

**Mobility Action Plan (MAP) Phase I Implementation Study
Project Advisory Committee (PAC)**

Meeting Summary

**January 21, 2009 – 10:00 a.m. to 1:30 p.m.
Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC)
101 – 8th Street, Fishbowl Conference Room
Oakland, CA 94607**

Meeting Attendees

See Attachment A

Meeting Summary

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m. by Kimberly Gayle, MAP PAC Chair. Ms. Gayle welcomed members and introduced the newly appointed Chief of the Division of Mass Transportation, Sharon Scherzinger. In addition, Ms. Gayle introduced Eric Schatmeier, the new Caltrans MAP PAC Project Manager and Interagency Liaison.

Ms. Sharon Scherzinger proceeded via telephone to welcome MAP PAC members, and emphasized the MAP PAC's significant role as a forum for improving transportation for seniors, persons with disabilities and low income individuals.

Lynn Daucher, the MAP PAC Co-Chair representing the Department of Aging, and Therese Knudsen of the meeting host Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) also welcomed members and offered opening remarks.

Eric Schatmeier discussed the October 29th meeting summary indicating that comments and/or revisions to the document from MAP PAC members would be welcome and incorporated as requested. He reminded MAP PAC members to review the summary and comment as needed.

Kimberly Gayle added that the October 29th meeting summary would be posted on Caltrans' Web site. Judith Norman also pointed out that the October 29th meeting summary erroneously stated that comments concerning a recommendation to review Wisconsin's Web Site to understand the concept of mobility management were made by David Wilder rather than David Cyra,. Ms. Norman apologized for this error and indicated that the appropriate corrections were made.

Mr. Schatmeier discussed the Action Plan Matrix. He indicated that the Matrix would continue to be provided as an on-going progress report throughout the project and briefly outlined the current status of items in the Matrix.

Trisha Murakawa was introduced as MAP PAC's new meeting facilitator. Ms. Murakawa's role will be to assist Caltrans in maintaining the focus of meetings and keeping meetings on track.

Following Roll Call, Judith Norman of JNTC briefly outlined the meeting format indicating that updates would be provided at every meeting in three areas: legislative, technical and outreach. She indicated that because of time constraints for this meeting, only the legislative and technical updates would be provided. However, Ms. Norman promised that at future meetings all three updates would be provided. She briefly outlined the meeting presentations.

Legislative Update

Jim Reed of NCSL provided the legislative update and overview, including a revised Human Service Transportation Matrix and updated Glossary of Terms. Nick Farber, NCSL presented the continuing research and Action Item updates on Federal and California statutes related to public transit-human services coordination.

MAP PAC Questions and Comments

Pat Piras commented on slide 10 of the presentation. She pointed out that the agency that established the statute on transit-related requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) was the Department of Transportation (DOT), not the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) as indicated by the supporting material for the slide show. She further asserted that FTA cannot make rules, only DOT can. Nick Farber explained that this information was obtained directly from ADA's published statute and indicated that he would research, and revise information as a result of his findings.

During the discussion of the Transportation Development Act (TDA) a committee member stated that an annual performance audit is required for transit operators who receive funding under the TDA.

Laura Williams suggested that the presentation materials replace the term "handicapped persons" with "persons with disabilities", as this is the current preferred and accepted terminology. Although Mr. Farber understands current terminology for persons with disabilities, he explained that language included in the slide presentation is quoted exactly as it reads in current statutes.

Pam Couch commented that the project team should include detailed information on Article 8 Unmet Transit Needs statutes. Ms. Couch recommended that NCSL access online resources such as the "purple book" to obtain more information on this process and suggested establishing a TDA working Group as part of the citizen participation process. Kimberly Gayle indicated that this issue will be researched as a separate action item if members agree.

Jim Reed promised that NCSL will update their review of the TDA statutes, as requested.

Related to the presentation on the Social Services Transportation Improvement Act (SSTIA), Linda Deavens commented that the acronym, SSTIA (Social Services Transportation Improvement Act) is not universally recognized in California and that SSTIA is commonly referred to as AB 120.

Linda Deavens pointed out that prior to enactment of ADA, TDA Articles 4.5 and 6.5 were used by transportation operators to pay for human service coordination. According to Ms. Deavens, a lack of funding for coordination activities prevents the statutes from being implemented. ADA, she asserted, has therefore become an unfunded mandate. Ms. Deavens suggested that funding should be identified, where available, when developing the Action Plan required by the

SSTIA. She stated that TDA was last updated in 1981. Additional research needs to be conducted on both TDA and SSTIA.

Kimberly Gayle stated that decisions are made locally on use of TDA funds for addressing unmet needs.

Lynn Daucher inquired about the responsibility for enforcement of statutory requirements.

Nick Farber responded that AB 120 formerly had a reporting requirement. However, this statutory requirement was removed from the law in 2002.

