



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

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 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

- Item # 1 CALL TO ORDER**
- Item # 2 SELF INTRODUCTIONS**
- Item # 3 PUBLIC COMMENTS FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA**
- Item # 4 APPROVAL OF 10/9/12 MEETING SUMMARY**
Responsible staff: Mary Travis
- Item # 5 ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE-CHAIR**
Responsible Staff: Mary Travis
- Item # 6 APPROVAL OF FY 13/14 UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS PUBLIC
HEARING DEFINITIONS AND SCHEDULE**
Responsible staff: Mary Travis
- Item # 7 APPROVAL OF FY 13/14 TDA ARTICLE 3 BICYCLE AND
PEDESTRIAN GRANT SCHEDULE AND RANKING CRITERIA**
Responsible staff: Mary Travis
- Item # 8 CHAIRMAN'S REPORT**
- Item # 9 STAFF REPORT**
- Item # 10 COMMITTEE MEMBER REPORTS**
- Item # 11 ADJOURNMENT**

The next meeting will be Tuesday, December 11TH - same time, same place!!

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.
Action

**CTAC/SSTAC MEETING SUMMARY
October 9, 2012**

Item # 1 CALL TO ORDER

Jim White, 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 6/12/12 MEETING SUMMARY

The meeting summary was approved; there were no changes.

Item # 5 REVIEW OF FY 12/13 CTAC/SSTAC MEETING SCHEDULE

Mary Travis, VCTC staff, presented the FY 12/13 CTAC/SSTAC meeting schedule and reviewed the topics to be discussed over the fiscal year. She noted that the February 4, 2013 public hearing on unmet transit needs would likely replace the regular meeting that month.

Committee members are encouraged to suggest additional topics, and there might be other changes during the year. After discussion, the Committee asked that updates on the Port of Hueneme and goods movement in the County be discussed; likely, this could happen at the January meeting. It was also asked that there be a workshop of Article 3 bike/pedestrian applicants in early February, and that the County APCD appear at a future meeting to discuss their work. The Committee then approved the meeting schedule.

Item # 6 REVIEW OF VCTC CALL FOR PROJECTS FOR FEDERAL SECTION 5307 JOBS ACCESS/REVERSE COMMUTE AND SECTION 5310 SENIORS/DISABLED GRANTS

Stephanie Young, VCTC staff, reviewed the Commission's "Call for Projects" for special projects under federal Sections 5307 JARC and 5310 Senior/Disabled programs. To be eligible, the cities/County/special agencies must submit projects that increase rides for 54 low-income persons or welfare recipients under the JARC funding, or, transit programs that especially assist senior citizens or persons with disabilities to use public transit. Ms. Young explained the program requirements and the selection process established by the federal government and the Commission.

Item # 7 ELECTION OF COMMITTEE VICE-CHAIR

Mary Travis mentioned the good news/bad news that long-time CTAC/SSTAC Chair Jim White had just been appointed as the County's Citizen representative on the VCTC. A fine compliment to Jim but a loss to the Committee as Jim must now resign. According to the operating rules, the Vice-Chair Charles Devlin will move up to Chair, and a new Vice-

Chair must be elected. However, as a complication, as of this meeting, Charles is resigning and appointing Mike Culver as his replacement, meaning Mike will actually become the Chair until January, when the annual elections are scheduled. After discussion, Susan White Wood was elected Vice-Chair. New Chair Culver thanked everyone for their support and gave a brief overview of his background in transportation.

Item # 8 CHAIRMAN’S REPORT

Chair White thanked the committee for all their support over the years and encouraged them to continue to attend local and/or County meetings where transportation issues might be discussed.

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 date when all Transportation Development Act (TDA) funds will be used locally just for transit and no longer for local streets.

