



**THURSDAY, March 8 2012, 1:30 P.M.
Camarillo City Hall
Camarillo**

**VENTURA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION (VCTC)
TRANSIT OPERATORS ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TRANSCOM)**

- Item #1** **CALL TO ORDER**
- Item #2** **INTRODUCTIONS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**
- Item #3** **PUBLIC COMMENTS**
- Item #4** **MEETING SUMMARY MARCH 8, 2012 – PG. 2**
Review and approve the meeting summary of the January 12, 2012 TRANSCOM meeting
- Item #5** **MINI CALL FOR PROJECTS FOR STP, CMAQ, AND TE FUNDS – PG. 5**
Recommend the Commission program of \$19,544,769 of STP funds to the project prioritized “above the line” in Attachment A, \$14,255,561 of CMAQ funds to the projects prioritized “above the line” in Attachment B, and \$2,600,000 of TE funds for the Surfers Point Bike Path Phase II in Ventura; and recommend the Commission approve the shelf list of \$6,517,626 for projects in Attachment C, for projects to be eligible to receive funds prior to September 30, 2013 should the need arise to avoid loss of funds or of program authority. Projects will receive funds in priority order depending on the need to use unobligated funds.
- Item #6** **ADOPT PROGRAM OF PROJECTS FOR FTA SECTION 5316 (JOB ACCESS & REVERSE COMMUTE) AND SECTION 5317 (NEW FREEDOMS) GRANTS – PG. 7**
Approve adopt the attached list of FY 2011/12 project scores and Program of Projects (POP); and, authorize the Executive Director to certify the applications and forward the applications and prioritized list to the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans).
- Item #7** **PROPOSITION 1B TRANSIT CAPITAL CALL FOR PROJECTS – PG. 12**
Approve the call for projects for Proposition 1B Public Transportation Modernization, Improvement and Service Enhancement Account.
- Item #8** **ADA CERTIFICATION UPDATE – PG. 18**
Mike Culver, MMP Director of Operations for the ADA Certification Program, will make a detailed presentation to TRANSCOM regarding the program. He will also provide the monthly report for February.
- Item #9** **SOCIAL SERVICE AGENCIES TOKEN POLICY – PG. 19**
Discuss and recommend VISTA Social Service Token Agency Policy
- Item #10** **VISTA POLICY REGARDING TRANSPORTING CHILDREN – PG. 22**
Discuss and recommend VISTA Transporting Children Policy
- Item #11** **ADJOURN**



Item #4

**MEETING SUMMARY
THURSDAY, February 9 2012, 1:30 P.M.
Camarillo City Hall
Camarillo**

Item #1

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Kroes called the meeting to order at 1:39 pm.

Item #2

INTRODUCTIONS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Peter Dehaan introduced Stephanie Young, new VCTC staff. He noted her primary functions will be the TIP and Prop 1B programs.

Ben Cacatian reported on the upcoming air quality standards, and the requirement for a plan to address them. It appears Ventura County will be a moderate non-attainment area.

Vic Kamhi raised concerns from the Transit Access Reporter newsletter regarding the challenges in Chicago to free senior rides on fixed route services but not on Dial-a-Route services; and door-to-door services in Modesto. He also noted a new FTA grant for state of good repair, the introduction of new buses on the LA DOT routes 422 and 423 in Thousand Oaks, and that Gold Coast Transit had joined the Southern California [Maintenance] Consortium.

Item #3

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None

Item #4

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Mike Houser was elected chair on a motion by Kathy Connell, seconded by Roc Pulido. Helene Buchman was elected vice-chair on a motion by Chuck Perkins, seconded by Mike Houser.

Item #5

MEETING SUMMARY January 12, 2012

That TRANSCOM review and approve the meeting summary of the January 12, 2012 TRANSCOM meeting on a motion by Chuck Perkins, seconded by Shaun Kroes.

Item #6

**FY 2011/12 PROPOSITION 1B TRANSIT SAFETY, SECURITY &
DISASTER RESPONSE FUND AVAILABILITY**

Stephanie Young presented the schedule for transit operators to submit Proposition 1B Transit Safety and Security fund proposals by March 29, 2012 and discussed the program. Pete DeHaan discussed the process and state review. Mike Houser noted that Amber (staff, State DHD) raised concerns about the use of the program exclusively for rail for the past several years. There was discussion about other potential uses of the 1B security funds. The staff recommendation was approved on a motion by Helene Buchman seconded by Kathy Connell.