Kimberly Gayle explained that Caltrans formerly reported to the State Legislature on the status of AB 120 statewide, but this reporting requirement was repealed 2002. The Department's ability to enforce local compliance of the statute became inconsequential since reporting was no longer required.

Clay Kempf added that CTSAs and Area Agencies on Aging have no funding resources for coordination activities.

One member indicated that some counties in the Bay Area still have not designated CTSAs, and went on to recommend that research be conducted to determine the status of active CTSAs in California and presented to the group in future meetings.

Kimberly Gayle suggested a subcommittee be formed to discuss this issue and stated that, if the committee agreed, an invitation for participation would be sent out.

Judith Norman suggested that a MAP PAC subcommittee formed to discuss study-related legislative issues could address this and other issues.

Drawing from the presentation made by NCSL on Medi-Cal transportation, Lynn Daucher and others discussed the important issue of Medi-Cal reimbursement for local transit agencies to provide non-emergency medical transportation to Medi-Cal recipients in the state. Commenters were concerned that local transit providers cannot receive reimbursement for providing Medi-Cal trips in California.

Judith Norman explained that although many believe transit providers cannot be reimbursed by Medi-Cal, two operators in San Diego County, MTS and NCTD are, in fact, being reimbursed for providing these trips to Medi-Cal recipients.

David Cyra added that San Diego MTS has a voucher program.

Pam Couch commented that Medi-Cal recipients are not entitled to discounted transit fares, but Medi Cal can reimburse them.

Ms. Norman indicated that the issue of Medi-Cal reimbursement for local transit agencies will be the subject of an upcoming MAP PAC meeting.

Nick Farber presented information on the new CMS rule, published in December 2008.

Pat Piras commented that she was not in favor of the new CMS rule. She indicated that it has been protested by numerous transportation agencies in the country and expressed the opinion

that the Federal Coordinating Council for Access and Mobility can sometime create difficulty in aiding paratransit providers in their coordination efforts.. She further suggested doing a pros and cons analysis on this issue.

David Cyra added that if individual states have no funding, they may not want to comply with new CMS rule.

Kim Martinson concurred with the idea of conducting additional research on the CMS rule and making recommendations to MAP PAC.

Jim Reed indicated that NCSL would track the comments on the proposed rule, due Feb. 23 and analyze the final guidance.

Technical Update

Judith Norman presented the Technical Update, including a discussion of the Review of Coordinated Transportation Plans for all regions and a summary of the proposed Interregional Gap Analysis Methodology.

Questions and Comments

Judith Norman presented information on her proposed regional geographic breakdown. She indicated that stakeholder outreach and the interregional gap analysis would be conducted consistent with the proposed geographic areas. She further explained that information from the Coordinated Plans would be used to inform the interregional gap analysis. She also indicated that Plan review would not compare Coordinated Plans between regions, but would be used to provide a statewide view of coordination.

Mike Brown inquired about the level of detail the gap analysis would cover.

Ms. Norman responded that the interregional gap analysis would reflect only information provided in each region's Coordinated Transportation Plan.

Jean Foletta commented that the Coordinated Transportation Plans were written when the funding situation was in better shape. She raised concerns that subsequent funding cuts may make plan findings misleading relative to current conditions.

Kimberly Gayle indicated that the project team would work with each MPO/RTPA to review plans and to develop an understanding of current conditions.

Linda Deavens inquired whether there would be separate answers for every plan. Ms. Norman responded that each individual plan would be reviewed and data from each separate plan would be available, as well as aggregate data on large/small urban areas and rural areas.

Therese Knudsen commented that each county will likely have varying levels of transportation services and inquired about how services at the county-level would be reflected in an analysis. She asked if service data would be broken down by county. Ms. Norman replied that service and other data would be available by county, based upon what is reported in each plan.

David Wilder added that in San Bernardino County there are a number of transportation providers and inquired about how information on these services would be included in the analysis.

Ms. Norman indicated that the Coordinated Plan for San Bernardino does include information on transportation resources in the county from all public operators.

Laura Williams stated that many cities in the Los Angeles area operate significant community-based services and inquired about whether these services are in the Coordinated Plan and would be captured in the analysis.

Ms. Norman responded that transportation services at the city and community level are accounted for in the transportation resources section of the Los Angeles County Coordinated Plan, as all cities participated in the survey of transportation resources during plan development.

Kimberly Gayle commented that the study stakeholder involvement process will assist in understanding the current needs and resources in each region.

Mike Brown emphasized that the interregional gap analysis should accurately reflect the findings of the plan review, and that the review findings should provide an understanding of what plan requirements have been left out of the plans.

David Cyra and a number of other MAP PAC members expressed concerns about the level of detail proposed for the review.