Item # 10 COMMITTEE MEMBER REPORTS

Committee members all thanked Chair White for his past years as Chair. Representative Hanson mentioned a new bus shelter is being installed at the “Y” intersection and should provide better weather protection. Representative Tello expressed concern about the relocation of the Gold Coast Transit bus stop near the old Levitz store as this area is being redeveloped. Representative Katz noted that too many people are mis-using the “911” number for general information instead of for emergencies and suggested better public advertising of the “511” information number would help this situation.

Item # 11 ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 3:45 PM.

November 13, 2012

MEMO TO: CTAC/SSTAC
FROM: MARY TRAVIS, MANAGER OF TDA & RAIL PROGRAMS
SUBJECT: ELECTION OF COMMITTEE CHAIR AND VICE-CHAIR

RECOMMENDATION:

- Elect Committee Chair and Vice-Chair

DISCUSSION:

Because former Chair Jim White and Vice-Chair Charles Devlin resigned from the CTAC/SSTAC, it is necessary for the Committee to elect a new Chair.

At the last meeting, there was confusion over the procedures for the election, and also, later information received that it was not appropriate for an actual sub-contractor of the Commission, that is, MMS who handles VCTC's Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) certification program, to have a representative actually Chairing the CTAC/SSTAC. Therefore, with thanks to Mike Culver for stepping up and apologies from staff for not recognizing the conflict of interest, the CTAC/SSTAC needs to elect a new Chair.

At the October meeting, Susan White Woods was elected as the new Vice-Chair. However, once again because of the confusion at the last meeting, it is appropriate for the CTAC/SSTAC to either re-confirm her as the Vice-Chair or elect a new Vice-Chair.

November 13, 2012

MEMO TO: CTAC/SSTAC

FROM: MARY TRAVIS, MANAGER OF TDA & RAIL PROGRAMS

SUBJECT: FY13/14 TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT (TDA) UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS PUBLIC HEARING SCHEDULE, PROCEDURES AND DEFINITIONS OF "UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS" AND "REASONABLE TO MEET"

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- Review and approve the schedule, procedures and definitions of "Unmet Transit Needs" and "Reasonable to Meet" for the FY 13/14 Unmet Transit Needs Public Hearing.

DISCUSSION:

Each year, the State Transportation Development Act (TDA) requires a public hearing be held to discuss public transit. The purpose of the annual public hearing is to take testimony on local and/or regional transit needs, and then develop findings that ensure that all reasonable transit needs are satisfied before TDA funds can be allocated for street and road purposes. The testimony is reviewed against adopted definitions describing what are "unmet transit needs" and what is "reasonable to meet".

A schedule for the FY 13/14 public hearing is attached. A Hearing Board will be appointed by the VCTC Chair, and they will hold the public hearing Monday, February 4, 2012 at 1:30 PM at Camarillo City Hall, and then, review the testimony and draft staff findings/recommendations at the same time and place on April 22, 2013. The procedures for the hearing will be the same as in past years, that is, testimony will be collected from the public and local agencies interested in transportation. Testimony can be submitted by letter, email, telephone call to VCTC's toll-free "800" number, by appearing at an East County or West County public meeting and/or at the public hearing. The testimony will be reviewed by VCTC staff and transit providers and analyzed in the context of the adopted definitions of "unmet transit needs" and "reasonable to meet".

Three years ago, a thorough discussion took place at VCTC's Citizen's Transportation Advisory Committee/Social Services Transportation Advisory Council (CTAC/SSTAC) about the required definitions used in the hearing process. Included as part of the discussion was a review of how other counties define the terms, and it was reassuring to discover that Ventura is setting the model for many other areas. Accordingly, staff is recommending the definitions stay basically the same.

"Unmet Transit Need":

"Unmet transit needs" are, at a minimum, those public transportation services that have been identified by substantial community input through the public hearing process or are identified in a Short Range Transit Plan, in local Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) paratransit plans and/or in the Regional Transportation Plan that have not yet been implemented or funded.

