

**CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**



**DRAFT
STRATEGIC IMPLEMENTATION PLAN**

Prepared by:

Judith Norman – Transportation Consultant



**In association with:
The National Conference of State Legislatures**



June 9, 2010

Table of Contents

Introduction and Background 2
Rationale for Development of SIP Recommendations..... 2
Development of Statewide Empowered Framework for Coordination 4
Institutional Roles and Responsibilities..... 9
Summary of SIP Strategies and Recommendations..... 11
Transportation Development Act (TDA)..... 11
 Unmet Transit Needs Process..... 11
 Farebox Recovery Ratio Requirements 14
 Social Service Transportation Advisory Councils (SSTAC)..... 18
 Unmet Transit Needs and SAFETEA-LU Coordinated Planning Requirements..... 22
Medi-Cal Non-Emergency Medical Transportation (NEMT) 25
Consolidated Transportation Service Agencies (CTSAs) 32
State-Level Coordination and Oversight 38
Coordinated Plan Funding Guidance 41
Conclusion 44
Appendix A – MAP PAC Roster..... 45
Appendix B – Participating Agency and Organization Study Listing..... 54
Appendix C – Unmet Transit Needs Documentation 45
Appendix D – TDA Working Group 54

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

The Strategic Implementation Plan (SIP) documents strategies and recommendations resulting from previous MAP study tasks. Development of the SIP was guided by local, regional, State and federal stakeholders to identify human services transportation coordination barriers and gaps, and corresponding strategies to address how transportation funding programs could be coordinated. To this end, the SIP report documents the following:

“Statutory, institutional, and administrative issues and recommended solutions to promote interagency collaboration, including coordinated transportation policy development and funding administration; and

Priorities for coordinating human services transportation and a strategic plan developed through open and informed discussions among various stakeholders from urban and rural areas”. The stakeholders included, but were not limited to: “local government officials, human services transportation agencies, transportation providers (public, private, non-profit, for-profit, and volunteers), employers, public and customer representatives”.¹

RATIONALE FOR DEVELOPMENT OF SIP RECOMMENDATIONS

Profile of Task Recommendations

The recommendations were developed as a result of the tasks and activities conducted during the MAP study, including the review of coordinated transportation plans developed by regional transportation agencies², the stakeholder involvement process³ and the legislative review and analysis⁴, discussed briefly below.

Stakeholder Involvement Process

The task recommendations on statewide priorities surfacing from the stakeholder involvement process reflected stakeholder agencies and organizations’ needs and preferences in the following areas.⁵

- Securing additional local and state funding to support coordinated projects;
- Evaluating local/regional policies related funding of coordinated projects;
- Making modifications to existing state transportation and human services legislative and funding requirements that impact coordination (i.e., Transportation Development Act (TDA) farebox ratio requirements, Medi-Cal reimbursement policies, insurance and liability);
- Providing additional coordination-related informational/educational resources; and

¹ State of California Mobility Action Plan for Improving Human Services Transportation Through Effective Statewide Coordination; November 2005; dot.ca.gov/hq/Mass_Trans/Interagency-Coordination.htm.

² Ibid.

³ Mobility Action Plan (MAP) Phase I Implementation Study Stakeholder Involvement Process Report; April 30, 2010.

⁴ Mobility Action Plan Phase I Implementation Study: Final Draft: Assessing Human Service Transportation Coordination in California: A Legal and Regulatory Analysis; May 30, 2010.

⁵ Mobility Action Plan (MAP) Phase I Implementation Study Stakeholder Involvement Process Report; April 30, 2010

- Updating coordinated plan funding guidelines to provide clarification on definitions and plan requirements, and improving plan content and organization.

Some stakeholder involvement task recommendations⁶ are outside the jurisdiction of Caltrans DMT to implement (e.g., developing local and state standards for insurance liability and legal issues related to vehicle sharing (California Department of Insurance), and developing criteria for scoring local grant applications (Regional Transportation Planning Agencies), and therefore were not included as SIP recommendations. Other policy and non-policy recommendations stemming from the stakeholder involvement process were integrated into the MAP PAC/stakeholder dialogue and resulted in SIP recommendations (e.g. Medi-Cal reimbursement for transit providers, information/education, and modifications to coordinated plan funding guidelines).

Moreover, one SIP recommendation was formulated to address the legislative impacts of TDA relative to farebox ratio requirements, which surfaced as a significant key issue with agency/organization stakeholders⁷. This recommendation will require legislative action to modify the TDA statutes.

Review of Public Transit – Human Service Coordinated Transportation Plans

The task recommendations resulting from the review of the coordinated transportation plans punctuated the need to modify the states’ coordinated plan funding guidance to ensure consistency between plans prepared by regional agencies by providing clarification on plan requirements and definitions, guidance on performance standards and improving plan organization and content⁸.

From the coordinated plan review process, one SIP recommendation was developed to modify the coordinated plan funding guidance, which includes incorporation of a number of modifications designed to improve the quality and consistency of coordinated plans updated in the future.

Legislative Review and Analysis

The MAP PAC and stakeholder dialogue conducted as a critical element of the legislative review and analysis⁹ resulted in the formulation of ten (10) recommendations which addressed “*restrictive and duplicative laws, regulations and programs related to human services transportation-funding programs*”¹⁰. However, two of the recommended strategies resulting from completion of this task related to development of transportation brokerages.¹¹ Those two recommendations were combined and the SIP will reflect only nine (9) of the original ten (10) recommended strategies.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Mobility Action Plan Phase I Implementation Study: Executive Summaries Public Transit –Human Services Coordinated Transportation Plans: Volumes I and II: Large/Small Urban and Rural Plans; April 30, 2010.

⁹ Mobility Action Plan Phase I Implementation Study: Final Draft: Assessing Human Service Transportation Coordination in California: A Legal and Regulatory Analysis; May 30, 2010.

¹⁰ State of California Mobility Action Plan for Improving Human Services Transportation Through Effective Statewide Coordination; November, 2005; [dot.ca.gov/hq/Mass Trans/Interagency-Coordination.htm](http://dot.ca.gov/hq/Mass%20Trans/Interagency-Coordination.htm).

¹¹ Mobility Action Plan Phase I Implementation Study: Final Draft: Assessing Human Service Transportation Coordination in California: A Legal and Regulatory Analysis; May 30, 2010.

Furthermore, almost all of the SIP recommendations arising from this task were administrative in nature, requiring no formal legal or regulatory action, and can reasonably be implemented. However, there is a single recommendation to modify the TDA statute to require SSTAC to review the unmet transit needs findings and work cooperatively with the regional transportation planning agency to develop recommendations that will be considered by the regional agency governing body. This recommendation will require legislative action to implement.

DEVELOPMENT OF A STATEWIDE EMPOWERED FRAMEWORK FOR COORDINATION

Public transit and human service agencies and organizations are well on their way toward full implementation and evaluation of local and regional coordinated transportation projects and plans throughout the state of California. However, creating an atmosphere of coordination between the two sectors is challenging. These local and regional agencies and organizations are effectively in the early stages of determining the true value and benefit of implementing and supporting coordinated transportation projects and programs, and have demonstrated the need for increased funding, and additional educational and informational support that potentially can be provided through cooperative efforts undertaken at the state level¹².

It is clear that given the current economic climate, efforts to build support and “committed cooperation” from state-level departments and agencies for coordinated plans and programs must be pragmatic, and likewise result in the achievement of concrete outcomes (i.e., increased mobility for the target populations, cost-savings, internal efficiencies, improved interagency relationships, etc.) for participating agencies and organizations.

However, to realize the desired outcomes, state-level departments and agencies, regional transportation planning agencies and other entities throughout the state must themselves “coordinate” and participate in partnerships and collaborative efforts to plan for and develop a statewide framework to implement coordinated programs and projects. In short, the continued growth of coordination between public transit and human services will require substantial and sustained effort to build state-level and regional agency/organization governing body understanding, support and acceptance of coordination principles and goals.

The SIP recommendations in this document effectively provide an integrated framework of initial steps and the associated actions designed to enable and empower Caltrans Division of Mass Transportation (DMT) and their state and regional partner agencies and organizations in their coordination efforts, as contained in the coordinated plans. These state and regional agency/organization partners are envisioned at a minimum, to include:

:

- California Commission on Aging
- Department of Aging
- Department of Social Services
- Department of Health Care Services
- Department of Rehabilitation
- Department of Developmental Services
- Department of Veterans Affairs
- Department of Mental Health

¹² Mobility Action Plan (MAP) Phase I Implementation Study Stakeholder Involvement Process Report; April 30, 2010.

- California Highway Patrol
- Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV)
- Regional Transportation Planning Agencies
- Consolidated Transportation Service Agencies (CTSAs)
- Transportation Development Act (TDA) Working Group
- Social Service Technical Advisory Committees (SSTAC)

Table 1 below outlines the eleven (11) SIP recommendations, which have been organized into four (4) implementation categories, as follows:

- 1. Existing State Program and Funding Guidance and Regulatory Requirements:** modifying State program and funding guidance, specifically the: 1) Coordinated plan funding guidance; 2) the TDA Unmet Transit Needs requirements; and 3) the TDA Farebox Recovery Ratio requirements.
- 2. Research and Evaluation of Coordination Concepts:** developing state-level department sponsored and funded pilot projects in the state that can serve to test the viability and future application of cost-saving coordination concepts.
- 3. Information and Education: Recommendations:** providing web-based linkages and other tools to educate and inform public transit and human service agencies and organizations on issues relative to funding and coordination.
- 4. State-Level Strategic Planning and Policy Development: Recommendation:** working with state-level departments and agencies, and other non-state advisory entities to define state coordination oversight approaches including the designation of an entity to improve human services transportation throughout the state.

The SIP implementation categories are used to group *similar* individual SIP recommendations resulting from MAP Goals 2 and 4.

**Table 1
SIP Recommendations**

Project Reference Number	Implementation Category/Recommendation
	Strengthen Existing State Program and Funding Guidelines and Regulatory Requirements
1	Legislatively amend the the TDA Unmet Needs Process to require SSTAC & TPA Joint Decision-Making
2	Legislatively amend the TDA farebox recovery ratio requirements based upon TDA Working Group findings
3	Modify Coordinated Funding Guidance to Require Unmet Needs Appendix
4	Modify Coordinated Funding Guidance to Provide Scoring Preference for CTSAs
5	Modify Coordinated Funding Guidance (Plan organization, detail and performance standards)
	Research and Evaluation of Coordination Concepts
6	Coordinate Efforts to Develop a State-Level NEMT Research Pilot Project on Public Transit Reimbursement
7	Coordinate Efforts to Develop a State-Level NEMT Transportation Brokerage Pilot Project
	Information and Education
8	Establish Web-Linkages With the State and Transportation Planning Agencies on Unmet Needs
9	Develop Educational Training Module and Materials for Decision-Makers related to CTSAs
10	Establish Web-Linkages and Information for Sharing on Value of CTSAs
	State-Level Strategic Planning and Policy Development
11	Interagency Work Effort to Establish State Coordinated Oversight Mechanism in California

In the diagram below, the implementation categories and the future planning activities associated with implementation of MAP Goals 1 and 3 are depicted as the “Building Blocks of Coordination for California”, designed to ensure steady progress toward development of a “Statewide Empowered Framework in Support of Local and Regional Coordination Efforts”. Although the implementation of MAP Goals 1 and 3 have not yet taken place, the planned action steps and associated deliverables specific to these goals are critical components to full realization of the state’s coordination objectives.

MAP Goal 1 delineates two (2) action steps, and the associated deliverables that that will effectively result in the drafting of an interagency Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the state departments of Health and Human Services (HHS) and Business, Transportation and Housing (BTH).

MAP Goal 3 delineates thirteen (13) action steps identified to ensure improvements to local and regional coordination efforts, including but not limited to: collection and reporting of coordination data and associated data management techniques and protocols, user information based strategies to further coordination, development of mechanisms to ensure cost-effective services, determining proper cost-allocation processes, assessing transportation technology needs, human service client eligibility, development of billing and payment systems, etc.

The SIP recommendations were developed in recognition of the fact that the most comprehensive approach to implementation of MAP Goals 2 and 4 would be needed to effectively respond to the coordination barriers and challenges identified in regional coordinated plans.¹³ For example, the SIP Information and Education recommendations were developed as

¹³ Mobility Action Plan Phase I Implementation Study: Executive Summaries Public Transit –Human Services Coordinated Transportation Plans: Volumes I and II: Large/Small Urban and Rural Plans; April 30, 2010.

a result of stakeholder agency/organization dialogue which demonstrated the broad-based need for increased information¹⁴ on coordinated-related policies and issues.

As these recommendations are implemented they will serve to increase availability and access to information for regional transportation planning agencies on transportation coordination-related issues, concepts and approaches throughout California, including coordination “best practices” statewide, CTSA activities, local and regional unmet needs, and information on other topics that may be developed over time.

As regional transportation planning agencies develop a greater understanding of the concepts of coordination, they will become more effective in assisting public transit and human service agencies and organizations in designing, developing and implementing coordinated projects and programs, which would result in increased mobility options for the target populations. Each additional SIP recommendation in turn will work to incrementally improve the level of information, funding and program guidance and support needed by regional agencies and local and regional public transit and human services agencies.


