AGENDA
1:30 pm, Tuesday, February 9, 2010

NOTE LOCATION THIS MONTH:
RTC Offices, 1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz

1. Call to Order

2. Introductions

3. Oral Communications

The Committee will receive oral communications during this time on items not on today’s agenda. Presentations must be within the jurisdiction of the Committee, and may be limited in time at the discretion of the Chair. Committee members will not take action or respond immediately to any Oral Communications presented, but may choose to follow up at a later time, either individually, or on a subsequent Committee agenda.

4. Additions or deletions to consent and regular agendas

CONSENT AGENDA

All items appearing on the consent agenda are considered to be minor or non-controversial and will be acted upon in one motion if no member of the E&D TAC or public wishes an item be removed and discussed on the regular agenda. Members of the E&D TAC may raise questions, seek clarification or add directions to Consent Agenda items without removing the item from the Consent Agenda as long as no other E&D TAC member objects to the change.

5. Approve Minutes from December 8, 2009 meeting (p. 3)

6. Receive Transportation Development Act Revenues Report as of January 2010 (p. 8)

7. Receive RTC Highlights from December 09 and January 2010 (p. 9)

8. Letter from E&D TAC to Metro regarding input on the Draft Title VI Policy/Program and the Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Goals (p. 11)

9. Letter from RTC to Coastal Commission dated 1/21/10 regarding support of Arana Gulch Park Master Plan (p. 12)

10. Information Items to be circulated at meeting:
   a. Easter Seals Project Action Mobility Planning Service
   b. Governor Schwarzenegger appointment to State Rehabilitation Council
   c. Santa Cruz Sentinel article dated 12/20/09 titled: Mayor rebuts ‘facts’ on Arana Gulch Plan

11. Receive Agency Updates (other than items on the regular agenda)
   a. Volunteer Center
b. Community Bridges/CTSA
   - FY 09-10 First Quarter Report and January CTSA Board Report (p. 14)
c. Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (METRO)
   - ParaCruz Operations Status Report: December 09 – January 10 (p. 16)
d. Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
e. Private Operators

REGULAR AGENDA

12. Approve TDA Claim from City of Scotts Valley – SV City staff (p. 29)
13. Provide Input on Updated METRO Website – Metro Staff (p. 34)
14. Receive MORE Program Report – Community Bridges (p. 35)
15. Receive Regional Transportation Plan update – RTC staff (p. 40)
17. Approve E&D TAC Position Update (materials provided at meeting) – RTC Staff
19. Next meeting: Tuesday, April 13, 2010 at 1:30 pm. HOLD MEETING IN MID COUNTY? (items: TDA claims, Ped Safety Work Group Draft Report, Finalize Unmet Needs list)
20. Adjourn

HOW TO REACH US

Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA 95060
Phone: (831) 460-3200 / fax (831) 460-3215
Email: info@sccrtc.org / website: www.sccrtc.org

ACCOMMODATIONS FOR PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES

The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission does not discriminate on the basis of disability and no person shall, by reason of a disability, be denied the benefits of its services, programs, or activities. This meeting location is an accessible facility. If you wish to attend this meeting and require special assistance in order to participate, please contact RTC staff at 460-3200 (CRS 800/735-2929) at least three working days in advance of this meeting to make arrangements. People with disabilities may request a copy of the agenda in an alternative format. As a courtesy to those person affected, please attend the meeting smoke and scent-free.

SERVICIOS DE TRADUCCIÓN/TRANSLATION SERVICES

Si gusta estar presente o participar en esta junta de la Comisión Regional de Transporte del condado de Santa Cruz y necesita información o servicios de traducción al español por favor llame por lo menos con tres días laborables de anticipio al (831) 460-3200 para hacer los arreglos necesarios. (Spanish language translation is available on an as needed basis. Please make advance arrangements (at least three days in advance by calling (831) 460-3200.)
MINUTES-DRAFT

Thursday, December 8, 2009

1. **Call to Order**

   John Daugherty called the meeting to order at 1:40 pm

2. **Introductions**

   **Members Present:**
   - Hal Anjo, Social Service Provider-Seniors (County)
   - Lisa Berkowitz, CTSA-Community Bridges
   - John Daugherty, Metro
   - Veronica Elsea, 3rd District
   - Sally French, Social Service Provider -Disabled (Hope Services)
   - Mike Molesky, Social Service Provider - Disabled
   - Catherine Patterson Valdez, Community Bridges

   **Excused Absences:**
   - Sharon Barbour, 5th District

   **Others Present:**
   - Peg Gallagher, Metro
   - Chris Schreiner, City of Santa Cruz

   **Alternates Present**
   - Sandra Coley, 4th District
   - Patty Talbot, Senior Council
   - April Warnock, Metro

   **Staff Present:**
   - Cathy Judd
   - Rachel Moriconi
   - Karena Pushnik

3. **Oral Communications**

   Hal Anjo announced that he has been appointed the Chair for the Seniors Commission.

   John Daugherty said that the new Headway schedule for Metro is available. He also mentioned that Metro has moved their administration facility from Encinal Street to Vernon Street. He offered his best wishes for a Happy Holiday season to all.

   Catherine Patterson Valdez said that a lease agreement for the new Lift Line location at 17th and Soquel is in the final stages.

   Mike Molesky announced that the Central Coast Alliance for Health successfully transitioned to the Central California Alliance for Health which includes Merced, and that they are now a tri-county Medi-Cal program which serves approximately 183,000 members. The agency expects to benefit from economies of scale by consolidating the operation for three counties.

   Karena Pushnik distributed the E&D TAC by-laws. She appreciated John Daugherty for his duties as Chair to the E&D TAC.
4. Additions and Deletions

None

CONSENT AGENDA

Action: Item 11b was pulled for discussion. The motion (Elsea/Berkowitz) to accept the remainder of the consent agenda passed unanimously.