Item #7

REVISIONS TO THOUSAND OAKS TRANSPORTATION CENTER FUNDS

Peter Dehaan summarized the circumstances and the recommendation to replace \$260,000 of Transportation Enhancement funds for the Thousand Oaks Transportation Center parking expansion project with \$260,000 in CMAQ funds. The staff recommendation was approved on a motion by Helene Buchman seconded by Kathy Connell.

Item #8

STATUS OF REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (RTP) PROJECTS

Peter Dehaan presented the status of RTP projects for the SCAG 2012 RTP and asked for TRANSCOM members to contact him with any comments.

Item #9

TRANSIT VEHICLE WEIGHT LIMITS ISSUE

Vic Kamhi gave a brief report on the issue of bus vehicle weights, and legislative actions being investigated by the California Transit Association.

Item #10

STATUS OF FEDERAL TRANSIT LEGISLATION

VCTC staff presented a brief oral report on the status of the Federal transit authorization.

Item #11

DISCUSSION OF STATUS OF CALTRANS MASS TRANSIT BUDGET

Staff reported on the Governor's proposed reductions in Division of Mass Transit staff in the draft budget, and the recommendations from the California Transit Association's consultant on state transit support to increase program support in the Division of Mass Transit.

Item #12

ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned at 3:50 pm.

ADMINISTRATION CONFERENCE ROOM



TRANSCOM

DATE: 2/9/12

NAME	BADGE #	NAME	BADGE #
Andrew Mikkelson		Shaun Kroes	028
Ben Cacatian	036	Steve Brown	
City of Fillmore (Bert Rapp)		Steve Rosenberg	
Chuck Perkins	031	Tom Mericle	
Darren Kettle		Vic Kamhi	
Debra Solomon		Nichole Majunie	
Drew Lurie		Leticia Leon	
Elizabeth Amador			
Fernando Castro		Darlene Cochran	
Andy Santamaria		Jacqui Cervantez Roberts	
Gina Summey		Dennis Miranda	
Gloria Sotelo		Ed Webster	
Grahame Watts			
Helene Buchman	077	Jim McLaughlin	
Jeff Hereford	058	Pat McLaughlin	
Joanna Capelle		Dan Beal	
John Quinn		Patti Post	
Karen Fajnor		Marlene Conner	
Kathy Connell	074	Jim Moore	
Kerry Forsythe			
Kimberly Gayle			
Linda Wright			
Martin Erickson			
Mary Travis			
Matt Gleason			
Mike Culver			
Mike Houser	015		
Myra Montejano			
Peter DeHaan	073		
Roc Pulido			

Ad Hoc Paratransit/
Human Service and Transportation Service

MARGARET HEATH - 057
Stephane Young



Item #5

March 8, 2012

MEMO TO: TRANSIT OPERATORS COMMITTEE
TRANSPORTATION TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

FROM: PETER DE HAAN, PROGRAMMING DIRECTOR
STEPHANIE YOUNG, PROGRAMMING ANALYST

SUBJECT: MINI CALL FOR PROJECTS FOR STP, CMAQ, AND TE FUNDS

SUBJECT: MINI CALL FOR PROJECTS FOR STP, CMAQ, AND TE FUNDS

RECOMMENDATION:

- Recommend the Commission program of \$19,544,769 of STP funds to the project prioritized "above the line" in Attachment A, \$14,255,561 of CMAQ funds to the projects prioritized "above the line" in Attachment B, and \$2,600,000 of TE funds for the Surfers Point Bike Path Phase II in Ventura.
- Recommend the Commission approve the shelf list of \$6,517,626 for projects in Attachment C, for projects to be eligible to receive funds prior to September 30, 2013 should the need arise to avoid loss of funds or of program authority. Projects will receive funds in priority order depending on the need to use unobligated funds.