For those SIP recommendations that can be implemented immediately, near-term benefits can be realized. However, others will require several years to implement and realize benefit. Although each recommendation can be viewed as stand-alone, and implemented by the state individually, the gradual implementation of all of the recommendations, will offer the greatest opportunity to realize coordination goals¹⁵.

Collectively, the SIP recommendations once fully implemented will be mutually beneficial in overcoming many of the barriers¹⁶ that currently impede progress toward coordination, and will form the foundation through which statewide coordination can thrive.

¹⁴ Mobility Action Plan Phase I Implementation Study: Final Draft: Assessing Human Service Transportation Coordination in California: A Legal and Regulatory Analysis; May 30, 2010.

¹⁵ State of California Mobility Action Plan for Improving Human Services Transportation Through Effective Statewide Coordination; November 2005; dot.ca.gov/hq/Mass_Trans/Interagency-Coordination.htm.

¹⁶ Mobility Action Plan Phase I Implementation Study: Executive Summaries Public Transit –Human Services Coordinated Transportation Plans: Volumes I and II: Large/Small Urban and Rural Plans; April 30, 2010



INSTITUTIONAL ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The Role of the Division of Mass Transportation

The California Department of Transportation Division of Mass Transportation (DMT) manages and administers State and Federal grant programs that provide funding for operating assistance and capital improvement projects for local and regional public transit operators and agencies. Inherent in this state-local collaboration is the DMT's role to provide technical assistance and leadership in encouraging interagency coordination efforts necessary to implement funded projects and programs as well as, to ensure that local agencies provide services efficiently and cost-effectively.

In recent years, Caltrans DMT has proactively worked with state and regional transportation planning agencies, public transit operators and human services agency/organization partners to:

- Develop the Mobility Action Plan and Goals;
- Oversee and develop the coordinated transportation plans for rural counties;
- Fund, provide support and guidance on urban and rural coordinated transportation projects (e.g. mobility management); and
- Review and approve public transit-human services coordinated transportation plans prepared statewide,

As the funding agency, facilitator and central partner, it is anticipated that Caltrans DMT will assume primarily a lead role in directly implementing or facilitating implementation of the Strategic Implementation Plan recommendations. The effort to implement the SIP recommendations will require considerable work on the part of Caltrans DMT, to harness the "goodwill" and cooperative relationships that the agency has developed with regional transportation planning agencies, and public transit and human service agency stakeholders.

Facilitating State Department and Agency Cooperation

To ensure that SIP recommendations can be implemented, Caltrans DMT must work to re-invigorate state-level departments' and interagency interest and understanding of the value and benefits of coordination. The state departments and agencies identified in the each SIP recommendations detailed in this document should be solicited as partners in the effort to establish state-level plans and programs to support coordination, as they directly or indirectly make and/or influence decisions related to human service funding and/or transportation.

Recognizing the current economic issues faced by the state, interdepartmental/ agency collaboration and leveraging of existing Federal, State and local funding resources should logically be a priority. State budget limitations and the need to provide or facilitate transportation for members of the target populations are common threads that are present in the organizational goals of all or most state-level agencies and departments. This offers a unique opportunity to forge new relationships between state departments and agencies. The challenge for Caltrans DMT will be to identify and/or quantify cost-savings or other potential benefits that can be realized by the departments and/or agencies through participation in coordinated efforts.

Caltrans DMT should secure the participation of some or all of the following state departments/agencies to participate in the implementation of SIP strategies outlined in this report:

- Department of Aging
- Department of Social Services
- Department of Health Care Services
- Department of Rehabilitation
- Department of Developmental Services
- Department of Veterans Affairs
- Department of Mental Health
- California Highway Patrol
- Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV)

Each state department and agency listed above is responsible for development, management, funding and oversight of various state transportation and healthcare-related programs for some or all members of the target populations (seniors, persons with disabilities and low-income individuals). As funding and oversight of transportation plans, programs and projects is not the primary business objective of these state departments and agencies, Caltrans DMT will need to provide information to increase their understanding of transportation and the benefits relative to realization of mobility for their customers/clients/consumers.

State departments and agencies will require varying levels of information and education about that the basic concepts of public transit and human services coordination and the relationship to overall mobility. These basic coordination concepts include:

- Background and intent of SAFETEA-LU (i.e. target populations, eligible funding uses, etc.)
- Coordinated Planning Requirements (i.e. development of locally developed plans)
- Mobility Management (i.e. brokerages)

For this purpose Caltrans DMT may need to either revise existing coordinated planning informational materials and/or create new fact sheets and information for state departments and agencies. Initial messages should stress the potential cost-savings and/or transportation benefits of coordination that could accrue to their departments/agencies, and the critical importance of their role in implementation of coordinated plans.

At the outset, Caltrans DMT may elect to conduct one or two short informational sessions (not to exceed 90 minutes) for state departments and agencies that could be used to educate and inform state departments and agencies about transportation coordination, and to discuss and solicit their participation as partners in implementation specific SIP recommendations.

It will be important that Caltrans DMT continue to employ the communication techniques and methods that have been successful in building its' current collaborative relationships with regional transportation planning agencies, and local and regional public transit and human service agencies throughout the state. Opening new channels of communication between state departments and agencies must be accomplished in order to achieve the states' coordination goals and implement SIP recommendations.

SUMMARY OF SIP STRATEGIES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The twelve (11) SIP recommendations as shown in Table 1 above include the following:

- **Transportation Development Act (TDA)** – four total recommendations:
 - Unmet Needs Process – three recommendations
 - Farebox Recovery Ratio – one recommendation
- **Medi-Cal Non-Emergency Medical Transportation (NEMT) Program** – two recommendations
- **Consolidated Transportation Services Agencies (CTSAs)** – three recommendations
- **State-Level Coordination and Oversight** – one recommendation

In addition a single non-policy related recommendation was developed by the project team, as follows:

- **Coordinated Plan Funding Guidelines** – one recommendation

Almost all SIP recommendations are administrative in nature and will require no formal legal or legislative action. However, two recommendations (i.e., amending the TDA Farebox recovery ratio requirement and amending TDA Unmet Transit Needs process to coordinated SSTAC unmet needs recommendations with those of regional agencies) will require both preliminary actions from both Caltrans DMT and the TDA Working Group, and formal regulatory action by the legislature for full implementation.

All recommendations will require that Caltrans DMT collaborate with other state-level departments and agencies, regional transportation planning agencies and other non-regulatory entities. The detailed SIP recommendations are presented below.

TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT (TDA)

TDA - Unmet Transit Needs Process

Under TDA Article 8 before allocating TDA funds, regional transportation planning agencies must comply with a number of requirements including but not limited to, consulting with its Social Service Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC) and identifying unmet transit needs of the jurisdiction that are reasonable to meet. *The transportation planning agency must also hold at least one public hearing to solicit comments on any unmet transit needs that may exist.*¹⁷ In addition, the responsibility to define “unmet needs” and “reasonable to meet” is at the discretion of the transportation planning agency. In addition, these agencies are required to “adopt by resolution a finding for the jurisdiction”...that “there are no unmet transit needs, there are no unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet or that there are unmet transit needs, including needs that are reasonable to meet.”¹⁸ These needs findings are required to be documented by the regional agencies and submitted annually to the Department of Transportation.

¹⁷ Transportation Development Act (TDA) Statutes and California Code of Regulations; March 2009. (TDA) Article 8. Other Claims for Funds:§ 99401.5 (c-e)-99401.6.

¹⁸ Ibid.

Strategy Description #1:

Caltrans DMT in cooperation with regional transportation planning agencies should establish website linkages between state and regional planning agency websites/pages to provide access to information on unmet needs hearings and the associated information on the local process.

The unmet transit needs hearings process¹⁹ was the subject of many discussions during the MAP study. Although some regional and local agency/organization stakeholders were very familiar with the unmet transit needs process in general, there were a number of perspectives about how unmet transit needs decisions are ultimately reached at the local and regional level. Even though regional transportation planning agencies do publish their unmet needs and reasonable to meet definitions, stakeholders still do not have a clear understanding of assumptions and criteria used to determine whether a local service request was unreasonable to meet. This lack of understanding clearly suggested the need establish additional methods to access information about the details of the local unmet needs hearings processes conducted by regional transportation agencies (e.g., local/regional needs identified, “unmet needs” and “reasonable to meet” definitions, regional agency rationale and determination of findings, etc.).

Pros:

- Augments Caltrans efforts to facilitate information sharing between public transit and human service agencies and organizations by providing greater access to information relevant to the agency’s funding programs.
- Offers the opportunity to continue to build upon the state’s relationships with local and regional agencies by opportunities to actively interface with these agencies to implement the recommendation.
- Provides public transit and human service stakeholders with “one-stop” access to existing unmet information that is reflective of the local and unmet needs regional planning processes conducted statewide.
- May facilitate increased human service agency and organization understanding and involvement in the unmet needs process.

Cons:

- Use of additional state and regional agency staff time resources that may or may not be available to establish technological interfaces and direct linkages to unmet needs information online.
- Will require additional planning and coordination on the part of Caltrans staff to work with each regional agency in the state, to ensure that consistent or similar information can be available via the web.

¹⁹ Mobility Action Plan Phase I Implementation Study: Final Draft: Assessing Human Service Transportation Coordination in California: A Legal and Regulatory Analysis; May 30, 2010.

- May place burden on regional transportation planning agencies to develop information that is currently unavailable related to the local unmet transit needs process.
- The ability to compare unmet needs information between regional transportation planning agencies in the state could conceivably create administrative challenges for transportation planning agencies in responding to questions from agencies and organizations both inside and outside the local area.

Recommendation:

Caltrans DMT should work with regional transportation planning agencies to create website links that will allow access to unmet needs information (e.g. local “unmet needs” and “reasonable to meet” definitions, service requests, unmet needs hearings findings, appeals process, etc.) at the regional level to stakeholder agencies/organizations and the public.

As state and regional agency website linkages are gradually established, the level of public transit and human services agencies’ access to unmet transit needs information resources statewide will be increased. This can serve to facilitate a more informed dialogue between regional transportation planning agencies and local/regional agency stakeholders during the annual unmet needs hearings processes conducted throughout the state. Greater access to information that factors into the unmet transit needs decisions of regional transportation planning agencies will be useful in supporting local agency/organization efforts to secure increased regional funding for these needs, including those that address the hard-to-serve needs of the target populations.

This strategy also enables online information-sharing between regional agencies throughout the state which can serve to highlight common or similar issues (i.e., criteria to determine unmet transit needs definitions, etc.) and acceptable outcomes (e.g. cost-effective options to address unmet transit needs).

Currently, there are forty-nine (49) “unrestricted” counties in California that have the option to use TDA Local Transit funds for streets and roads if the statutory requirements are met. These counties had a population of less than 500,000 in the federal census year 1970, and are required to participate in the unmet transit needs process. In addition, there are ten (10) “restricted” counties that must use all TDA funding for transit, and had a population greater than 500,000 in 1970. These counties are not required to participate in the unmet transit needs process. (Appendix C).

Logically, only those agencies participating in the unmet transit needs process would be actively involved in the implementation of this strategy in partnership with Caltrans DMT and the TDA Working Group. Regional transportation planning agencies who are not required to participate in the unmet transit needs process, although not necessarily participating actively in implementation activities associated with this recommendation, will potentially benefit from the information-sharing aspect of this strategy.

Caltrans DMT established the TDA Working Group which is comprised of Caltrans staff and regional agency and public transit stakeholders as shown in Appendix D. The mission of the working group is “to provide a forum, with balanced representation, where issues and concerns relating to the TDA can be identified and actions initiated to address those issues and concerns.” The working group seeks to create a mutual understanding of the TDA laws and processes; provide improved communication and working relationship between the state and its

regional partners; and, identify, explore, advocate, and implement program improvements. Recognizing that the TDA Working Group already have a long-standing working relationship with Caltrans DMT on TDA-related issues, and the fact that some members are regional transportation planning agencies staff representatives, they will be important participants in the process to implement this and other SIP recommendations related to TDA. It is anticipated that the Working Group will participate in decisions related to online content and presentation of information, and other elements as determined by Caltrans.

Caltrans DMT should also solicit the partnership of the Social Services Transportation Advisory Committees (SSTAC) and Consolidated Transportation Services Agencies (CTSAs) to solicit their input and perspectives on what information is the most valuable for stakeholders and potentially their assistance in development of online content specific to their region.

To potentially reduce the overall timetable necessary for complete implementation of this recommendation, Caltrans should consider meeting and coordinating with regional agency staff representatives collectively to agree upon parameters of establishing these state-regional web linkages.

Responsible Parties:

- Caltrans Division of Mass Transportation
- Caltrans/Transportation Development Act (TDA) Working Group

Stakeholders/Partners:

- Regional Transportation Planning Agencies
- Social Service Transportation Advisory Councils
- Consolidated Transportation Services Agencies

Timeline for Implementation:

Estimate 6-12 months depending upon Caltrans DMT and regional staff availability to implement this recommendation.

