



Intercity Transit Funding Working Group
12:30 p.m., Tuesday, January 27, 2026
STA Office – Twin Sisters CR (3rd Floor)

Zoom Link Info:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/89137405685?pwd=Z3ZyUjFyVm5wVU8rZCtKRlInbXA3UT09>

Webinar ID: 891 3740 5685

Passcode: 515662

MEETING AGENDA

- 1. 20th Anniversary of the Intercity Transit Funding Working Group** Daryl K. Halls
Attachment: June 2006 ITFWG Staff Report
- 2. Public Comment**
- 3. Recommendation of the STA Board regarding Solano Express Service** ITFWG
Changes for FY 2026-27
 - A. Yellow Line
 - B. Route 82
 - C. Green Line
 - D. Red Line
 - E. Blue Line
- 4. Development of Solano Express Funding and Cost Sharing Agreement for** ITFWG
FY 2026-27
 - A. Schedule
 - B. Service Hours
 - C. Cost Per Hour
 - D. Cost Sharing Formula
- 5. Discussion Items Requested by SolTrans** Kristina Botsford,
 - 1. Vanpool to Davis based on STA's Board Action** SolTrans
 - 2. Solano Express Fares – Increase and Major Issues with In-County Fares**
- 6. Next Steps – Status of the STA Board Subcommittee** Robert Guerrero

Intercity Transit Funding Working Group Members

Louren Kotow – Dixon Read-Ride
Sanjay Mishra / Shaun Vigil – FAST
Beth Kranda / Kristina Botsford – SolTrans
Nouae Vue – Suisun Microtransit
Lori DaMassa - Vacaville City Coach
Daryl Halls /Ron Grassi/Robert Guerrero - STA



DATE: June 2, 2006
TO: STA Board
FROM: Elizabeth Richards, Director of Transit and Rideshare Services
RE: Intercity Transit Funding Agreement Proposal

Background:

The Solano Transportation Authority's (STA) I-80/I-680/I-780 Transit Corridor Study was adopted by the STA Board on July 14, 2004. This Study identified eight (8) intercity bus routes in Solano County, some of which are subsidized by more than one jurisdiction. Cost-sharing methodologies for these routes vary. The Study recommended developing an annual and multi-year funding agreement or Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for intercity transit services as a part of the next steps following completion of the study.

Of the eight (8) intercity bus routes currently in service, six (6) had subsidy sharing arrangements among the participating jurisdictions. These subsidy-sharing arrangements were negotiated in agreements among the participants, some of which were documented and others were not. With the addition of Regional Measure 2 (RM 2) funded service, there is now a ninth (9) intercity transit route – Vallejo Transit Rt. 92, serving Solano County.

STA's coordination of the annual multi-agency Transportation Development Act (TDA) matrix and the State Transit Assistance Fund's (STAF) project funding for the county has clarified and simplified the claims process locally and regionally. Having a coordinated multi-year, multi-agency funding strategy with predictability and some flexibility would help to further stabilize intercity transit service funding in Solano County.

Last year, STA conducted nationwide research and presented a summary of subsidy allocation factors and methodologies to the STA Transit Consortium. Three (3) subsidy-sharing options with various factors were presented to the transit operators and one was selected for further testing. This methodology included ridership and vehicle miles as the key factors. Data was to be collected from the transit operators to test the draft formula.

STA staff collected much of the data and began testing a variety of scenarios primarily using the two factors of ridership and vehicle miles. In late October 2005, these initial scenarios were shared with the transit operators and other funding partners to review and discuss. Since that time a series of weekly meetings with the same participants (now referred to as the Intercity Transit Funding Working Group) have been held to review and refine the data that is input into the funding scenarios.

To determine the net cost of each intercity route, one of the key inputs is the total cost of each route. The Intercity Transit Funding (ITF) Working Group agreed to use the same methodology among operators to calculate and distribute costs among all routes. Upon

review of early data, the ITF Working Group expressed a shared concern that intercity transit service must be operated cost-effectively to reduce the burden to all the funding partners. To reduce costs to Intercity Transit Services, the transit operators explored options to coordinate and streamline services along parallel routes in the near-term and long-term. Proposed changes that are approved and implemented would in turn affect the route costs.