BACKGROUND:

At the December meeting, VCTC approved guidelines (Attachment F) for the Mini Call for Projects. Project applications were due to VCTC on February 6th. Prior to the deadline staff received \$92.3 million in applications, many of which were for projects requesting consideration in multiple funding categories. In addition, on February 27th staff received an application from the Port of Hueneme for \$6,060,367 in CMAQ for the Multi-Modal Shoreside Power Project. VCTC staff established a list of the projects submitted and gave initial scoring to the projects according to the approved criteria. VCTC staff also met with Ben Cacatian of the Ventura County Air Pollution Control District (VCAPCD) to review the CMAQ projects for eligibility, and review the scoring for air quality. A subcommittee, appointed by TRANSCOM and TTAC, met on February 27th to review the projects listing and the scoring. In addition, as directed by TRANSCOM and TTAC, the subcommittee recommended a project shelf list. The subcommittee did not review the Port of Hueneme project.

Two of the nominated projects were not included in the project ranking as they were determined to be ineligible. Based on feedback from FTA staff, the proposed East County Fixed Route Transit Service is likely ineligible since much of the service appears to supplant the existing VISTA East service. The proposed Oxnard Gateway signs were nominated for TE funds as a highway beautification project, but signage does not appear to be an eligible highway beautification activity based on the TE Guidelines.

Staff did not perform a TE project scoring since all of the projects eligible for TE funds were also eligible for CMAQ. Staff instead recommends that all of the available TE funds be programmed for the Surfers Point Bike Path Phase II project in Ventura. For administrative purposes it will be simpler to use all of the available TE funds on one project, and Phase I of this project was also funded through TE. All of the remaining TE-eligible projects were included in the CMAQ project scoring.

TRANSCOM AGENDA

March 8, 2012

Item #5

Page #2

Due to the federal Toll Credit policy, it is possible for a project to proceed with no local match, rather than the minimum required 11.47% match. Three cities plus VCTC requested that their projects receive 100% federal funds. However, the recommendation is to require all the cities to provide at least the minimum match, to allow the funding of more projects given the large number of projects submitted. VCTC is still recommended to receive 100% federal funding to avoid increasing the amount of Local Transportation Funds taken "off the top." In addition, Gold Coast Transit requested three years of funding for the Victoria Avenue Transit Service, but to allow funding of more projects, staff is recommending funding only the first two years, with the third year being eligible for consideration in a future call for projects.

Specific scoring issues are as follows:

- The STP criteria included a 5-point penalty if the prior "Mini-Call" projects were delivered after the date stated on their applications unless the agency submitted a letter giving a satisfactory reason for the delay. Attachment E provides the letter submitted by Oxnard. Based on the information in this letter, staff and the subcommittee recommended that Oxnard not receive the 5-point penalty.
- A 15-point equitable distribution score was applied to some projects for the County of Ventura, Camarillo, and Thousand Oaks to bring those agencies' totals close to their population share of the available funds. Attachment D shows the funding distribution by jurisdiction for the recommended program. Other agencies are below their population share but none of their projects remain unfunded. In particular, Fillmore, Santa Paula, and Port Hueneme did not nominate any projects, although Santa Paula recently received a significant amount of funding during the programming of prior project cost increases. This cost increase, along with others approved by TTAC and TRANSCOM in November 2011, is shown in Attachment D. Cost increases were subtracted from agencies' population shares.
- Although not included in the criteria, the subcommittee discussed and recommended various "tie-breaker" methods to select between STP projects having the same score which could not all be funded based on the available funds. It was recommended that the Camarillo street rehabilitation project be funded since Camarillo is under its population share, and that the Simi Valley street rehabilitation project be funded on grounds that Simi Valley was significantly under its share in the 2010 Mini Call for Projects. The Oxnard Rose Avenue Resurfacing was placed above the line since it most closely matches the remaining amount of funds.
- Due to the project having been submitted late, staff has not scored the Port of Hueneme project for air quality due to the project having been submitted after the scheduled review by VCAPCD and the subcommittee. Staff recommends against funding this project because it was submitted 21 days past the deadline.