5. Approved Minutes from August 11 and October 13, 2009 meetings
6. Received Transportation Development Act Revenues Report as of November 09
7. Received RTC Highlights from November 09
8. Received 11/16/09 letter from Save Our Shores regarding support of the Arana Gulch Master Plan
9. Received 11/16/09 Street Smarts article regarding dangers of hybrid car’s lack of engine noise
10. Other Updates - none
11. Received Agency Updates
   a. Volunteer Center
      - FY 09-10 First Quarter Report
   b. Community Bridges/CTSA
      - FY 08-09 Fourth Quarter and Final Reports
      - Veterans and Dialysis Ride Statistics update (pulled from consent agenda)
   c. Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (METRO)
      - ParaCruz Operations Status Report: October-November 09
      - Bus Stop Improvement list
   d. Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
   e. Private Operators

REGULAR AGENDA

11.b Community Bridges Update regarding Veterans and Dialysis Rides

Item 11.b was pulled for discussion from the consent agenda. Catherine Patterson Valdez said that she met with the Santa Cruz Veterans office regarding unmet transportation needs that can be funded through the 5317 grant. Fliers were posted and shuttle information was included in the Veterans Newsletter. Rides are free and initially no appointments were necessary but, due to the demand, appointments now require scheduling. Catherine mentioned that she is working with the Palo Alto Veterans facility on a grant to continue the transportation program beyond the grant funding timeframe.

Catherine said that Community Bridges has provided only 118 Dialysis Rides since the end of August which is less than the amount anticipated. The program could provide about 240 rides per month based on the 5317 grant funds secured. She will meet with METRO and Dialysis staff to discuss transitioning riders from ParaCruz to Lift Line.
Catherine stated that the Out-of-County Medical Transportation Program, formerly coordinated by the American Red Cross, is being run by Lift Line using the same volunteer drivers and dispatchers. Lift Line now covers the cost for drivers to become qualified with background checks and drug tests.

**Action:** The motion (Molesky/Elsea) to approve the status report of this item passed with Catherine Patterson Valdez abstaining.

12. **Approve Transportation Development Act claim from the City of Santa Cruz for Branciforte Creek Bike/Pedestrian Bridge – City of Santa Cruz Staff**

Chris Schneiter supplied an aerial map and summary for the Branciforte Creek Bike/Pedestrian Bridge for the City of Santa Cruz TDA claim. He said that the $75K in TDA funds is to start the project development process, create a concept and initiate the environmental review. He said that improvements to the bridge between the park/county building and the Galleria are not part of this project, but are included in the City of Santa Cruz Bicycle Plan.

**Action:** The motion (Molesky/Elsea) to approve the City of Santa Cruz TDA claim passes unanimously.

13. **Review Metro’s Draft Title VI (Non Discrimination) Program/Policy – Metro Staff**

Peggy Gallagher explained Metro’s Non Discrimination program/policy, the provision for complaint procedure and Federal requirements. She mentioned that the Metro’s advisory committee suggested the inclusion of gender identification and that she would like to go back to the board at their December 18th meeting with comments or suggestions from the E&D TAC and other groups. Sharon Barbour, in absentia, suggested using the term “gender” in place of “sex” and Peggy said that using both the term “sex” and “gender identification” would offer broad coverage. In response to supplying riders with information in Spanish, Peggy said that the threshold dictated by the Federal Government is 1000 people or 5% of the service population and mentioned that language assistance will be available on the new Metro website. Peggy said that she would produce an outline with comments from the public hearing held in November and will report back to E&D TAC in 2010.

**Action:** The motion (Elsea/French) to submit a letter to Metro approving the regulations as written adding appreciation for the response from Metro to the E&D TAC concerns about the accessibility of the complaint forms and accept the recommendation that the category of those protected include gender identification passed with John Daugherty abstaining.

14. **Review Metro’s Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Goals – Metro Staff**

Peggy Gallagher explained the Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Program goals and the relevance to the E&D TAC. She said that the permanent formula set by the State of California for the goal is to take the contracts for the upcoming year and go into the regions contract bids are anticipated. Regions 4 and 5 were chosen that encompass Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Monterey, Napa, San Benito, San Francisco, San Luis Obispo, San Mateo, Santa Barbara, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, Solano and Sonoma counties. The goal was set at 1.73% of $6 Million and calculated by the number of available contracts versus the DBE’s in the service...
area. Peggy clarified that a “disadvantaged” business enterprise is defined per the federal
government, that Metro can not change the definition and that it does not include disabled
people as minorities.

**Action:** The motion (Molesky/Elsea) to support the Disadvantaged Business Enterprise
policy goal passed with John Daugherty abstaining.

15. **Draft 2010 Regional and State Transportation Improvement Program – RTC Staff**

Rachel Moriconi provided a replacement page of proposed amendments to existing projects
recommended for state and regional funding. She gave an overview of the STIP program
saying that the Regional Transportation Commission has the responsibility of programming a
variety of State and Federal funds mandated by the Regional Transportation Improvement
Program (RTIP). She discussed funding proposals for several projects and asked the E&D TAC
for recommendations to the Commission to program the STIP funds.

Discussion included whether to support transferring funds from Metro’s trip planner to bus stop improvements. The Google Trip Planner is not functional for blind people. Metro will consult with Veronica regarding the development of their new website.

For clarification on funding for the HOV lanes Project, Rachel said that the additional funding
is needed to finalize the Environmental document. Rachel also stated that the Commission is
looking at a new rating system called Sustainable Transportation Access Rating System
(STARS) for evaluating transportation projects.

**Action:** The motion (Molesky/French) to hold separate votes for the four STIP
recommendations to the Commission passed as follows:

- *Program $1.1 Million in STIP funds for Broadway/Brommer Multiuse Path through Arana Gulch, passed unanimously*
- *Additional STIP Funds for Highway 1 HOV Lanes, Soquel-Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes and RTC Planning, Programming and Monitoring activities through FY 14/15, passed with John Daugherty abstaining and Michael Molesky voting “no”.*
- *Shift $500K in STIP funds from SCMTD Trip Planner to Bus Shelter and Bus Stop Improvements, passed with John Daugherty abstaining.*
- *Approve proposed amendments to other projects requested by project sponsors, passed unanimously.*

16. **Draft 2010 Legislative Agenda – RTC Staff**

Rachel Moriconi provided an overview stating that the Commission tracks proposed legislation
at the State and Federal level and the RTC adopts a general legislative program during the
year which identifies items on which to act.

