



**CITIZEN'S TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE/
SOCIAL SERVICES TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COUNCIL (CTAC/SSTAC)**

TUESDAY, MARCH 13, 2012 -- 1:30 PM – 3:30 PM

County Government Center – Hall of Justice Pacific Meeting Room
800 South Victoria Avenue, Ventura, CA 93009
Staff Contact: Mary Travis (805)642-1591 ext. 102 or mtravis@goventura.org

1. **CALL TO ORDER**
2. **SELF INTRODUCTIONS**
3. **PUBLIC COMMENTS FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA**
4. **APPROVAL OF 11/8/11, 12/6/11 AND 1/10/12 MEETING SUMMARIES - RESPONSIBLE STAFF: Mary Travis** **Page 2**
5. **ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE-CHAIR**
6. **REVIEW OF APPLICATIONS FOR FY 12/13 TDA ARTICLE 3 BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN FUNDS** **Page 8**
RESPONSIBLE STAFF: Mary Travis
7. **REVIEW VCTC POLICY FOR SOCIAL SERVICE AGENCY TRANSIT TOKENS** **Page 11**
RESPONSIBLE STAFF: Vic Kamhi/Fabian Gallardo
8. **REVIEW VISTA POLICY FOR TRANSPORTING CHILDREN** **Page 14**
RESPONSIBLE STAFF: Vic Kamhi/Fabian Gallardo
9. **CHAIRMAN'S REPORT**
10. **STAFF REPORT**
11. **COMMITTEE MEMBER REPORTS**
12. **ADJOURNMENT**

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act and Government Code Section 54954.2, if special assistance is needed to participate in a Commission meeting, please contact the Clerk of the Board at (805) 642-1591 ext 101. Notification of at least 48 hours prior to meeting time will assist staff in assuring that reasonable arrangements can be made to provide accessibility at the meeting.

Item # 4.a.
Action

**CTAC/SSTAC MEETING SUMMARY
November 8, 2011**

Item # 1 CALL TO ORDER

Jim White, VCTC Chair, called the meeting to order at 1:35 PM, and welcomed everyone.

Item # 2 SELF INTRODUCTIONS

The committee members and staff introduced themselves..

Item # 3 PUBLIC COMMENTS (for items not on agenda)

There were no public comments.

Item # 4 REVIEW OF 10/11/11 MEETING SUMMARY

The meeting summary was approved; there were no changes.

**Item # 5 APPROVAL OF FY 12/13 UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS PUBLIC HEARING DEFINITIONS
AND SCHEDULE**

Mary Travis, VCTC staff, presented the FY 12/13 Unmet Transit Needs Public Hearing schedule and evaluation criteria. The annual public hearing is required by the State Transportation Development Act (TDA) regulations to take testimony concerning possible unmet transit needs that might be reasonable to meet by the cities/County with TDA funds.

The hearing will be on Monday February 6th, 1:30 – 3:30 PM at Camarillo City Hall. Instead of the usual monthly CTAC/SSTAC meeting in February, members are encouraged to attend the public hearing. There will also be two public meetings to take comments – tentatively set on Wednesday January 17th, 6:30 -7:30 PM at Moorpark City Hall and on Thursday January 18th, 6:30 – 7:30 PM at the Oxnard Public Library. The public or interested agencies can also submit comments by mail to the Commission, by email or by telephoning VCTC's Transit Info Center. After all the comments are received, they will be analyzed by VCTC staff working with local transit providers, and recommendations developed for CTAAC/SSTAC and finally Commission approval.

The Committee discussed the draft schedule and evaluation criteria at length. It was noted that the unmet transit needs process has resulted in numerous improvements over the years. Although many times the findings declare there are no unmet transit needs, improvements are suggested as the result of the annual hearing process.

After discussion, the Committee approved the meeting schedule and evaluation criteria.

**Item # 6 REVIEW OF FY 12/13 SCHEDULE AND EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR
TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT (TDA) ARTICLE 3 BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN
FUND APPLICATIONS**

Mary Travis, VCTC staff, reviewed the FY 12/13 Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3 Bicycle/Pedestrian fund application schedule and evaluation criteria. After

lengthy discussion, it was moved that the Safety component of the evaluation criteria be increased from 30 to 40 points; the motion failed. It was also discussed whether or not to make the 50% local match mandatory; it was ultimately agreed to leave the local contribution as “highly recommended”. After discussion, the schedule and evaluation was approved for the Commission consideration in December with the application packets being mailed to the cities/County in mid-January.