Based on discussions at prior Committee and Commission meetings, the subcommittee discussed the policy for having a shelf of projects that would receive funding should circumstances warrant to avoid a possible loss of funds or of program authority. The subcommittee recommended that the projects shown in Attachment C be approved as a two-year shelf list, to be funded in priority order to the extent the projects are able to quickly obligate funds when required. The subcommittee also recommended that projects on the shelf list receiving funds before September 30, 2012 would not have priority for funding in future calls for projects.

As in prior discussions regarding federal funds, it is important to note that the upcoming reauthorization could limit the ability to spend STP funds on local road rehabilitation. Although there is a significant amount of funds recommended for local road rehabilitation, since the Mini-Call for Projects is programming funds through FY 2012/13, the ability to use these STP funds for local rehabilitation is subject to possible federal policy changes made through reauthorization. Similarly, should there be a significant reduction in federal funds in the next two years it could be necessary to delay projects to later years.

A SEPARATE TABLE [PDF] IS INCLUDED IN THE MAILING WITH THE SCORES



Item # 6

March 8, 2012

MEMO TO: TRANSIT OPERATORS COMMITTEE

FROM: STEPHANIE YOUNG, PROGRAM ANALYST

SUBJECT: ADOPT PROGRAM OF PROJECTS FOR FTA SECTION 5316 (JOB ACCESS & REVERSE COMMUTE) AND SECTION 5317 (NEW FREEDOMS) GRANTS

RECOMMENDATION:

- Adopt the attached list of FY 2011/12 project scores and Program of Projects (POP); and,
- Authorize the Executive Director to certify the applications and forward the applications and prioritized list to the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans).

BACKGROUND:

The Job Access & Reverse Commute (JARC) and New Freedom (NF) Programs are authorized under the provisions set forth in SAFETEA-LU. Caltrans Division of Mass Transportation administers Section 5316 JARC and Section 5317 NF funds allocated to small urbanized areas (50,000 – 200,000 population) and non-urbanized areas (<50,000 population).

At the February 3, 2012, Commission meeting, the Commission approved a call for projects for the FY 2011-12 Section 5316 and 5317 Small Urban and Non Urban (Rural) grants, with applications due to VCTC from agencies on February 22, 2012. Projects approved by the Commission will be submitted to Caltrans by March 23, 2012, in accordance with the Caltrans adopted timeline for grant applications. In Ventura County, projects serving Camarillo, Simi Valley, Santa Paula, Fillmore, and the rural portions of the unincorporated areas are eligible to receive funds from the small urban and rural apportionments.

Subsequently four applications were received as follows:

The Arc of Ventura County	JARC Operating Assistance for existing Employment Transportation Services
City of Simi Valley	JARC Operating Assistance for existing fixed-route transit service between Simi Valley and Chatsworth
Ventura County Transportation Commission	JARC Operating Assistance for extended hours and more buses on the VISTA Coastal Express route
Ventura County Transportation Commission	JARC Operating Assistance for extended hours and more buses on the VISTA Highway 126 route

TRANSCOM AGENDA

March 8, 2012

Item #6

Page #2

As part VCTC's recent call for projects for large urban JARC and New Freedom funds, VCTC considered projects for small urban and rural funds, and approved \$41,300 of New Freedom for the Mobility Management project by Mobility Management Partners (MMP). This project is thus included in the Program of Projects (ATTACHMENT A). VCTC had also approved \$48,800 of JARC funds for the Arc Employment Transportation Service, but this project application was resubmitted to allow for use of toll credits in place of a local match.

Federal law requires that all projects using 5316 and 5317 funds must be consistent with the approved human services coordination plan, which in Ventura County is the Human Service Transportation and Transit Service Coordination Study (April 13, 2007). This plan identifies Ventura County coordinated transportation priorities and project selection criteria. Each proposed project was evaluated by VCTC staff to ensure that it "is derived from the Coordinated Plan."

Grant Timeline

Caltrans has prepared a timeline which calls for the following:

- Grant applications submitted to VCTC by February 22, 2012.
- VCTC forwards a regional prioritized list with scores and copies of applications to Caltrans by March 23, 2012.
- Completion of State Review, Evaluation, and Program of Projects by Caltrans in May 2012.
- Tentative Award Announcement made in June 2012. Projects awarded pending FTA grant approval.
- Final Award Announcement made in December 2012.