TDA – Farebox Recovery Ratio (FBRR) Requirements

To receive funding under the TDA a claimant must achieve a minimum farebox recovery ratio which is "a ratio of fare revenues to operating cost at least equal to the ratio it had during 1978/1979, or 20 percent if the claimant is in an urbanized area, or 10 percent if the claimant is in a non-urbanized area, whichever is greater."²⁰ If the claimant had a ratio greater than those requirements during 1978/1979 it is required to have a ratio larger than what it had during that time period. A transportation planning agency or a county transportation commission *may* set their farebox recovery ratio to not less than 15 percent in a county with a population of 500,000 or less, if the operator provides services in an urbanized area (which also has to participate in

²⁰ Transportation Development Act (TDA) Statutes and California Code of Regulations; March 2009. (TDA) Articles 4.5 and 8..

the unmet transit need process) and the agency documents the reasons for lowering the requirement. Also, the transportation planning agency may set the farebox recovery ratio at any level they desire if the service is for the seniors and persons with disabilities. A claimant may receive a two-year exemption for services provided to new areas or along new routes, and can also receive an exception for not meeting the farebox recovery requirement their first time. If the claimant fails to meet the farebox recovery requirement, its funding will be reduced by the amount its required fare revenues have fallen short of the standard.²¹

Strategy Description #1:

Caltrans DMT in cooperation with the TDA Working Group should work to amend the existing Transportation Development Act Article 4 which requires claimants that receive TDA funding to meet “a ratio of fare revenues to operating cost at least equal to the ratio it had during 1978/1979, or 20 percent if the claimant is in an urbanized area, or 10 percent if the claimant is in a non-urbanized area, whichever is greater...”²². Implementation of this strategy would require legislative modifications to the TDA statutes to simplify

During the stakeholder involvement process MAP study stakeholders recommended that modifications to the statutes should be made to ease the impacts of the requirements on operators.²³

Pros:

Depending upon the modifications proposed:

- Could result in greater consistency in the farebox recovery ration area of TDA
- Could create a more secure TDA funding environment
- Potential to encourage development of new services

Cons:

- Implementation cannot be effectuated until preliminary steps are taken by the TDA Working Group, including, but not limited to, updating 2005 survey findings and/or development of additional information which substantially supports the formal legislative change.
- May have cost impacts to conduct a telephone survey and analysis of agencies operating services throughout the state as the effort would be labor intensive and require substantial time and effort.
- Potential funding impacts depending upon the nature of modification.

²¹ Ibid.

²² *Transportation Development Act - Statutes Codes and Regulations* (Sacramento: California Department of Transportation, Division of Mass Transportation, 2005); Article 4.

²³ Mobility Action Plan (MAP) Phase I Implementation Study Stakeholder Involvement Process Report; April 30, 2010.

- There may be challenges in securing approvals and support for a legislative amendment.
- Will require additional planning on the part of Caltrans DMT and the TDA Working Group to work to address this recommendation and update previous survey findings

Recommendation:

Caltrans DMT in cooperation with the TDA Working Group should amend the existing Transportation Development Act Article 4 which requires claimants that receive TDA funding to meet “a ratio of fare revenues to operating cost at least equal to the ratio it had during 1978/1979, or 20 percent if the claimant is in an urbanized area, or 10 percent if the claimant is in a non-urbanized area, whichever is greater...”²⁴. Implementation of this strategy would require legislative modifications to the TDA statutes to reduce

During the MAP study stakeholders discussed the numerous challenges (e.g. cancellation of existing services, inability to implement new and necessary services, etc.) that public transportation providers face in meeting the TDA farebox recovery ratio requirements. Study stakeholders believe that the impacts of the statute relative to the development of new services have been and will continue to be detrimental to the state’s coordination goals to increase services for the target populations. The MAP PAC and study stakeholders understood that this and other statutory and non-statutory recommendations would be referred to the TDA Working Group for further action.

In an earlier April 2005 work effort, the TDA Working Group conducted a statewide survey and analysis²⁵ to assess the impacts of the TDA Farebox Recovery Ratio on fixed-route and demand-responsive services statewide. The results of the survey and analysis by type of service area showed that all service types are experiencing significant challenges in meeting TDA farebox recovery requirements (i.e. either failing to meet or struggling to meet).²⁶

The results obtained in the survey conducted by the TDA Working Group included a “diversity and range of service types”,²⁷ and therefore includes services operated for members of the target populations.

In addition, the survey responses showed that “Frontier counties providing fixed route service have the most difficult time meeting FBRR (83% either failing or struggling). The rural areas providing fixed route seem to have the least amount of difficulties with FBRR. The other two service areas (Urban & Blended) providing either fixed route or demand response have a 40% or greater rate of struggling or failure with FBRR and over 50% with the deviated fixed route.”²⁸

²⁴ *Transportation Development Act - Statutes Codes and Regulations* (Sacramento: California Department of Transportation, Division of Mass Transportation, 2005); Article 4.

²⁵ Summary and Analysis of TDA Farebox Ratio Survey; April 2005; <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/MassTrans/Docs-Pdfs/STATE-Tda-Survey-Results.pdf>

²⁶ Ibid.

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ Ibid.

The effort undertaken by the TDA Working Group demonstrated “very strong support to amend FBRR in the TDA law. Almost two-thirds of the participants want to simplify statute and/or allow the use of local support to be added to passenger revenue in the FBRR calculations.”²⁹

Agency respondents to the TDA Working Group survey offered a number of “suggestions to improve the farebox recovery ratio”³⁰ and bring consistency to the statutes, as follows:

*The TDA law is not consistent with the way the FBRR is applied throughout the state. Some systems are held to an even higher standard than the 10% or 20%, if their FBRR was higher in the 1978/79 fiscal year. Some agencies are allowed to use local support while others are not. Under Article 8 local jurisdictions can establish their own FBRR while under Article 4 they cannot.*³¹

On the local support issue, agencies commented that “certain entities are allowed to use local support dollars and others are excluded. This suggestion would allow all entities to use of local support dollars as revenue and adding that revenue to the entities’ fare revenue when calculating FBRR.”³² The results of the previous survey supports MAP study agency/organization perspectives³³ about the impacts of the farebox recovery ratio on transit operators.

To implement this recommendation, Caltrans DMT in partnership with the TDA Working Group would need to re-visit this issue and conduct an update to the previous agency survey that can achieve a higher rate of response. The higher response rate will be necessary to develop more conclusive results which can potentially provide a strong rationale for effectuating any modification to the TDA statute.

The objective of the updated survey would be to ascertain whether the situation relative to meeting the farebox recovery ratio has worsened, improved or remained the same for transit agencies and to identify any associated impacts to services operating in their service areas. (e.g., discontinued/cancelled, not funded because ratios may not be able to be met). The survey can be conducted via telephone or over the internet, and should target the 300+ operating agencies included in the first survey.

In addition to conducting an updated survey, DMT and the TDA Working Group will need to work to garner agency support for a legislative modification. The telephone survey could assist in assessing agencies’ interest in supporting or participating in the modification of the legislation. Interested agencies could be requested to provide letters of support for the effort.

In addition, as mentioned earlier, this recommendation is being referred to the TDA Working Group for action. It is anticipated that Caltrans DMT working cooperatively with this group will decide upon the nature of the revisions to the statute, based upon responses received from transit agencies. Using these responses, Caltrans DMT must also assess the impacts of any proposed changes and develop a technical memorandum documenting the results of the

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ Ibid.

³¹ Ibid.

³² Ibid.

³³ Mobility Action Plan (MAP) Phase I Implementation Study Stakeholder Involvement Process Report; April 30, 2010.

updated survey and analysis and proposed modifications to the statute including any anticipated impacts.

Responsible Parties:

- Caltrans Division of Mass Transportation

Stakeholders/Partners:

- Transportation Development Act Working Group
- Regional Transportation Planning Agencies
- Public Transit and Paratransit Operators

Timeline for Implementation:

Estimate 12-18 months depending upon Caltrans DMT and regional staff availability to work through the process and develop proposed language and garner support for change.

TDA - Social Service Transportation Advisory Councils (SSTAC)

The TDA established Social Services Transportation Advisory Councils (SSTAC). The councils are required to consist of:

1. One representative of potential transit users who is 60 years of age or older
2. One representative of potential transit users who is handicapped
3. Two representatives of the local social service providers for seniors, including one representative of a social service transportation provider, if one exists
4. Two representatives of local social service providers for the handicapped, including one representative of a social service transportation provider, if one exists
5. One representative of a local social service provider for persons of limited means
6. Two representatives from the local CTSA³⁴

Members of the SSTAC “shall be appointed by the transportation planning agency”³⁵ and shall “annually participate in the identification of transit needs in the jurisdiction, including unmet transit needs that may be reasonable to meet”. In addition SSTAC is required to “annually review and recommend action by the transportation planning agency”.³⁶

The SSTAC was envisioned to serve as a conduit at the regional/local level to facilitate actions that can result in funding and support for coordination and consolidation of social service transportation. Their involvement with regional transportation planning agencies through participation in local unmet transit needs processes is important in ensuring knowledgeable human service agency/organization involvement in social service transportation coordination and funding issues.

³⁴ Transportation Development Act (TDA) Statutes and California Code of Regulations; March 2009. (TDA) Article 3: Local Transportation Funds § 99238 (a) 1-6

³⁵ Transportation Development Act (TDA) Statutes and California Code of Regulations; March 2009. (TDA) Article 3: Local Transportation Funds § 99238 (b) and (c) 1-2.

³⁶ Ibid.

The effort to understand TDA decisions made by regional transportation planning agencies relative to funding of unmet transit needs was the focus of considerable MAP study stakeholder discussion. Some of the uncertainty exhibited by stakeholders can be attributed to unfamiliarity with the specific local unmet needs criteria used by regional agencies to determine what needs are both “unmet” and “reasonable to meet”. Nevertheless, stakeholder agencies and organizations expressed their preferences to establish an additional opportunity for an increased level of public transit and human service agency involvement in the unmet transit needs process³⁷.

Strategy Description #2:

Caltrans DMT in cooperation with the TDA Working Group should require that SSTAC review and comment on the annual unmet needs hearing findings made by regional agency staff prior to governing body approval/determination, and that SSTAC recommendations are developed cooperatively with the regional transportation planning agency. This strategy will likely require a legislative modification to the current TDA statutes.

There is already an *existing requirement for SSTAC to review unmet transit needs and make recommendations*, however, language related to the timing of the SSTAC review and development of recommendations is not mentioned in the statutes.

Pros:

- Ensures that SSTAC who represents agencies, organizations and other individual supporters of social service and coordinated transportation programs become fully aware of the rationale for regional transportation agency decisions on unmet transit needs as they participate more directly in the decision-making process.
- Combining the process to review and develop recommendations will help to avoid misunderstanding and conflict between the social services/human services community and the regional transportation planning agency.
- Will reduce duplication of effort and potential time saving in reviewing and preparing unmet transit needs recommendations for both the SSTAC and regional transportation planning agencies.
- Contributes to the credibility, efficacy and accountability of the existing unmet transit needs process.
- Elevates the human service agency/organization perspective, thereby increasing the confidence of human service stakeholders in the process.
- Provides an opportunity for the regional transportation agency governing bodies to consider both the perspectives of human service agencies and organizations and regional agency staff recommendations prior to making an unmet transit needs determination.

³⁷ Mobility Action Plan (MAP) Phase I Implementation Study Stakeholder Involvement Process Report; April 30, 2010.

Cons:

- Will require legislative action to modify the statutes which is a more involved and complex process.
- Must assess the interest and willingness of SSTAC to assume this potential new role in regions where this does not occur, because as required by TDA law no other entities other than SSTAC can serve in this capacity relative to the unmet transit needs process.
- Only directly impacts those regional transportation planning agencies that are required to participate in the unmet transit needs process.
- May result in increased responsibility for SSTAC members with no funding support.

Recommendation:

Caltrans DMT in cooperation with the TDA Working Group should to make a recommendation to the Legislature to modify TDA statutes³⁸ to require that the SSTAC review and recommend action cooperatively with regional transportation planning agency staff prior to a final determination being made by the governing body. This strategy will likely require a legislative modification to the current TDA statutes.

There is already an *existing requirement for SSTAC to review unmet transit needs and make recommendations*, however, language related to the timing of the SSTAC review and development of recommendations is not mentioned in the statutes. The MAP PAC and other study stakeholders believed that local and regional stakeholders need to facilitate greater involvement in the unmet transit needs decision-making process. This recommendation was developed to respond to this issue. It was also understood by stakeholders that this recommendation would be referred to the TDA Working Group for action.

It is envisioned that the combined effort to development unmet needs transit recommendations within each region would occur immediately following the unmet needs hearing(s), and that the combined insights of both the SSTAC and the regional transportation agency would be ultimately reflected in the recommendations presented to regional agency governing bodies.

Under TDA, the SSTAC is required “to participate in the identification of unmet needs” and serve “as a mechanism to solicit the input of transit dependent and transit disadvantages persons, including the elderly, handicapped and persons of limited means,”³⁹ and is required to review and make recommendations on unmet transit needs in their regions. However, it is unclear about whether SSTAC in every region is in compliance with this TDA review requirement, and whether SSTAC provides their recommendations in sufficient time to be considered in conjunction with the regional transportation agency staff recommendations to their governing body.

