



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

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 10, 2013 -- 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

- Item # 1 CALL TO ORDER**
- Item # 2 SELF INTRODUCTIONS**
- Item # 3 PUBLIC COMMENTS FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA**
- Item # 4.a. APPROVAL OF 10/8/13 MEETING SUMMARY**
- Item # 4.b. APPROVAL OF 11/12/13 MEETING SUMMARY**
Responsible staff: Mary Travis
- Item # 5 REVIEW OF ADOPTED TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT (TDA)**
ANNUAL UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS PUBLIC HEARING DEFINITIONS AND
SCHEDULE
Responsible staff: Mary Travis
- Item # 6 DISCUSSION OF FY 14/15 TDA ARTICLE 3 BICYCLE AND**
PEDESTRIAN GRANT SCHEDULE AND RANKING CRITERIA
(Handout at Meeting)
Responsible staff: Mary Travis
- Item # 7 CHAIRMAN'S REPORT**
- Item # 8 STAFF REPORT**
- Item # 9 COMMITTEE MEMBER REPORTS**
- Item # 10 ADJOURNMENT**

The next meeting will be Tuesday, January 14, 2014 - same time, same place!!
HAPPY NEW YEAR!!

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
October 8, 2013

Item # 1 CALL TO ORDER

Susan White Wood, VCTC Chair, called the meeting to order at 2 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 6/11/13 MEETING SUMMARY

The meeting summary was approved; there were no changes.

Item # 5 REVIEW OF FY 13/14 CTAC/SSTAC MEETING SCHEDULE

Mary Travis, VCTC staff, presented the FY 13/14 CTAC/SSTAC meeting schedule and reviewed the topics to be discussed over the fiscal year. Committee members are encouraged to suggest additional topics, and there might be other changes during the year. Because the 2014 meeting dates needed to be corrected, a revised schedule will be handed out at the next meeting. With the corrections, the Committee then approved the meeting schedule.

Item # 6 INITIAL DISCUSSION OF ANNUAL TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT (TDA) UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS PUBIC HEARING PRACTICES AND OUTREACH

Mary Travis, VCTC staff, introduced Carlos Hernandez with COH & Associates and Kirsten Ayars with Ayars & Associates. Carlos and Kirsten have been selected by the Commission to do a thorough review of the annual process for determining unmet transit needs each year. Because the Commission would like improvements to be in place for the FY 14/15 public hearing process in the Spring, this project is on a fast-track for completion.

Carlos and Kirsten will be checking with other counties in California for “best-practices” and conferring with a wide range of local agencies and individuals as well as the Commissioners for their suggestions on improvements. In particular, the public outreach and description of what an “unmet transit needs public hearing” should accomplish will be the focus of interest.

At the November meeting, the consultants will return with the draft report so Committee members are encouraged to contact them with any comments as soon as possible.

Item # 7 INITIAL DISCUSSION OF ANNUAL ALLOCATION OF TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT (TDA) ARTICLE 3 BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN FUNDS

Mary Travis, VCTC staff, mentioned the Commission has expressed interest in reviewing the annual allocation of TDA Article 3 bicycle/pedestrian funds. The Commission has assigned to CTAC/SSTAC the responsibility to rank Article 3 project applications each year. The overall question is, should more ambitious and multi-agency projects be emphasized or should the Commission continue to support multiple smaller projects? This discussion will continue at the November meeting.

Item # 8 CHAIRMAN’S REPORT

Chair White Wood thanked the committee for all their participation and encouraged them to continue to attend local and/or County meetings where transportation issues might be discussed. She also mentioned the VCTC newsletter comes out monthly and can be found on the Commission website.

Item # 9 STAFF REPORT

Mary Travis, VCTC staff, mentioned there will be big changes to Ventura County transit services over the next year as we get closer to the July 1, 2014 date when the majority of the Transportation Development Act (TDA) funds will be used locally just for transit and not for local streets.

Item # 10 COMMITTEE MEMBER REPORTS

There were no Committee reports.

Item # 11 ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 PM.

Item # 4.b.
Action

**CTAC/SSTAC MEETING SUMMARY
November 12, 2013**

Item # 1 CALL TO ORDER

Miranda Patton, Vice-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 10/8/13 MEETING SUMMARY

Action on the meeting summary was postponed to the next meeting because of lack of quorum.