Project Scoring

Scores adopted by the Commission will not necessarily be the final scores for these projects, and VCTC is not in a position to issue grant funds. Rather, VCTC is the first step in a process to receive grant funds based on a statewide priority list. As part of this initial review, prior to submission to Caltrans, applicants will be able to submit additional information which may affect their scores. Following submittal of the scores/rankings approved by the Commission, the applications will be reviewed (and possibly modified) by Caltrans. Project scores assigned by staff can be found in ATTACHMENT B.

VCTC used following criteria provided by Caltrans to prioritize projects:

- A. Goals and Objectives (20 points possible): Applicant should provide a clear and comprehensive project description including details on current service, targeted populations that are served and how the project will support new, enhancement, or expansion of service or system capacity. Describes how the project helps to establish, preserve or improve mobility for the targeted populations. Applicant demonstrates how the project is consistent with the overall JARC or New Freedom program goals and objectives. Applicant demonstrates how project is consistent with and is derived from the Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan (Coordinated Plan) and how the project directly addresses transportation gaps and/or barriers identified through the locally developed human services transportation planning process within their communities. (Applicant indicates the section/page number in the Coordinated Plan addressing the gaps and/or barriers). Applicant identifies opportunities and/or efforts to coordinate with available transportation operators in the project area.
- B. Implementation Plan (30 points possible): Applicant provides a well-defined operations plan with defined routes, schedules, current/projected ridership, key personnel, and marketing strategies with supporting documentation for carrying out the project. For Capital projects, applicant provides an implementation plan that includes project tasks, timeframes, benchmarks, key milestones, key personnel, deliverables and estimated completion date with supporting documentation. Describe type of equipment you are interested in purchasing and identify the components. Discuss how the requested ancillary equipment will be used to support the transportation program. Discuss any expected improvements in service delivery or coordination and any reduction in the cost to provide service. If computer equipment is being requested, also describe current method of collecting and tracking information. Both the operations and implementation plans must identify key personnel assigned to this project and their qualifications, including resumes and certifications as supporting documentation. Applicants must demonstrate their institutional capability to carry out the service delivery aspect of the project.

TRANSCOM AGENDA

March 8, 2012

Item #6

Page #3

- C. Program Performance Indicators (20 points possible): Applicant identifies clear measurable outcome-based performance measures and indicators and provides a quantifiable methodology used to evaluate the effectiveness of the project in meeting its identified goals and objectives. Applicant states the number of persons to be served, trip purpose(s), and the number of trips. Additional measurable units of service can also be used. Applicant must describe the outcome (impact) that the project will have on low-income (JARC) or individuals with disabilities (New Freedom). Applicant describes a process that details the ongoing monitoring and evaluation of the project or service, including methodologies and desired outcomes based upon the performance objectives identified.
- D. Communication and Outreach (20 points possible): Stakeholder list should include, but not be limited to, Health and Human Services Agencies, public/private sector, non-profit agencies, transportation providers, and members of the public representing low-income (JARC) and individuals with disabilities (New Freedom). Applicants will be evaluated based on their ability to coordinate with other community transportation and/or social service resources. Applicants must keep stakeholders involved and informed of project activities throughout the project timeline. Applicant must also describe how they would promote public awareness of the project. Three (3) letters of support from stakeholders must be attached to the grant application. (One of the three support letters may come from a client of the proposed project.)
- E. Emergency Planning and Preparedness (10 points possible): Applicant describes emergency planning and drill activities. Provides proof the agency is included in the response plan with the County Office of Emergency Services (OES) or demonstrates efforts made to be included in the response plan. Applicant indicates the drill(s) they participated in or are scheduled to participate in. Applicant participates in security/emergency planning, drills/exercises, and/or decision making activities. Applicants that are transportation providers should complete the vehicle inventory detailing their active vehicle fleet.