³⁸ Transportation Development Act (TDA) Statutes and California Code of Regulations; March 2009. (TDA) Article 3: Local Transportation Funds § 99238 (b) and (c) 2.

³⁹ Transportation Development Act (TDA) Statutes and California Code of Regulations; March 2009. (TDA) Article 3: Local Transportation Funds § 99238.5 (a).

It should be mentioned that TDA law prevents other social service entities from being designated to assume the role of reviewing and making recommendations on unmet transit needs, as follows:

“(d) It is the intent of the Legislature that duplicative advisory councils shall not be established where transit advisory councils currently exist and that those existing advisory councils shall, instead, become part of the social services transportation advisory council.”⁴⁰

For regional transportation agencies that presently facilitate SSTAC review and comment on regional agency staff unmet transit needs recommendations after they are developed or already approved by the governing body, this modification would change that process by requiring SSTAC to participate with regional agency staff to develop recommendations for consideration by the governing body. This would ensure full consideration of SSTAC input into the final unmet transit needs determination made by the regional transportation agency governing body.

Implementation of this recommendation requires that SSTAC and regional transportation planning agencies must work together in every county participating in the unmet transit needs process, to develop the final unmet needs recommendations immediately following the hearing(s) in their region. This collaborative effort will serve to raise the awareness and understanding of regional transportation planning agencies on issues related to local unmet transit needs for the target populations of seniors, persons with disabilities and low-income individuals, and could result in a more favorable funding climate for specialized transportation services.

Given that TDA is only one of the many sources of revenue used to fund transportation programs and projects, SSTAC entities not already doing so, would need to increase their knowledge and participation in the regional transportation planning process, to develop a more comprehensive understanding of regional funding priorities and how TDA and other local, state and federal funds are currently allocated and distributed. This information can assist SSTAC in identifying unmet transit needs (i.e., capital improvements of transit stops and facilities near new development and rail or bus station areas, etc.) that may already planned or could be funded from other sources of revenue/agencies (e.g. developer fees, or city/county public works departments), and will also elevate the presence of these entities within the region. Implementation of this recommendation would also facilitate consistent broad-based compliance with the provisions of TDA related to unmet needs, and ensures that their collective input is officially documented and received by regional agencies prior to their final determination. This recommendation can created a higher level of understanding and acceptance of the regional transportation agency unmet transit needs process.

As this recommendation will likely require action by the legislature to modify the language in the statute, Caltrans DMT may need to work cooperatively with CalAct or another advocacy group to assist in securing legislative support and/or elected official “buy-in” to amend the applicable TDA statutes.

Responsible Parties:

- Caltrans Department of Mass Transportation

⁴⁰ Transportation Development Act (TDA) Statutes and California Code of Regulations; March 2009. (TDA) Article 3: Local Transportation Funds § 99238 (d).

Stakeholders/Partners:

- TDA Working Group
- Regional Transportation Planning Agencies
- California Association for Coordinated Transportation

Timeline for Implementation:

Estimate 2-3 months for Caltrans DMT in cooperating with the TDA Working Group to determine level of regional agency compliance with TDA statutes relative to SSTAC review and recommendations. Estimate 3-6 months to develop proposed statute change language in cooperation with regional transportation planning agencies. Estimate 6-12 months to work with CalAct or other entity to secure legislature support to amend the applicable TDA statutes. The time needed to fully implement this recommendation will be dependent upon Caltrans DMT, the TDA Working Group and regional staff availability.

TDA - Unmet Transit Needs and SAFETEA-LU Coordinated Planning Requirements

The TDA specifies requirements for regional transportation planning agencies under the unmet transit needs process to do the following: *“identify the unmet transit needs of the jurisdiction which have been considered as part of the transportation planning process”* and conduct *“an analysis of existing transportation and specialized transportation services, including privately and publicly provided service.”*⁴¹ As previously discussed, regional transportation planning agencies are required to meet these and other requirements before funding can be allocated for local and community transportation programs.

Under SAFETEA-LU coordinated planning requirements the designated recipient (typically the regional transportation planning agency in the county) must develop a Public Transit – Human Services Coordinated Plan which must contain the following:

*“1. An assessment of available services that identifies current transportation providers (public, private and non-profit); 2. An assessment of transportation needs for individuals with disabilities, older adults and people with low incomes. This assessment can be based upon the experiences and perceptions of planning partners or on more sophisticated data collection efforts.”*⁴²

The MAP study legislative review and analysis⁴³ identified overlap and duplication between these two statutes and in the Action Plan provisions of the Social Services Transportation Improvement Act (SSTIA).^{44/45}

⁴¹ Transportation Development Act (TDA) Statutes and California Code of Regulations; March 2009. (TDA) Article 8. Other Claims for Funds:§ 99401.5 (b) and (2).

⁴² FTA C9050.1 5/1/2007 Chapter V Coordinated Planning Page Section 2b. 1-4; pages V-1 and V-2.

⁴³ Mobility Action Plan Phase I Implementation Study: Final Draft: Assessing Human Service Transportation Coordination in California: A Legal and Regulatory Analysis; May 30, 2010.

⁴⁴Ibid.

⁴⁵ 1979 Cal. Government Code: Part 13 (commencing with Section 15950) Division 3, Title 2: Chapter 4 § 15973/15975.

The existing provisions of these statutes demonstrate that there is:

- *Duplication of effort in conducting outreach and stakeholder involvement efforts and activities to inventory and/or collect qualitative and quantitative data and information on existing transportation needs and resources; and*
- *Duplication of documented outcomes (transportation needs and services).*⁴⁶

Strategy Description #3:

Caltrans DMT should require that information on documented on unmet specialized transit needs for the target populations and service-related information resulting from unmet transit needs processes be appended or directly included in updates of Public Transit – Human Service Coordinated Transportation plans developed in the future.

During MAP study discussions related to the unmet transit needs hearings, stakeholders quickly identified the obvious duplication and overlap between the statutes related to these data collection requirements, and wanted to ensure that the service needs of the target populations and the transportation services-related information collected during the unmet transit needs process will be incorporated and considered in the coordinated plans developed by regional transportation planning agencies.

Pros

:

- Will likely encourage more frequent coordinated plan updates as the unmet transit needs process is conducted annually.
- Will ensure that regional transportation planning agencies keep pace with the changing transportation needs of the target populations within each region.
- Could result in the development of a greater number of fundable coordinated transportation projects stemming from the unmet transit needs process.

Cons:

- Will require some additional staff planning and administrative resources to integrate elements of both efforts in Caltrans DMT TDA funding guidance.
- The fact that only those regions that participate in the unmet needs process will be impacted by the potential change may be viewed by some regional agencies as inequitable.
- May warrant consultation with interagency stakeholders depending upon potential impact.
- Does not address duplication and overlap in the statutes.

⁴⁶ Mobility Action Plan (MAP) Phase I Implementation Study: Assessing Human Service Transportation Coordination in California: A Legal and Regulatory Analysis, May 2010, pg.50.

Recommendation:

Caltrans DMT in cooperation with the TDA Working Group should require that regional transportation planning agencies' information on unmet transit needs and transportation services be appended or directly included in all updated coordinated transportation plans in the future. Legislative modifications to the statutes are not being recommended, as this action would require that both the state and federal statutes be amended.

However, this recommendation can be accomplished administratively by Caltrans DMT through modifications to the funding application, training materials and coordinated planning support tools developed by the agency. The authority to enforce this requirement to incorporate or append unmet transit needs and services information into coordinated plans is already provided in the SAFETEA-LU statutes.⁴⁷

As the target populations of both requirements are essentially the same, this action will be taking the first step toward formally combining the results of the two efforts, without having to modify the statutes. This recommendation would result in consideration of all unmet needs identified in the region, and depending upon regional funding priorities, would facilitate the development of coordinated projects that could address those needs and/or service requests identified during the unmet transit needs process.

This recommendation will not address the overlap in the conduct of stakeholder outreach necessary to meet the unmet transit need or coordinated plan requirements. (e.g., unmet transit needs hearings or coordinated planning stakeholder involvement activities).

The FTA allocates Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) FTA Section 5316 and New Freedom (NF) Section 5317 directly to the designated recipients of urbanized areas to use to fund eligible coordinated projects and programs. Caltrans DMT is "the designated recipient administering the FTA Section 5310 program, and the small urban and rural portions of FTA Sections 5316 and 5317".⁴⁸ All designated recipients are subject to the coordinated planning requirements of SAFETEA-LU. Although Caltrans DMT is not responsible for allocation of 5316 and 5317 funding for large urban counties, the agency is responsible for allocation of 5310 funds statewide. This responsibility empowers the Caltrans to serve as the central oversight agency for California.

The DMT has developed online funding-related resources in the form of 5310 and JARC and NF application materials, funding fact sheets, a coordination checklist, links to the federal circulars and other coordinated planning reference materials. In addition, DMT provides training sessions for urban and rural county regional transportation planning agencies and public transit and human services stakeholders statewide on the requirements of all its funding sources including FTA Sections 5310, 5316 and 5317.

To implement this recommendation Caltrans should:

- Add new language to existing funding applications, training materials, and develop new fact sheets which explain the new requirement to append or include unmet transit needs and service-related information into coordinated plans updated in the future; and

⁴⁷ FTA C9050.1 5/1/2007 Chapter V Coordinated Planning Page Section 2b. 1-4; pages V-1 and V-2.

⁴⁸ <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/MassTrans/Coord-Plan-Res.html>.

- Consult and coordinate with the TDA Working Group in development of suitable language that should be incorporated into the agency’s written and online information and training materials.

In the longer term, to effectively eliminate duplication of effort and overlap in these separate but required planning and funding efforts, regional transportation planning agencies should consider combining both the outreach efforts and the documentation of target population needs and service resources required as elements of the unmet transit needs and the coordinated planning processes into the overall regional transportation planning process. This action will result in a more effective and efficient use of regional agency staff and financial resources and will maintain compliance with federal and state regulations and guidelines.

Responsible Parties:

- Caltrans Department of Mass Transportation
- Transportation Development Act Working Group

Stakeholders/Partners:

- Regional Transportation Planning Agencies
- Mobility Action Plan Project Advisory Committee

Timeline for Implementation:

Estimate 3-6 months to develop and incorporate modifications to the guidelines along with other recommended changes depending upon the availability of DMT staff resources.

MEDI-CAL NON-EMERGENCY MEDICAL TRANSPORTATION (NEMT) PROGRAM

Medi-Cal Transportation Provider Requirements

The State of California has traditionally limited the instances of reimbursement for transit systems in providing non-emergency medical trips for Medi-Cal recipients. The Department of Health Care Services (DHCS) currently has stringent requirements to enroll and be certified as a medical transportation provider for Medi-Cal recipients. Applicants must meet the following “Standards of Participation specified, in the following codes:

- “Chapter 7 (commencing with Section 14000) and Chapter 8 (commencing with Section 14200) of Part 3 of Division 9 of the Welfare and Institutions Code; and
- Division 3, Title 22, of the California Code of Regulations”⁴⁹.

In addition to meeting these code regulations and standards of performance, applicants and must complete and submit the required Medi-Cal application. Furthermore, considerable documentation must be submitted along with these forms verifying specific information provided by the applicant. This documentation must be provided to substantiate the applicant’s ability to

⁴⁹ Medical Transportation Provider Application Package Instructions, <http://www.dhcs.ca.gov>.

meet CMS rules (i.e. securing National Provider Identifier (NPI) – Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services administrative process) and the California Code regulations, which include a number of business-related, driver and vehicle-related requirements.⁵⁰

The process of enrolling as a Medi-Cal transportation provider is complex and challenging, requiring that applicants obtain and submit all required certifications, licenses and permits to support completion and submittal of Medi-Cal forms to the State. In addition, following the submission of a completed application and the supporting documentation, there is a lengthy process of review conducted by the State. If an application is approved, the successful applicant will be required to maintain auditable records of Medi-Cal trips.

Strategy Description #1:

Caltrans DMT in cooperation with the California Health and Human Services Agency (CHHS) and the Departments of Aging and Healthcare Services, to develop project parameters and fund a non-emergency medical transportation (NEMT) pilot project to research the feasibility of allowing Medi-Cal reimbursement of public transit operators to provide trips to medical destinations for Medi-Cal recipients.

There was considerable discussion related to Medi-Cal's trip reimbursement policies as they apply to public transportation providers.⁵¹ Study stakeholders maintained that Medi-Cal's policy of not reimbursing trips taken by beneficiaries on public transit hinders their ability to schedule and keep their medical appointments, and results in undesirable health-related outcomes for the target populations. As a result, the recommendation was made to implement a research project designed to investigate the cost and other related impacts of changing the state's policy to allow transit operator reimbursement.

Pros:

- Resumes the state's' interagency coordination efforts started in development of the Mobility Action Plan.
- Creates the opportunity for Caltrans DMT, CHHS and the Departments of Aging and Healthcare Services to collectively strategize and consider plans to develop coordinated projects that can potentially leverage and maximize scarce state financial resources.
- Provides the opportunity to actualize plans at the state level to improve mobility for members of the target populations.
- Development and implementation of a state-sponsored NEMT research pilot project will allow a thorough assessment of the cost-effectiveness of current practices relative to Medi-Cal transportation reimbursement.