Item # 7 CHAIRMAN’S REPORT

Chair White thanked the committee for attending and urged members to attend local and/or County meetings where transportation issues might be discussed. He also urged members attend the February unmet transit needs hearing in February.

Item # 8 STAFF REPORT

Mary Travis, VCTC staff, mentioned the December meeting will be the first not second Tuesday of the month or on December 6. She also noted that the updated County Bicycle Map will be available in December.

Item # 9 COMMITTEE MEMBER REPORTS

Representative Bravo mentioned that the Santa Paula Bike Trail is nearing completion and will be opened officially soon although it is already being used.

Item # 10 ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 3:45 PM.

**CTAC/SSTAC MEETING SUMMARY
December 6, 2011**

Item # 1 CALL TO ORDER

Jim White, VCTC Chair, called the meeting to order at 1:45 PM, and welcomed everyone.

Item # 2 SELF INTRODUCTIONS

The committee members and staff introduced themselves..

Item # 3 PUBLIC COMMENTS (for items not on agenda)

There were no public comments.

Item # 4 REVIEW OF 11/8/11 MEETING SUMMARY

Because there wasn't a quorum, this item was carried over to the January meeting for approval. However, two corrections were noted: Under Item # 6, the Article 3 evaluation criteria was adjusted to increase safety from 25 to 30 points with a reduction in special considerations from 15 to 10 points. Also, the meeting adjourned at 2:45 PM not 3:45.

Item # 5 UPDATE ON VENTURA COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Steve DeGeorge, VCTC staff, presented the Ventura County Comprehensive Transportation Plan. This is the first long-range planning effort for transportation in the County including all modes from bicycles to buses to roads. The Plan has a thirty-year horizon that accounts for planned growth as well as needs expressed by local agencies, the cities/County, and citizens who attended several community outreach meetings held over the past year.

The biggest issue, not surprisingly, is a lack of funding to meet the needs unless a new source of revenue is found. Steve mentioned that there apparently isn't enough public support currently to achieve the necessary 2/3 vote to increase the local sales tax for transportation purposes but this option will have to be considered at some point in the future if the mobility needs of Ventura County are to be supported.

Item # 6 UPDATE ON GOLD COAST TRANSIT OPERATIONS

Margaret Heath, Gold Coast staff, reviewed the current operations of Gold Coast Transit (GCT), the largest bus operator in Ventura County with extensive intercity service in the west county area. GCT currently carries about 3.4 million passengers per year with service costs funded by fares, federal, state and local funds contributed by the cities of Ojai, Oxnard, Port Hueneme, San Buenaventura and the County of Ventura. Margaret noted that GCT staff is continually looking at the routes and schedules to create the most cost-efficient and effective bus and ADA operations. She also discussed GCT's "Try Travel" training and mentioned that community relations and outreach to the riders and potential riders is an ongoing effort.

Item # 7 UPDATE ON VISTA TRANSIT OPERATIONS AND THE COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSIT PLAN

Vic Kamhi, VCTC staff, presented an overview of the VISTA intercity/intercounty bus operations on the Hwy. 101, Hwy. 126, CSUCI, East County, Conejo Connection and Coastal VISTA routes, and also, the local VISTA dial-a-ride services in Santa Paula and Fillmore/Piru. Vic also mentioned the new bus transfer system whereby passengers can transfer free between VISTA and the local bus operations and/or between the local services.

Vic continued his presentation by reviewing the County Transit Plan currently being prepared by VCTC consultants. The Transit Plan is required to address a change in State regulations under SB716, that will eliminate Transportation Development Act (TDA) funds being spent on local streets and roads. Instead, in 204, all the TDA money must be spent on transit services. In order to accomplish this goal, VCTC staff is working with the cities/County to implement the changes needed while still providing the local and intercity services that best need all the transit needs. Vic responded to questions and will report back to CTAC/SSTAC when the Transit Plan is finalized.

Item # 8 CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

Chair White thanked the committee for attending and urged members to attend local and/or County meetings where transportation issues might be discussed. He also urged members remember the February 6th unmet transit needs hearing in Camarillo.

Item # 9 STAFF REPORT

Mary Travis, VCTC staff, wished everyone a Happy New Year! She also noted that the updated County Bicycle Map will be available in late December.

Item # 10 COMMITTEE MEMBER REPORTS

There were no Committee member reports.

Item # 11 ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 3:45 PM.