“Reasonable to Meet”:

Following is the VCTC adopted definition of "Reasonable to Meet" including the recommended benchmarks for the passenger farebox recovery ratio for new transit services in Ventura County.

An unmet transit need shall be considered “reasonable to meet” if the proposed service⁽¹⁾ is in general compliance with the following criteria:

Equity

1. The proposed service will not cause reductions in existing transit services that have an equal or higher priority.
2. The proposed service will require a subsidy generally equivalent to other similar services.

Timing

1. The proposed service is in response to an existing rather than future transit need.

Feasibility

1. The proposed service can be provided within available funding.⁽²⁾
2. The proposed service can be provided with the existing fleet or under contract to a private provider.

Performance

1. The proposed service will not unduly affect the operator's ability to maintain the required passenger fare ratio for its system as a whole.
2. The proposed service will meet the scheduled passenger fare ratio standards as described in the recommended benchmarks for the passenger farebox recovery ratio for new transit services in Ventura County.
3. The estimated number of passengers to be carried will be in the range of other similar services, and/or, the proposed service provides a "link" or connection that contributes to the effectiveness of the overall transit system.

Community Acceptance

1. The proposed service has community acceptance and/or support as determined by the unmet needs public hearing record, inclusion in adopted programs and plans, adopted governing board positions and other existing information.

(1) Proposed Service is defined as the specific transit service identified as an unmet need (as defined) and which requires evaluation against this definition of “reasonable to meet”.

(2) The lack of available resources shall not be the sole reason for finding that a transit need is not reasonable to meet.

RECOMMENDED BENCHMARKS FOR PASSENGER FAREBOX RECOVERY RATIO FOR NEW TRANSIT/PARATRANSIT SERVICES IN VENTURA COUNTY.

The State has established a basic requirement in Section 99268 of the Public Utility Code for all proposed transit services in urban areas. This requirement is to achieve a 20% passenger fare ratio by the end of the third year of operation. A similar targeted passenger fare ratio of 10% exists for special services (i.e. elderly and disabled) and rural area services.

VCTC has established more detailed interim passenger fare ratio standards, which will be used to evaluate services as they are proposed and implemented, which are described below. Transit serving both urban and rural areas, per state law, may obtain an "intermediate" passenger fare ratio. (1)

END OF TWELVE MONTHS

Performance Level		<u>Recommended Action</u>
<u>Urban Service</u>	<u>Rural/Special Services</u>	
Less than 6 %	Less than 3 %	Provider may discontinue service
6% or more	3% or more	Provider will continue service, with modifications if needed

END OF TWENTY-FOUR MONTHS

Performance Level		<u>Recommended Action</u>
<u>Urban Service</u>	<u>Rural/Special Services</u>	
Less than 10%	Less than 5%	Provider may discontinue service.
10% or more	5% or more	Provider will continue service, with modifications, if needed

END OF THIRTY-SIX MONTHS (2)

Performance Level		<u>Recommended Action</u>
<u>Urban Service</u>	<u>Rural/Special Services</u>	
Less than 15%	Less than 7%	Provider may discontinue service
15-20%	7-10%	Provider may consider modifying and continuing service
20% or more	10% or more	Provider will continue service, with modifications if needed

(1) Per statute the VCTC may establish a lower fare ratio for community transit (dial-a-ride) services.

(2) A review will take place after 30 months to develop a preliminary determination regarding the discontinuation of proposed services.