Cons:

⁵⁰ Ibid.

- Use of additional state staff time resources by DMT and other departments that may or may not be available to ensure that the interagency coordinated work effort remains on track and accomplishes objectives.
- Implementation cannot be effectuated until preliminary steps are taken to educate human services departments on coordination value, benefits and challenges, and to achieve consensus on plans and project development.
- Funding for potential NEMT pilot research project will need to be identified and secured.

Recommendation:

Caltrans DMT should assume the lead in coordinating planning and project development efforts with the California Health and Human Services Agency (CHHS) and the Departments of Aging and Healthcare Services to develop and fund a NEMT pilot research project in California designed to assess the potential cost-effectiveness and associated impacts of Medi-Cal NEMT reimbursement of public transit providers.

There was lengthy discussion among public transportation stakeholders about need to provide non-emergency trips to Medi-Cal recipients.⁵² However, given the traditional constraints on funding of fixed-route “mass” transportation and the added responsibility to provide ADA trips, additional funding for these non-emergency medical trips has not been available. The scarcity and non-availability of in-house funding for Medi-Cal trips makes it necessary for transportation providers to ensure that prior to providing these trips that external funding resources are in place. Logically, transportation providers, both public and private have looked to Medi-Cal for potential funding reimbursement for these trips with limited success, particularly in California.

Despite the general belief that Medi-Cal reimbursement is not available for traditional transportation providers,⁵³ an exception to the policy was identified. Presently in San Diego County, California, the San Diego Metropolitan Transit System and the North County Transit District are participating in collaboration with the County of San Diego in a Medi-Cal reimbursement arrangement.⁵⁴ This program has been operating for several years and can be used as a model to assess the viability and cost-effectiveness of expanding this type of program to other counties in the state.

Throughout the MAP study the California Department of Aging has been an important partner to Caltrans DMT in helping to promote and support the state’s coordination efforts, and the agency’s understanding of the value and benefits of coordinating efforts to improve mobility for the target population makes them an important ally in the process to educate and bridge the gap between transportation and health and human services agencies at the state level. Their continued assistance and participation will be critical in the implementation SIP recommendations.

Caltrans DMT in cooperation should initially work to educate and provide information to the coordinating partner healthcare agencies on transportation and coordination, and should develop definitive plans (i.e. goals and objectives, scope of work, deliverables and budget) to

⁵² Mobility Action Plan Phase I Implementation Study: Final Draft: Assessing Human Service Transportation Coordination in California: A Legal and Regulatory Analysis; May 30, 2010.

⁵³ Ibid.

⁵⁴ Ibid.

conduct a study on this NEMT Medi-Cal reimbursement issue as soon as possible. The general study parameters would be designed to:

- Research the San Diego County NEMT reimbursement model to evaluate how those programs are working and to identify challenges faced
- Assess the feasibility of allowing Medi-Cal reimbursement of public transit operators facilitated through their local government agency
- Develop and recommend acceptable cost-effective approaches to implement Medi-Cal reimbursement programs as deemed feasible.

Caltrans DMT as the lead agency will also need to identify and take the necessary steps to secure the funding for this project.

Responsible Parties:

- Caltrans Department of Mass Transportation (DMT)

Stakeholders/Partners:

- California Health and Human Services Agency (CHHS)
- California Department of Aging
- California Department of Health Care Services

Timeline for Implementation:

Timeline is dependent upon availability of DMT and other state agency and department staff resources for implementation. Estimate 6-12 months to develop project direction, parameters and funding application; Estimate an 3-6 months for application approval and funds disbursement; Estimate an additional 12-15 months for project implementation and assessment. Some activities may be accomplished concurrently and would therefore shorten the overall timetable for implementation.

Non-Emergency Medical Transportation (NEMT) Provisions

Federal Medicaid regulations require each state plan to "ensure necessary transportation for recipients to and from providers;" and "describe the methods the agency will use to meet this requirement."⁵⁵

However, non-emergency medical transportation (NEMT) is covered only when a recipient's medical and physical condition does not allow that recipient to travel "by passenger car, taxicabs or other forms of public or private conveyances".⁵⁶ "Transportation is also not covered if the care to be obtained is not a Medi-Cal benefit."⁵⁷ California's approach to providing NEMT for Medi-Cal beneficiaries is reflective of the state's efforts to control transportation costs through establishment of programmatic limits on utilization of transportation services.

⁵⁵ 42 CFR §431.53 (West 2009).

⁵⁶ 22 CCR §51151 (West 2009).

⁵⁷ <http://www.hrsa.gov/reimbursement/states/california-medicaid-covered-services.htm>

“Nationally state agencies, health plans and other human services transportation providers have elected to use transportation brokers as a viable option to control costs and improve the quality of the services provided. “The idea of the brokerage is built concerning containing cost, guaranteeing appropriate levels of service and providing consistency in service quality. Transportation brokerages promote greater accountability and better data management, thereby reducing abuse, fraud and waste.”⁵⁸ Currently California has not established a transportation brokerage for the provision of medical transportation for Medi-Cal beneficiaries.

“Brokers typically operate under a capitated rate structure. The broker is paid a flat fee, and state agencies and health plans are guaranteed budget predictability. They can control medical transportation costs, reduce abuses in the system and ensure that all recipients have access to healthcare. The brokerage system maximizes the least-costly modes of transportation and utilizes all available transportation resources, including non-profit and public transit agencies. The broker also promotes efficiencies within the contracted provider network. The broker provides total system oversight – eligibility screening, vehicle inspections, driver certifications, scheduling and billing/payment to ensure uniform, quality services and access to needed healthcare.”⁵⁹

“The United States Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Inspector General (OIG), that states consider using transportation brokers as an effective means of controlling Medicaid non-emergency transportation costs. This recommendation came from an OIG study (OEI-04-95-00140) prompted by significant increases in non-emergency Medicaid transportation cost during the 1990’s. Their study concluded that, in addition to controlling costs, transportation brokerage firms have been effective in reducing fraud and abuse by providers and recipients, and in increasing utilization of low cost modes of transportation such as publicly-funded transit systems.”⁶⁰

“The Community Transportation Association of America (CTAA) recognized transportation brokers as “the most successful approach to managing Medicaid transportation” in its 2001 publication entitled, “Medicaid Transportation: Assuring Access to Health Care”. This study concluded that brokers provide a high level of expertise in the medical transportation field, utilize state-of-the art telecommunications and software technologies, and employ innovative cost and utilization monitoring techniques.”⁶¹

Strategy Description #2:

Caltrans DMT in cooperation with the California Health and Human Services Agency (CHHS) and the Departments of Aging and Healthcare Services should develop parameters and obtain funding to develop a NEMT pilot brokerage project in California.

During the MAP study research and resulting stakeholder dialogue addressed the issue of California’s limitations on NEMT for Medi-Cal beneficiaries.⁶² In a 2009-10 budget analysis, the Legislative Analyst’s Office (LAO) indicated “that Medi-Cal potentially could improve the availability and quality of its NEMT services while reducing costs by contracting with a

⁵⁸ [http://www.logisticare.com/uploadedfiles/UNV_Brokerage_106.1\(1\).pdf](http://www.logisticare.com/uploadedfiles/UNV_Brokerage_106.1(1).pdf)

⁵⁹ Ibid.

⁶⁰ <http://www.southeastrans.com/transportation-management-solutions/transportation-brokerage-management.html>

⁶¹ Ibid.

⁶² Mobility Action Plan Phase I Implementation Study: Final Draft: Assessing Human Service Transportation Coordination in California: A Legal and Regulatory Analysis; May 30, 2010.

transportation broker to manage a portion of its NEMT services.⁶³ In addition, the LAO recommended “that the state conduct a pilot program by contracting with such a vendor for two years to evaluate the potential for improvement.”⁶⁴

Pros:

- Continues to build upon the state’s interagency coordination efforts started as a result of the Mobility Action Plan.
- Addresses the Legislative Analyst’s Office (LAO) recommendation to develop a NEMT brokerage in California which was identified in the MAP study legislative report.
- Creates the opportunity for Caltrans DMT, CHHS and the Departments of Aging and Healthcare services to collectively strategize and consider plans to develop a joint project that can serve to leverage and maximize scarce state financial resources.
- Provides the opportunity to actualize plans at the state level to improve mobility for members of the target populations.
- Can result in development of a state-sponsored NEMT pilot brokerage project could serve to evaluate the implications and associated impacts of establishing transportation brokerages in California.

Cons:

- Use of additional state staff time resources that may or may not be available to ensure that the interagency coordinated work effort remains on track and accomplishes objectives.
- Implementation cannot be effectuated until preliminary steps are taken to educate human services departments on coordination value, benefits and challenges, to assure achievement of consensus on plans and project development.
- Funding for potential NEMT transportation brokerage pilot project will need to be identified and secured.

Recommendation:

Caltrans DMT should work with the California Health and Human Services Agency and the Departments of Aging and Healthcare Services to develop plans and secure funding to implement a two-year pilot project to assess the viability and benefit of NEMT brokerages.

Over the years, there has been significant, successful use of transportation brokerages throughout the country to provide management and oversight of transportation services for public agencies. The National Consortium on the Coordination of Human Services Transportation indicates “A successful brokerage program acts as a gatekeeper for human services agencies that provide transportation services for their clients. From trip schedule to

⁶³ http://www.lao.ca.gov/analysis_2009/health/health_an109004003.aspx

⁶⁴ Ibid.

drop off, brokerages are tasked with reducing overall costs and providing clients with the most efficient and appropriate mode of transportation”⁶⁵

The LAO indicates that they “believe” that a transportation brokerage is “a concept that could work for Medi-Cal”⁶⁶ and goes on to cite the potential benefits of establishing a transportation brokerage.

However, as the state has limited experience on the NEMT transportation brokerage issue, implementation of this recommendation will require that Caltrans DMT work initially to increase state agency/department knowledge about NEMT brokerages (i.e., what are NEMT brokerages, how to establish brokerages, potential value and benefit of establishing a brokerage in California, and the estimated costs).

This can be accomplished through the development of a “white paper” which would provide details of brokerage concepts in relationship to California’s Medi-Cal transportation environment, including potential impacts to CTSAs. Such a document can be used to: 1) to educate both Caltrans and project partners; 2) provide a basis for decision-making relative to brokerage concepts for the state; and 2) can inform the NEMT pilot project parameters (i.e., project scope, goals and objectives, project outcomes and budget). The LAO’s research on the NEMT brokerage issue can serve as a baseline for development of this document.

Following the joint decision-making process to develop the project scope and required outcomes for a NEMT brokerage pilot project, Caltrans DMT, CHHS and the Departments of Aging and Healthcare Services can proceed toward implementation activities which include submission of “a State plan amendment (SPA) that elects this option and assures that applicable requirements related to cost-effectiveness, competitive procurement, oversight and quality are being met.” Additionally, States are required to include documentation proving cost effectiveness, and contracts with transportation brokers must be approved by CMS.”⁶⁷

Responsible Parties:

- Caltrans Department of Mass Transportation

Stakeholders/Partners:

- California Health and Human Services Agency
- California Department of Aging
- California Department of Health Care Services

Timeline for Implementation:

Timeline is dependent upon availability of DMT and other state partner agency/department staff resources for implementation. Estimate 6-12 months to develop project direction, parameters

⁶⁵<http://web1.ctaa.org/webmodules/webarticles/articlefiles/HumanServicesTransportationBrokerageBibliography.pdf>

⁶⁶ http://www.lao.ca.gov/analysis_2009/health/health_an109004003.aspx

⁶⁷ ⁶⁷ <https://www.cms.gov/smdl/downloads/SMD06009.pdf>

and funding application; Estimate an additional 3-6 months for application approval and funds disbursement; Estimate an additional 12-24 months to secure the necessary Department of Health and Human Services Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) approvals, program implementation and assessment. Some activities may be accomplished concurrently and would therefore shorten the timetable for implementation.

CONSOLIDATED TRANSPORTATION SERVICE AGENCIES (CTSAs)

Strategy Description #1

Caltrans should work with CTSAs and regional transportation planning agencies statewide to establish direct web links and other informational materials available online that would provide information about CTSAs for public transit and human service agencies throughout the state, including but not limited, to designation eligibility requirements, agency roles and responsibilities, funding sources, coordination activities (e.g. mobility management). Modifications to the statute are not being recommended at this time.

Stakeholder dialogue during the MAP study on CTSA issues demonstrated that there was a clear lack of knowledge of the current regulations pertaining to CTSAs, and agency/organization stakeholders believed that more clear-cut information related to establishing, funding and maintaining CTSAs should be developed and made available online.

Pros:

- Would strengthen the state's working relationships with CTSAs.
- Would increase overall understanding of CTSAs relative to their responsibilities and functions at the regional level, through development of information on the value and benefits of CTSAs, and their role in promoting coordination and improvement of mobility for the target populations.
- Requires interest and cooperation of CTSAs to assist in planning and development of web-based information.
- Could facilitate more wide-spread information sharing and collaborative planning between CTSAs.

