

Appendix D

**ACE Ceres–Merced Extension  
Ridership, Revenue, and Benefits Report**

---

**To:** Dan Leavitt, Manager of Regional Initiatives

**Cc:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Subject:** ACE Ceres-Merced Extension Project EIR – Ridership, Revenue, and Benefits Technical Memorandum

**From:** Lincoln James, AECOM (Authored by Laura McWethy, AECOM)

**Date:** January 27, 2021

## Introduction

This technical memorandum summarizes the methodology used to create ridership forecasts for the ACE Ceres-Merced Extension Project. This memorandum describes the process of developing the ridership forecasts, including key assumptions and inputs such as demographic data and conceptual operating plans, as well as the describing the ridership forecasts.

## Ridership Methodology

The ridership forecasts were developed using the ACE Passenger Rail Forecasting Model (“ACE Model”). AECOM developed and has used the ACE Model to forecast ridership for recent and ongoing plans and projects to implement service improvements to the Altamont Corridor Express (ACE) and San Joaquins services, including the *ACEforward* program and the Valley Rail Sacramento Extension.

The ACE Model considers both intercity and commuter passengers and is based on the Amtrak forecasting model developed by AECOM. The ACE Model was calibrated to match existing ACE ridership and updated to account for future short- and long-term investments in the passenger rail network in Northern California, including select connections with BART.

The ACE Model is an incremental model that only forecasts rail ridership, as opposed to total travel by all modes. The model pivots off of existing ridership and service by station pair and the forecasts are based on demographic growth and service characteristics such as depart/arrival times of day, travel time between station pairs and train headways. In cases where there is no existing service, a proxy station pair that has similar characteristics to the new station pair is assigned, and the base ridership is adjusted to account for differences in market size and service. Each train is modeled separately, which allows for time-of-day factoring for both departure and arrival times. Connections are explicitly modeled, and factored lower to reflect the lower appeal of a required transfer. The model produces ridership forecasts that are unconstrained with regard to train capacity and parking capacity. To account for situations where the demand may be greater than the proposed service, the ridership results can be post-processed to reduce ridership to match available capacity at key choke points.

## Demographic Assumptions

In addition to the rail service operating plan, demographic forecasts are one of the key inputs to the ACE Model. Demographic growth forecasts from Moody's Economy.com procured in 2013 were used in the ACE Model to generate trips on both ACE. These forecasts are based on detailed national and regional econometric modeling and provide corridor-wide consistency with respect to key measures of growth, including population, income, and employment. This dataset is a custom forecast of demographic data at the county level, and includes low, base, and high forecasts of total population, total non-farm employment, and total personal income.

The ACE Model, however, requires demographic data for each station. To translate county-level demographic data to smaller-scale station-level data, AECOM employed a custom geographic information system (GIS) application to calculate the population and employment contained within buffers around each station. Buffers ranging in radius from five to twenty miles around stations were used, and the weighted average population and employment for each buffer were inputted into the ACE Model.

The ACE Model was previously updated to reflect demographics from the 2018 Alameda County Transportation Commission (ACTC) travel demand forecasting model ("ACTC Model") which includes demographic forecasts for Plan Bay Area 2050. For this analysis, percentage changes in demographic data by jurisdiction from the base (2013) model to the updated (2018) model were estimated for analysis years of 2030 and 2040. These jurisdictional-level percentage changes were applied to ACE Model base demographic data associated with each station, with consideration to the geographic location, catchment area, and other characteristics of each station. This allows the demographics used in this analysis to be consistent with other planning projects in the region.

## Model Refinements

Additional adjustments were made to the ACE model to improve the ridership forecasts and better match station catchment areas and characteristics. First, the population buffers resulting from AECOM's GIS application were revised around Ceres, Modesto, and Ripon stations. Prior to refinements, the buffers were created using straight-line distances around the stations and did not include highway access travel times or a measure of the directionality of the system, which is the standard procedure, but do not represent the unique characteristics of accessing some of the stations. In this particular area, it is expected that residents on the northwest side of the stations would choose to travel to the more inbound station to board ACE, rather than driving outbound and then taking an ACE train inbound, as it would reduce both the ACE travel time and the access drive time to the station. For example, a passenger that resides in northern Modesto may choose to drive inbound to Ripon to board an ACE train rather than drive outbound to the Modesto station to then board an inbound ACE train. Similarly, a passenger residing to the north/northwest of Ceres may rather drive inbound to Modesto rather than outbound to Ceres to board an inbound ACE train. Because of this potential situation, a portion of the population that was assigned to Ceres in the buffer process was shifted to Modesto, and

a portion of the population assigned to Modesto was shifted to Ripon. These shifts allow the model to better reflect demand at these stations.