In addition, two additional cost-sharing scenario factors were agreed to be added: bus stops and ridership by boardings. Bus stop by jurisdictions served and ridership data was collected for this purpose as well as to assist in evaluating the productivity of routes.

The original purpose of the ITF Working Group was to develop a uniform methodology for shared funding of Intercity Transit Services. This has been complicated due to the issue of overall rising costs and potential service changes. To maintain the ITF Working Group's focus, principles were drafted. In addition, for the purpose of evaluating Intercity Transit Service changes on the basis of not only cost but also systemwide impacts, service parameters were also drafted. These were approved by the STA Board in March 2006 (see Attachments A and B).

Discussion:

There has been a common interest among all participants to conclude this process and develop a consistent Intercity Transit Funding methodology and agreement. Yet each jurisdiction has specific issues to address. These issues are presented by jurisdiction in Attachment C.

Taking into account the various local issues, cost and revenue assumptions, service proposals and timelines, STA staff has developed a set of draft comprehensive recommendations. This can also be found on Attachment C. This proposal for FY 2006-07 addresses the first two Principles for this effort: a near-term consistent cost-sharing methodology and coordinated service changes that can be marketed comprehensively. This proposal has been discussed with the ITF Working Group and was presented to the STA Transit Consortium and STA TAC in April 2006 in addition to a meeting with the Public Works Directors specifically to discuss this topic. In April, the Transit Consortium and TAC approved a draft of Attachment C. Since that time, further discussions with transit operators with outstanding issues have been completed. The resolution of these issues is included in the draft final matrix (Attachment C) and was reviewed and approved by Consortium and TAC in May.

To address the third principle concerning long-term cost-sharing issues, a similar effort will need to be continued into FY 2006-07. With additional time, comprehensive and consistent data can be collected, particularly ridership data. Evaluation of service changes can be considered and a more refined cost-sharing methodology can be tested and reviewed for a long-term agreement with a target date of completion for FY 2007-08.

Recommendation:

Approve the following:

1. The recommendations pertaining to Intercity Transit Cost-Sharing Funding Agreement and Service as outlined in Attachment C.
2. Authorize the Executive Director to develop and sign an Intercity Transit Funding Agreement for FY 2006-07 based on the recommendations outlined in Attachment C.

Attachments:

- A. ITF Working Group Guiding Principles
- B. Intercity Transit Service Route Analysis Evaluation Parameters
- C. Intercity Transit Cost-Sharing Funding Agreement for FY 2006-07

INTERCITY TRANSIT FUNDING WORKING GROUP

Guiding Principles

Principle 1:

To provide certainty to intercity transit operators and funding partners, establish a consistent method and an agreement for sharing subsidies for all intercity routes by Solano transit operators for FY 2006-07 and future years based on a consensus of the participating jurisdictions.

Principle 2:

To focus limited financial resources and deliver productive intercity transit service as soon as possible, develop a cost effective and affordable revised route structure that will; 1) be implemented with the new subsidy sharing agreement; 2) meet the policy/coverage requirements agreed upon; 3) be marketed jointly.

Principle 3:

To focus limited financial resources and deliver productive intercity transit service on an ongoing basis while meeting the policy/coverage requirements agreed upon, develop strategies to consistently evaluate, modify, and market intercity transit services after the intercity subsidy sharing agreement is implemented.

INTERCITY TRANSIT SERVICE

Service Plan Review

Potential Route Analysis Evaluation Parameters

Productive Measures

- Farebox recovery ratio
- Cost per vehicle service hour
- Cost per vehicle mile
- Cost per passenger trip
- Passengers per vehicle service hour

Policy/Coverage Requirements

- Provides connectivity between cities
- Provides regional transit connections
- Meets Unmet Transit Needs
- Minimize stops in each city
- User friendly