Item # 5 REVIEW OF FY 13/14 CTAC/SSTAC MEETING SCHEDULE

Mary Travis, VCTC staff, presented the FY 13/14 CTAC/SSTAC meeting schedule and reviewed the topics to be discussed over the fiscal year. Committee members are encouraged to suggest additional topics, and there might be other changes during the year. Because the 2014 meeting dates needed to be corrected, a revised schedule will be handed out at the next meeting. With the corrections, the Committee then approved the meeting schedule.

Item # 6 REVIEW OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ANNUAL TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT (TDA) UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS PUBLIC HEARING PRACTICES, DEFINITIONS AND OUTREACH

Mary Travis, VCTC staff, introduced Carlos Hernandez with COH & Associates and Kirsten Ayars with Ayars & Associates. Carlos and Kirsten have been selected by the Commission to do a thorough review of the annual process for determining unmet transit needs each year. Because the Commission would like improvements to be in place for the FY 14/15 public hearing process in the Spring, this project is on a fast-track for completion.

Carlos and Kirsten reviewed the results of their research and recommendations for improvements to the definitions of "Unmet Transit Need" and "Reasonable to Meet". They both expressed their appreciation for the individuals and agencies willing to work with the Commission to improve the annual process despite the perceived lack of response to the needs discussed in the past. The biggest change will be to the public participation process, where the Commission will partner with interested agencies and transit operators to better explain the annual hearing and what specific testimony is most useful and productive to planning agencies.

The overall goal is to make the public hearing process less “legal” and more citizen-oriented along with developing findings as a continuing year-long activity.

Item # 7 INITIAL DISCUSSION OF ANNUAL ALLOCATION OF TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT (TDA) ARTICLE 3 BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN FUNDS

Mary Travis, VCTC staff, mentioned the Commission has expressed interest in reviewing the annual allocation of TDA Article 3 bicycle/pedestrian funds. The Commission has assigned to CTAC/SSTAC the responsibility to rank Article 3 project applications each year. The overall question is, should more ambitious and multi-agency projects be emphasized or should the Commission continue to support multiple smaller projects? This discussion will continue at the November meeting.

Item # 8 CHAIRMAN’S REPORT

Vice-Chair Patton mentioned Chair White Wood is taking some medical leave but should be back at the helm in a month or two. She thanked the committee for all their participation.

Item # 9 STAFF REPORT

There was no staff report.

Item # 10 COMMITTEE MEMBER REPORTS

There were no Committee reports.

Item # 11 ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 2:45 PM.



Item # 5

December 9, 2013

MEMO TO: CTAC/SSTAC

FROM: MARY TRAVIS, ANALYST II

**SUBJECT: TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT (TDA) UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS
PUBLIC HEARING DEFINITIONS AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROCESS**

RECOMMENDATION:

Receive report on final recommendations regarding the annual Transportation Development Act (TDA) unmet transit needs public hearing definitions and public participation input program.

BACKGROUND:

VCTC has been designated by the State as the Transportation Planning Agency (TPA) for Ventura County. One of the TPA responsibilities is administration of the Transportation Development Act (TDA) which is a major source of transportation funding for the cities and County of Ventura.

Each year, California Public Utilities Code (PUC) Section 99401.5 (c) requires the transportation planning agency to hold at least one public hearing pursuant to Section 99238.5 to solicit comments on the Unmet Transit Needs that may exist within the jurisdictions and that may be reasonable to meet by establishing or contracting for new public transportation, or specialized transportation, or by expanding existing services.

All Unmet Transit Needs that are reasonable to meet must be funded before any allocation is made from TDA funds to the cities/County for streets and roads pursuant to PUC Section 99401.5 (e). The State also requires this discussion must be countywide. Moreover, per amendments to the TDA by SB 716 and SB 203 (which are effective July 1, 2014) this determination must be made specifically for the cities under 100,000 in population which are not a part of the Gold Coast Transit District (GCT). These cities are Camarillo, Fillmore, Moorpark and Santa Paula.

Although the public hearing and subsequent annual determination of "Unmet Transit Needs" are required by law, the local process has also become a useful tool for the cities and County to use in assessing how public transit services should be provided for the benefit of Ventura County.

