

Mesa County: MCM 97-172(1)

City of Grand Junction: 58-01

City of Fruita: 2001-21

Town of Palisade: None

RESOLUTION NO. 58-01

**A JOINT RESOLUTION CONCERNING THE ADOPTION OF THE ADDENDUM TO
THE MESA COUNTY TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR 1998-2002**

WHEREAS, a Five-Year Transit Development Plan is required to be developed and approved by local governments in Mesa County in order for Mesa County to continue receiving Federal Transit Administration funding for transit services; and

WHEREAS, the Federal Transit Administration awarded planning assistance to Mesa County to assist in the funding for the preparation of the Transit Development Plan; and

WHEREAS, a Transit Development Plan Committee was appointed to develop a recommendation for transit services in the area, including representatives from the City of Grand Junction, City of Fruita, Town of Palisade, Mesa County, and the Mesa County Civic Forum under the guidance of the Grand Junction/Mesa County Metropolitan Planning Organization; and

WHEREAS, the preferred alternative as recommended by the Transit Development Plan Committee has been adopted by the City of Fruita, Town of Palisade, Mesa County, and the City of Grand Junction; and

WHEREAS, several public hearings have been held to receive input regarding the Transit Development Plan; and

WHEREAS, Mesa County agrees to the levels of local government and federal funding as set forth in the Transit Development Plan, subject to annual appropriation; and

WHEREAS, the original Transit Development Plan was approved by the County Commissioners of Mesa County on September 8, 1997 (MCM 97-172); the Grand Junction City Council on September 17, 1997 (GJCC 59-97); the City of Fruita City Council on August 11, 1997 (1997-37); and the Town of Palisade Board of Trustees on August 23, 1997 (97-21); and

WHEREAS, the County Commissioners of Mesa County, the Grand Junction City Council, the Fruita City Council, and the Town of Palisade Board of Trustees now wish to modify the original Transit Development Plan;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT JOINTLY RESOLVED BY THE COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF MESA COUNTY, THE GRAND JUNCTION CITY COUNCIL, THE FRUITA CITY COUNCIL, AND THE TOWN OF PALISADE BOARD OF TRUSTEES AS FOLLOWS:

The 1998-2002 Transit Development Plan Addendum is hereby approved and staff is directed to

Mesa County: MCM 97-172(1)

City of Grand Junction: 58-01

City of Fruita: 2001-21

Town of Palisade: None

submit the Addendum to the Federal Transit Administration.

PASSED AND ADOPTED BY THE MESA COUNTY COMMISSIONERS ON _____
_____.

MESA COUNTY BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

By: /s/ Kathryn H. Hall_____

ATTEST:

/s/ Gincy French, Chief Deputy_____
Monica Todd, Clerk & Recorder

PASSED AND ADOPTED BY THE GRAND JUNCTION CITY COUNCIL ON June 6, 2001.

GRAND JUNCTION CITY COUNCIL

By: /s/ Cindy Enos-Martinez_____

ATTEST:

/s/ Stephanie Nye_____
Grand Junction City Clerk

PASSED AND ADOPTED BY THE FRUITA CITY COUNCIL ON _____
_____.

FRUITA CITY COUNCIL

By: /s/ Doug Hall_____

ATTEST:

/s/ Margaret Steelman
Fruita City Clerk

PASSED AND ADOPTED BY THE PALISADE BOARD OF TRUSTEES ON _____
_____.

TOWN OF PALISADE BOARD OF TRUSTEES

By: /s/ Dean W. Smith

ATTEST:

/s/ Vivian Touve
Palisade Town Clerk

I. Introduction Addendum

(May, 2001)

The first 5 tasks outlined in the original 1998-2002 Transit Development Plan (TDP), remain unchanged until the TDP revision/extension scheduled for September, 2002. These tasks include:

Task 1. Data Compilation;

Task 2. Transit Demand Estimation;

Task 3. Exploration of Alternatives for Provision of Public Transportation;

Task 4. Services; and

Task 5. Completion and Distribution of the TDP

The Addendum to the original TDP includes an additional task outlining the continual implementation of the original Detailed Work Plan.

