

AMADOR TRANSIT (AT) MINUTES
November 7, 2024 – 10:32 a.m.
ACTC Board Room-117 Valley View Way Sutter Creek, CA 95685

The Amador Transit Board of Directors met on the above date, and the following proceedings were had, to wit:

Present on Roll Call:

Patrick Crew-Board of Supervisors, Chairman
 Steve McLean- City of Jackson, Vice Chairman
 Dan Riordan-City of Sutter Creek
 Sandy Staples-City of Amador City
 Richard Forster-Board of Supervisors
 John Plasse-Citizen at Large

Absent:

None

Also Present:

Patricia Maggie Amarant, AT General Manager
 John Gedney, ACTC Executive Director
 Felicia Bridges, ACTC Transportation Planner/Recording Clerk

AGENDA:

Motion: It was moved by Director Forster, seconded by Director Plasse, and unanimously carried to approve the Agenda.

Ayes: Crew, Mclean, Forster, Plasse, Riordan, Staples
 Noes: None
 Absent: None

PUBLIC MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA: None

CONSENT AGENDA (Items 1-7):

#3. Ridership Analysis, Amador-Sacramento Express, September 2024: Director Forster asked why ridership decreased significantly from August to September, and looking at the graph at the bottom of the page, noted that route is almost flat-lined and down from last year. Ms. Amarant replied she could not say exactly why, if we compare to June, we have been over 200 passengers every month. She noted it may be attributed to State workers that are general commuters but are still working from home. Director Forster asked the board and Ms. Amarant to continue to monitor that ridership trend.

Motion: It was moved by Director Forster, seconded by Vice Chairman McLean, and unanimously carried to approve the Consent Agenda.

Ayes: Crew, McLean, Forster, Plasse, Riordan, Staples
 Noes: None
 Absent: None

#8. AT General Manager Report (Informational Only):

- **Review of Sacramento Service billing and fare collections:** Ms. Amarant reviewed her staff report. She then reviewed the contract details.

Director Riordan asked, under the Recitals section, what is the significance of stating it is operating from Rancho Murieta to Downtown Sacramento. Ms. Amarant replied the initial way the contract was setup was AT is responsible for Amador County to Rancho Murieta while the County of Sacramento is responsible for Rancho Murieta into Sacramento and back to Rancho Murieta. Director Riordan commented it is for financial reasons then. Ms. Amarant replied yes.

Director Plasse stated the background for this item is noted in the minutes of the last meeting, in which the board was trying to understand the differentiation of the fare box ratios in the Amador County operations verses the Sacramento route. He noted the cost to lease the bus from Sacramento is only \$1.00 per year to AT, and not influential in terms of expenses. However, looking at Consent Agenda item #5-Performance Report-September 2024, there is a huge disparity in Cost Per Hour. The Cost per Hour under the Sacramento route is \$26.21 while the Cost per Hour in our normal AT operations varies from \$100-200. Ms. Amarant stated the Cost per Hour is AT costs including everything (i.e. fixed route, Dial-A-Ride, especially the expansions of DAR) that run for 8+ hours per day, while the reimbursed Sacramento route is one route (4.34 hours) per day. She noted it also depends on the how many days of service are included in the month. Ms. Amarant then explained commuters that work for the State are provided a SacRT bus pass (paid for by their employer) which are discounted to a cost of \$1.65 per rider paid to AT instead of the regular \$7.00 cost. She continued that pass enables them to have a cheaper fare and that is subtracted from the total bill, because AT keeps that \$248.00 difference. Ms. Amarant explained commuters that do not receive the SacRT pass can buy a book of tickets, which those fares are collected without reimbursement. AT averages approximately \$7,000 per month that SacRT reimburses AT.

Director Plasse stated Sacramento County is reimbursing us for our operational costs only between Rancho Murieta-Sacramento, but AT incurs the costs to Rancho Murieta and back to Amador County. He asked if AT is keeping all the fare revenue. Ms. Amarant replied yes, the only time we reimburse them is when they use the SacRT card, again only from Rancho Murieta to Sacramento. Director Plasse reiterated the problem is we are keeping all fares but only accounting for operational costs of our section. Ms. Amarant stated AT calculates, in the performance report, service days in a month] multiplied by an amount (approximately \$175) and those costs typically run \$3,400-3,500 per month. So when AT gets reimbursed by Sacramento the \$7,000 per month, that reimbursement has already covered our in-county costs. She noted she will provide further information on these calculations next month.

Director Plasse stated if AT is being reimbursed the costs by Sacramento for the in-county costs, then those costs should not be showing up in our operational costs on the performance summary report. The costs nor the fares should be showing up in the in-county calculation, because they are showing up in the Sacramento route. The Sacramento route should be entirely separate.

Director Riordan clarified that data therefore should be exempt from the farebox revenue calculation. Director Plasse stated yes, exempt from the in-county operational farebox revenue calculation. Director Riordan explained if all the expenses are covered than it does not seem fair or reasonable to include the fares towards to farebox. Rather it is a wash and potentially artificially inflating the farebox calculation. Director Staples stated, with regard to the number of passengers, AT is reimbursing the ones that use the SacRT card (99 in September) and yet we had 209 riders, so those riders that started here and paid the full fare, that revenue stays with AT. She stated that totals 100 riders. Ms. Amarant replied yes, those are fares that AT keeps and puts in the bank. She stated she does not understand why they cannot be included in the calculation, noting they have been included for years and years. Director Plasse asked if one could take fares from the Upcountry route and apply them to the costs associated with the Camanche route? He stated no, because they operate independently as do the costs associated.