**CTAC/SSTAC MEETING SUMMARY
January 10, 2012**

Item # 1 CALL TO ORDER

Jim White, VCTC Chair, called the meeting to order at 1:45 PM, and welcomed everyone.

Item # 2 SELF INTRODUCTIONS

The committee members and staff introduced themselves..

Item # 3 PUBLIC COMMENTS (for items not on agenda)

There were no public comments.

Item # 4 REVIEW OF 11/8/11 AND 12/6/11 MEETING SUMMARIES

Because there wasn't a quorum, this item was carried over to the March meeting for approval. However, two corrections were noted to the 11/8/11 summary: Under Item # 6, the Article 3 evaluation criteria was adjusted to increase safety from 25 to 30 points with a reduction in special considerations from 20 to 15 points. Also, the meeting adjourned at 2:45 PM not 3:45.

Item # 5 ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE-CHAIR

This item was carried over to the March meeting.

Item # 6 UPDATE ON MOORPARK TRANSIT OPERATIONS

Shaun Kroes, Moorpark staff, reviewed the current operations of Moorpark's transit operation which include fixed route, dial-a-ride and seasonal services. The city has a local transit operation and also participates as a member of the VISTA East operation. Kroes discussed the city's routes and service parameters, and also noted the transfer arrangements with other service providers. He mentioned the city buses are all fueled with CNG and have low floors for easier boarding. Plans for the future are focused on adding later evening and weekend services.

Item # 7 UPDATE ON SIMI VALLEY TRANSIT OPERATIONS

Chuck Perkins, Simi Valley Transit General Manager, noted that Simi Valley Transit is the only municipally-owned and operated transit operation in Ventura County with over half the workers being City employees. He described the four fixed routes running in Simi Valley with one route connecting with Los Angeles at the Chatsworth Train Station. He also discussed the close cooperation with Los Angeles on for special ADA transportation. Perkins said all their vehicles are CNG fueled, and that Simi's maintenance facility was recently upgraded and expanded. He concluded by highlighting plans for even more cooperation among the eastern area operators.

Item # 8 UPDATE ON THOUSAND OAKS TRANSIT OPERATIONS

Michael Houser, Thousand Oaks staff, stated that Thousand Oaks Transit (TOT) is the four largest transit operator in Ventura County but the largest provider of senior services.

The City also participates in the VISTA 101, VISTA East and Conejo Connection operations. All the TOT vehicles are CNG fueled with a fueling station in Newbury Park. Recent improvements have been made in the past year including extension of service hours for both the fixed route and dial-a-ride operations. Thousand Oaks is working to add more service including on weekends but this is difficult given the requirement to get 20% of operating costs from the fares received. He concluded by noting TOT buses have WiFi and that the City is committed to continuing to make improvements.

Item # 9 CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

Chair White thanked the committee for attending and urged members to attend local and/or County meetings where transportation issues might be discussed. He also urged members remember the February 6th unmet transit needs hearing in Camarillo.

Item # 10 STAFF REPORT

Mary Travis, VCTC staff, noted that in addition to the public hearing on February 6th, there will also be two community meetings: January 17th in Moorpark and January 18th in Oxnard. She also noted the updated County Bicycle Map will be available in late March.

Item # 11 COMMITTEE MEMBER REPORTS

There were no Committee member reports.

Item # 12 ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 3:45 PM.



Item # 6

March 13, 2012

**MEMO TO: CITIZEN'S TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE/SOCIAL SERVICES
TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COUNCIL**

FROM: MARY TRAVIS, MANAGER OF TDA & RAIL PROGRAMS

**SUBJECT: REVIEW OF FY 12/13 APPLICATIONS FOR TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT
ACT (TDA) ARTICLE 3 BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN FUNDS**

RECOMMENDATION:

- Receive and consider information about the applications from cities/County for FY 12/13 TDA Article 3 bicycle/pedestrian funds.

DISCUSSION:

Each year, under Article 3 of the State regulations governing the TDA, two percent of the TDA funds estimated to be available in Ventura County are taken "off the top" of the apportionment and set aside to be claimed for bicycle and pedestrian projects. This Article 3 money is discretionary funding allocated by VCTC according to policies and procedures formulated by CTAC/SSTAC and approved by VCTC.

The FY 12/13 TDA revenue estimate has increased as the result of better than expected sales tax receipts and we currently estimate there will be a total of \$552,000 available in FY 12/13. After 15% or \$82,800 is deducted for Class I bicycle trail maintenance, \$470,000 remains available. Added to this amount is \$134, 075 remaining unallocated from FY 11/12; this brings the total available in FY 12/13 for discretionary allocation under the criteria established by VCTC to \$604,075.