Program of Projects			
The Ventura County Transportation Commission (VCTC) will hold a public hearing on the Program of Projects (POP) for the Small Urban and Non-Urban (Rural) Areas for projects to be funded with Federal Transit Administration New Freedom Initiative and Jobs Access Reverse Commute (JARC) funds in the 2011/12 Fiscal Year (FY 2012). The New Freedom funds available in FY 2012 are estimated to be \$41,300. The JARC funds available in FY 2012 are estimated to be \$1,260,983. The estimates are based on anticipated FY 2012 funds and prior year carry-over funds. The public hearing will be held at 8:30am on Friday, April 13, 2012, in the Camarillo City Council Chamber, 601 Carmen Drive, in Camarillo. The POP is available for public inspection at 950 County Square Drive, Suite 207, Ventura CA 93003. Unless a subsequent notice is published, this project list will become the final Program of Projects for inclusion in the Southern California Association of Governments Regional Transportation Improvement Program.			
FY 2012 New Freedom/JARC Program of Projects			
	Total Cost	Federal Share	Local Share & Other
New Freedom Initiative			
<u>Capital/Planning Funds</u>			
Mobility Management through Mobility Management Partners	\$41,300	\$41,300	\$0
	\$41,300	\$41,300	\$0
Total New Freedom	\$41,300	\$41,300	\$0
Jobs Access Reverse Commute			
<u>Operating Assistance</u>			
Arc Employment Transportation Service Ventura County Transportation Commission	\$97,596	\$97,596	\$0
Coastal Express Transit Service	\$130,783	\$130,783	\$0
Highway 126 Transit Service	\$392,800	\$392,800	\$0
Simi Valley Fixed-Route Service to Chatsworth	\$1,474,800	\$737,400	\$737,400
	\$2,095,979	\$1,358,579	\$737,400
Total JARC	\$2,095,979	\$1,358,579	\$737,400

JARC AND NEW FREEDOMS PROJECT SCORES

Applicant	Project	Federal Funds Requested	Scores					TOTAL
			Section A	Section B	Section C	Section D	Section E	
The Arc of Ventura County	Employment Transportation Services	\$97,596	20	29	20	18	10	97
VCTC	VISTA Coastal Express	\$130,783	20	28	18	20	10	96
VCTC	VISTA Highway 126	\$392,800	20	28	18	20	10	96
Simi Valley	Fixed Route Service to/from Chatsworth	\$737,400	20	30	18	20	6	94
MMP	Mobility Management Services	\$41,300	20	28	20	20	10	98



Item #7

March 8, 2012

MEMO TO: TRANSIT OPERATORS SUBCOMMITTEE

FROM: PETER DE HAAN, PROGRAMMING DIRECTOR

SUBJECT: PROPOSITION 1B TRANSIT CAPITAL CALL FOR PROJECTS

RECOMMENDATION:

- Approve call for projects for Proposition 1B Public Transportation Modernization, Improvement and Service Enhancement Account.

BACKGROUND:

Proposition 1B, approved by the voters in 2006, includes \$3.6 billion for transit capital projects, to be distributed to transit operators and regional agencies by formula. The Transit Investment Study developed a list of recommended transit capital projects to be funded by Proposition 1B, as well as project selection criteria to be used if additional unanticipated funds become available. Subsequent to the development of the project list, unanticipated funds did in fact become available, in the form of \$19 million of federal stimulus funds for transit. As a result, the majority of the projects that were on the list have already been funded. The criteria provide that two-thirds of the funds go to bus projects, and one-third to rail projects, based on the historic funding split between the two modes. The attached list shows the projects included in the transit investment study, including which projects were funded through ARRA.

The VCTC share of Proposition 1B Transit Capital funds is approximately \$39,645,000, which based on the Transit Investment Study would be divided \$26,430,000 to bus and \$13,215,000 to rail. The bus mode has thus far used \$7,576,009, and the rail mode has used \$2,988,594, leaving approximately \$18,854,000 for bus and \$10,227,000 for rail. The remaining funds should be available over the next five years, although the funding is contingent upon the state's ability to sell bonds, which at present appears to be fairly reliable.

Eligible uses for Proposition 1B transit funds include rehabilitation of transit facilities; purchase of transit system equipment including vehicles and computer systems; capital projects to improve transit safety; and capital projects that result in expansion of transit service.