Proxy station assignments, which are described briefly in the Methodology section above, also were thoroughly vetted to ensure the similarity between a proxy station and the corresponding station for which it is a proxy. Several factors were considered when improving the match between a proxy station and corresponding/new station. One factor is whether a new station is an end-of-line station; if so, then a proxy station that also is an end-of-line station is likely a good choice as a proxy, as they typically have a larger ridership draw. Demographics around a station matter as well. Stations in relatively high employment areas should be matched with a proxy that also is in a high employment area; similarly, stations in less dense or more rural areas should be matched with proxy stations in less dense areas. Distance between stations is also a factor. When a proxy station is chosen for a new station, the distance between the proxy station and other ACE stations should be similar to the distance between the new station and other ACE stations. Proxy station assignments were reviewed and revised based on the considerations described above. For example, the station pair of Merced to Modesto is a shorter-distance pair that includes an end of the line station and a moderate commute market. For this pair, the existing Stockton to Vasco station pair is used as the proxy to match with those characteristics. Downtown Manteca to Tracy uses the proxy station pair of Lathrop-Manteca to Tracy, as Downtown Manteca is located close to Lathrop-Manteca, but the existing ridership is factored down based on the addition of new stations in the area of Lathrop-Manteca.

## Scenarios and Forecasts

The scenarios and resulting forecasts are described below. Ridership impacts, including passenger revenue (order-of-magnitude estimate only), parking demand at stations, and reduction in vehicle miles traveled (VMT), are also presented. For the ACE extension to Merced, the ridership analysis does not include the HSR project effect on ACE ridership (or vice versa). As the ridership does not include any impacts from HSR, this also extends to further components of ridership such as parking demand and VMT reductions. There are two reasons for this:

1. While the HSR extension to Merced is an adopted project, the exact timing and frequency of HSR service to Merced is still a work in progress;
2. The project team has analyzed the ACE extension to Merced on its own as a separate independent utility project from HSR. This is best done by not including any potential ridership effects due to transfers between ACE and HSR.

Similarly, the Valley Link project has not been factored into the ridership analysis for the ACE extension to Merced as the Valley Link project is not yet formally approved (but may be approved in Spring 2021). Though the Valley Link project would likely increase ACE ridership between Merced and Lathrop, it will likely decrease trips along the existing ACE line, and the project is not yet fully funded all the way to Lathrop and may be built in phases from west to

east. The Merced-Bakersfield HSR Interim Service and Valley Link will be addressed under the cumulative impacts section of the EIR.

The ridership modeling considers two future years: 2030, which assumes the full operating plan for 4 roundtrips each weekday; and a long-term horizon year (2040), which also assumes 4 roundtrips each weekday while capturing future population and employment growth along the route in the next 15–20 years. The assumption for each of these years for both build and no build are summarized in Table 1.

**Table 1: Scenario Descriptions**

	2030	2040
<b>No Build</b>	Existing ACE service No Valley Link service No California High-Speed Rail service	Existing ACE service No Valley Link service No California High-Speed Rail service
<b>Build-Atwater</b>	ACE with Sacramento and Merced Extensions, Atwater station No Valley Link service No California High-Speed Rail service	ACE with Sacramento and Merced Extensions, Atwater station No Valley Link service No California High-Speed Rail service
<b>Build-Livingston</b>	ACE with Sacramento and Merced Extensions, Livingston station No Valley Link service No California High-Speed Rail service	ACE with Sacramento and Merced Extensions, Livingston station No Valley Link service No California High-Speed Rail service

**No Build Scenario**

For 2030 No Build, inbound and outbound ACE service includes the extensions to Natomas and Ceres, with the following roundtrip train service and bus connections:

- Two direct trains between Stockton and San Jose
- One direct train between Ceres and San Jose with connecting bus service between Ceres and Merced
- One direct train between Natomas and San Jose
- One direct train between Natomas and Stockton
- Three trains between Ceres and Natomas via the Natomas Extension with connecting bus service between Ceres and Merced. These three trains also connect at North Lathrop to other inbound ACE trains with service to San Jose.
- Four buses between Ceres and Merced, connecting to the trains at Ceres.