Applications for the discretionary funding were received from the County and the cities of Camarillo, Moorpark, Oxnard, Port Hueneme, San Buenaventura and Simi Valley. The cities of Fillmore, Ojai, Santa Paula and Thousand Oaks did not apply. The applications submitted total \$493,250; see Attachment # 1 for a summary of the requests. Because of the size of the applications, a summary is included here but complete packets will be available at the meeting or will be mailed if requested.

It appears there will be enough money to fully fund the requests, however, in the event the estimate runs short, CTAC/SSTAC should still rank the applications to ensure the most worthy projects are funded first. At today's meeting, the cities/County will present their proposals and respond to questions from committee members. At the April 10th meeting, field visits to the projects will be discussed, and at the May 8th meeting, the ranking of new projects will take place. Recommendations approved by the CTAC/SSTAC will then be presented to the Commission for consideration at their June 1, 2012 meeting.

FY 11/12 TDA ARTICLE 3 BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN FUND APPLICATIONS

AGENCY	ARTICLE 3 REQUEST	PROJECT NAME	OTHER FUNDS	TOTAL FUNDS
Camarillo	\$50,000	Lewis Road/Temple Avenue Sidewalk	\$50,000	\$100,000
Moorpark	100,000	City Hall pedestrian/ADA access	100,000	200,000
Oxnard	93,250	"Bicycle Boulevard" plan implementation	93,250	186,500
Pt. Hueneme	10,000	Hueneme Beach bikeway upgrade project	10,000	20,000
San Buenaventura	100,000	Five Points intersection bike/pedestrian improvements	250,000	350,000
Simi Valley	75,000	Arroyo Simi Bike path signal modifications	75,000	150,000
County	65,000	Oak View sidewalk	65,000	130,000
TOTAL	\$493,250		\$643,250	\$1,136,500
<i>Funding Available</i>	<i>\$604,075</i>			

TDA ARTICLE 3 GRANT EVALUATION CRITERIA

1. Matching Funds (Yes or No)		2. Safety (30 points possible)	
This criterion evaluates local support for the proposed project in terms of financial partnership. It is mandatory that there be a minimum 50/50 match of the request. Is the City/County willing to match its request at 50 % or greater?		This criterion evaluates how the proposed project will effect safety at existing facilities or improve safety by building new facilities. When describing the project conditions include any accident statistics and how the project will improve or correct the situation. Will the proposed project improve safety or correct an existing safety problem including providing secure parking for bicycles?	
3. Project Readiness (15 points possible)		4. Special Considerations (15 points possible)	
This criterion evaluates deliverability of a proposed project. Please note that, funds not used within two years must be returned for redistribution the following year or a City and/or County may request that the project readiness be reevaluated so that the City and/or County may retain their allocation. Is this a new or continuing project and is the proposed project ready for construction in the fiscal year of allocation? Have past allocations been fully spent?		This criterion is designed to add flexibility and allows cities and/or agencies to be creative and discuss any other ways in which the proposed project will benefit City/County residents, for example, improving air quality, reducing VMT, serving older areas without recent improvements, making major improvements to accessibility and/or to serve lower income residents. When discussing this criterion please be specific! Does the proposed project provide a benefit to City/County residents that has not been discussed elsewhere?	
5. Maintenance of Facility (10 points possible)		6. Connectivity (5 points possible)	
This criterion evaluates whether a proposed project will be maintained at an appropriate level after the project is completed. Please discuss whether the proposed project has a long range maintenance plan associated with it. How will the proposed project be maintained?		This criterion evaluates the proposed project's relationship to regional and/or local planned pathway systems. When discussing this criterion please include an 8 1/2 " x 11" map illustrating the existing plan and the proposed project. Will the proposed project close a missing link in an existing local or regional bike or pedestrian plan?	
7. Involvement of Other Agencies (10 points possible)		8. Traffic Generators (5 points possible)	
This criterion evaluates whether the proposed project has local and/or regional significance. When discussing this issue please list all other agencies involved and their roles. Are any other agencies outside the applicant's jurisdiction involved in planning or constructing any phase of this proposed project?		This criterion evaluates the proposed project's usefulness in serving major traffic generators. Will the proposed project serve major bicycle or pedestrian traffic generators such as schools, libraries, work sites, downtown areas, retail centers, transit nodes?	
9. Expected Utilization Rate (5 points possible)		10. Multi-Modal Interface (5 points possible)	
This criterion evaluates the proposed project's usage. The project should be discussed in terms of the usage as a percentage of the applicant's population or as a percentage of the population the project affects.		This criterion evaluates the proposed project's connectivity to transit modes and other forms of transportation. How will the project encourage multi-modal travel?	