Ms. Amarant states our adopted 'Reasonable to Meet' criteria for the Unmet Transit Needs process states the "AT overall service must achieve a 10% fare box return". Director Plasse stated the Sacramento route was specifically carved out. Ms. Amarant replied it has always been included in the calculation. Director Riordan noted he can see where the confusion lies, and asked if the State or other oversight agency has a clear answer for this. Mr. Gedney stated the history of this discussion goes back to our annual audits, where the farebox recovery ratio being shown was confusing because of this reimbursement lump, and that is when the determination was made for the audit process to exclude the contract reimbursement and the fares for that route for the calculation. He continued, the 'Reasonable to Meet' criteria for the unmet needs process is different, and is something we do to evaluate whether a new service would be eligible for funding, providing the expanded DAR services as an example. Director Riordan asked from the State's perspective, when they ask are you meeting the 10%, what is their rule. Mr. Gedney stated utilizing the calculations through the audit process. Ms. Amarant stated she will change the reports to reflect separating the Sacramento revenue and fares. Ms. Staples again asked where do those fares go that are left out (100 riders previously mentioned). Mr. Gedney reviewed the TDA requirements and noted the 'Reasonable to Meet' may need to be modified to clear this up. Director Forster stated without that revenue from the Sacramento route it would probably hurt the AT farebox ratio, possibly lead us to shutting that route down. Director Plasse commented how the board reacts to accurate information is yet to be determined. He noted he just wants accurate information. Chairman Crew requested Ms. Amarant include the details of how she performs the calculations, and the answers from the audit in next months agenda packet. Ms. Amarant replied she would bring that information back next month.

- Information regarding estimate repairs of bus #402: Ms. Amarant reviewed her staff report. Director Forster stated the question last month pertained to if there are other vendors locally to perform the required repairs, as the costs to repair that bus seemed high. Ms. Amarant replied AT has come across this problem before, and there are still very minimal shops willing to work on the buses. Director Plasse noted that should be a consideration when purchasing new buses as well.
- Other dispatch software maintenance costs (from Tuolumne Transit-they use VIA): Ms. Amarant reviewed her staff report. Director Forster asked if the approximately \$7,000 per month that AT pays for software maintenance is all inclusive, because it seems like there have been additional bills. Ms. Amarant replied there are several other software that AT utilizes. One that Caltrans requires will enable AT to have GPS on Google Maps, which has an annual fee to accommodate that service. Additionally, there is a new requirement that transit providers will have to show 'real-time' bus location on an application. She noted that may be another cost that AT will have to incur in the near future.

REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS:

#9. Review and approve final draft of the Disciplinary Policy and Reso #24-05: Ms. Amarant reviewed her staff report. She noted, on page three (3) of the first paragraph, the last sentence has an incomplete sentence and she will modify that for the final. She then highlighted the additional language requested from Director Forster regarding Section D. Speeding Citations with legal counsel recommendation.

Motion: It was moved by Director McLean, seconded by Director Staples, and unanimously carried to approve the revised Disciplinary Policy with the modification as discussed.

Ayes: Crew, McLean, Forster, Plasse, Riordan, Staples
 Noes: None
 Absent: None

#10. Review and approve Zero Tolerance Drug and Alcohol Policy and Reso #24-06: Ms. Amarant reviewed her staff report.

Director Forster asked, regarding drug testing, what happens if someone has a prescription card for marijuana. Ms. Amarant replied there is zero tolerance for that with AT. Director Plasse asked what about a prescription narcotic provided by the staff members physician. Ms. Amarant replied no, however, in the event they are prescribed something, the protocol is to notify management and schedule the use of that medication when not on duty. Director Riordan asked if the policy could/should apply to all staff and not differentiate among staff. Director Plasse commented that is a good point as many staff members may fill multiple roles. Directors agreed to review that in the future.

Motion: It was moved by Director Forster, seconded by Director Staples, and unanimously carried to approve the Zero Tolerance Drug and Alcohol Policy and approval of resolution #24-06.

Ayes: Crew, McLean, Forster, Plasse, Riordan, Staples
 Noes: None
 Absent: None

#11. Approve Monthly Claims List:

Motion: It was moved by Director Forster, seconded by Director Staples, and unanimously carried to approve the amended claims list.

Ayes: Crew, McLean, Forster, Plasse, Riordan, Staples
 Noes: None
 Absent: None

#12. Future Agenda Items: None

Closed Session: At 11:36 a.m. Vice Chairman McLean called for a Closed Session as noticed: Conference - Pending or Potential Litigation-Pursuant to Government Code Section §54956.9 Presenter: Patricia Maggie Amarant, General Manager. At 11:57 a.m. the Vice Chairman adjourned the closed session of AT and reported an update was provided.

ADJOURNMENT:

At 11:58 a.m. the Vice Chairman adjourned the regular meeting to Thursday, December 5, 2024 at 9:00 a.m. at 117 Valley View Way, Sutter Creek, CA 95685.

ATTEST: _____
 Patrick Crew, Chairman
 Amador Transit

 Recording Clerk

Note: Copies of referenced documents are available at the AT and ACTC offices.