DISCUSSION:

One alternative for use of Proposition 1B funds would be for VCTC to issue a typical call for projects, with transit agencies would requesting funds for eligible ready-to-go projects, and those projects would be funded to the extent that funds available. However, given that Proposition 1B provides a fixed amount of

TRANSCOM AGENDA

March 8, 2012

Item #7

Page #2

funds which are for the most part available whenever needed, a more strategic approach is needed to assure that sufficient funds are reserved for future high-priority projects. The Transit Investment Study identified the following bus capital needs which staff believes are not yet funded, and these needs are significantly greater than the amount of remaining funds:

Bus Replacement	\$17 million
Bus Stop Enhancements	\$700,000
New Gold Coast Facility	\$8.82 million (tentatively-discussed Prop 1B contribution)
Ojai Maintenance Facility	\$500,000

For rail, the study identified \$3,000,000 in city rail station improvements, but a significant amount of funds could also be used by Metrolink for various projects.

Given the need to carefully plan for the remainder of the Proposition 1B program, staff is proposing to request eligible agencies provide the following items as part of this Proposition 1B Transit Capital call for projects. (VCTC staff will work with SCRRA to determine upcoming capital rail requirements other than station needs.)

1. Updated list of projects to be requested over the remainder of Proposition 1B. (The list need not be limited to projects previously shown in the Transit Investment Study.)
2. List of projects that will be ready-to-go within the next 12 months, which should therefore be submitted at this time for bond funds.

Based on the information received, VCTC will work with TRANSCOM to consider current priorities for Proposition 1B funding. Given the large amount of capital projects shown in the Transit Investment Study, it is possible that the current Proposition 1B fund funding could be limited to bus replacements only, to ensure sufficient funds remain for potential bus operational and administrative facility needs as well as future bus replacements.

The following is the schedule for nomination and selection of projects.

VCTC Approval of Policy for Call for Projects	April 13, 2012
Availability of Applications	
Project Information due to VCTC	June 15, 2012
Review by Transit Operators Committee	July 12, 2012
Approval by VCTC	September 7, 2012
Submission of Projects to Caltrans	September 17, 2012
Fund Availability	January 2013
(Per State law, Proposition 1B Transit Capital projects can proceed prior to fund availability.)	

At this time staff needs to bring to the attention of Proposition 1B recipients a new requirement which applies to all Proposition 1B funds, including the PTMISEA funds as well as the safety and security funds administered by CalEMA. Under the provisions of the recently passed AB 436, all Proposition 1B construction contracts awarded after January 1, 2012 are subject to prevailing wage requirements, under

TRANSCOM AGENDA**March 8, 2012****Item #7****Page #3**

the enforcement of the Department of Industrial Relations. All such contracts must include prevailing wage language, and upon award the awarding agency must provide notice electronically to the Department. Furthermore, the Department will invoice the awarding agency not more than $\frac{1}{4}$ of 1% of the cost of the contract for the Department's enforcement activities, although the Proposition 1B funds provided for the project may be used to pay the enforcement cost. Further information, including the directions for notifying the Department of contract awards, is available at www.dir.ca.gov, by clicking on the link for "CMU" or "Compliance Monitoring Unit." It is important to note that this requirement will apply not only to construction projects in the current Proposition 1B calls for projects, but also to previously-programmed construction projects having contracts awarded starting in 2012.

Responsible Agency	Project	ARRA Funded	Amount	Remaining Prop 1B Projects Estimated Cost		
				All Projects	W/O Leesdale and Gold Coast Facility	W/O Rolling Stock
Camarillo	Bus Transfer Facility at Central and Del Norte	x	\$24,000			
Camarillo	14 to 20- passenger vehicles for Dial-A-Ride (35-40 vehicles)			4,000,000 to	\$6,000,000	\$6,000,000
Camarillo	26 to 30 passenger fixed route vehicles (5-7 vehicles)			1,000,000 to	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000
Camarillo	Benches/shelters/ schedules improvements				\$250,000	\$250,000
Camarillo	Metrolink station improvements				\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000
Camarillo	Pedestrian grade separation at Metrolink station				\$17,000,000	
Camarillo Health Care District	Two Type II Buses and Three Type I Buses	x	\$258,514			
Gold Coast Transit	Replacement Supervisory Vehicles and Related Equipment	x	\$185,000			
Gold Coast Transit	Eight CNG-fueled Transit Buses	x	\$3,608,000			
Gold Coast Transit	Upgraded Farebox System	x	\$600,000			
Gold Coast Transit	Operations Facility Modernization	x	\$2,091,257			
Gold Coast Transit	Transit Enhancements	x	\$101,723			
Gold Coast Transit	ADA Paratransit Operations	x	\$1,000,000			
Gold Coast Transit	Replacement vehicles for fixed routes and paratransit			\$2,000,000 to	\$4,000,000	\$4,000,000