Item # 7

March 13, 2012

**MEMO TO: CITIZENS TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE/SOCIAL SERVICES
TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COUNCIL**

**FROM: FABIAN GALLARDO, TRANSIT INTERN
VICTOR KAMHI, DIRECTOR OF BUS SERVICES**

SUBJECT: SOCIAL SERVICE AGENCIES TOKEN POLICY

RECOMMENDATION:

- Discuss and recommend VISTA Social Service Token Agency Policy

BACKGROUND:

VCTC offers token passes to social service agencies around the county. These agencies buy tokens in bulk for \$1.00 and hand out tokens without charge to their members. The tokens are redeemed by VISTA, and may be redeemed by any other transit agency in the County (VCTC reimburses the agency \$1 per token).

Over the course of the program VCTC has encountered some problems. Some of the major problems staff has had include: lack of a definition for what constitutes as a social service agency and pricing inequities.

Without a definition of what a social service agency is, VCTC has no guidelines to which it can base approval or denial for purchase of such tokens. Not having a definition to stand by can make it extremely difficult when deciding whether to sell or not sell tokens to a group.

The pricing inequities that exist have been a problem for VCTC. The lack of uniformity in fare pricing between the different transit agencies and different VISTA services, as well as Senior/disabled rider fares has made it difficult to maintain equity in pricing. Operators other than VISTA may value the token differently while the reimbursement from VCTC remains uniform. Some agencies see the token as equal to \$1.00, if there is a difference in fare price the passenger is responsible for paying the remaining amount. At other agencies the token is given a value equal to the price of a regular fare. This pricing may cause seniors/disabled to pay more and for regular adults to inadvertently receive a discount.

Staff has developed and proposed definition of “social service agencies” and three alternatives option regarding the use of “social service” tokens:

Option A will continue current VCTC practices. All tokens will continue to be sold and reimbursed at \$1.00. Seniors will continue to overpay and regular adults will continue to receive a discount. However, staff would be more comfortable having tokens be closer to actual cost.

Option B will bring token prices closer to actual fare prices for many of the transit agencies by dropping individual token cost and setting different token requirements for adults and senior citizens. If we sell the tokens for \$0.60, seniors will pay a actual VISTA fare. In some instances receiving a if used on other systems, the will receive a small discount. Adults will also pay a fare closer to actual value, overpaying by some cents in some the case of the Dial-a-Rider (3 tokens equal to \$1.80 for a \$1.75 ride, but a slight discount on fixed route (two tokes equals \$1.20 for a \$1.25 ride). Option B will require that VCTC purchase more tokens. Token cost varies by size of order. The purpose of these tokens was never to offer discounts but to offer social service agencies with ticket-like pieces they could give to members of their organization.

Option C will have VCTC providing several different tokens – a \$.60 tokens, \$1.25 tokens, and \$1.75 tokens. This would set the tokens to the current VISTA fares. Like Option B VCTC will need to purchase more tokens; it will also require distribution, collection, and accounting of three different tokens. Because of the complexity, this option is not recommended.

Attached is the proposed VISTA policy with all three options.

DRAFT

VISTA POLICY
APPROVED BY VCTC
_____, 2012

POLICY 3: SOCIAL SERVICE AGENCIES

Policy:

- **(DEFINITION)** A Social Service Agency provides public services that promote self-sufficiency, health, and well being. This includes any registered 501 non-profit organization, Ventura County health and human service agency, and any local school district.
- The Ventura County Transportation Commission offers single-fare tokens for any Social Service Agency wishing to provide its members with access to the VISTA, Gold Coast, Moorpark, Simi Valley, and Thousand Oaks Transit networks.
 - **(OPTION A)** Tokens cost \$1.00 (Current system). Seniors and adults pay 1 token for a single one-way trip aboard any participating transit network.
 - **(OPTION B)** Tokens cost \$0.65. Seniors pay 1 token for a single one-way trip aboard any participating transit network; adults pay 2 tokens for ride.
 - **(OPTION C)** Tokens cost \$.60, \$1.25, and \$1.75. Seniors and disabled pay 1 token for a single one-way trip in county VISTA, while general fares use the \$1.25 token, and Dial-a-Ride passengers use the \$1.75 token.