Ms. Norman responded that the project team will provide recommendations based on findings of the analysis. Ms. Norman explained that analysis will be used to develop a profile or snapshot of the coordination environment statewide. The data and information compiled for this activity is provided by each of the plans and guidance from the MPOs/RTPAs.

David Cyra inquired about the number of coordinated plans completed and if there are plans to combine two plan years.

Kimberly Gayle replied that all Coordinated Plans were completed and adopted for 2006, 2007 and 2008. Ms. Gayle added that San Diego County has updated its plan.

Judith Norman explained that the packet's sample Data Base Record was provided for information only and is proposed to capture service information from the plans in only three areas: mode, span of service and frequency.

Therese Knudsen inquired about what information would be collected in the proposed data categories on the matrix (e.g. barrier and gaps). Ms. Norman explained that these categories correspond to the coordination requirements of JARC and New Freedom and that sample data was added only to illustrate the process, and obtain guidance from the MAP PAC on the direction of the analysis.

Kimberly Gayle reinforced the importance of building consensus on this study element. She directed Eric Schatmeier and Judith Norman to work with MAP PAC members to develop an approach that is satisfactory to the group.

Ms. Norman stated that in order to remain on schedule with the study, guidance from the group on the Coordinated Plan review process was needed.

Ms. Gayle recommended that a subcommittee be formed to discuss this issue prior to the March 25th meeting. She instructed Mr. Schatmeier and Ms. Norman to work with MAP PAC to schedule a meeting.

Pam Couch questioned the need for a statewide strategic plan on utilizing transportation funding, as transportation funding is scarce. She also raised concerns about the understanding of mobility management by agencies and organizations.

Kimberly Gayle indicated that Caltrans will not delve into local funding decision processes.

Linda Deavens inquired about sample data shown on Page 9 of the Sample Data Base Report.

Judith Norman explained that the report was constructed as a sample and only serves to illustrate how data from the plans would be tabulated from the raw data.

Kimberly Gayle indicated that Caltrans and the project team will use this review as an opportunity to improve the Coordinated Plan process. She also encouraged input, feedback and guidance from the MAP PAC group in order to develop statewide guidance designed to assist the regions to develop better plans.

Linda Deavens suggested completing the plan and outreach concurrently. Ms. Norman replied that she would adhere to the study schedule and would present the schedule for the stakeholder outreach at the next meeting.

Laura Williams commented on the sample matrix and the fact that potential gaps may not be captured in the analysis. For example, the proposed data matrix should include a way to capture information such as that shuttle vans need to be, but in some cases aren't, wheelchair accessible. She also raised concerns regarding specific Federal regulations, and added that a number of accessible taxi operators are in violation of the regulations.

Ms. Norman replied that she would make changes to the matrix to add the accessibility data item for all mode types, as requested.

Meeting Action Items

1. Correct information on PPT Slide page 10. Change from FTA to DOT.
2. Consider establishing TDA working group as part of the stakeholder involvement process.
3. Update TDA research to include information on Article 8 Unmet Needs statutes
4. Conduct additional historical legislative research on TDA and SSTIA
5. Conduct research on Active CTSA's in California and present and discuss at a future MAP PAC meeting
6. Form a subcommittee to discuss legislative issues including: TDA Article 8 Unmet Needs, CTSA issues and other issues as needed
7. Conduct pros and cons analysis of the recent CMS Rule
8. Conduct comprehensive funding review of California state agency resources
9. Work with MPOs and RTPAs on Coordinated Plan review and stakeholder involvement activities

10. Form technical subcommittee and meet prior to the next MAP PAC meeting on Coordinated Plan review methodology and review elements specific to the Interregional Gap Analysis. Provide report on subcommittee results at March 25th meeting.
11. Revise Coordinated Plan Review Matrix Outline in accordance with subcommittee recommendations.

Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, March 25, 2009 at the City of Norwalk, Los Angeles County in Southern California.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 1:30 p.m.

**MAP PAC Meeting Attendees
Wednesday, January 21, 2009**

In-Person Meeting Attendees

Kimberly Gayle, Chair
Lynn Daucher, Co-Chair
Eric Schatmeier
David Cyra
Maureen Powers
Tighe Boyle
Mike Brown
Linda Deavens
Bill Doyle
Tom Hicks
Therese Knudsen
Pat Piras
Mary Steinert
Jean Foletta

Telephone Meeting Attendees

Megan Juring
Pam Couch
Clay Kempf
Jacklyn Montgomery
Kyle Maetani
Sharon Scherzinger
Shelley Mitchell
Becky Franks
Kim Martinson
Donald Roberts
Virginia Webster
Nina-Weiler Harwell
David Wilder
Laura Williams
Stacy Zwagers

MAP PAC Study Project Team

Judith Norman
Ray Clay
Elyse Kusunoki
Trisha Murakawa
Jim Reed
Nicholas Farber