Audible pedestrian signals were discussed as a priority item that could be added as an item to
pursue for State funding.

**Action:** The motion (Elsea/Berkowitz) to include audible pedestrian signals as a priority item at the State funding level passed unanimously.

Veronica Elsea gave an update on the Pedestrian Safety Work Group. She informed members that the group met with the 5 jurisdictions and they are drafting a report with information about sidewalk maintenance issues. She said that the group is going into their second round of meetings with the jurisdictions to clarify and gather more information. Veronica said that the group will be helping the jurisdictions with their outreach programs to alert property owners of their responsibilities for out of compliance sidewalks.

18. Nominations for E&D TAC Positions – RTC Staff

Karena Pushnik said that there are 4 positions on the E&D TAC that will expire at the end of 2009. She also noted the vacant positions and said that she has been in contact with Supervisors to help fill those vacancies. Karena also mentioned that there is an item in the by-laws that states if a member is absent for 3 consecutive meetings that they be dropped from the committee. There was general agreement to send letters to Ben Morada and Sharon Barbour informing them of their responsibilities.

*Action: The motion (Daugherty/Elsea) to recommend that the member positions expiring roll over, contingent upon acceptance by the individuals, passed unanimously.*

18.1 Consider Position on Proposed Federal Policy regarding eligibility of pedestrian projects near transit facilities

Karena Pushnik said that the Federal Government considers priority funding for pedestrian and bicycle facilities within 1500 feet of transit facilities and the proposed change in the policy would expand the radius for projects to be eligible for Federal funding to ½ mile for pedestrian projects and 3 miles for bicycle improvements.

*Action: The motion (Elsea/Berkowitz) to recommend addition of this proposal to the Federal Legislative agenda and to recommend the Commission to support the proposal passes with Mike Molesky abstaining.*

19. Adjourned at 3:55 pm

Next meeting: Tuesday, **February 9, 2010** at 1:30 pm. RTC conference room @ 1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz

*Prepared by: Cathy Judd, SCCRTC Staff*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>FY08-09 ACTUAL REVENUE</th>
<th>FY09-10 ESTIMATE REVENUE</th>
<th>FY09-10 ACTUAL REVENUE</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE AS % OF PROJECTION</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE % OF ACTUAL TO PROJECTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JULY</td>
<td>570,200</td>
<td>454,800</td>
<td>454,800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUGUST</td>
<td>760,200</td>
<td>646,170</td>
<td>539,000</td>
<td>-107,170</td>
<td>-16.59%</td>
<td>90.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPTEMBER</td>
<td>634,334</td>
<td>539,184</td>
<td>719,093</td>
<td>179,909</td>
<td>33.37%</td>
<td>104.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTOBER</td>
<td>567,100</td>
<td>499,048</td>
<td>490,500</td>
<td>-8,548</td>
<td>-1.71%</td>
<td>103.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOVEMBER</td>
<td>756,100</td>
<td>665,368</td>
<td>555,900</td>
<td>-109,468</td>
<td>-16.45%</td>
<td>98.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECEMBER</td>
<td>700,859</td>
<td>616,756</td>
<td>625,785</td>
<td>9,029</td>
<td>1.46%</td>
<td>98.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JANUARY</td>
<td>538,600</td>
<td>538,600</td>
<td>465,300</td>
<td>-73,300</td>
<td>-13.61%</td>
<td>97.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEBRUARY</td>
<td>590,700</td>
<td>590,700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARCH</td>
<td>578,624</td>
<td>578,624</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRIL</td>
<td>432,400</td>
<td>432,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY</td>
<td>464,400</td>
<td>464,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE</td>
<td>606,615</td>
<td>606,615</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>7,200,133</td>
<td>6,632,665</td>
<td>3,850,378</td>
<td>-109,548</td>
<td>-1.65%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
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December 2009 Meeting Highlights

Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line Acquisition status report delivered:
The RTC received a status report that most of the due diligence reports are complete and that Sierra Northern Railway was selected as the shortline operator should the Commission decide to purchase the rail right-of-way. The acquisition could be complete by March 2010.

SAFE modernization bill supported:
The RTC approved pursuing legislation that would allow individual SAFE programs to increase funding for their programs and to modernize obsolete language in order to take advantage of new technologies. SAFE programs include Freeway Service Patrol tow trucks, CHP enforcement on the Highway 17 corridor, call boxes, intelligent transportation systems and traveler information system programs.

Public hearing for Regional Transportation Improvement Program scheduled:
The RTC scheduled a public hearing for the January 14, 2010 RTC meeting to receive public input and adopt the 2010 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP). The RTIP lists projects which are scheduled to receive funding and assigns new funding to projects. Only $1.1 million for bicycle and pedestrian projects is anticipated to be available at this time. It is recommended that these funds be assigned to the Broadway-Brommer Multiuse Path.

Notice to Proceed with final design engineering for the Highway 1 Auxiliary Lane project issued:
The RTC authorized the Executive Director to issue a Notice to Proceed with the final design phase of the Highway 1 Auxiliary Lane project, consistent with the original project schedule adopted by the RTC, Caltrans and the California Transportation Commission in April 2007. Construction is anticipated to begin in summer 2011.

Sustainability assessment for Highway 1 HOV Lane project approved:
The RTC approved a contract for the Sustainable Transportation Access Rating System (STARS) to conduct a sustainability assessment for the Highway HOV Lane project. STARS is a point-based rating guideline and planning tool which attempts to integrate capacity enhancement, transit, transportation demand management, transportation system management and land use. The goals of the
STARS approach are to improve transportation access, maximize benefit-cost and reduce transportation climate pollution.