No Build inbound and outbound ACE train service is shown in Table 2 and Table 3, respectively. Existing Amtrak intercity services in the region also was assumed for 2030 No Build, including San Joaquins and Capitol Corridor services. For the 2040 No Build, ACE service is the same as the ACE service used in 2030 No Build.

**Table 2: No Build ACE Timetable – Inbound**

	A01	A03	A05	A07	A09	302	204	304
<b>Merced</b>	3:09					3:59	4:59	5:59
<b>Atwater</b>	3:26					4:16	5:16	6:16
<b>Turlock</b>	3:55					4:45	5:45	6:45
<b>Ceres</b>	4:17					5:05	6:05	7:05
<b>Modesto</b>	4:25					5:13	6:13	7:13
<b>Ripon</b>	4:36					5:24	6:24	7:24
<b>Manteca</b>	4:44					5:32	6:32	7:32
<b>North Lathrop</b>						5:41	6:41	7:41
<b>Stockton</b>		5:33	6:33	7:33	8:39	5:52	6:52	7:52
<b>Lodi</b>				7:18	8:25	6:09	7:09	8:09
<b>Elk Grove</b>				6:56	7:56	6:31	7:31	8:31
<b>Sutterville</b>				6:42	7:42	6:45	7:45	8:45
<b>Midtown Sacramento</b>				6:36	7:36	6:51	7:51	8:51
<b>North Sacramento</b>				6:29	7:29	6:58	7:58	8:58
<b>Natomas</b>				6:19	7:19	7:09	8:09	9:09
<b>North Lathrop</b>		5:45	6:45	7:45		5:45	6:45	7:45
<b>Lathrop-Manteca</b>	4:52	5:52	6:52	7:52		5:52	6:52	7:52
<b>Tracy</b>	5:04	6:04	7:04	8:04		6:04	7:04	8:04
<b>Vasco</b>	5:33	6:33	7:33	8:33		6:33	7:33	8:33
<b>Livermore</b>	5:38	6:38	7:38	8:38		6:38	7:38	8:38
<b>Pleasanton</b>	5:46	6:46	7:46	8:46		6:46	7:46	8:46
<b>Fremont</b>	6:08	7:08	8:08	9:08		7:08	8:08	9:08
<b>Great America</b>	6:26	7:26	8:26	9:26		7:26	8:26	9:26
<b>Santa Clara</b>	6:33	7:33	8:33	9:33		7:33	8:33	9:33
<b>San Jose</b>	6:45	7:45	8:45	9:45		7:45	8:45	9:45

\*Grey highlighted timestamps are transfers to another train.

\*\*Orange highlighted rows are stations that are part of the Ceres-Merced bus service.

**Table 3: No Build ACE Timetable - Outbound**

	A98	A04	A06	A08	A10	215	315	217
<b>Merced</b>		18:41				19:52	20:52	21:52
<b>Atwater</b>		18:27				19:38	20:38	21:38
<b>Turlock</b>		18:01				19:12	20:12	21:12
<b>Ceres</b>		17:43				18:55	19:55	20:55
<b>Modesto</b>		17:37				18:49	19:49	20:49
<b>Ripon</b>		17:25				18:37	19:37	20:37
<b>Manteca</b>		17:17				18:28	19:28	20:28
<b>North Lathrop</b>						18:20	19:20	20:20
<b>Stockton</b>	14:28		18:28	19:27	20:27	18:07	19:07	20:07
<b>Lodi</b>	14:44		18:44			17:53	18:53	19:53
<b>Elk Grove</b>	15:06		19:06			17:31	18:31	19:31
<b>Sutterville</b>	15:20		19:20			17:17	18:17	19:17
<b>Midtown Sacramento</b>	15:26		19:26			17:11	18:11	19:11
<b>North Sacramento</b>	15:33		19:33			17:04	18:04	19:04
<b>Natomas</b>	15:41		19:41			16:51	17:51	18:51
<b>North Lathrop</b>			18:16	19:16	20:16	18:16	19:16	20:16
<b>Lathrop Manteca</b>		17:10	18:10	19:10	20:10	18:10	19:10	20:10
<b>Tracy</b>		16:51	17:51	18:51	19:51	17:51	18:51	19:51
<b>Vasco</b>		16:22	17:22	18:22	19:22	17:22	18:22	19:22
<b>Livermore</b>		16:17	17:17	18:17	19:17	17:17	18:17	19:17
<b>Pleasanton</b>		16:08	17:08	18:08	19:08	17:08	18:08	19:08
<b>Fremont</b>		15:45	16:45	17:45	18:45	16:45	17:45	18:45
<b>Great America</b>		15:29	16:29	17:29	18:29	16:29	17:29	18:29
<b>Santa Clara</b>		15:20	16:20	17:20	18:20	16:20	17:20	18:20
<b>San Jose</b>		15:15	16:15	17:15	18:15	16:15	17:15	18:15

\*Grey highlighted timestamps are transfers to another train.