Cons:

- Will require that Caltrans DMT actively take the lead on this recommendation to ensure objectives are met.
- Use of additional staff time resources for planning and coordination on the part of Caltrans DMT and CTSA staff to work through the details of this recommendation.
- Will require planning and coordination on the part of Caltrans staff to work with all interested CTSAs throughout the state.
- May create challenges for Caltrans DMT and CTSAs to agree upon content of online materials and information.

Recommendation:

Caltrans should work with CTSA's and regional transportation planning agencies statewide to establish direct web links and other informational materials available online that would provide information about CTSA's for public transit and human service agencies throughout the state, including but not limited, to designation eligibility requirements, agency roles and responsibilities, funding sources, coordination activities (e.g. mobility management).

The California Association for Transportation (Cal-Act) currently has online information available related to CTSA's and other coordination-related concepts and issues. This information provides solid baseline information about the statutory intent and purpose of these entities, roles and responsibilities and funding. Caltrans DMT can also benefit from use of the information in the E-Book, which can be used as a baseline to update CTSA contacts, and to work with CTSA's and Cal-Act to add to new "image enhancing" information related to CTSA successes and "best practices" (e.g. innovative projects and programs) which better reflect the current California environment.

Responsible Parties:

- Caltrans Department of Mass Transportation

Stakeholders/Partners:

- Consolidated Transportation Service Agencies
- California Association for Transportation (Cal-Act)
- Regional Transportation Planning Agencies

Timeline for Implementation:

Estimate 9-15 months to initiate web interfaces, and to develop the associated online informational materials. Meeting this timetable will depend upon the availability of Caltrans DMT and CTSA/regional transportation planning agency/CalAct staff time resources available to implement the recommendation.

Strategy Description #2

Caltrans DMT should working cooperatively with CTSA's and regional transportation planning agencies to develop an educational/informational training module and/or materials designed specifically for regional transportation planning agency decision-makers designed to increase their knowledge about the value and benefits of supporting the efforts of CTSA's in their local transportation environment.

During a number of MAP PAC study meetings stakeholders expressed their concerns about regional transportation planning agency compliance relative to the designation of CTSA's in California counties in accordance with the requirements of the SSTIA. Study stakeholders agreed that the statutes already in place need to be enforced requiring that either every county or every region represented by a regional planning agency have a CTSA. However, the

interpretation of the SSTIA requirement to designate CTSA allows flexibility for regional transportation planning agencies in assessing the value of designating CTSA within their own regions. This policy serves to maintain local control in the provision and funding of services. As stakeholder discussion progressed, there was agreement that another approach might be to provide more education and information which is specifically designed for regional transportation planning agencies decision-makers promoting the value of establishing and funding CTSA.

Pros:

- Would increase regional transportation planning agencies' overall understanding of CTSA relative to their responsibilities and functions at the regional level, through development of information on the value and benefits of CTSA, and their role in promoting coordination and improvement of mobility for the target populations.
- Requires interest and cooperation of CTSA to assist in planning and development of web-based information.
- Could facilitate more wide-spread information sharing between CTSA related to "best practices".
- Through increased education of decision-makers, this recommendation could potentially result in designation of CTSA in areas of the state where they have not been designated by the regional transportation planning agency.

Cons:

- Requires interest and staff time resources of CTSA to assist in planning and development of decision-maker focused educational materials and/or information on California CTSA.
- Cost-related consequences to cover the cost of creating informational/educational materials and distribution by Caltrans DMT or CTSA staff representatives.
- May create challenges for Caltrans DMT and CTSA to reach consensus on content and format of informational/educational materials.

Recommendation:

Caltrans should work jointly with CTSA and regional planning agencies to develop an educational/informational training module and/or materials targeted towards regional transportation planning agency decision-makers to educate and inform them about the true benefits that can be achieved through establishment and/or support of CTSA (e.g. cost-savings, increased mobility, leveraging of scarce transportation resources, etc.). This recommendation should be implemented in concert with the previous recommendation (CTSA Strategy Description #1).

Over the course of the study, it became apparent to stakeholders that regional transportation planning agencies decision-makers lack understanding of CTSA, as evidenced by both the non-designation of these entities in some areas of the state, and the inconsistent financial

support realized by existing CTSA. In an effort to facilitate greater understanding of CTSA for the purpose of securing regional transportation agency support for these entities this recommendation was formulated.

Working with CTSA, Caltrans DMT could initially develop an informational/instructional packet for distribution and consumption by decision-makers that would include at a minimum, the following information:

- Updated CTSA contact lists;
- Single-page case study overviews which demonstrate “best practices”;
- Other issue papers related to coordination issues of the day (e.g. insurance liability, funding sources for coordinated programs and projects, establishing CTSA, etc.); and
- Summary briefs on CTSA enacting legislation

It is important to ensure that the packet of information developed for this audience is concise, yet informative. The packet could be distributed initially to each regional agency, and would then need to be supported by Caltrans DMT staff to respond to questions and/or comments from regional agencies.

As a follow-on effort to the development of the packet, Caltrans DMT staff in partnership with CTSA and regional transportation planning agencies could also plan a series of regional workshops for decision-makers. Conceivably these workshops would not exceed two hours in length and should include information that provides insights on how regional agencies can support CTSA activities and overall coordination efforts in the local transportation environment. Sessions should also be designed to allow decision-makers to actively participate in short scripted strategy planning exercises designed to raise their awareness of the challenges of coordination and project planning.

Responsible Parties:

- Caltrans Department of Mass Transportation

Stakeholders/Partners:

- Consolidated Transportation Service Agencies
- Regional Transportation Planning Agencies

Timeline for Implementation:

Estimate 6-9 months to develop effective educational/informational themes topics which demonstrate the value and benefits of CTSA and coordination; potentially an additional 3-9 months to plan schedule and conduct decision-maker workshops. Meeting this timetable will depend upon the availability of Caltrans DMT and CTSA and regional agencies staff time resources available to implement the recommendation.

Strategy Description #3

Caltrans DMT in coordination with large regional transportation planning agencies should make modifications to the existing coordinated planning funding applications to provide scoring preference/priority on Section 5310 (Caltrans only), 5316 and 5317 coordinated projects and programs developed by CTSA that can demonstrate achievement of service performance goals and objectives (i.e., increases in the number of trips provided for members of the target populations) on funded projects.

Members of the MAP PAC, CTSA representatives and other study stakeholders agreed that support of CTSA activities is critical and necessary to continue to progress toward the state's coordination goals, and that the development of incentives that improve their ability to continue to develop coordinated programs and projects should be recommended.

Pros:

- Demonstrates state support for the coordination efforts and activities of CTSA.
- Could potentially positively impact the amount of funding that CTSA may be awarded through coordinated plan competitive project selection processes conducted throughout the state.
- Could promote the development of a greater number of coordinated projects facilitated by CTSA with other public transit and human services agencies.
- Could encourage designation of new CTSA in areas of the state where they have not been designed by the regional transportation planning agency in the region.

Cons:

- Use of additional Caltrans DMT and large urban counties staff time resources to modify coordinated plan funding applications and associated materials.
- Caltrans DMT must determine the level or degree of scoring priority/preference that will be afforded for CTSA, and the performance/productivity requirements for projects that qualify for priority/preference in scoring.
- Will require some work on the part of regional agencies to incorporate new and/or additional required guidance into project funding application requirements.
- Will also require Caltrans DMT staff time to inform and educate regional agencies on the proposed changes. This will require some level of outreach as revisions are being considered and after they are finalized.
- Could potentially be viewed as inequitable by regional agencies with undesignated CTSA and other public transit and human services agency/organization stakeholders at the local/regional and state levels not receiving scoring priority/preference.

Recommendation:

Caltrans DMT should make modifications to the existing coordinated planning funding applications to provide scoring preference/priority on Section 5310, 5316 and 5317 coordinated projects and programs developed by CTSA's. In addition, to maintain equity and consistency in regional coordinated funding programs statewide, Caltrans DMT should also require that regional transportation planning agencies and/or other designated recipients of JARC and NF in large urban counties, also incorporate this CTSA preference/priority modification. Projects receiving preferences in scoring must be those that clearly result in measurable increases in trips provided and/or arranged for members of the target populations (seniors, persons with disabilities and low income individuals).

Because of the history and accomplishments in the coordination of human services, fully functioning and active CTSA's are viewed by many as the foremost leaders in initiating, implementing and supporting vital human service coordination activities, including but not limited to mobility management. Throughout the study there was consensus on the issue of empowering and strengthening the position of CTSA's, particularly in the area of funding support.

In the development of funding priorities/preferences for CTSA's, Caltrans DMT and must ensure clarity on the issue of meeting service-related performance and productivity measures (e.g. minimum productivity requirements, how project/program success can be measured, etc.) Recommendations related to establishing clear guidance in the state's funding program guidelines is detailed below in the Coordinated Plan Funding Guidance: Strategy Description #1.

Responsible Parties:

Caltrans Department of Mass Transportation

Stakeholders/Partners:

Regional Transportation Planning Agencies

Consolidated Transportation Service Agencies

Timeline for Implementation:

Estimate 9-12 months to develop and incorporate modifications to state and large urban regional transportation planning agency's coordinated funding application and associated materials, along with other recommended modifications depending upon the availability of DMT staff resources. This timeline could conceivably be longer should Caltrans DMT elect to develop all recommended modifications in consideration of interagency stakeholder input.

STATE LEVEL COORDINATION AND OVERSIGHT

Strategy Description #1

Caltrans DMT in cooperation with a number of state-level departments and agencies (identified below) should participate in an interagency strategic planning effort to establish a Mobility Council other coordination oversight mechanism in California.

There was consensus by MAP PAC and other stakeholder agencies and organizations throughout the state, that greater state level assistance is needed to provide political support, structured guidance and information to local and regional agencies and organizations to ensure their continual progression toward achievement of coordination objectives both now and in the future. This recommendation was developed to address this need.

In addition, MAP PAC should continue to serve in an advisory capacity to assist Caltrans as needed in future planning activities associated with implementation of MAP Goals 1 and 3, as their oversight and guidance in progressing through the implementation of MAP Goals 2 and 4 has been invaluable.

Pros:

- Resumes upon the state's interdepartmental/agency coordination efforts started in development of the Mobility Action Plan.
- Offers the opportunity to secure broad-based support at the state-level if consensus can be reached.
- Could result in development of a central coordinated oversight framework at the state-level that fully supports and empowers the local and regional coordinated planning process.
- Operating through a coordinating council oversight structure, the state could bolster support for regional/local coordination efforts by electing to establish local/regional coordinating boards and/or a "community managers" component.
- Could be used as a conduit for California to assess "best practices" in funding of coordination plans, programs and policies.
- Significant value and benefit in continuing to include the MAP PAC in an advisory capacity, as needed, on local/regional coordinated planning issues, and on activities associated with MAP PAC Goals 1 and 3. The committee is comprised of a broad-based representation of public transit and human service agencies and organizations throughout the state, who can reflect the viewpoints and needs of all members of the target populations (seniors, persons with disabilities and low-income individuals).
- Implementation of this recommendation may facilitate implementation of MAP Goal 1.

Cons:

- Implementation cannot be effectuated until preliminary strategic planning efforts are undertaken through an interdepartmental/agency working group, specifically Caltrans DMT staff activities to educate and inform other state departments/agencies on the value and benefits of coordination.
- Should the interdepartmental/agency working group support establishment of a Mobility Coordinating Council or other oversight mechanism, an Executive Order or legislation to legally establish a Mobility Coordinating Council for the state would be required.

- State budgetary issues in California currently limit the ability to rapidly progress toward creation of a more formal state-level coordination oversight structure.
- Will result in additional administrative effort and staff time resources on the part of Caltrans DMT staff to actively lead and coordinate the planning effort, and for staff of other state-level departments/agencies to participate.
- May be cost impacts to maintain administrative and meeting support should Caltrans DMT staff resources be unavailable.
- May be challenging to maintain interest and participation and/or reach consensus on issues as department/agency perspectives vary between departments and agencies.
- No negative impacts are noted in continuing to include the MAP PAC, as needed, in an advisory capacity on issues related to local/regional coordination and on activities associated with MAP PAC Goals 1 and 3.

Recommendation:

Caltrans DMT should serve as lead agency to establish a Mobility Coordinating Council or other oversight structure in California. This multi-department/agency strategic planning effort should be developed to ensure involvement of other state departments, as follows:

- Department of Aging
- Department of Social Services
- Department of Health Care Services
- Department of Rehabilitation
- Department of Developmental Services
- Department of Veterans Affairs
- Department of Mental Health
- California Highway Patrol
- Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV)

The inter-department/agency work effort envisioned will require of participation high-level state officials (i.e. Agency Secretaries/Department Heads).

In order to ensure that the inter-department/agency group is proactive and capable of developing and implementing a state agenda leading to development of the Mobility Council, it is recommended that the group be comprised of high-level state officials (i.e. Agency Secretaries or Department Heads), as they must be positioned to represent their department/agency's viewpoints relative to the issues and be likewise be decision-makers within their state department or agency.