**January 2010 Meeting Highlights**

**2010 Regional Transportation Improvement Program adopted:**
Following a public hearing, the RTC adopted the proposed *2010 Regional Transportation Improvement Program* designating $1.1 million of State Transportation Improvement Program Transportation Enhancement (STIP TE) funds to the Broadway/Brommer Multiuse path. In addition, $1.45 million was programmed to fund the environmental review phase of the Highway 1 HOV Lanes project. Other funding included $925,000 of state funds to required planning, programming and monitoring activities and $500,000 in state funds to the Highway 1 Soquel-Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes project to help defend a challenge to the final environmental documents.

**Advisory committee for Sustainable Transportation Access Rating System approved:**
The RTC approved a technical advisory committee for the Sustainable Transportation Access Rating System (STARS) to assist the RTC and the Highway 1 HOV Lanes project. STARS is a point-based rating guideline and planning tool which attempts to integrate capacity enhancement, transit, transportation demand management, transportation system management and land use.

**2010 State and Federal Legislative Programs adopted:**
The RTC adopted the State and Federal Legislative Programs after receiving a report from its state legislative assistant and an update from staff highlighting key issues affecting transportation. Included in the reports were a proposed “gas tax swap” in the 2010 state budget and the possibility of a federal Jobs for Main Street Act that could fund “ready to go” road and transit projects.

**Report on Highway 1/17 Merge Lanes Landscaping Project delivered:**
The RTC received a presentation describing the planned landscaping for the Highway 1/17 Merge Lanes project. The long awaited landscaping project had been delayed due to budget constraints, but received approval for funding from the California Transportation Commission in October 2009. Among the species of shrubs and trees included in the plan are 400 native coastal redwoods. Work is anticipated to begin in April 2010.

**Transportation Development Act (TDA) Claim for the City of Santa Cruz approved:**
The RTC allocated $75,000 for the Branciforte Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge, $1,000 for the bicycle parking program and $20,000 for bikeway striping and improvements when it approved an Article 8 TDA claim for bike and pedestrian improvement projects for the City of Santa Cruz.
January 5, 2010

Les White, General Manager
Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District
370 Encinal St, #100
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

RE: Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee input on the Draft Title VI Policy/Program and the Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Goals

Dear Mr. White:

The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission’s Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E&D TAC) advises transportation service providers and planning agencies on issues related to the provision of specialized transportation for people with disabilities, seniors and persons with limited means.

At their December 8, 2009 meeting, the E&D TAC took the following actions based on the Metro’s request for input from the committee:

- The E&D TAC approves the draft regulations as written, including the acceptance of gender identification as a protected group. The committee appreciates the response from Metro to the E&D TAC concerns about the accessibility of the complaint forms.

- The E&D TAC supports the Disadvantaged Business Enterprise policy goals.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

John Daugherty, Chair
Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee
January 21, 2010

Bonnie Neely, Chair
California Coastal Commission
45 Fremont Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94105-2219

RE: Support for the Arana Gulch Master Plan

Dear Chair Neely:

The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) staff urges you to approve the City of Santa Cruz and the County of Santa Cruz’s permit request for the Arana Gulch Park Master Plan. The RTC has had a long history of supporting the proposed multi-use trail connecting Broadway and Brommer Streets, which is included in the Arana Gulch Master Plan. The proposed multi-use trail is designed for bicycles, pedestrians, and people with disabilities. Given that the path provides safe access between the City of Santa Cruz and community of Live Oak for such a wide range of users, the RTC’s two citizen advisory committees, the Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee and the Bicycle Committee, are among the many entities in our region that have taken positions of support for this project.

The Arana Gulch Park Master Plan supports several of the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Plan’s Goals and Policies, including policies to increase bicycle and pedestrian use and reduce vehicle miles traveled, fill gaps in the transportation system, support development of multi-use paths, and increase safety.

Please accept the following comments for your consideration:

- On January 14, 2010 the RTC programmed $1.1 million of the region’s share of federal Transportation Enhancement funds to the Broadway-Brommer Bike Path. This was in addition to the $1.8 million previously allocated to this project over a period spanning many years. The RTC has preserved funding for this project even though transportation funding is very limited because of its importance to the regional transportation system.

- RTC staff strongly supports the Bicycle/Pedestrian Path Connection proposed in the Arana Gulch Park Master Plan. This proposed multi-use trail will help fill a critical gap in the regional east-west bicycle and pedestrian network thereby increasing the ease and safety of bicycle and pedestrian trips for transportation purposes in and between our communities. Currently, there is no continuous bike lane/bike path that connects Santa Cruz and the Live Oak/Capitola area. Providing a complete and convenient regional bicycle and pedestrian network increases the opportunity and attractiveness of bicycle and pedestrian trips for transportation purposes. Bicycle/pedestrian facilities have positive, cumulative environmental impacts. Our community’s efforts to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions by promoting alternative transportation would be greatly aided by this project.

- This project also provides “universal access” by enabling all people, including young, old and disabled persons who may have diminished perceptual or ambulatory abilities, to travel safely to destinations served by our public streets and pathway systems.
- We fully support ADA accessibility to wheelchair users that would be provided by the Arana Gulch multi-use path. Of all four greenbelts in Santa Cruz County, only this project would construct trails that allow access for people using mobility devices. The paved trail would also allow persons with disabilities improved access to the coastal zone.

- The Arana Gulch Master Plan trail system is consistent with the concepts for the Monterey Bay Scenic Sanctuary Trail (MBSST) Network which includes interpretive elements as well as transportation elements and recreation elements. The RTC is expected to undertake a Master Plan and Environmental Review process for the MBSST this spring.