\*\*Orange highlighted rows are stations that are part of the Ceres-Merced bus service.

**Build Scenarios**

The build scenarios included the same non-ACE service as the No Build (San Joaquins and Capitol Corridor Amtrak services for 2030 and the Amtrak services). For ACE, the build includes all the No Build service and converts the Ceres-Merced bus connection to rail, converting three bus stops to rail stations and improving travel times to these markets. Two versions of the build were tested:

one version with a station at Atwater and the other version with a station at Livingston. The full inbound and outbound ACE schedules for the build runs are provided in Table 4 and Table 5, respectively.

**Table 4: Build Atwater/Livingston ACE Timetable - Inbound**

Station	A01	A03	A05	A07	A09	302	204	304
<b>Merced</b>	3:43					4:31	5:31	6:31
<b>Atwater/Livingston**</b>	3:57/4:01					4:45/4:49	5:45/5:49	6:45/6:49
<b>Turlock</b>	4:08					4:56	5:56	6:56
<b>Ceres</b>	4:17					5:05	6:05	7:05
<b>Modesto</b>	4:25					5:13	6:13	7:13
<b>Ripon</b>	4:36					5:24	6:24	7:24
<b>Manteca</b>	4:44					5:32	6:32	7:32
<b>North Lathrop</b>						5:41	6:41	7:41
<b>Stockton</b>		5:33	6:33	7:33	8:39	5:52	6:52	7:52
<b>Lodi</b>				7:18	8:25	6:09	7:09	8:09
<b>Elk Grove</b>				6:56	7:56	6:31	7:31	8:31
<b>Sutterville</b>				6:42	7:42	6:45	7:45	8:45
<b>Midtown Sacramento</b>				6:36	7:36	6:51	7:51	8:51
<b>North Sacramento</b>				6:29	7:29	6:58	7:58	8:58
<b>Natomas</b>				6:19	7:19	7:09	8:09	9:09
<b>North Lathrop</b>		5:45	6:45	7:45		5:45	6:45	7:45
<b>Lathrop-Manteca</b>	4:52	5:52	6:52	7:52		5:52	6:52	7:52
<b>Tracy</b>	5:04	6:04	7:04	8:04		6:04	7:04	8:04
<b>Vasco</b>	5:33	6:33	7:33	8:33		6:33	7:33	8:33
<b>Livermore</b>	5:38	6:38	7:38	8:38		6:38	7:38	8:38
<b>Pleasanton</b>	5:46	6:46	7:46	8:46		6:46	7:46	8:46
<b>Fremont</b>	6:08	7:08	8:08	9:08		7:08	8:08	9:08
<b>Great America</b>	6:26	7:26	8:26	9:26		7:26	8:26	9:26
<b>Santa Clara</b>	6:33	7:33	8:33	9:33		7:33	8:33	9:33
<b>San Jose</b>	6:45	7:45	8:45	9:45		7:45	8:45	9:45

\*Grey highlighted timestamps indicate transfers to another train.

\*\*The first timestamp in a cell refers to Atwater and the second timestamp refers to Livingston in the Atwater and Livingston Build scenarios, respectively.