Gold Coast Transit	Computer hardware & software				\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000
Gold Coast Transit	Driving Training camera system				\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000
Gold Coast Transit	Replace Facility				\$40,000,000		
Metrolink	Track/Structure Restoration	x	\$1,146,535				
Metrolink	Positive Train Control Design	x	\$2,480,000				
Metrolink	Central Maintenance Facility Improvements & Keller Yard	x	\$960,000				
Metrolink	Metrolink Operating Assistance	x	\$582,000				
Moorpark	Three CNG-fueled Transit Buses	x	\$1,260,000				
Moorpark	ADA Paratransit Operations	x	\$52,175				
Moorpark	Replacement vehicles for fixed routes and paratransit			\$2,000,000 to	\$4,000,000	\$4,000,000	
Moorpark	Bus Stop Enhancements				\$200,000	\$200,000	\$200,000
Ojai	Three LPG-fueled Buses	x	\$465,970				
Ojai	Maintenance Facility				\$500,000	\$500,000	\$500,000
Ojai	Transit stop enhancements				\$75,000	\$75,000	\$75,000
Oxnard	Bus Stop Enhancements				\$500,000	\$500,000	\$500,000
Simi Valley	Replace/upgrade Deteriorated Transit Shelters	x	\$484,000				
Simi Valley	Modernization of Transit Garage	x	\$867,349				
Simi Valley	Three CNG-fueled Transit Buses	x	\$1,380,000				
Simi Valley	ADA Paratransit Operations	x	\$303,400				
Simi Valley	Replacement vehicles for fixed routes and paratransit			\$4,000,000 to	\$6,000,000	\$6,000,000	
Simi Valley	Farebox replacements				\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000
Simi Valley	Additional Metrolink parking			\$1,000,000 to	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000

Simi Valley	Safety improvements			\$500,000	\$500,000	\$500,000
Thousand Oaks	Five 12 passenger CNG-fueled Cutaway Vehicles	x	\$425,000			
Thousand Oaks	Bus Stop Enhancements	x	\$39,511			
Thousand Oaks	ADA Paratransit Operations	x	\$111,240			
Thousand Oaks	Replacement vehicles for fixed routes and paratransit			\$2,000,000 to	\$3,000,000	\$3,000,000
Thousand Oaks	Safety improvements			\$500,000	\$500,000	\$500,000
VCTC	Particulate Traps for 40 VISTA Buses	x	\$400,000			
VCTC	Smart Card Upgrade	x	\$168,000			
VCTC	Scales for ADA Certification	x	\$10,000			
VCTC	Nextbus renewal			\$696,150	\$696,150	\$696,150
Total ARRA			\$19,003,674			
All Projects				\$89,721,150		
W/O Leesdale and Gold Coast Facility					\$32,721,150	
W/O Rolling Stock						\$7,721,150



Item #8

March 8, 2012

MEMO TO: TRANSIT OPERATORS COMMITTEE
FROM: PETER DE HAAN, PROGRAMMING DIRECTOR
SUBJECT: ADA CERTIFICATION UPDATE

RECOMMENDATION:

- Receive report

BACKGROUND:

As discussed at the January meeting, Mike Culver, MMP Director of Operations for the ADA Certification Program, will make a detailed presentation to TRANSCOM regarding the program. He will also provide the monthly report for February.



Item #9

March 8, 2012

**MEMO TO: TRANSIT OPERATORS COMMITTEE
 CITIZENS TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**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.

TRANSCOM AGENDA

March 8, 2012

Item #9

Page #2

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 tokens 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.

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 #10

March 8, 2012

**MEMO TO: TRANSIT OPERATORS COMMITTEE
 CITIZENS TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**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.

TRANSCOM AGENDA**March 8, 2012****Item #10****Page #2**

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.

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/childrentraveling.aspx>