The Arana Gulch Master Plan meets the Coastal Commission's goal of improving access to the coastal zone and we strongly encourage you to support this project.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. If you have any questions please feel free to contact me at 831-460-3200.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

George Dondero
Executive Director

cc: RTC
RTC Bicycle Committee
RTC E & D TAC Committee
City of Santa Cruz Public Works – Chris Schneiter
Community Bridges
PROGRAM REPORT to BOARD of DIRECTORS

Program Name: Lift Line / CTSA
Date of Board Meeting: January 12, 2010

A. Services: Specialized Transportation to medical appointments, dining sites and special events.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calendar</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>YTD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Year 09/10</td>
<td>5,632</td>
<td>6,392</td>
<td>5,593</td>
<td>5,504</td>
<td>5,712</td>
<td>6,111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Year 08/09</td>
<td>7,411</td>
<td>6,998</td>
<td>6,012</td>
<td>6,798</td>
<td>5,029</td>
<td>5,428</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37,676</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nov. & Dec. 2009 is not an audited number at this time.

B. Accomplishments:
- For this period Lift Line provided specialized transportation for the Monterey Concours deElegance for specialized transportation.
- Successfully began in-house coordination and operation of the Lift Line/CTSA Volunteer Out of County transportation program to North Bay Medical Locations.
- Provided rides for the ISSP shelter though April 2009 and began providing rides Winter Shelter Program as November 15th.
- Began the 5317-Vetran transportation to Monterey on November 2nd and the 5317-Dialysis rides in August of 2009.
- Signed a new contract with San Andreas Regional Center in July '09 and began transportation for them in December '09, expanding Lift Line's service to the Monterey County.
- Lift Line lost its contract with the Parks Department for parking in September '09. In looking for new a new parking space, we ultimately found a location which enables us to consolidate our maintenance facility, parking and operations office all at one new location. We are still in the process of finalizing a new lease.
- Staff mailed out 199 taxi scrip and medical rides applications from July 1st – December 28th, 2009.

C. Challenges:
- Lift Line / CTSA had to wait to start the 5317-Vetran & Dialysis rides due to State Budget hang-ups.
- Two (2) of Lift Line staff are out on long term medical leave and during this period and another two (2) drivers were out at least 5 weeks on FMLA. Having four (4) drivers out at one time did impact our ability to provide optimal customer service that we strive to provide.
- Lost Park's Department parking lot contract.
- Currently one of our contracts utilizes all but one driver from 8:00 – 10:30 and 2:15 – 4:30 everyday, making it difficult to provide medical transportation for residents with early morning or late afternoon appointments. Our budget does not allow for us to pay another contractor to help with this rides which is affecting local residents.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measures to be Included in Quarterly Reports</th>
<th>TDA Medical</th>
<th>Meals on Wheels</th>
<th>Taxi Scrip</th>
<th>Eldercare</th>
<th>Out-of-County Medical (Red Cross)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July</td>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>Sept</td>
<td>Qtr</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>Aug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unduplicated Passengers per Month</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Passenger Trips (Units of Service) per Month</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>844</td>
<td>1,091</td>
<td>1,199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Incidents per Month</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Accidents per Month</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Mechanical Failures (including lift failures) per Month</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of No-Shows per Month</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Turn downs or Refusals per Month</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Donations per Month</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$60</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Operating Cost per Passenger Trip                        | $36.15| $8.39 | $11.71 | $10.20 | $14.71|
| Operating Cost per Vehicle Service Hour                  | $50.08| $44.89 | $48.70 | 0.88   | 0.51  | 0.47  | 0.52 |
| Passengers per Vehicle Service Hour                      | 1.12  | 6.17  | 4.96   | 0.28   | 0.02  |
| Passengers per Vehicle Service Miles                     | 0.88  | 0.32  | 0.28   | 1.92   | 4.285 | 2.670 | 5.876 |
| Van Mileage per Program                                  | 8,118 | 8,139 | 33,802 | 1,920  | 4,285 | 2,670 | 5,876 |

Footnote: Line 9 includes both tax and Lift Line costs and units of service combined. Lines 10 through 13 reflect Lift Line data only and excludes tax costs and units of service.
DATE: December 18th, 2009
TO: Board of Directors
FROM: April Warnock, Paratransit Superintendent
SUBJECT: METRO PARACRUZ OPERATIONS STATUS REPORT

I. RECOMMENDED ACTION

This report is for information only - no action requested

II. SUMMARY OF ISSUES

- METRO ParaCruz is the federally mandated ADA complementary paratransit program of the Transit District, providing shared ride, door-to-door demand-response transportation to customers certified as having disabilities that prevent them from independently using the fixed route bus.

- METRO assumed direct operation of paratransit services November 1, 2004. This service had been delivered under contract since 1992.

- Discussion of ParaCruz Operations Status Report.

- Attachment A: On-time Performance Chart displays the percentage of pick-ups within the "ready window" and a breakdown in 5-minute increments for pick-ups beyond the "ready window". The monthly Customer Service Reports summary is included.

- Attachment B: Report of ParaCruz’ operating statistics. Performance Averages and Performance Goals are reflected in the Comparative Operating Statistics Table in order to establish and compare actual performance measures, as performance is a critical indicator as to ParaCruz’ efficiency.

- Attachments C, D, E, F, G: ParaCruz Performance Charts display trends in rider-ship and mileage spanning a period of three years. Graph G is a graphical display reporting use of sub-contracted taxi companies for each month.

- Attachment H: Current calendar year’s statistical information on the number of ParaCruz in-person eligibility assessments, including a comparison to past years, since implementation in August of 2002.
III. DISCUSSION

In the month of October 2009, ParaCruz performed 304 fewer rides than October of 2008, which was a record-breaking month with 8766 rides. This difference in the number of rides is directly related to October of 2008 having 23 working/weekdays, and October of 2009 having 22 working/weekdays.

In the Comparative Operating Statistics Reports, call center figures are unavailable due to the district-wide installation of the VOIP telephone system.