**Table 5: Build Atwater/Livingston ACE Timetable – Outbound**

Station	A98	A04	A06	A08	A10	215	315	217
<b>Merced</b>		18:17				19:35	20:35	21:35
<b>Atwater/ Livingston**</b>		18:03/17:59				19:21/19:17	20:21/20:17	21:21/21:17
<b>Turlock</b>		17:52				19:10	20:10	21:10
<b>Ceres</b>		17:43				18:55	19:55	20:55
<b>Modesto</b>		17:37				18:49	19:49	20:49
<b>Ripon</b>		17:25				18:37	19:37	20:37
<b>Manteca</b>		17:17				18:28	19:28	20:28
<b>North Lathrop</b>						18:20	19:20	20:20
<b>Stockton</b>	14:28		18:28	19:27	20:27	18:07	19:07	20:07
<b>Lodi</b>	14:44		18:44			17:53	18:53	19:53
<b>Elk Grove</b>	15:06		19:06			17:31	18:31	19:31
<b>Sutterville</b>	15:20		19:20			17:17	18:17	19:17
<b>Midtown Sacramento</b>	15:26		19:26			17:11	18:11	19:11
<b>North Sacramento</b>	15:33		19:33			17:04	18:04	19:04
<b>Natomas</b>	15:41		19:41			16:51	17:51	18:51
<b>North Lathrop</b>			18:16	19:16	20:16	18:16	19:16	20:16
<b>Lathrop-Manteca</b>		17:10	18:10	19:10	20:10	18:10	19:10	20:10
<b>Tracy</b>		16:51	17:51	18:51	19:51	17:51	18:51	19:51
<b>Vasco</b>		16:22	17:22	18:22	19:22	17:22	18:22	19:22
<b>Livermore</b>		16:17	17:17	18:17	19:17	17:17	18:17	19:17
<b>Pleasanton</b>		16:08	17:08	18:08	19:08	17:08	18:08	19:08
<b>Fremont</b>		15:45	16:45	17:45	18:45	16:45	17:45	18:45
<b>Great America</b>		15:29	16:29	17:29	18:29	16:29	17:29	18:29
<b>Santa Clara</b>		15:20	16:20	17:20	18:20	16:20	17:20	18:20
<b>San Jose</b>		15:15	16:15	17:15	18:15	16:15	17:15	18:15

\*Grey highlighted timestamps indicate transfers to another train.

\*\*The first timestamp in a cell refers to Atwater and the second timestamp refers to Livingston in the Atwater and Livingston Build scenarios, respectively.

## Forecast Results

The forecasted annual and daily ACE ridership in Years 2030 and 2040 is shown in Table 6 below for the No Build, Build-Atwater, and Build-Livingston scenarios. Annual revenue, person miles travelled (PMT), and automobile VMT avoided are also shown in Table 6. Revenue is calculated based on the ridership forecasts, but is not an input into the model, meaning fares do not affect ridership numbers directly in the model. Unmodeled attributes such as fare are indirectly included in the incremental model through the baseline ridership, in that it is assumed that the proposed fares will be the same or similar to the existing fares. In cases where there is not existing ridership, such as for the extensions, proxy station pairs are assigned which are assumed to have similar characteristics, including market size, service levels, and fares.

The revenue was calculated as the ridership forecast for each station pair multiplied by the existing fare for each station pair. For new station pairs, fares were interpolated based on existing fares. As auto travel is not included in the ACE model, the VMT was estimated based on train miles by station pair multiplied by ridership and adjusted for average auto occupancy. All new ridership is assumed to be diverted from automobiles.

Overall ridership and the other metrics in both build scenarios are very similar in both 2030 and 2040. Overall ridership in the build scenarios is about 12 percent higher than in the No Build scenario, and annual revenue is about 10 percent higher than in the No Build. The Atwater and Livingston runs have similar total ridership.

**Table 6: Forecasted Ridership, Revenue, & Auto VMT Avoided**

	2030			2040		
	No Build	ATW	LVG	No Build	ATW	LVG
Annual Ridership	3,735,500	4,180,900	4,176,800	4,797,100	5,367,500	5,364,100
Daily Ridership	14,760	16,530	16,510	18,960	21,220	21,200
Annual Revenue (\$)	24,511,200	27,041,500	27,033,900	31,632,200	34,872,800	34,872,300
Annual PMT	199,178,400	223,606,100	223,043,600	257,031,900	288,276,300	287,851,800
Annual Auto VMT Avoided	-	24,375,000	23,966,200	-	31,122,800	30,671,000

Combined station ons and offs (boardings and alightings) for each scenario and forecast year are shown below in Table 7. Relative to the No Build scenario, ridership in the build scenarios is forecasted to increase significantly at Merced, Atwater/Livingston, and Turlock stations as these stations are converting from bus to rail service; moderately at Modesto, Ripon, and Downtown Manteca stations (on the order of 15 percent); and (in general) slightly along the Natomas Extension stations and for ACE stations from Stockton to San Jose (on the order of 5 percent).