Implementation of this element of the recommendation will also require that Caltrans DMT serving as project lead would:

1. Re-establish interdepartmental/agency relationships that began in development of the Mobility Action Plan through informal meetings/conversations and preparation and distribution of an overview of the issues (including potential value and benefit to state)

necessary to inform and solicit interest and commitment from high-level officials and executives to participate in the strategic planning effort;

2. Work with the group to develop a strategic agenda and reasonable goals and objectives that can guide the planning effort;
3. Facilitate establishment of a regular agreed upon meeting schedule for those departments participating in the planning effort; and
4. Ensure sufficient administrative support in the form of developing agendas, meeting handouts, developing meeting summaries and accomplishing meeting follow-up and support activities.

As indicated previously, the state's current financial condition will constrain DMT's ability to work consistently to implement this recommendation. However, some limited progress can be made to make contact with departmental and agency executives and management on this recommendation in the near-term (#1 above).

In addition to ensure full implementation of both elements of this recommendation, MAP PAC comprised of public transit and human service agency and organization representatives throughout the state, should continue to serve in an advisory capacity to assist Caltrans as needed in consideration and development of coordinated information and approaches specific to the final MAP Phase I Implementation study recommendations and future planning activities associated with MAP Goals 1 and 3.

Responsible Parties:

Caltrans Department of Mass Transportation

California Commission on Aging

Stakeholders/Partners:

- Department of Aging
- Department of Social Services
- Department of Health Care Services
- Department of Rehabilitation
- Department of Developmental Services
- Department of Veterans Affairs
- Department of Mental Health
- California Highway Patrol
- Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV)

- Mobility Action Plan Project Advisory Committee

Timeline for Implementation:

The timeline for implementation is dependent upon availability of DMT and other state department staff resources for implementation. Estimate 12-15 months to educate and inform state departments, assess mobility council and/or other oversight structure feasibility and develop recommendations; Estimate an additional 12 months to secure state approvals and begin program implementation. Some activities may be accomplished concurrently and would therefore shorten the overall timetable.

COORDINATED PLAN FUNDING GUIDANCE

Strategy Description #1:

Caltrans DMT should modify the existing state coordinated plan funding guidance and associated materials to provide greater clarification on plan requirements and definitions, and to ensure that updated plans prepared are structurally consistent statewide and in full compliance with federal funding requirements.

The MAP study review of the coordinated plans yielded significant “collective” information about the coordinated transportation environment in regions throughout the state.⁶⁸ The review also resulted in recommendations for improvement related to plan organization, clarifications and detail.

Pros:

- Better understanding of plan requirements by regional agencies, as well as, public transit and human stakeholder agencies and organizations.
- Improvement in the overall quality and over consistency of updated plans statewide.
- Organizational/format modifications will facilitate ease in plan review and approval by Caltrans DMT staff.
- Improves compliance with federal requirements.

Cons:

- Many or all coordinated plan updates will require some level of additional work on the part of regional agencies to re-structure and/or incorporate new and/or additional required detail into plans.
- Will require Caltrans DMT staff time to inform and educate regional agencies on the proposed changes. This may require some level of outreach prior to finalizing revisions.

⁶⁸ Mobility Action Plan Phase I Implementation Study: Executive Summaries Public Transit –Human Services Coordinated Transportation Plans: Volumes I and II: Large/Small Urban and Rural Plans; April 30, 2010.

Recommendation:

Caltrans DMT should update the state's coordinated plan funding guidance to include modifications that provide improved information and greater clarification on required plan elements, definitions and examples to explain important coordination concepts. Recommended revisions to the coordinated plan funding guidance and materials are summarized below.

Plan Organization

At a minimum, a standardized plan organizational format should be used in all plans which can which strictly responds to the four (4) federal requirements, as follows:

1. As assessment of available services
2. An assessment of transportation needs for the target populations
3. Strategies, activities and/or projects to address the identified gaps between current services and needs
4. Priorities for implementation based on resources, time and feasibility for implementing specific strategies and/or activities identified.

The organization of the plan should clearly demonstrate that all required elements of the plan have been completed and documented by urban and rural agencies in future plan updates. Caltrans may elect to develop a standardized template based upon federal guidance.

Plan Detail

Recognizing the inconsistencies in the coordinated plans relative to the service assessment/inventory, the state should require that a minimum level of information be included in the coordinated plans updated by regional transportation planning agencies that will provide sufficient general information on public transit and human services transportation operated in the region. Service information should at a minimum include:

- Identification of each agency/organization operating services
- Mode of services operated (e.g. fixed-route, ADA complementary paratransit, general public or senior paratransit, social service transportation, etc.)
- Customers/clients served (general public, dialysis, seniors, persons with disabilities, etc.)
- Routes and/or destinations served
- Days and hours operated
- Number of vehicles (accessible and non-accessible)

Collection and reporting of this minimum level of information will ensure that the range of public transit and human services transportation operated in the region is better reflected in coordinated plans, and will likewise facilitate a better local comparison of target population needs to the available resources.

Performance Standards

Caltrans DMT should provide greater guidance for regional transportation agencies relative in developing acceptable project performance measures for coordination projects. At this juncture, human service agencies and organizations remain unclear on how to measure performance and to achieve performance efficiencies on coordinated service projects, as well as, related mobility support or research projects.

Therefore, it is important that projects approved for funding by regional transportation planning agencies in the future achieve federal funding program objectives. This is especially important given the potential changes proposed to the re-authorization bill, which will likely include more stringent service performance and productivity measures relative to projects funded with 5310, Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) and New Freedom funds.

In establishing performance measures, Caltrans DMT should as much as possible strike a balance in maintaining consistency and compliance with emerging federal guidelines and developing reasonable to meet standards for human service agencies and organizations. In recognition of the fact that Caltrans DMT must delay modifications to the program funding guidelines related to service productivity and performance until the re-authorization bill requirements are finalized, project team recommendations on this issue have not been proposed.

Mobility Management

Mobility management is the predominant coordination program/project activity being undertaken throughout California. Plan stakeholders recognized the need to create a central “facilitating mechanism” to effectuate coordination, both regionally and within individual public transit and human service agencies and organizations. The regional mobility manager with its multiplicity of roles (e.g. information conduit, project partner and/or collaborator, broker, etc.) can serve as the translator and liaison between the two systems toward the goal of mobility improvement for the target populations.

As coordination efforts between public transit and human and social service agencies and organizations continue to be implemented throughout the state, it is anticipated that the presence of mobility managers and the associated implementation of mobility management programs, projects and activities will increase substantially.

Organizationally mobility management can be accomplished in any number of ways which include, but are not necessarily limited to:

- Integration of a new functional unit or section within an existing or newly formed agency/organization. For example, within existing/newly formed CTSA's; or within departments or divisions of public transit or human service agencies and organizations)
- Creation of a new and separate organizational structure established strictly for mobility management purposes.

It will therefore be important to ensure that these entities can remain flexible and innovative in their approaches to coordination, and understand that their role will vary depending upon agency/organization preferences, and the nature of the strategy, plan or activity to be accomplished.

Responsible Parties:

Caltrans Division of Mass Transportation

Timeline for Implementation:

Estimate 9-12 months to develop and incorporate modifications to the guidelines along with other recommended changes depending upon the availability of DMT staff resources. This timeline could conceivably be longer should Caltrans DMT elect to develop all recommended modifications in consideration of interagency stakeholder input.

CONCLUSION

To ensure that the state continues to progress toward the development of a “State Empowered Framework in Support of Local and Regional Coordination Efforts”, Caltrans DMT must proceed to implement SIP recommendations and both MAP Goals 1 and 3 as discussed earlier in this report.

Over the course of the MAP study, Caltrans DMT executives and management have repeatedly affirmed the agency’s commitment to accomplish the objectives of the Mobility Action Plan. However, federal and state financial issues will likely delay immediate action on full implementation of some SIP recommendations.

Moreover, the positive consequence of the interagency liaison activities that have been undertaken by Caltrans DMT management and staff in recent years, including the conduct of the MAP study, has created a climate of cooperation, interest and willingness by public transit and human service agencies and organizations to facilitate coordination. The SIP recommendations are a “springboard” that can ensure the agency’s gradual, yet consistent progress toward complete implementation of all Mobility Action Plan Goals, action steps and strategies, and establishment of the Statewide Framework for Coordination for California.

MOBILITY ACTION PLAN PROJECT ADVISORY COMMITTEE (MAP PAC) ROSTER

Appendix A

MEMBERS	TITLE/AFFILIATION	LOCATION	E-MAIL
Kimberly A. Gayle (MAP PAC Chair)	Office Chief, Federal Transit Grants Caltrans, Division of Mass Transportation	1120 N Street, MS 39 Sacramento, CA 94274-0001 (916) 654-8074	Kimberly_gayle@dot.ca.gov
Lynn Daucher (MAP PAC Co-Chair)	Director, California Department of Aging (CDA)	1300 National Drive, Suite 200 Sacramento, CA 95834 (916) 419-7500 (916) 928-2268 facsimile	ldaucher@aging.ca.gov
Megan Juring (Special Advisor)	Assistant Secretary, California Health & Human Services Agency (CHHS)	1600 9 th Street, Rm 460 Sacramento, CA 95814 (916) 654-0662	mjuring@chhs.ca.gov
Karol Swartzlander	Community Choices Project	1600 9 th Street Sacramento, CA 95814	KSwartz2@chhs.ca.gov
Ann Crettola	Temp -Assistant Director, Strategic Planning, Department of Developmental Services	1600 9 th St, Rm 240, MS 2-13 Sacramento, CA 95814 (916) 654-1989	acrettola@dds.ca.gov
Steve Curti	Transit Rep. District 6 Caltrans	P.O. Box 12616 1352 W. Olive Ave Fresno, CA 93728-2616 (559) 488-4162	steve_curti@dot.ca.gov
David J. Cyra, PE	FTA REGION IX, Ambassador	W313 S7767 Edna Ct. Mukwonago, WI 53149 (262) 363-4497, (202)247-5364 (262) 363-9191 Facsimile	CYRAETTC@aol.com
Maureen Powers, PhD	Chair, Western Contra Costa Transit Authority	601 Walter Avenue Pinole, CA, 94564	mopowers@yahoo.com

Mobility Action Plan Strategic Implementation Plan

		(510) 375-7290	
Ana Acton	Executive Director, FREED Center for Independent Living Centers	117 New Mohawk Road Nevada City, CA 95959 (530) 265-4444	ana@freed.org
Todd M. Allen	Director of Business Development and Community Relations, Route Match Software, Inc	2301 Stonehenge Drive, Ste 116 Raleigh, NC USA 27615 (919) 676-8327	todd.allen@routematch.com
Rebecca Azhocar	Executive Director, Charles I. Cheneweth Foundation	P.O. Box 90 National City, CA 91951 (619) 267-7054	razhocar@cheneweth-foundation.org
David Ball	System Change Advocate, Community Access Center	6848 Magnolia Ave. Suite 150 Riverside, CA 92506 (951) 274-0358 x 104 (951) 274-0833 Facsimile (951) 274-0834 TTY	scadvocate@ilcac.org
Geetu Banerjee	CTSA Analyst Access Services	707 Wilshire Blvd., 9 th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90071 (213) 270-6080	banerjee@asila.org
Samantha Basquez	Consultant, Welfare to Work Division Department of Social Services	744 P Street, MS 8-16-26 Sacramento, CA 95814 (916) 657-2128 (916) 651-9055	Samantha.Basquez@dss.ca.gov
George A. Berrios Jr.	SGT. - Research and Planning Section – Community Outreach and Marketing Unit, CHP	2555 First Avenue Sacramento, CA 95818 (916) 843-3210	gberrios@chp.ca.gov
Tighe Boyle	Paratransit, Inc	431 I Street, Suite 200 Sacramento, CA 95814 (916) 429-2009	TigheB@paratransit.org

Mobility Action Plan Strategic Implementation Plan

Paul S. Branson	Community Mobility Manager	750 Lindaro Street, Ste 261 San Raphael, CA 94901-6029 (415) 226-0863 (415) 499-6099 Facsimile	pbranson@co.marin.ca.us
Mike Brown	Deputy Secretary, Public Safety Business Transportation and Housing Agency	980 9 th Street, Suite 2450 Sacramento, CA 95814 (916) 323-7730 (916) 657-7235 Facsimile	mlbrown@chp.ca.gov
Cindy Chiaverini	Caltrans, Division of Mass Transportation	(916) 654-6990	Cindy_chiaverini@dot.ca.gov
Pam Couch	Executive Director Modoc County Transportation Comm.	111 W. North St. Alturas, CA 96101 (530) 233-6422	pamcouch@frontiernet.net
Diane Cooper	Executive Director Peg Taylor Adult Day Health Care Center	124 Parmac Road Chico, CA 95926 (530) 342-2345	dcoopptc@sbcglobal.net
Seth Cutter Jr.	Bicycle and Pedestrian Coordinator, Caltrans District 11, Planning Division	Planning Division, MS/240 4050 Taylor Street San Diego, CA 92110 (619) 688-2597	seth_cutter@dot.ca.gov
Celinda Dahlgren	Executive Director, Central Contra Costa Transit Authority	2477 Arnold Industrial Way Concord, CA 94520 (925) 680-2045	Dahlgren@cccta.org
Gracie A. Davis	ADA Eligibility Administrator Orange County Transportation Authority	550 South Main Street P.O. Box 14184 Orange, CA 92863	gdavis@octa.net