Task 6. On-going Services

The purpose of this activity was to analyze more closely the preferred transit alternative selected by the Transit Steering Committee. In April of 2001, the Transit Steering Committee voted to implement the level of service and corresponding transit route and service structure proposed by the Regional Transportation Planning Office (RTPO). Together with the existing contractor, MesAbility, and the assistance of an outside consultant, a plan was adopted that included 22 peak period vehicles and 65,000 annual revenue hours.

I. **Service Options Considered.** The TDP Committee, which oversaw the production of the original TDP, analyzed and reviewed several service options prior to settling on the current system. Systems considered include:

- *Fixed route*--Fixed route transit operations generally provide the highest ridership and are, thus, the most efficient. They are also rigid in terms of schedule and geographic area served. A fixed route system can operate as a pulse or grid system. Pulse systems are designed under the philosophy of all (or components of the total system) bus routes meeting at a centralized point in order to provide transfer opportunities for passengers. Pulse systems are generally less expensive to operate than grid systems, but could present timing problems as traffic congestion worsens. Grid systems operate on a street grid with buses coming every so often (the desired timing is usually 15 minute headways; however, timing is largely tied to funding, as each bus on the grid increases the variable operating costs. In an effective grid system the passenger does not need to be as concerned with being at the stop on time, as another bus will be coming along shortly.

Fixed route systems are usually general public systems and most have some type of federal funding. Examples of fixed route systems that may not be federally funded

include main street trolleys and various shuttle systems.

Fixed route systems that are open to the general public must meet the guidelines set forth under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990. This means that the system must make provisions for the disabled, either by deviating off route by 3/4 of a mile to pickup disabled passengers at their homes or by providing complementary paratransit.

- *Demand-response*--Is often referred to as paratransit and almost always refers to senior and disabled transportation or both. Under the ADA, a fixed route operator who does not deviate off route is required to provide "complementary paratransit". This is usually a door to door, day in advance reservation system that operates similar to a taxi service. Vehicles are mostly ADA accessible with wheelchair accommodations. Demand response systems are considerably more expensive to operate than fixed route services when compared on a cost per passenger basis. A good demand response system carries around 3 rider per hour (That is, for every hour a vehicle is in service, it provides three one-way passenger trips). One method to increase efficiency on demand response systems is to provide subscription trips. Subscription trips are regular recurring trips that have been booked in advance for a period of time. By increasing the number of subscription trips, a transit agency can produce run schedules that resemble fixed route services. Under the ADA; however, a maximum of 50% of total passenger trips provided by a demand response system can be subscription trips.
- *Route deviation*--Or deviated fixed route services operate much the same way as a fixed route, but include a provision for the bus to deviate off route up to 3/4 mile for disabled passenger pickup. Deviated fixed route systems are usually a compromise that allows the provider to implement fixed route service without the added expense of complementary paratransit. As one might expect, these systems are not as effective in urban and high-density areas, as the route deviations often force the bus to run behind schedule. These types of systems are most effective in rural settings, where there is great distance between points of contact.
- *Flex routing and innovative options*--A number of innovative approaches to providing transit services have recently come into play in an effort to improve services. A flex route might have two geographic destinations with a fixed time at each stop. Between timed stops, the bus may act much the same as a paratransit or deviated fixed route system by stopping for passengers along the way. These approaches are relatively new to transit theory and, thus, unproven. Individual successes have occurred, but widespread use by a major urban transit provider has not yet occurred.

The current Grand Valley Transit system utilizes a mix of the above references services to form a "neighborhood flexible transit system". This system takes full advantage of the positive aspects of each service delivery option and then customizes portions of the service to fit individual ridership needs. The system was designed as a mobility system that first considers the needs of the elderly, disabled and low-income.

b. The advent of the Grand Valley Transit (GVT) system in February 2000 marked the realization of the goal of introducing a limited fixed route, mobility system. The adopted system includes eighteen (18) fixed and fixed point deviation routes operating from Palisade to Grand Junction to Fruita and four (4) additional paratransit vehicles to provide Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) support. All vehicles operate from 6:00 AM to 6:00 PM Monday through Friday and have fully-accessible vehicles.