IV. FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

NONE

V. ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A: ParaCruz On-time Performance Charts
Attachment B: Comparative Operating Statistics Tables
Attachment C: Number of Rides Comparison Chart
Attachment D: Shared vs. Total Rides Chart
Attachment E: Mileage Comparison Chart
Attachment F: Year To Date Mileage Chart
Attachment G: Daily Drivers vs. Subcontractor Rides Charts
Attachment H: Eligibility Chart
ParaCruz On-time Performance Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>October 2008</th>
<th>October 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total pick ups</td>
<td>8766</td>
<td>8462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent in “ready window”</td>
<td>93.67%</td>
<td>95.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 5 minutes late</td>
<td>2.67%</td>
<td>1.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 10 minutes late</td>
<td>1.71%</td>
<td>.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 to 15 minutes late</td>
<td>.85%</td>
<td>.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 to 20 minutes late</td>
<td>.57%</td>
<td>.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 to 25 minutes late</td>
<td>.19%</td>
<td>.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 to 30 minutes late</td>
<td>.21%</td>
<td>.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 to 35 minutes late</td>
<td>.05%</td>
<td>.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 to 40 minutes late</td>
<td>.05%</td>
<td>.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 or more minutes late</td>
<td>.07%</td>
<td>.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(excessively late/missed trips)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total beyond “ready window”</td>
<td>6.33%</td>
<td>4.05%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the month of October 2009, ParaCruz received two (2) compliments and six (6) Customer Service complaints. Three of complaints were not valid.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Oct 08</th>
<th>Oct 09</th>
<th>Fiscal 08-09</th>
<th>Fiscal 09-10</th>
<th>Performance Averages</th>
<th>Performance Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requested</td>
<td>9374</td>
<td>9198</td>
<td>33,624</td>
<td>33,867</td>
<td>8399</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performed</td>
<td>8766</td>
<td>8462</td>
<td>31,828</td>
<td>31,803</td>
<td>7771</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancels</td>
<td>17.48%</td>
<td>17.84%</td>
<td>16.44%</td>
<td>17.46%</td>
<td>18.2623%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Shows</td>
<td>2.45%</td>
<td>3.21%</td>
<td>3.08%</td>
<td>2.99%</td>
<td>2.61%</td>
<td>Less than 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total miles</td>
<td>57,099</td>
<td>55,276</td>
<td>212,931</td>
<td>207,232</td>
<td>52,540</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Av trip miles</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within ready window</td>
<td>93.67%</td>
<td>95.95%</td>
<td>93.11%</td>
<td>95.71%</td>
<td>94.85%</td>
<td>92.00% or better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excessively late/missed trips</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Zero (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call center volume</td>
<td>6984</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>21,058</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call average seconds to answer</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Less than 2 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hold times less than 2 minutes</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Greater than 90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinct riders</td>
<td>831</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>1,259</td>
<td>1,243</td>
<td>802</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most frequent rider</td>
<td>56 rides</td>
<td>49 rides</td>
<td>184 rides</td>
<td>185 rides</td>
<td>51 rides</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared rides</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
<td>63.7%</td>
<td>62.6%</td>
<td>63.58%</td>
<td>Greater than 60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passengers per rev hour</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>Greater than 1.6 passengers/hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rides by supplemental providers</td>
<td>15.65%</td>
<td>14.94%</td>
<td>9.58%</td>
<td>11.94%</td>
<td>8.98%</td>
<td>No more than 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendor cost per ride</td>
<td>$23.67</td>
<td>$21.60</td>
<td>$22.86</td>
<td>$22.82</td>
<td>$23.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ParaCruz driver cost per ride (estimated)</td>
<td>$23.21</td>
<td>$24.34</td>
<td>$23.63</td>
<td>$23.67</td>
<td>$24.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rides &lt; 10 miles</td>
<td>70.04%</td>
<td>69.88%</td>
<td>70.34%</td>
<td>69.13%</td>
<td>70.06%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rides &gt; 10</td>
<td>29.96%</td>
<td>30.12%</td>
<td>29.66%</td>
<td>30.87%</td>
<td>29.94%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. DISCUSSION

In the month of November 2009, ParaCruz performed 658 more rides than November of 2008. This increase in the number of rides performed reflects the steady growth of use of ParaCruz services.

In the Comparative Operating Statistics Reports, call center figures are unavailable due to the district-wide installation of the VOIP telephone system. The VOIP telephone system reports have been installed, and training is currently underway.