There are not significant differences in station-level ridership between the two build scenarios; however, there is slightly more ridership at Atwater in the Build-Atwater scenario compared to at

Livingston in the Build-Livingston scenario. Furthermore, there is slightly less ridership at Merced in the Build-Atwater scenario compared to the Build-Livingston scenario, which suggests that Atwater is an attractive option for some passengers who would otherwise board an ACE train at Merced.

**Table 7: ACE Station Ons & Offs**

Station	2030			2040		
	No Build	ATW	LVG	No Build	ATW	LVG
<b>Merced</b>	31,900	251,500	257,000	41,500	319,700	335,300
<b>Atwater</b>	17,100	115,300	-	22,000	149,100	-
<b>Livingston</b>	-	-	106,200	-	-	130,800
<b>Turlock</b>	32,400	177,600	177,000	41,700	229,700	228,700
<b>Ceres</b>	153,200	151,200	151,300	196,000	193,500	193,500
<b>Modesto</b>	340,400	401,200	401,100	436,800	515,700	514,500
<b>Ripon</b>	209,500	245,000	244,200	276,700	322,600	322,600
<b>Downtown Manteca</b>	136,700	156,300	155,800	181,200	206,700	206,700
<b>Natomas</b>	295,300	317,200	316,900	371,800	399,700	399,000
<b>North Sacramento</b>	235,500	248,300	248,100	295,600	311,800	311,300
<b>Midtown Sacramento</b>	460,200	483,800	483,600	575,900	605,900	604,900
<b>Sutterville</b>	261,800	271,500	271,300	329,000	341,300	340,900
<b>Elk Grove</b>	331,300	350,000	349,900	413,600	437,400	436,800
<b>Lodi</b>	141,500	158,500	158,400	178,400	200,100	199,600
<b>Stockton</b>	283,100	320,000	319,200	370,600	417,900	417,900
<b>North Lathrop</b>	209,700	209,700	209,700	282,200	282,200	282,200
<b>Lathrop/Manteca</b>	168,500	179,400	179,200	216,200	230,000	230,000
<b>Tracy</b>	664,500	693,700	693,100	886,800	924,800	924,800
<b>Vasco</b>	229,100	239,100	238,400	287,800	299,500	299,300
<b>Livermore</b>	244,100	250,500	250,200	306,000	313,700	313,400
<b>Pleasanton</b>	787,400	807,700	806,800	983,700	1,007,300	1,007,700
<b>Fremont</b>	344,400	357,300	357,600	436,800	453,200	453,400
<b>Great America</b>	1,406,200	1,467,600	1,468,900	1,829,500	1,909,800	1,910,800
<b>Santa Clara</b>	94,200	98,400	98,500	122,700	128,300	128,300
<b>San Jose</b>	393,000	411,000	411,300	511,700	535,300	535,600
<b>Total Ons &amp; Offs</b>	7,471,000	8,361,800	8,353,700	9,594,200	10,735,200	10,728,000

Forecasted weekday parking demand at several stations is shown in Table 8 for each scenario and forecast year, which are proportional to the station-level ridership. The largest forecasted increases in weekday parking demand in the build scenarios relative to the No Build scenario are

at Merced, Atwater/Livingston, and Turlock. Modesto and Ripon are forecasted to have moderate increases in weekday parking demand, and all other stations are forecasted to have only slight increases in parking demand.

**Table 8: Estimated Weekday Parking Demand**

Station	2030			2040		
	No Build	ATW	LVG	No Build	ATW	LVG
<b>Merced</b>	45	358	366	59	455	477
<b>Atwater</b>	24	164	-	31	212	-
<b>Livingston</b>	-	-	151	-	-	186
<b>Turlock</b>	46	253	252	59	327	325
<b>Ceres</b>	218	215	215	279	275	275
<b>Modesto</b>	484	571	571	622	734	732
<b>Ripon</b>	298	349	347	394	459	459
<b>Downtown Manteca</b>	195	222	222	258	294	294
<b>Stockton</b>	403	455	454	527	595	595
<b>North Lathrop</b>	298	298	298	402	402	402
<b>Lathrop/Manteca</b>	240	255	255	308	327	327
<b>Tracy</b>	946	987	986	1,262	1,316	1,316
<b>Vasco</b>	326	340	339	410	426	426
<b>Livermore</b>	347	356	356	435	446	446
<b>Pleasanton</b>	1,120	1,149	1,148	1,400	1,433	1,434
<b>Fremont</b>	490	508	509	622	645	645