- The current system includes a central circulator, which utilizes eight (8) routes; half running opposite directions, that service the downtown area, Mesa State College, Department of Human Services and many additional key destinations. The route was designed for 15 minute headways; however, 20 minute wait times are more common.
- In addition to the circulator routes, there are four shuttles, each utilizing two buses to achieve half hour headways. Two north/south and two east/west alignments that encompass Walker Field Airport, the Horizon Drive commercial area, Orchard Mesa, Mesa Mall, the many additional important destinations. These shuttles provide more direct access than the circulator systems and cover a wider geographical area and provide some Dial-A-Ride Ride (fixed-point deviation) service.
- Two buses provide a rural route system for the City of Fruita and the Town of Palisade. These routes operate every second hour within the affected areas. These routes are rural, commuter routes only.
- Demand Response (paratransit) service is available to those members of the community who have a disability that precludes them from utilizing the fixed route and Dial-A-Ride services. Four vehicles operate an average of eight hours per day to provide this door to door type transit. Demand response is available throughout the urban area service boundary.

Given that GVT operates approximately 260 days per year, the above referenced system requires approximately 65,000 revenue hours (a revenue hour is defined as any hour in which a transit vehicle is available to provide service) per operating year. The approved number of revenue hours is sufficient to meet the rising demand for transit service in the Grand Valley and is representative of the system unveiled in 2000 and currently operating in 2001. Future adjustments to the service level will be addressed through the Transit Steering Committee.

VIII. Transit Development Plan Addendum

(May, 2001)

Introduction

This Chapter presents an Addendum to the five-year Transit Development Plan. The remainder of the original 1997-2002 Transit Development Plan which includes sections addressing Operations Scheme, Management and Organization, Steering Committee, Transit Coordinator, Marketing Program, and Detailed Work Plan remains unchanged until the revision/extension scheduled for September, 2002.

In April of 2001, the Transit Steering Committee voted to implement the level of service and corresponding transit route and service structure proposed by the Regional Transportation Planning Office (RTPO). Together with the existing contractor, MesAbility, and the assistance of an outside consultant, a plan was adopted that included 22 peak period vehicles and 65,000 annual revenue hours. The updated information for the preferred option is as follows:

1. Fixed-route system which includes 2 downtown circulators and 2 shuttles, one traversing north/south the other east/west.
2. Intercity bus system providing transit services from the communities of Fruita and Palisade with connections to the public transit system within the urban area boundary.
3. Complimentary door-to-door demand response paratransit services within the urban area boundary.

Service Needs

In 1997 the TDP Committee decided that the preferred transit service option would target Mesa County's mobility challenged population. These targeted groups remain as the Committee decided in 1997 and includes:

- Persons with mobility impairments or disabilities that keep them from being able to drive an automobile;
- Elderly persons who can no longer drive, or no longer wish to drive;
- Low income people who cannot afford an automobile (including both unemployed and the working poor).

In order to serve these targeted population groups, the following steps are recommended:

Step One: Provide a fixed-route system which includes 2 downtown circulators and 2

shuttles, one traversing north/south the other east/west.

The current system includes a central circulator, which utilizes eight (8) routes; half running opposite directions, that service the downtown area, Mesa State College, Department of Human Services and many additional key destinations. The route was designed for 15 minute headways; however, 20 minute wait times are more common.

In addition to the circulator routes, there are four shuttles, each utilizing two buses to achieve half hour headways. Two north/south and two east/west alignments that encompass Walker Field Airport, the Horizon Drive commercial area, Orchard Mesa, Mesa Mall, the many additional important destinations. These shuttles provide more direct access than the circulator systems and cover a wider geographical area and provide some Dial-A-Ride (fixed-point deviation) service.

Step Two: Provide intercity bus transit services from the communities of Fruita and Palisade with connections to the public transit system within the urban area boundary.

Two buses provide a rural route system for the City of Fruita and the Town of Palisade. These routes operate every second hour within the affected areas and provide some Dial-A-Ride service. These routes are rural, commuter routes and can only make a limited number of stops in the populated areas.

Step Three: Provide complimentary door-to-door demand response paratransit services within the urban area boundary.