Mobility Action Plan Strategic Implementation Plan

		(310) 848-8561	
Linda Deavens	Deputy Executive Director Paratransit, Inc.	P.O. Box 321100 Sacramento, CA 95823-0401 (916) 429-2009 ext. 302	lindad@paratransit.org
Bruce De Terra	Transit Rep. District 3 Caltrans	2800 Gateway Oaks P.O. Box 911 Sacramento, CA 95901 (916) 274-0614 530-933-0126 Mobile	bruce_de_terra@dot.ca.gov
Bill Doyle	Vice President Information Solutions Group	1201 Main Street, Suite 1980 Columbia, SC 29201 (803) 748-1212- Office (916) 960-7382- CA Office	bdoyle@infosol-group.com
Tom Dumas	Transit Rep. District 10 Caltrans	1976 E. Charter Way P.O. Box 2048 Stockton, CA 95201 (209) 941-1921	tom_dumas@dot.ca.gov
Maureen El Harake	Transit Rep. District 12 Caltrans	3337 Michelson Drive Ste 380 Irvine, CA 92612-8894 (949) 724-2086	maureen_el_harake@dot.ca.gov
Dr. Sue ElHessen	Chair of Policy & Issue Development State Independent Living Council (SILC)	9433 Ives Street Bellflower, CA 90706 (562) 866-5215	selhessen@gmail.com
Charles Fenner	Senior Advisor, DMV	2570 24 th Street, M/S H 104 Sacramento, CA 95818 (916) 657-7020	cfenner@dmv.ca.gov

Mobility Action Plan Strategic Implementation Plan

Jean Finney	Transit Rep. District 4 Caltrans	111 Grand Avenue P.O. Box 23660 Oakland, CA 94623-0660 (510) 286-6196	jean_finney@dot.ca.gov
Sandra Fitzpatrick	Executive Director California Commission on Aging	1300 National Drive, Suite 173 Sacramento, CA 95834 (916) 419-7591	sfitzpatrick@ccoa.ca.gov
Randy Floyd	Executive Director, Antelope Valley Transit Authority	42210 6 th Street West Lancaster, CA 93534 (661) 729-2206	rfloyd@avta.com
Jean Foletta	Transportation Superintendent, ADA and Accessible Services, San Joaquin Regional Transit District (RTD)	Post Office Box 201010 Stockton, CA 95201 (209) 955-8433 (209) 982-1678 Facsimile (209) 993-2352 Cell	jfoletta@sanjoaquinRTD.com
Moira Fordyce, PhD	Clinical Professor of Medicine Stanford University School of Medicine	2728 Monserat Ave Belmont, CA 94002 (650) 691-3507	Moiraf9@gmail.com
Tracey Frost	Caltrans, Division of Mass Transportation	(916) 654-8222	tracey_frost@dot.ca.gov
Evelyn Galindo	Resource Director South Central L.A. Regional Center	650 W. Adams Blvd Los Angeles, CA 90007 (213) 744-8443 (213) 744-8488 Facsimile	EvelynG@sclarc.org
Melody Goodman	Community Program Specialist, Developmental Disabilities Area Board 10	411 N. Central Ave, Suite 620 Glendale, CA 91203 (818) 543- 4631	Melody.goodman@scdd.ca.gov

Mobility Action Plan Strategic Implementation Plan

Cecilia Gonzalez	East Los Angeles Regional Center	1000 S. Fremont Ave Alhambra, CA 91802 (626) 299-4700	cgonzalez@elarc.org
Anicia Gottwig	Associate Transportation Planner, Planning Division, Caltrans D-11	4050 Taylor Street, MS/240 San Diego, CA 92110 (619) 688-0274	Anicia_gottwig@dot.ca.gov
Alane Haynes	Accessible Services Administrator North County Transit District	810 Mission Avenue Oceanside, CA 92054 (760) 966-6607	Ahaynes@nctd.org
Katie Heatly	Outreach – Santa Clara County	926 Rock Avenue, Suite 10 San Jose, CA 95131 (408) 436-2865 (408) 382-0470 Facsimile	katieh@outreach1.org
Kim Hemperly	Senior Analyst, Antelope Valley Transit Authority	42210 6 th Street West Lancaster, CA 93534 (661) 729-2332	khemperly@avta.com
Tom Hicks	CTSA Manager, Monterey-Salinas Transit District	Ryan Ranch Road Monterey, CA 93940 (831) 760-0875	thicks@mst.org
Pam Holland	CS Manager, Public Information Officer Antelope Valley Transit Authority	42210 6 th Street West Lancaster, CA 93534 (661) 729-2222	pholland@avta.com
Claudia Hollis	Branch Manager, Freed Center for Independent Living	508 J Street Marysville, CA 95901 (530) 742-4474	Claudiah@freed.org
Mindy Jackson	Executive Director, El Dorado County Transit Authority	6565 Commerce Way Diamond Springs, CA 95619	mjackson@eldoradotransit.com

Mobility Action Plan Strategic Implementation Plan

(530) 642-5383 x 210

Frances Jacobs	Manager of Community Services East Los Angeles Regional Center	1000 S. Fremont Ave Alhambra, CA 91802 (626) 299-4730	fjacobs@elarc.org
Rex Jackman	Transit Rep. District 1 Caltrans	1656 Union Street P.O. Box 3700 Eureka, CA 95502-3770 (707) 445-6412	rex_jackman@dot.ca.gov
Cindy Johnson	CEO, Mobilitat	1605 Green River Way Green River, Wyoming 82935 (888) 806-6595 (307) 895-3425 (307) 871-4916 cell	Cindy.johnson@ mobilitatsoftware.com
John Kehoe	Chair, Policy Council California Senior Advocates League	1222 Fitch Way Sacramento, CA. 95864 (916) 359-6851	Jkehoe242@aol.com
Clay Kempf	Executive Director, Seniors Council of Santa Cruz and San Benito Counties	234 Santa Cruz Avenue Aptos, CA 95003 (831) 688-0400 ext. 15	clayk@seniorscouncil.org
Beth Kranda	Transit Analyst San Bernardino Associated Governments	1170 W. 3 rd Street, 2 nd Floor, San Bernardino, 92410 (909) 884-8276 (909) 885-4407 Facsimile	bkranda@sanbag.ca.gov
Jessica Lee	Department of Social Services	(916) 654-1785	Jessica.lee@dss.ca.gov

Mobility Action Plan Strategic Implementation Plan

Angus McKenzie-Frazier	Program Specialist II for Planning Riverside County Office on Aging	6296 River Crest Drive, Suite K Riverside, CA 92507 (951) 867-3800	AMcKenzie-Frazier@co.riverside.ca.us
Kimberly Martinson	Executive Director, CAE Transportation Management Association of San Francisco	235 Montgomery St, Suite 665 San Francisco, CA 94104 (415) 392-0210	kmartinson@tmasf.org
Heather Menninger	AMMA Transit Planning	306 Lee Avenue Claremont, CA 91711 (909) 621-3101	heather@ ammatransitplannin.org
Brad Mettam	Transit Rep. District 9 Caltrans	500 S. Main Street Bishop, CA 93514 (760) 872-0691	brad_mettam@dot.ca.gov
Michelle Millette	Transit Rep. District 2 Caltrans	1657 Riverside Drive P.O. Box 496073 Redding, CA 96049-6073 (530) 229-0517	michelle_millette@dot.ca.gov
Jackie Montgomery	Executive Director, CALACT	865 Howe Avenue, Suite 330 Sacramento, CA 95825 (916) 920-8018	jacklyn@calact.org
David Murray	Transit Rep. District 5 Caltrans	50 Higuera Street San Luis Obispo, CA 93401 (805) 549-3168	david_murray@dot.ca.gov
Dan Palumbo	Chief Operating Officer, South County Senior Services	24300 El Toro Rd, Bldg A, Ste. 2000, Laguna Woods, CA 92637 (949) 498-0400	dpalumbo@myagewell.org

Jim Parker

Director of Transportation
Norwalk Transit

12700 Norwalk Blvd.
P.O. Box 1030
Norwalk, CA 90651-1030
(562) 929-5550

jparker@ci.norwalk.ca.us

**Mobility Action Plan Phase I Implementation Study
Mobility Action Plan Project Advisory Committee (MAP PAC)
Participating Agency and Organization Study Listing**

- 1) Department of Developmental Services
- 2) North County Transit District
- 3) Freed Center for Independent Living
- 4) Riverside County Office on Aging
- 5) California Department of Transportation
- 6) Full Access & Coordinated Transportation (FACT)
- 7) San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG)
- 8) Information Solutions Group
- 9) AARP-California
- 10) California Commission on Aging
- 11) Community Bridges
- 12) East Los Angeles Regional Center
- 13) Central Contra Costa Transit Authority
- 14) Department of Motor Vehicles
- 15) Mobilitat Software
- 16) Seniors Council
- 17) Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC)
- 18) My Age Well Senior Services
- 19) Community Access Center
- 20) San Bernardino County Department of Aging & Adult Services
- 21) Leisure World
- 22) Peg Taylor Adult Health Care Center
- 23) State Independent Living Council (SILC)
- 24) South Central Los Angeles Regional Center
- 25) County of San Diego
- 26) Access Services
- 27) California Highway Patrol
- 28) Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA)
- 29) Amma Transit Planning
- 30) Cal ACT
- 31) San Joaquin Regional Transit District
- 32) Department Social Services
- 33) Partnership with Industry
- 34) Norwalk Transit
- 35) California Senior Advocates League
- 36) Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
- 37) Community Choices Project

- 38) Outreach, Inc.
- 39) Antelope Valley Transit Authority
- 40) Transportation Management Association of San Francisco
- 41) Californians for Disability rights, Inc.
- 42) Paratransit, Inc.
- 43) California Department of Aging
- 44) Ride-On Transportation
- 45) Western Contra Costa Transit Authority
- 46) Amador Regional Transit System (ARTS)
- 47) Amador County Transportation Commission (ACTC)
- 48) Developmental Disabilities Area Board 10
- 49) Business Transportation and Housing Agency
- 50) Nevada County Transportation Commission
- 51) El Dorado County Transit Authority
- 52) Stanford University School of Medicine-Moira Fordyce Ph.D
- 53) Modoc County Transportation Comm.
- 54) San Diego Association of Governments
- 55) Pat Piras Consulting
- 56) Epic Branch, California Department of Public Health
- 57) Marin Transit District
- 58) David J. Cyra
- 59) Cheneweth-Foundation
- 60) Personal Assistance Services Council of Los Angeles
- 61) Stanislaus Council of Governments
- 62) Route Match
- 63) Monterey - Salinas Transit District

Unmet Transit Needs Documentation

The first list is the counties classified as ‘unrestricted’. An unrestricted county had a population of less than 500,000 in the federal census year 1970. They are called unrestricted because they have the option of using TDA funding (LTF) for streets & roads if they followed the process under section 99401.5 & 99401.6.

Alpine	Nevada*
Amador*	Placer
Butte	Plumas*
Calaveras	Riverside
Colusa	San Benito
Del Norte	San Bernardino**
El Dorado *	San Joaquin
Fresno	San Luis Obispo
Glenn	Santa Barbara
Humboldt	Santa Cruz*
Imperial	Shasta
Inyo*	Sierra
Kern	Siskiyou
Kings	Solano
Lake*	Sonoma*
Lassen	Stanislaus
Madera	Sutter
Marin*	Tehama
Mariposa	Trinity
Mendocino	Tulare
Merced	Tuolumne
Modoc*	Ventura
Mono	Yolo
Monterey	Yuba
Napa*	

* These counties commit all remaining TDA monies to transit after administration, programming, planning, and bicycle& pedestrian facilities.

** Even though San Bernardino had over 500,000 population in 1970, they qualified for a special exemption in PUC section 99232 as a county having over 4,500 miles of county road.

These counties do not need to submit unmet transit needs documentation because they must use all TDA funding for transit. They are restricted because they had a population greater than 500,000 in 1970.

Alameda
Contra Costa
Los Angeles

Sacramento
San Bernardino
San Diego

San Francisco
San Mateo
Santa Clara

Orange

TDA Working Group

NAME	TITLE	AGENCY
Mary Travis	Manager of Regional and Rail Programs	Ventura County Transportation Commission
Bob Bates	Planner	Metropolitan Transportation Commission
Les Beshears	Planning Coordinator	Fresno Council of Governments Nevada County Transportation
Dan Landon	Executive Director	Nevada County Transportation Commission
Michael Bair	Director of Transit and Rail Programs	San Bernardino Assoc. of Governments
Linda Deavens	Associate Director	Para-transit, Inc.
Chris Schmidt	Senior Transportation Planner	Caltrans, San Diego Office
Tom Dumas	Senior Transportation Planner	Caltrans, Stockton Office
David Brewer	Deputy Director of Highways and Planning	California Transportation Commission
Joshua Shaw	Executive Director	California Transit Association
Jacklyn Montgomery	Executive Director	California Assoc. for Coordinated Transportation
Susan Tsushima	Division of Accounting and Reporting	State Controller's Office
Brent Siemer	Director	Eureka City of Public Works
Darin Grossi	Deputy Director	Tuolumne County Public Works Department
John Jelichich	Executive Director	Trinity County Transportation Commission
Jim Brown	Assistant Director	Sacramento Area Council of Governments