DISCUSSION:

The Commission has been developing and refining the Regional Transit Study for the past three years. After review of the initial plan in March 2012 and adoption of the report in March 2013, it

was apparent that Ventura County's annual review of transit needs and subsequent development of findings mandated through the State TDA did not reflect the current standards for this critical annual event.

The Commission directed staff to seek consultant assistance to review and revise the existing public participation program and development of findings and definitions, including outreach to a variety of stakeholders such as Commissioners, local legislators, social service agencies and the public. The major goal of the consultant review is to make VCTC's annual "Unmet Transit Needs" activity a more positive and responsive activity for the public using, and the agencies providing, public transit services.

In September, COH & Associates partnering with Ayars & Associates was retained for the project. After extensive outreach to local individuals and agencies, and review of best practices in other counties, COH has issued its' draft report recommending changes to the definitions of "Unmet Transit Need" and "Reasonable to Meet", and also, to the public participation process during the hearing period.

The draft report was reviewed by the Citizen's Transportation Advisory Committee/Social Services Advisory Council (STAC/SSTAC) and the transit operator's committee, TRANSCOM. Their comments have been incorporated into the final draft document. A copy of the complete report has been distributed to the Commissioners and is available for review on VCTC's website "govventura.org". The definitions and public participation recommendations in the report were adopted by the Commission at its' December 6, 2013 meeting.

Recommended Definitions of "Unmet Transit Need" and "Reasonable to Meet"

The definitions for "Unmet Transit Needs" and "Reasonable to Meet" are adopted annually by the Commission as required by law. The current definitions have been in place for many years and are based on the legalese of the TDA. While the definitions satisfy the regulations, the consultants found they are neither helpful to the public nor easy to decipher. While the consultants found the basic framework for VCTC's definitions is quite similar to other counties they also found several places where the language could be clarified and/or simplified.

"Unmet Transit Need": in response to past confusion, the definition has been expanded to give specific examples of what are or aren't transit needs under the TDA, which is admittedly a narrower definition than might be assumed by the general public. Also, it is now clearly quantified what the threshold is for "substantial" community support, i.e., 15 requests from the general public and/or 10 requests for service for transit-challenged persons.

"Reasonable to Meet": the criteria used to determine if transit requests are "reasonable" has been simplified and more importantly quantified to remove the subjective elements. The quantified elements now include an analysis of service requests in terms of feasibility, timing, equity, cost-effectiveness and service effectiveness.

Public Participation Involvement Enhancements

Consultant interviews with a wide-range of individuals and agencies who have been involved with the annual public hearing process revealed the same sentiment – despite some frustration with the annual findings, everyone would like the process to work in a more positive and rewarding manner. This shared response creates the perfect opportunity for the Commission to positively partner with social service agencies and citizen advocacy groups to solicit more focused testimony each year and improve the responsiveness of the annual public hearing.

It is also important that establishing a partnership before the hearing is held, and continuing to make this annual transit review a part of the overall Ventura County/city/GCT planning efforts, will also accomplish better long-range transit planning.

Fiscal Year (FY) 2014/2015 Public Hearing Schedule: A detailed schedule with specific dates and locations of events will be distributed to the Commission and posted on the website in January.

- The schedule for the upcoming public hearing cycle will now begin with VCTC holding three training workshops (in the Heritage Valley, the East County and the GCT District boundaries) to partner with interested parties to “teach” people what type and detail about transit needs is most helpful. These workshops will be held in January 2014. New, user-friendly materials for public distribution will also be prepared and circulated through a variety of channels and outlets. Because of the time constraints and in order to produce the best results, the existing sub-contract with Ayars and Associates will be extended through January to assist with this partnership effort.
- In February 2014, three community “listening” sessions will be held in cooperation with the transit providers and social service agencies in the Heritage Valley, the East County and the GCT District boundaries – these sessions will be participant-friendly and encourage public discussion. It will also be explained that the collection of transit need input will be a continuing effort throughout the year albeit punctuated by the annual Public Hearing.
- The required Public Hearing will be March 3, 2014 or the first Monday in March. At the hearing, the Hearing Board will be briefed on the comments heard to date and will also take any additional comments, however, most of the input about transit needs should have already been received.
- In March and April, staff will then work with the cities/County and interested local agencies to develop the draft findings and respond directly to people and agencies who submitted testimony. Also, the draft findings will be posted on the website to encourage public reaction. In keeping with development of more user-friendly materials, the findings will be easier to navigate and understand with the required legalese confined as much as possible to the Commission resolution approving the findings. Note that specific findings must be made for the cities of Camarillo, Fillmore, Moorpark and Santa Paula before these cities can claim any TDA funds for local street purposes.
- CTAC/SSTAC and the Hearing Board will review the draft findings in May.
- The Commission will consider the findings at its’ June 6, 2014 meeting. If additional time for review is needed, the item can be carried over and considered at the July 11, 2014 meeting.
- The deadline for submittal of FY 2014/2015 findings to State is August 15th.