Demand Response (paratransit) service is available to those members of the community who have a disability that precludes them from utilizing the fixed route and Dial-A-Ride services. Four vehicles operate an average of eight hours per day to provide this door to door type transit. Demand response is available throughout the GVT service area, with the exception of Palisade (no service). The City of Fruita provides limited demand response service through an agreement with Family Health West.

Funding Strategies

In addition to the financing techniques outlined in the original TDP, the following is a breakdown of the different funding sources that will be used to fund the Amended preferred option:

1. Operating Costs

FTA Section 5307 urban area formula funds will be used to fund the operating expenses for the

fixed-routes, shuttles, dial-a-ride public transit, and complimentary door-to-door paratransit services within the urban boundary. The Operating costs will be matched at a 50/50 ratio by contributions from local funding sources.

FTA Section 5307 funds will also continue to be used for Capital Cost of Contracting and Associated Capital Maintenance costs associated with expenditures for public transit service within the urban boundary. These costs will be matched at an 80/20 ratio by contributions by local funding sources.

FTA Section 5311 rural transportation funds will be used to provide Operating funding for the intercity bus transit services from the urban area boundary to Fruita and Palisade and back. The Operating costs will be matched at a 50/50 ratio. The local match will come from contributions by local funding sources.

FTA Section 3037 (Access to Jobs) will be used to supplement the Operating funds used to provide fixed-route, shuttles, and dial-a-ride public transit services. The Operating costs will be matched at a 50/50 ratio by contributions from local funding sources.

1. **Project Administration Costs**

Costs associated with Project Administration for all FTA grants will be requested as each grant is applied for. These grants include Section 5307, Section 5311, Section 5309, and Section 3037. The amount requested for Project Administration shall not exceed 20% of the total of each individual grant. The local match for Project Administration will come from local funding sources in the form of cash and in-kind matches.

1. **Capital Equipment Costs**

Capital Equipment costs, including computer hardware and software, office equipment, and bus shelters and associated items, will be funded through Section 5307 and Section 3037 funding with local match being provided by local funding sources.

1. **Rolling Stock Costs**

ADA compliant buses - both new and for replacement - will be funded through Section 5307, Section 3037, and Section 5310 (paratransit capital) funding.

Buses to be used for the fixed-routes, shuttles, and dial-a-ride public transit will be purchased using Section 5307, Section 5309 (discretionary capital grant), and Section 3037 funding. Buses to be used for the complimentary door-to-door demand response paratransit services will be purchased using Section 5310 funding.

Local match for the Rolling Stock will come from contributions by local funding sources.

1. **Capital Construction Costs**

Construction of bus shelters and transfer points within the urban area boundary will be funded using Section 5307, Section 3037, and Section 5309 funding. Local match for the Capital Construction will come from contributions by local funding sources.

Construction and re-habilitation of the proposed Historic Intermodal Plaza (HIP) will be funded

with a Section 5309 grant. Local match for the HIP will come from private/public partnerships.

1. Transit Planning

Costs associated with additional rural transit planning, research, training, technical assistance, and special projects will be offset through an FTA Section 5313(b) transit planning grant. Local match for Transit Planning will come from contributions by local funding sources.

Local Funding Sources

The original TDP stated that the Grand Junction City Council’s approval of the TDP was conditioned on a maximum City contribution of \$50,000 annually. In April, 2001, the TSC along with staff from Mesa County, the Cities of Grand Junction, Fruita, and Palisade, and the purchased transportation contractor, MesAbility, met to discuss a new set of acceptable rationales for establishing local funding.

The details of how the FTA required local matches will be distributed among the participating entities is still under consideration; however, the following groups have committed to contributing a portion of the total local match (both cash and in-kind) needed to provide the level of service approved by the TSC:

- | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------|
| Mesa County | Palisade |
| Department of Human Services | School District 51 |
| Grand Junction | Fruita |
| Private businesses | Mesa State College |

Federal Transit Administration Funds Available

Mesa County has available and will be applying for the following Federal Transit Administration Funds:

- | | |
|---|---|
| Section 5307 urban area formula funds | Section 5313(b) rural transit planning funds |
| Section 5309 capital discretionary funds | Section 3037 Access to Jobs funds |
| Section 5310 paratransit capital funds | Section 5311 rural transit funds |