

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

**Subcommittee Telephone Meeting Summary
March 9, 2009 – 10:00 a.m. to 11:30 a.m.**

Meeting Attendees

See Attachment A

Meeting Summary

The meeting was conducted via telephone and Eric Schatmeier, the Caltrans Interagency Liaison and MAP Study Project Manager began the meeting at 10:03 a.m. Mr. Schatmeier informed meeting participants that Kimberly Gayle was unable to participate due to scheduling difficulties, and indicated that he would manage the meeting. Mr. Schatmeier requested that those participating on the telephone introduce themselves beginning north to south (i.e. agency/organization location in the State of California, as applicable).

Following self-introductions, Mr. Schatmeier reminded participants that the meeting was being conducted to ensure MAP PAC input and guidance to the project team related to the review of the Coordinated Transportation Plans, specifically focusing upon the interregional gap analysis element of the study.

Pat Piras mentioned that the meeting materials were only sent out to a small group of MAP PAC members, and that some individuals who wanted to participate did not receive the materials. Mr. Schatmeier indicated that Caltrans and the project team will make every effort to ensure that everyone who wants to participate is notified in the future. Mr. Schatmeier then introduced Judith Norman, the project team consultant to present and discuss the PowerPoint (PPT) meeting materials.

Partly in answer to Ms. Piras' concern, Judith Norman clarified that meeting notices were only sent to those members that responded and volunteered their participation, and advised that their personal schedules were compatible with the most frequently selected day and time (morning or afternoon). Most who volunteered for participation on the subcommittee indicated that March 9th in the morning was the best day/time choice. (In future subcommittee meetings, project managers will furnish materials to those who are interested in participating even if they are not available at the preferred time.) Ms. Norman apologized for any inconvenience this process may have caused.

Ms. Norman went on to provide an overview of the RFP work scope relative to MAP Goal 2, subtasks 3.1 – 3.4 and review of the Coordinated Plans for large/small urban and rural areas. Ms. Norman explained that the plan review task was designed to develop two distinct work products: the Statewide Executive Summary and the Interregional Gap analysis. She indicated that development of the Statewide Executive Summary would require a review that is less rigorous than what would be required for the interregional analysis, even though as she explained, some large/small urban and all rural plans do not presently have executive summaries. Ms. Norman indicated that the project team was charged to develop the rural plan

summaries, and that the large/small urban plan summaries that had not been developed would also be prepared by the project team. Linda Deavens inquired about how many large/small urban plans did not have executive summaries. Judith Norman replied that 2 large/small urban properties do not currently have executive summaries included in their plans.

Ms. Norman completed the presentation by posing three questions to members for their input: 1.) What interregional relationships should be analyzed? 2.) What Coordinated Plan elements should be reviewed? and 3.) What level of detail?

Subcommittee Discussion

Linda Deavens suggested that perhaps the project team should first complete the initial review of all the Coordinated Plans as outlined in subtasks 3.1 and 3.2. She added that this review process could offer insight that could assist the subcommittee in developing the parameters for the more in-depth plan review needed for the interregional gap analysis.

Ms. Norman responded that the project team had planned to conduct an initial in-depth review of the plans, which would serve to maintain efficiency in their work efforts.

Mr. Schatmeier indicated his agreement that the plan review associated with development of the Statewide Executive Summary should be completed first, and that the findings were going to be shared with MAP PAC members over the course of the study.

David Cyra concurred that the initial review would likely yield information that would help to define the parameters for the interregional gap analysis.

Ms. Norman re-focused the group, inquiring about its perspectives on what inter-regional relationships, as shown in the Power Point (PPT) should be analyzed, and what elements should be reviewed.

David Cyra indicated that the review should encompass plan information related to needs, resources, barriers and gaps. In addition, Mr. Cyra stated that not many plans have inter-state relationships, but where these relationships surface they could be examined. In addition, he stated that the analysis should touch on all three categories of inter-regional relationships outlined by the project team. Mr. Cyra mentioned that statewide priorities should be developed dependent upon those reflected in Coordinated plans statewide.

Bob Prath suggested that the project team may want to define major regions based upon geography. He also suggested that the decision should be made early to rule out international transportation relationships. He explained that San Diego and Imperial Counties have the busiest international relationships in the state being on the border with Tijuana and Calexico.

Eric Schatmeier indicated that Caltrans may want to re-examine this issue within the context of the work scope. An examination of the local plans would be needed to determine the overall relevance of this issue. He also stated that he appreciated that the issue was raised, but would postpone a decision until more is known.

Laura Williams raised the issue of a potential “disconnect” between laws regarding provision of paratransit ADA service and the service actually reported/operated. Specifically, Ms. Williams’ indicated review of service information provided by the project team from the previous meeting, leads her to believe that there may be a violation of the law because of a “gap” between levels

of service provided by fixed route transit and levels provided by paratransit. Ms. Williams cited the local city example in the Jan. 21st meeting materials developed by the project team.

Judith Norman explained that the data and materials developed for that meeting were examples only and did not necessarily reflect reality.