VCTC: Assessment of Annual Transportation Development Act (TDA)

Unmet Transit Needs

Definitions & Public Involvement

Report of Findings

Recommendations

The annual report of unmet transit needs Findings would be significantly improved with the implementation of the following three recommendations:

- Make a clear connection between each finding and performance measure criteria. Explain how or why proposed services fail or pass the criteria for each definition. Show evaluation results including calculations for quantitative measures.
- Include a summary of data and assumptions used to evaluate proposed services such as system-wide transit service data from the National Transit Database and ridership estimates.
- Include a summary of the analysis pursuant to PUC 99401.5 that requires an annual assessment of the size and location of identifiable groups likely to be transit dependent or transit disadvantaged, among other items. The report should include a discussion on how the recommended Findings would impact service to the transit dependent or transit disadvantaged identified in the evaluation.

Unmet Transit Need

Public Involvement

Over the last few years, the Ventura County Transportation Commission (VCTC) has recognized that the Unmet Transit Needs process is outdated for Ventura County. A large part of the problem rests with unmet needs definitions that are vague and unclear to the public. Another part of the problem lies in a root frustration with the public involvement process and a lack of understanding regarding how to affect positive change within the system.

VCTC staff has tried a few of different tactics in the past, including adding evening public meetings and sending out materials to encourage increased participation. To better understand the problems with the current system and create recommendations to improve public involvement in the Unmet Transit Needs process, Ayars and Associates conducted outreach to a wide variety of transportation-interested parties that included community organizations, individuals, elected officials, public health agencies, unions, farm worker residential organizations, after school programs, and student groups.

Outreach Summary

Outreach and focused interviews were conducted with 49 Ventura County elected officials and community organizations focused on transit, seniors, after school care, tourism, colleges, and healthcare between October 7 and 23, 2013.

During the outreach process, it became clear that VCTC staff have tried to include a wide variety of community members ranging from senior citizens to community groups serving minority and transit-dependent populations. While community members commented that individual staff members were helpful, there is an acknowledged disconnect between the current definitions of an unmet need and what the public feels should be addressed as part of the Unmet Transit Needs process or as a portion of another transportation planning process. A number of key issues surfaced that resonated with a wide variety of people, including:

Key Issues

- Frustration that the current process identifies issues, but that all issues are deemed "unreasonable to meet"
- Evening meetings are at a better time than daytime hearings, but the process feels outdated and difficult for transit-dependent individuals
- Most people are unaware of what actually qualifies as an Unmet Transit Need
- Materials and information are not getting to the bus riders
- There is not an easy way to know how comments are affecting transportation planning or if they do any good at all
- Current program pits agency vs. rider
- If more money is needed (which most people felt it was), then VCTC needs to show which projects would be a priority and a potential timeline for implementation – it should be noted that many people who would like to help improve transit would also be likely to help Ventura become a self-help county
- The majority of people on the existing VCTC outreach list are not knowledgeable about the Unmet Needs Process and are unaware that they receive materials

Public Involvement

Recommendations

Based on the feedback from observers, frustrated riders, people who feel underserved by the current process, and individuals who have tried to help VCTC gain input for the Unmet Transit Needs process, Ayars and Associates devised the following recommendations for improving the public outreach component. Recommendations are grouped into two key areas – improvements for the current public hearing process and a customized public partnership that specifically addresses unique VCTC options.