Fiscal Year 13/14 Unmet Transit Needs Public Hearing and Process Schedule

November 13, 2012	CTAC/SSTAC reviews FY 13/14 unmet transit needs public hearing definitions
December 7, 2012	VCTC approves FY 13/14 unmet transit needs public hearing schedule and definitions
December 10, 2012	Letters/flyers are sent to community groups, social service agencies, transit operators, and the general public to announce the public hearing and information is posted on the www.goventura.org website
January 4, 2013	Legal notice for public hearing published
January 9 and 16, 2013	Display advertisements on public hearing published in local English and Spanish language newspapers
January 23, 2013	East County public meeting, 6:30 PM, in Moorpark
January 24, 2013	West County public meeting, 6:30 PM, in Oxnard
January 25, 2013	Reminder notices on the public hearing sent to agencies/citizens
February 4, 2013	Public Hearing, 1:30 p.m. at Camarillo City Hall
February 11, 2013	5 p.m. hearing record closed - no further public testimony accepted
March 14, 2013	Transit Operators Advisory Committee (TRANSCOM) reviews testimony and makes recommendations regarding the staff proposed findings
March 22, 2013	(Tentative Date) Managers Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC) reviews testimony and makes recommendations regarding the proposed findings
April 9, 2013	CTAC/SSTAC reviews testimony and makes recommendations regarding the staff proposed findings
April 22, 2013	1:30 p.m. at Camarillo City Hall - Hearing Board reviews and approves findings
May 3, 2013	9 a.m. at Camarillo City Hall - VCTC adopts Unmet Transit Needs Public Hearing Findings
May 6, 2013	Adopted findings are forwarded to the State for review
August 15, 2013	Deadline for State review of findings

November 13, 2013

MEMO TO: CTAC/SSTAC

FROM: MARY TRAVIS, VCTC STAFF

**SUBJECT: APPROVAL OF FY 13/14 SCHEDULE AND EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR
TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT (TDA) ARTICLE 3
BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN FUND APPLICATIONS**

RECOMMENDATION:

Review, adjust and approve the schedule and evaluation criteria for the applications from cities/County for FY 13/14 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 13/14, we expect about \$550,000 will be available for these purposes. About 150% or \$82,500 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 \$467,500 remaining for allocation to the cities and County of Ventura for local bicycle or pedestrian projects on a competitive basis.

VCTC has established an annual process for the cities/County to submit projects and compete for the available funds; please see the recommended FY 13/14 Article 3 allocation schedule (Attachment # 1) and project evaluation criteria (Attachment #2). VCTC 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.

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 as part of the request for funds and a clear 8 ½ x 11 map with directions to the project is requested to facilitate field visits. 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 felt the submittals were mostly for routine projects such as curb cuts. While this example is a worthwhile activity, the Committee felt 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. This point will therefore be emphasized when the FY 13/14 application packets are distributed in January.

**FY 12/13 TDA ARTICLE 3
BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN FUND ALLOCATION SCHEDULE**

November 11, 2012	CTAC/SSTAC reviews draft FY 13/14 schedule and evaluation criteria
December 7, 2012	VCTC reviews/approves schedule and evaluation criteria
January 14, 2013	County Auditor estimates FY 13/14 TDA funds available
January 21, 2013	Article 3 application packets sent to cities/County for their consideration
February 5, 2013	Applicant workshop 3 PM at VCTC conference room
<u>February 25, 2013</u>	<u>Noon - City/County applications due at VCTC office</u> (Note: resolutions authorizing the claims may be submitted at a later date but must be received at the VCTC before any funds will be allocated to the claimant.)
March 12, 2013	CTAC/SSTAC meeting to review project applications/ interviews project applicants
April 9, 2013	CTAC/SSTAC meeting with general discussion of projects and field visits
May 14, 2013	CTAC/SSTAC meeting to rank projects and make funding recommendation to VCTC
June 7, 2013	VCTC reviews recommendation and approves FY 13/14 Article 3 project funding allocations
November, 15. 2013	Instructions sent to County Auditor allocating FY 13/14 Article 3 funds
December 15, 2013	Instructions sent to County Auditor allocating FY 13/14 Class I Bike Trail maintenance funds

g:mary/agenda/13/14 article3schedule&evalcrit

TDA ARTICLE 3 GRANT EVALUATION CRITERIA

1. Matching Funds (Yes or No)		2. Safety (25 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? 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 (20 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?	