IV. FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

NONE

V. ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A: ParaCruz On-time Performance Charts
Attachment B: Comparative Operating Statistics Tables
Attachment C: Number of Rides Comparison Chart
Attachment D: Shared vs. Total Rides Chart
Attachment E: Mileage Comparison Chart
Attachment F: Year To Date Mileage Chart
Attachment G: Daily Drivers vs. Subcontractor Rides Charts
Attachment H: Eligibility Chart
ParaCruz On-time Performance Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>November 2008</th>
<th>November 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total pick ups</td>
<td>7137</td>
<td>7795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent in “ready window”</td>
<td>96.46%</td>
<td>95.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 5 minutes late</td>
<td>1.56%</td>
<td>2.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 10 minutes late</td>
<td>.92%</td>
<td>1.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 to 15 minutes late</td>
<td>.48%</td>
<td>.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 to 20 minutes late</td>
<td>.27%</td>
<td>.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 to 25 minutes late</td>
<td>.13%</td>
<td>.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 to 30 minutes late</td>
<td>.08%</td>
<td>.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 to 35 minutes late</td>
<td>.06%</td>
<td>.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 to 40 minutes late</td>
<td>.04%</td>
<td>.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 or more minutes late</td>
<td>.01%</td>
<td>.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(excessively late/missed trips)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total beyond “ready window”</td>
<td>3.54%</td>
<td>4.93%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the month of November 2009, ParaCruz received seven (7) Customer Service complaints. Six of the complaints were not valid. One (1) complaint was valid.
### Comparative Operating Statistics This Fiscal Year, Last Fiscal Year through November 2009.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nov 08</th>
<th>Nov 09</th>
<th>Fiscal 08-09</th>
<th>Fiscal 09-10</th>
<th>Performance Averages</th>
<th>Performance Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requested</td>
<td>8047</td>
<td>8646</td>
<td>41,673</td>
<td>42,513</td>
<td>8449</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performed</td>
<td>7137</td>
<td>7795</td>
<td>38,965</td>
<td>39,596</td>
<td>7826</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancells</td>
<td>21.37%</td>
<td>19.38%</td>
<td>17.39%</td>
<td>18.02%</td>
<td>18.09%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Shows</td>
<td>2.51%</td>
<td>4.16%</td>
<td>2.97%</td>
<td>3.06%</td>
<td>2.74%</td>
<td>Less than 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total miles</td>
<td>48,596</td>
<td>50,086</td>
<td>261,528</td>
<td>257,073</td>
<td>52,665</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Av trip miles</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within ready window</td>
<td>96.46%</td>
<td>95.07%</td>
<td>93.69%</td>
<td>95.57%</td>
<td>94.73%</td>
<td>92.00% or better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excessively late/missed trips</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Zero (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call center volume</td>
<td>5902</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>26,960</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call average seconds to answer</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Less than 2 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hold times less than 2 minutes</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Greater than 90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinct riders</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>1,345</td>
<td>1,330</td>
<td>803</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most frequent rider</td>
<td>35 rides</td>
<td>56 rides</td>
<td>201 rides</td>
<td>209 rides</td>
<td>53 rides</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared rides</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>65.1%</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
<td>62.7%</td>
<td>62.94%</td>
<td>Greater than 60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passengers per rev hour</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>Greater than 1.6 passengers/hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rides by supplemental providers</td>
<td>12.76%</td>
<td>16.66%</td>
<td>10.16%</td>
<td>12.87%</td>
<td>9.30%</td>
<td>No more than 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendor cost per ride</td>
<td>$25.35</td>
<td>$21.71</td>
<td>$23.20</td>
<td>$22.39</td>
<td>$22.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ParaCruz driver cost per ride (estimated)</td>
<td>$28.25</td>
<td>$26.29</td>
<td>$24.57</td>
<td>$24.12</td>
<td>$24.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rides &lt; 10 miles</td>
<td>71.19%</td>
<td>69.97%</td>
<td>70.50%</td>
<td>69.30%</td>
<td>69.96%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rides &gt; 10</td>
<td>28.81%</td>
<td>30.03%</td>
<td>29.50%</td>
<td>30.70%</td>
<td>30.04%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TOTAL vs. SHARED RIDES

TOTAL RIDES

SHARED RIDES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>JUL</th>
<th>AUG</th>
<th>SEP</th>
<th>OCT</th>
<th>NOV</th>
<th>DEC</th>
<th>JAN</th>
<th>FEB</th>
<th>MAR</th>
<th>APR</th>
<th>MAY</th>
<th>JUN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 07-08</td>
<td>6826</td>
<td>7157</td>
<td>7462</td>
<td>8447</td>
<td>7237</td>
<td>6899</td>
<td>6847</td>
<td>6777</td>
<td>7005</td>
<td>7959</td>
<td>8299</td>
<td>7262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 08-09</td>
<td>7849</td>
<td>7163</td>
<td>8050</td>
<td>8766</td>
<td>7137</td>
<td>7382</td>
<td>7173</td>
<td>7150</td>
<td>8615</td>
<td>7966</td>
<td>8308</td>
<td>7821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 09-10</td>
<td>7918</td>
<td>7062</td>
<td>8364</td>
<td>8462</td>
<td>7795</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 07-08</td>
<td>3762</td>
<td>3823</td>
<td>4305</td>
<td>5077</td>
<td>4240</td>
<td>3745</td>
<td>3850</td>
<td>4242</td>
<td>4296</td>
<td>4666</td>
<td>5645</td>
<td>4803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 08-09</td>
<td>5094</td>
<td>4219</td>
<td>4495</td>
<td>4942</td>
<td>4909</td>
<td>3725</td>
<td>4647</td>
<td>3666</td>
<td>4578</td>
<td>4138</td>
<td>4722</td>
<td>4415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 09-10</td>
<td>4034</td>
<td>3413</td>
<td>4781</td>
<td>4747</td>
<td>4337</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The chart illustrates the comparison between total rides and shared rides over different fiscal years.
## YEAR TO DATE MILEAGE COMPARISON

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>JUL</th>
<th>AUG</th>
<th>SEP</th>
<th>OCT</th>
<th>NOV</th>
<th>DEC</th>
<th>JAN</th>
<th>FEB</th>
<th>MAR</th>
<th>APR</th>
<th>MAY</th>
<th>JUN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 07-08</td>
<td>45123</td>
<td>92803</td>
<td>141390</td>
<td>195026</td>
<td>243212</td>
<td>286017</td>
<td>334217</td>
<td>378323</td>
<td>424761</td>
<td>476831</td>
<td>530792</td>
<td>572750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 09-09</td>
<td>51320</td>
<td>100012</td>
<td>155835</td>
<td>212831</td>
<td>261528</td>
<td>310340</td>
<td>360287</td>
<td>410771</td>
<td>471186</td>
<td>529283</td>
<td>581698</td>
<td>636901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 09-10</td>
<td>51007</td>
<td>98150</td>
<td>151170</td>
<td>206446</td>
<td>257073</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: [Table Data](#)
### OUT OF DATABASE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Range</th>
<th>UNRESTRICTED</th>
<th>CONDITIONAL</th>
<th>RESTRICTED TRIP BY TRIP</th>
<th>TEMPORARY</th>
<th>VISITOR</th>
<th>DCSD</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/1/2005 to 12/31/2005</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/2006 to 12/31/2006</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/2007 to 12/31/2007</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/2008 to 12/31/2008</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>477</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### INTO DATABASE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Range</th>
<th>UNRESTRICTED</th>
<th>CONDITIONAL</th>
<th>RESTRICTED TRIP BY TRIP</th>
<th>TEMPORARY</th>
<th>VISITOR</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>DENIED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/1/2005 to 12/31/2005</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/2006 to 12/31/2006</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/2007 to 12/31/2007</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/2008 to 12/31/2008</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MONTHLY ASSESSMENTS - 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>UNRESTRICTED CONDITIONAL</th>
<th>RESTRICTED CONDITIONAL</th>
<th>RESTRICTED TRIP BY TRIP</th>
<th>TEMPORARY</th>
<th>DENIED</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JANUARY</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEBRUARY</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARCH</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRIL</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULY</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUGUST</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPTEMBER</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTOBER</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOVEMBER</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NUMBER OF ELIGIBLE RIDERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Active</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>5336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>5315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>4820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>4895</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To: Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee
From: Karena Pushnik, RTC Staff
Re: City of Scotts Valley Article 8 Transportation Development Act Allocation Request for $93,000 for its Citywide Sidewalks Project