Ways to Improve Public Involvement

- Solicit feedback from bus riders and other transit users throughout the year; VCTC staff should sort comments into Unmet Transit Needs, Operational Issues, Long Range Planning, etc. and not rely on the public to direct comments solely to the Unmet Transit Needs process
- Create text, voicemail, email, and regular mail collection points for comments that can be checked throughout the year with clear time-tables to show when comments will be considered
- Update outreach flyers to graphically grab people's attention
- Add an example of a positive outcome from the Unmet Transit Needs process – perhaps the addition of VISTA service – to the Unmet Transit Needs flyer and outreach materials
- Use existing transit space (i.e. bus ads, posters in transit centers, etc.) to solicit feedback and expand awareness
- Update the outreach list to include current contact people and active community organizations, with additions to the list to include:
 - MICOP – Mixteco/Indigena Community Organizing project
 - The Client Network
 - Amigos 805
 - LA “M” 103.7 FM
 - Radio Lazar

Ways to Improve Public Involvement continued...

- Consider bus surveys to help prioritize key improvements and share information with transit users
- Consider comment boxes at transit centers, colleges, universities, and key healthcare service agencies to solicit input throughout the year
- Empower the Citizen's Transportation Advisory Committee by sharing ongoing information about VCTC's activities and key milestones
- Consider holding public input meetings that are sponsored by social service agencies and community organizations in place of the two VCTC night meetings to encourage greater public participation
- Extend an invitation to transit operators to attend public input meetings and hearings; send operational service issues to transit providers and request follow-ups be sent to commenters and VCTC
- Update the format of the Unmet Transit Needs report for readability and easy to find information; color code information to fall into categories such as Unmet Transit Need, Findings and Analysis: Short Range Planning or Long Range Planning, Existing Service Issue, etc.

Customized Public Partnership for VCTC

A consistent theme that arose during the public outreach process is that many people in Ventura County would like to help improve transit. This presents a unique opportunity for VCTC, because these individuals have offered to help create positive change rather than merely complain about lack of service. Ayars and Associates recommends that VCTC improve their Unmet Transit Needs process by partnering with community organizations, agency representatives, individuals, and elected officials to gather input for Unmet Transit Needs and larger transportation projects. Since some efforts to work with these groups have failed in the past, it is important that this partnership address two key areas in order to be effective:

1. Recognize that people have been frustrated in the past by lack of understanding on what qualifies as an Unmet Transit Need

2. Show how improvements can be made through the Unmet Transit Needs process and through other VCTC transportation planning efforts

Steps to create a public partnership

- Hold 3 *training workshops* based on VCTC subregions (East County, Heritage Valley, and Gold Coast Transit) and invite key stakeholders, such as groups listed on pages 22 and 23
- Prepare materials for training that include examples of what is helpful to see on an unmet need suggestion and what isn't
- Prepare a one-sheet re: transportation planning and where comments go if they are not deemed unmet needs
- Work with local media and elected officials to "kick-off" yearly process with events around the county to highlight ways to submit comments and participate at the public hearing
- Hold community meetings sponsored by community organizations or agencies, so that participation is encouraged by people already working with transit-dependent, senior, and special needs populations
- Gather input and demonstrate how comments are helpful to the planning or operations process even if not determined to be unmet needs
- Work with local organizations and elected officials to identify and plan for short and long range transit improvements
- Send a follow-up report to everyone invited and involved in the process that demonstrates next steps and thanks them for participating; the report should also be posted on VCTC's website, featured in the VCTC newsletter, and highlighted via existing VCTC social media channels

Conclusion

Unmet Transit Need

Recommended Definition

Based on a review of the best management practices in California, we recommend using Option 3: Expanded as the new Unmet Transit Need definition.

Recommended Unmet Transit Need Definition Option 3: Expanded

Public transportation services identified by the public with sufficient broad-based community support that have not been funded or implemented. Unmet transit needs identified in a government-approved document meet the definition of an unmet transit need. Sufficient broad-based community support means that persons who will likely use the service on a routine basis demonstrate support: at least 15 requests for general public service and 10 requests for disabled service.

Unmet transit needs specifically include:

- Public transit services not currently provided to reach employment, medical assistance, shop for food or clothing, to obtain social services such as health care, county welfare programs and educational programs. Service must be needed by and benefit the general public.
- Service expansions including new routes, significant modifications to existing routes, and major increases in service hours and frequency.

