility.](#)
  - d) **Safety and Security Improvements:** 10 points

Does the project mitigate an existing safety and/or security deficiency? **Yes.** Arriving passengers are using the sidewalks around the transit center and the walls of the building in lieu of restrooms. Construction of appropriate restroom facilities will serve to mitigate this problem.

**Local Match/Leverage:** 10 points

**Identify source of matching funds if applicable.** TDA funds @ 10%.

To what degree are other funding resources complementing the project? 100% = 10 points, 50% = 5 points, <50% = up to 4 points.

**5. Additional Criteria (0 Points):**

SLOCOG will use additional criteria for funding consideration once scoring is complete.

- a) **Equitability:** Does it provide an equitable distribution of funds? Is it fair to all concerned? If not, modify to ensure a fair distribution of funding.
- b) **Funding Suitability:** Is the project better suited for Proposition 1B capital funding?

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: **January 4, 2007**

Please fill out a separate form for each project and return to SLOCOG via Email to [tgillham@slocog.org](mailto:tgillham@slocog.org) by **Thursday January 4<sup>th</sup> 2007 at 4:00 p.m.**

**FY 2006/2007**  
**State Transit Assistance Project Application**

**1. Name and Contact:**

Name of Project: [Implement Marketing Program](#)

Contact Person: [Mike Compton](#)

Phone #: [237-3999](#)

**2. Threshold Criteria (please explain):**

a) **Board Approval:** Is the project supported by your agency's Governing Board? (Please attach approval resolution, meeting minutes, or the date approval is expected) [Project approval is expected to be granted at the City Council meeting of January 16, 2007](#)

b) **Increase Transit:** Does the project result in increased transit capital or operations without replacing existing transit funds? (i.e. it does not supplant existing transit funds, but increases public transportation) [Yes, this project is for non-budgeted, non-funded transit marketing activities and will not supplant existing transit funds.](#)

c) **Plan Consistency:** Is the project consistent with local and regional plans? (Short Range Transit Plan, Regional Transportation Plan) [Implementing an effective marketing program was a specific recommendation of the City's recently adopted SRTP. The study noted that the City basically had no program in place. The City received a grant to development a marketing plan but the grant did not include implementation.](#)

**3. Project Description (please provide project schedule with milestones by quarter):**

[Implement transit marketing program. Once the City has decided on a specific new logo \(funds have been allocated for this portion\), the City will need to re-paint all buses, install logo decals on buses and re-paint or replace all bus stop infrastructure \(shelter, bench & trash receptacle\). Similarly, new transit guide and bus stop signage will be needed. Estimated cost is \\$175,000. Assuming project approval on or before 3/31/07, preparation and printing of guide and bus stop signs would begin immediately upon award and would be completed by 6/30/07. The painting of buses would commence as soon as bids are awarded, on or before 6/30/07. Bus painting would be completed by the end of the third calendar quarter and re-painting of bus stop infrastructure by the end of the fourth calendar quarter.](#)

*Note: If green is chosen as a primary color, the bus stop infrastructure will not require re-painting.*

**4. Evaluation Criteria (60 Points):**

a) **Please Describe the Need for the Project:** 15 points

i. [As noted in the recently adopted SRTP, the City has no marketing program. As noted above, the City did receive a grant for development of a marketing plan but the grant did not include implementation. The City allocated TDA funds to develop a new logo to create brand recognition. However, funds are needed to repaint buses, repaint existing bus stop infrastructure to develop and print rider guide and create & install new bus stop signs reflecting the new logo.](#)

b) **Cost-Effectiveness of the Project:** 15 points

i. [For operating projects please estimate or include any other indicators you feel adds merit to the project. \(i.e. operating cost per passenger, operating cost per passenger mile, and farebox recovery\) It is impossible to estimate the exact improvement in ridership and farebox recovery but all transit professionals will attest to the success of effective marketing programs.](#)

ii. [For capital projects please describe how the project meets industry standards. Is the project economical? \(i.e. cost unit for capital\) Not applicable.](#)

c) **Sustainability:** 10 points

- i. For operating funds: Will funding (& ridership) be available to continue the service? **Yes.** Future increases in TDA revenues will be used to fund guide reprinting as needed and replace signs as needed and paint new buses as they are put into service.
  - ii. For capital funds: Do maintenance costs and life-cycle costs indicate it is a wise capital investment or should other options be pursued? **Not applicable.**
- d) **Safety and Security Improvements:** 10 points  
Does the project mitigate an existing safety and/or security deficiency? **Only to the extent that riders will know where bus stops are located and where the buses travel, especially to medical facilities.**

**Local Match/Leverage:** 10 points

**Identify source of matching funds if applicable. TDA funds @ 10%.**

To what degree are other funding resources complementing the project? 100% = 10 points, 50% = 5 points, <50% = up to 4 points.