Item # 8

March 13, 2012

**MEMO TO: CITIZENS TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE/SOCIAL
SERVICES TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COUNCIL**

**FROM: FABIAN GALLARDO, TRANSIT INTERN
VICTOR KAMHI, DIRECTOR OF BUS SERVICES**

SUBJECT: VISTA POLICY REGARDING TRANSPORTING CHILDREN

RECOMMENDATION:

- Discuss and recommend VISTA Transporting Children Policy

BACKGROUND:

VISTA fixed-route and VISTA Heritage Valley Dial-A-Ride (DAR) services transport large numbers of children every day. Currently VISTA only requires that a passenger be 5 years old to board either without adult supervision or at least someone in their teens. VISTA bus operators are placed in compromising position where they are not comfortable transporting a five year old child riding alone without clear parental guidance if not presence. Even where there is a standing reservation, the driver and dispatch are placed in a compromised position if the child requests a changed destination (for example, "my mother told me to meet her at"). Both changing the destination on the instruction of a 5 year old or leaving a child alone at the curb of potentially an unattended destination are uncomfortable and potentially a liability for VISTA and the contractor.

Currently, parents let VISTA Heritage Valley Dial-A-Ride operators know where their child needs to go when the reservation is made, but there is nothing in place that prevents a child from changing the directions by directly telling bus operators where to be taken to. On board VISTA fixed-routes, there is nothing in place that prevents a 5 year old to board alone in Ventura and take the Coastal Express to Santa Barbara. Changes in destination have been accepted by call-ins from the "parent", however, except for call back, there is no way to verify.

Protecting Ventura County's children is a top priority. Staff also realizes that children in the Santa Paula/Fillmore area make up a significant share of VISTA Heritage Valley Dial-A-Ride ridership. Children in the area frequently use the service to commute to and from school. VCTC is considering a policy that serves to protect VISTA and our juvenile rider while maintaining the current services provided.

VISTA Heritage Valley Dial-A-Ride operates within county boundaries and for the most part serves as a shuttle for people trying to get to places across town. VISTA fixed-routes operate between Ventura and Santa Barbara County and serve more of a regional transit need. Because of the differences in distance travelled between the two, a two-tiered system of implementation would be ideal. Rules that apply to VISTA Heritage Valley Dial-A-Ride might not be able to apply to VISTA fixed-route.

Currently the VISTA fixed route operators procedure is if they have a concern about a young child boarding a bus, they contact dispatch and dispatch contacts the local police department. The proposed change in that policy is that any child under ten (10) require accompaniment by a passenger at least 15 years of age.

In developing this policy staff examined several different transit agency policies, both public and private, to develop a policy that would work best for Ventura County. These agencies included: COACH USA, Greyhound, Amtrak, Tri Met (Portland Transit), RTA (Riverside Transit) and LA Metro.

The proposed DAR policy calls for children under the age of ten (10) will only be picked up and delivered to locations predetermined in writing by a Parent/Guardian.

Attached is the proposed VISTA policy.

DRAFT

VISTA POLICY
APPROVED BY VCTC
_____, 2012

POLICY 2: TRANSPORTING CHILDREN

Policy:

- **Dial-A-Ride Services:** Children under the age of ten (10) will only be picked up and delivered to locations predetermined in writing by a Parent/Guardian. Contact VISTA Heritage Valley Dial-A-Ride a form.
- **Fixed-Route Services:** Any child under ten (10) require accompaniment by a passenger at least 15 years of age.

Children and other young people comprise a majority of our ridership on many of our routes. Currently VISTA only requires that a passenger be 5 years or older to board. Parents let VISTA Heritage Valley Dial-A-Ride operators know where their children need to go or be picked up from. However, there is nothing within our policies that prevents a child from instructing a bus driver where to drop of pickup him/her.

This policy will formalize current procedures and implement new age restrictions. Children under ten using dial-a-ride will only be picked up and delivered to locations predetermined by a Parent/Guardian, in writing. Also, children under the age of ten using VISTA fixed-routes will require accompaniment by a passenger at least 15 years of age. Fixed-route services, unlike dial-a-rides services, cross county lines and cover long distances which can be dangerous for young children to travel alone. Coach, Greyhound, and all major charter bus carriers have similar age restrictions.¹

¹ Greyhound: Children Traveling <http://www.greyhound.com/en/ticketsandtravel/childretraveling.aspx>