Unmet transit needs specifically exclude:

- Operational changes such as minor route changes, bus stop changes, or changes in schedule.
- Requests for extended hours or days of service.
- Service for groups or individuals that is not needed by or will not benefit the general public.
- Comments about vehicles, facilities, driver performance and transit organizational structure.
- Requests for better coordination.
- Requests for reduced fares and changes to fare restrictions.
- Improvements funded or scheduled for implementation in the following year.
- Future transportation needs.
- Duplication or replacement of existing service.

Reasonable to Meet

Recommended Definition

Outcome	Definitions	Measures & Criteria
Equity	The proposed service will not cause reductions in existing transit services that have an equal or higher priority. (Note: existing VCTC definition)	Measures: Vehicle revenue service hours and revenue service miles. Criteria: Transit vehicle service hours and miles will not be reduced on existing routes to fund the proposed service. (Note: Newly proposed)
Equity	The proposed service is available to all persons. (Note: Newly proposed)	Criteria: Proposed service is not solely benefiting any one group but rather the general public as a whole as demonstrated through public input. (Note: Newly proposed)
Timing	The proposed service is in response to an existing rather than future transit need. (Note: existing VCTC definition)	Criteria: Same as definition that proposed service is in response to an existing rather than future transit need; based on public input.
Feasibility	The proposed service can be provided with the existing fleet or under contract to a private provider. (Note: existing VCTC definition)	Measure: Vehicle spare ratio. Criteria: Transit system must be able to maintain FTA's spare ratio requirement of 20% (buses in peak service divided by the total bus fleet cannot fall below 20%). If less than 20%, can additional buses be obtained (purchased or leased) or can service be provided under contract to a private provider? (Note: Newly proposed)
Feasibility	There are adequate roadways to safely accommodate transit vehicles. (Note: Newly proposed)	Measure & Criteria: Route inspection to determine adequacy of infrastructure to accommodate transit vehicles and passengers. (Note: Newly proposed)
Cost Effectiveness	The proposed service will not unduly affect the operator's ability to maintain the required passenger fare ratio for its system as a whole. (Note: existing VCTC definition)	Measure: Total estimated annual passenger fare revenue divided by total annual operating cost (the entire service including the proposed service) Criteria: fare revenue/operating cost cannot fall below the operator's required passenger fare ratio. (Note: Newly proposed)

VCTC: Unmet Transit Needs Definitions & Public Involvement

Outcome	Definitions	Measures & Criteria
Cost Effectiveness	The proposed service will meet the scheduled passenger fare ratio standards described in Attachment A. (Note: existing VCTC definition)	Measures and criteria in Attachment A.
Service Effectiveness	Estimated passengers per hour for the proposed service will not be less the system-wide average after three years. (Note: Newly proposed)	Measure: Passengers per hour. Criteria: Projected passengers per hour for the proposed service is not less than 70% of the system-wide average (without the proposed service) at the end of 12 months of service, 85% at the end of 24 months of service, and 100% at the end of 36 months of service.

VCTC reserves the right to waive results of the analysis in an effort to fund new service.

Updated ATTACHMENT A		
It is desirable for all proposed transit services in urban areas to achieve a 20% passenger fare ratio by the end of the third year of operation. A passenger fare ratio of 10% is desired for special services (i.e., elderly and disabled) and rural area services. ^a More detailed passenger fare ratio standards, which will be used to evaluate services as they are proposed and implemented, are described below. Transit serving both urban and rural areas, per state law, may obtain an "intermediate" passenger fare ratio.		
Urban Service	Rural Service	Recommended Action
New Service Performance Criteria: End of Twelve Months		
Less than 6%	Less than 3%	Provider may discontinue service
6% or more	3% or more	Provider will continue service, with modifications if needed
New Service Performance Criteria: End of Twenty-Four Months		
Less than 10%	Less than 5%	Provider may discontinue service
10% or more	5% or more	Provider will continue service, with modifications if needed
New Service Performance Criteria: End of Thirty-Six Months^b		
Less than 15%	Less than 7%	Provider may discontinue service
15% to 19%	7% to 9%	Provider may consider modifying and continue service
20% or more	10% or more	Provider will continue service, with modifications if needed
^a Per statute the VCTC may establish a lower fare for community transit (dial-a-ride) services.		
^b A review will take place after 30 months to develop a preliminary determination regarding the discontinuation of proposed services.		