**5. Additional Criteria (0 Points):**

SLOCOG will use additional criteria for funding consideration once scoring is complete.

- a) **Equitability:** Does it provide an equitable distribution of funds? Is it fair to all concerned? If not, modify to ensure a fair distribution of funding.
- b) **Funding Suitability:** Is the project better suited for Proposition 1B capital funding?

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: **January 4, 2007**

Please fill out a separate form for each project and return to SLOCOG via Email to [tgillham@slocog.org](mailto:tgillham@slocog.org) by **Thursday January 4<sup>th</sup> 2007 at 4:00 p.m.**

**FY 2006/2007**  
**State Transit Assistance Project Application**

1. **Name and Contact:**  
Name of Project: [Bus Stop Improvements](#)  
Contact Person: [Mike Compton](#) Phone #: [237-3999](#)
  
2. **Threshold Criteria (please explain):**
  - a) **Board Approval:** Is the project supported by your agency's Governing Board? (Please attach approval resolution, meeting minutes, or the date approval is expected) [Project approval is expected to be granted at the City Council meeting of January 16, 2007](#)
  - b) **Increase Transit:** Does the project result in increased transit capital or operations without replacing existing transit funds? (i.e. it does not supplant existing transit funds, but increases public transportation) [Yes, this project is for non-budgeted capital expenditures and will not supplant existing transit funds.](#)
  - c) **Plan Consistency:** Is the project consistent with local and regional plans? (Short Range Transit Plan, Regional Transportation Plan) [It is the COG policy that bus stops with 15 or more daily passengers should have full bus shelter \(including bench and trash receptacle\) and stops with 8 to 14 should have bench and trash receptacle.](#)
  
3. **Project Description (please provide project schedule with milestones by quarter):**  
[Install bus stop amenities, shelters, benches, trash receptacles and appropriate signage. Estimated cost is \\$75,000 including installation. Assuming project approval on or before 3/31/07, bus stop amenities should be delivered by 6/30/07. Installation will commence immediately upon receipt and should be completed by the end of the third calendar quarter.](#)
  
4. **Evaluation Criteria (60 Points):**
  - a) **Please Describe the Need for the Project:** 15 points
    - i. [City has identified six \(6\) bus stops that currently or in the near term will meet the criteria for a full shelter and amenities and twelve \(12\) stops for a bench and trash receptacle. Installation of such improvements provides a safe and attractive place for riders while waiting for bus. These improvements may attract additional transit riders. As an "indirect marketing tool" they advertise that the City has a public transit system.](#)
  - b) **Cost-Effectiveness of the Project:** 15 points
    - i. [For operating projects please estimate or include any other indicators you feel adds merit to the project. \(i.e. operating cost per passenger, operating cost per passenger mile, and farebox recovery\) It is impossible to estimate the exact improvement in ridership and farebox recovery but it is believed that such bus stop amenities will attract additional ridership.](#)
    - ii. [For capital projects please describe how the project meets industry standards. Is the project economical? \(i.e. cost unit for capital\) Shelters to be acquired will meet current ADA regulations and industry standards.](#)
  - c) **Sustainability:** 10 points
    - i. [For operating funds: Will funding \(& ridership\) be available to continue the service? Not applicable.](#)
    - ii. [For capital funds: Do maintenance costs and life-cycle costs indicate it is a wise capital investment or should other options be pursued? Shelters require very little maintenance. What little maintenance is required; i.e. emptying trash receptacles and cleaning shelters is currently handled out of existing TDA resources under contract with third party vendor.](#)

d) **Safety and Security Improvements:** 10 points

Does the project mitigate an existing safety and/or security deficiency? **Yes, installation of shelters w/benches and benches will provide a safe and secure place for riders to wait for bus.**

**Local Match/Leverage:** 10 points

**Identify source of matching funds if applicable.** TDA funds @ 10%.

To what degree are other funding resources complementing the project? 100% = 10 points, 50% = 5 points, <50% = up to 4 points.

5. **Additional Criteria (0 Points):**

SLOCOG will use additional criteria for funding consideration once scoring is complete.

- a) **Equitability:** Does it provide an equitable distribution of funds? Is it fair to all concerned? If not, modify to ensure a fair distribution of funding.
- b) **Funding Suitability:** Is the project better suited for Proposition 1B capital funding?

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: **January 4, 2007**

Please fill out a separate form for each project and return to SLOCOG via Email to [tjillham@slocog.org](mailto:tjillham@slocog.org) by **Thursday January 4<sup>th</sup> 2007 at 4:00 p.m.**