Ms. Williams indicated that the results of the Coordinated Plan reviews should help to reveal instances when accessible services fall short of requirements. Lack of reporting of needs and resources show gaps.

Ms. Norman acknowledged the need to determine if needs and resources have been reported in the plans. She added that the review of transportation needs and resources in each region is planned. She also said that the plan review is not meant to be punitive, but will provide a statewide view.

Linda Deavens suggested review of every jurisdictions ADA paratransit plan.

Eric Schatmeier acknowledged that the review of the plans could well reveal the results Ms. Williams predicts and that this could be looked at in the interregional gap analysis. He cautioned, however, against suggesting that Caltrans has “oversight responsibility.” over recommendations or service described in local plans. The MAP project team is charged with reviewing local plans and summarizing them in yet another public document.

Ms. Williams agreed that the State need not be punitive but advisory, maintaining accountability and providing training and education..

Mr. Schatmeier agreed and added that the study document will provide a tool to assist all in these efforts.

Ms. Norman inquired about whether there were other comments related to the interregional relationship issue.

Laura Williams commented that some emphasis should be placed on travel to major regional trip generators such as airports. She provided an example of the lack of service for persons with disabilities due to fixed-route service cuts in the East San Gabriel Valley. She stated that persons with disabilities were left with no direct transportation to the airport. She added that regional destinations include airports, hospitals and medical facilities, etc. She noted only commuter buses serve these destinations and that these types of services are typically not accessible.

Jean Foletta stated that non-emergency medical transportation (NEMT) should be explored. She expressed the need to determine what funding resources human service agencies have for transportation. Ms. Foletta raised the issue of the limitations on Medi-Cal in California for public transit agencies. She indicated that her agency could help out and provide trips, if Medi-Cal would be flexible. She pointed out that Florida and other states have different policies that allow these trips to be provided and that these efforts have yielded success.

Linda Deavens inquired about the prospect of not finding sufficient information on interregional gaps in the Coordinated Plans.

Eric Schatmeier responded that if the information is not contained in the plans then the project team will report findings as appropriate.

Ms. Foletta stated that she actively participated in the preparation of the Coordinated Plan for San Joaquin County and that NEMT is a large issue. However, because NEMT is so complex and difficult to understand, the plan does not discuss this issue in-depth. She suggested that smaller regions may also have limited reporting and treatment of this issue in their plans. She inquired about how the project team would go about understanding NEMT within these areas.

Ms. Norman answered that the project team will not only review the plans but will also work closely with MPOs and RTPAs to understand key transportation needs and resources in each region.

Maureen Powers asserted that she had reviewed the Western Contra Costa Transit Authority (WESCAT) Coordinated Plan. She referred participants to Appendix D in the plan which provides a larger, generalized summary of gaps in the region. Ms. Powers suggested that the project team initially consider taking a larger view and developing general categories. She suggested that this might be a better way to go.

Jean Foletta raised a needs-related service issue in the Stockton area. She explained that folks who need to go to Stanford and other regional medical centers for specialized care cannot make the trip. She stated that these trips cannot be provided by fixed-route operators.

David Cyra emphasized the previous issue of being clear on what Medi-Cal is doing on reimbursement for specialized trips. He added that new Medicaid regulations allow some flexibility, but the California may not allow reimbursement because of the size the state and the amount of funding that may be needed. This means that California is probably not providing the same level of service as other states. Gaps in service are caused because of limited funding of these trips. States have flexibility to set policies. Mr. Cyra said that this is a big issue in California.

Eric Schatmeier suggested that, since the MAP will serve as an action plan for the entire State, it might be most productive for the Coordinated plan reviews to identify common interregional gaps and barriers to be reported in the Statewide plan. In that way, recommended actions would have the broadest applicability.

Bob Prath mentioned that the analysis will also inform legislative review.

Judith Norman concurred and explained that the study work tasks are integrated and interrelated.

There being no further questions or comments, Mr. Schatmeier thanked meeting participants hoping that the meeting was as productive for the participants as it had been useful for Caltrans and the project team.

Linda Deavens commented in closing that the revised approach to Coordinated Plan review was better than what was previously proposed.

Meeting Action Items

1. The subcommittee recommended that the project team start with a general review of the coordinated plans to complete the Statewide Executive Summary which will provide information needed to develop additional plan review parameters for developing the interregional gap analysis.
2. The project team will provide status reports on the progress of Coordinated Plan review and development of the Statewide Executive Summary at future MAP PAC meetings.

Next Meeting

The need for additional meetings of this subcommittee is yet to be determined.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 11:12 a.m.

Attachment A

**MAP PAC Meeting Attendees
Monday, March 9, 2009**

Meeting Attendees

Eric Schatmeier
Maureen Powers
Linda Deavens/Mary Steinert
Jean Foletta
Pat Piras
David Cyra
Beth Kranda
Alane Haynes
Bob Prath
Laura Williams

MAP PAC Study Project Team

Judith Norman
Ray Clay