Public Involvement

Recommended Enhancements

VCTC can improve public involvement both in terms of hearing from more people and reducing the amount of frustration with the process by:

- Soliciting year-round feedback (through comments and surveys) and sorting responses into Unmet Transit Needs, Operational Issues, Long-range planning, etc.
- Updating outreach materials to graphically grab people's attention and demonstrate the effectiveness of the process; then positioning materials where transit users will see them
- Updating outreach lists with current contacts and providing information to interested parties, such as CTAC members, throughout the year
- Utilizing existing channels of communication with key interest groups and inviting transit partners to participate in the public process (meetings & public hearing)
- Updating the Unmet Transit Needs report for readability and to demonstrate effectiveness of public input

Please refer to pages 19 and 20 for a complete list of enhancement recommendations.

Customized Public Partnership

Building on the improvements to public involvement, VCTC has a unique opportunity to partner with community organizations, elected officials, social service agencies, and transit users to help gather input for both the Unmet Transit Needs process and long-range transportation planning efforts. Key steps to create a successful partnership are listed on page 21 and include:

- Holding training workshops to enable interested parties to effectively help VCTC gather input
- Working with local elected officials and media to get the word out before the public hearing
- Holding community meetings sponsored by community organizations that already work with special needs groups to encourage more people to participate in the process
- Following up with everyone involved to show the effectiveness of the process with the updated Unmet Transit Needs report

By updating the definitions of Unmet Transit Need and Reasonable to Meet while improving public involvement in the overall process, VCTC will address key public concerns related to both a lack of understanding regarding what qualifies as an Unmet Transit Need and how public input can positively affect transportation planning in Ventura County.



Item # 6

December 10, 2013

MEMO TO: CTAC/SSTAC

FROM: MARY TRAVIS, VCTC STAFF

**SUBJECT: DISCUSSION OF FY 14/15 SCHEDULE AND EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR
TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT (TDA) ARTICLE 3
BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN FUND APPLICATIONS**

RECOMMENDATION:

Review the evaluation criteria for the applications from cities/County for FY 14/15 TDA Article 3 bicycle/pedestrian funds.

DISCUSSION:

Pursuant to California PUC Section 99233.3, each year a portion of the available Transportation Development Act (TDA) Local Transportation Funds each year must be used for planning, maintaining and constructing facilities for the exclusive use of pedestrians and bicyclists. In FY 14/15, we expect about \$600,000 will be available for these purposes. About 15% or \$90,000 of the total will be allocated to the cities/County based on the Class I Bike Trail mileage the agency maintains under the Commission's Class I Bicycle Trail Maintenance program. After this is deducted, there should be about \$510,000 remaining for allocation to the cities and County of Ventura for local bicycle or pedestrian projects on a competitive basis.

The annual allocation process is intended to be competitive and the Commission has assigned the responsibility to the Citizen's Transportation Advisory Committee/Social Services Transportation Advisory Council (CTAC/SSTAC) for reviewing the applications and making application ranking order recommendations to the Commission.

Currently, each city and the County are allowed to submit one project for funding consideration. The applicants are informed that it is strongly recommended they provide a 50/50 match with local and/or other grant funds to augment the Article 3 funds being requested. Every application must include a written response to the each of evaluation criteria adopted annually by the Commission as part of the request for funds. Applicants are also asked to report on the status of projects for which they were awarded past Article 3 allocations.

In discussing past allocations, CTAC/SSTAC and the Commission have felt the submittals were mostly for routine projects such as curb cuts. While this example is a worthwhile activity, it has been suggested that the Article 3 funds should be used for more innovative and exciting projects, and also, for bigger projects that might involve more than one city or just the County. Attached is the current evaluation criteria the Committee should review and offer recommendations on improvements to the evaluation process.

CURRENT 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 highly recommended that there be a minimum 50/50 match of the request. Is the City/County willing to match its request at 50 % or greater? Yes or No?		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; please report on past allocations.		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 and/or special districts 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?	
--	--	--	--

REVISED TDA ARTICLE 3 GRANT EVALUATION CRITERIA

(Note: this will be handout at the meeting)