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee recommend that the Regional Transportation Commission:

Approve by resolution the City of Scotts Valley’s Article 8 Transportation Development Act Allocation Claim in the amount of $93,000 for its Citywide Sidewalks Project

BACKGROUND

Each year the Regional Transportation Commission allocates Article 8 Transportation Development Account (TDA) funds to local jurisdictions for bikeway and pedestrian projects. TDA funds allocated to a local jurisdiction may be rolled over from one fiscal year to the next. TDA claims with pedestrian amenities must be reviewed by the Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee prior to approval by the Regional Transportation Commission.

DISCUSSION

The City of Scotts Valley is requesting $93,000 in TDA funds for its Citywide Sidewalks Project. This collection of projects will provide sidewalks and/or Americans with Disabilities Act compliant curb ramps on Bean Creek Road, Bine Hill School Road and other locations in the city. A TDA claim for this project is attached (Attachment 1).

City staff will attend the meeting to answer questions.

Attachments

1. Article 8 TDA Allocation Claim 01/19/10 Letter and TDA Claim Form from the City of Scotts Valley
January 19, 2010

The City of Scotts Valley hereby submits a claim for $93,315 in TDA revenues for its Citywide Sidewalks Project. This includes the $4,105 balance of TDA that we request to be redirected from the Glen Canyon Road Sidewalk Project which was completed several years ago. I attest that the information provided in the claim form is accurate.

Sincerely,

Ken D. Anderson
Public Works Director/City Engineer

ca
Transportation Development Act (TDA) – Local Transportation Funds CLAIM FORM for Bike/Ped Projects

If you have any questions about this claim form or would like an electronic copy of the form, please contact the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission at 460-3200.

Project Information

1. Project Title: Citywide Sidewalk Construction and ADA Ramps

2. Implementing Agency: City of Scotts Valley

3. Sponsoring Agency (if different) – must be a TDA Eligible Claimant:

4. TDA funding requested this claim: $93,315

5. Fiscal Year (FY) for which funds are claimed: FY 09/10

6. General purpose for which the claim is made, identified by the article and section of the Act which authorizes such claims: Article 8 Bicycle and/or Pedestrian Facility

7. Contact Person/Project Manager: Majid Yamin
   Telephone Number: 831.438.5854
   E-mail: myamin@scottvalley.org
   Secondary Contact (in event primary not available): Ken Anderson
   Telephone Number: 831.438.5854
   E-mail: kanderson@scottvalley.org

8. Project/Program Description/Scope (use additional pages, if needed, to provide details such as work elements/tasks): Construct sidewalk and/or ADA ramps on Bean Creek Road, Vine Hill School Road and other locations within the City

9. Number of people to be served/anticipated number of users of project/program: Counts unavailable.

10. Project Location/Limits (attach a map and/or photos if available/applicable, include street names):
    Various locations including Bean Creek Road and Vine Hill School Road.

11. Justification for the project. (Why is this project needed? Primary goal/purpose of the project; problem to be addressed; project benefits; importance to the community): To improve safety and reduce congestion.

12. Consistency and relationship with the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) – please reference Project or Policy number: Goal No. 2: Increase mobility.

SV-P20 (Vine Hill School Road Sidewalks; SV-P06 (Citywide Access Ramps); SV-P05 (Citywide Sidewalk Program); SV-P35 (Bean Creek Road)

12-4
13. Measures of performance, success or completion to be used to evaluate project/program:

Increase pedestrian, especially school children, traffic.

14. Impact(s) of project on other modes of travel, if any (ex. parking to be removed): N/A

15. Project Cost/Budget, including other funding sources, and Schedule:

**Capital Projects – OR ATTACH PROJECT BUDGET**

**Project Start Date:** January 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Planning</th>
<th>Environmental</th>
<th>Design/ Engineering</th>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Other *</th>
<th>Contingency</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCHEDULE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Month/Yr) Completion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date /</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Cost/Phase</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$149,315</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$169,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$TDA Requested</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(this claim)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior TDA:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Please describe what is included in "Other":*

16. Preferred Method and Schedule for TDA fund distribution, consistent with the RTC Rules and Regulations (a. 90% prior to completion/10% upon completion; or b. 100% after completion):

17. TDA Eligibility:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement Description</th>
<th>YES/NO?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Has the project/program been approved by the claimant's governing body? Attach resolution or other board action info (capital improvement program, budget, minutes, etc). If &quot;NO,&quot; provide the approximate date approval is anticipated.</td>
<td>Yes, approved at 12/09 mtg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Has this project previously received TDA funding?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. For capital projects, have provisions been made by the claimant to maintain the project or facility, or has the claimant arranged for such maintenance by another agency for the next 20 years?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Has the project already been reviewed by the RTC Bicycle Committee and/or Elderly/Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee? (If &quot;NO,&quot; project will be reviewed prior to RTC approval).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. For &quot;bikeways,&quot; does the project meet Caltrans minimum safety design criteria pursuant to Chapter 1000 of the California Highway Design Manual? (Available on the internet via: <a href="http://www.dot.ca.gov">http://www.dot.ca.gov</a>).</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Documentation to Include with Your Claim:**
All Claims

☐ A letter of transmittal addressed to the SCCRTC Executive Director that attests to the accuracy of the claim and all its accompanying documentation.

☐ Resolution from the TDA Eligible Claimant indicating its role and responsibilities.

Article 8 Bicycle/Pedestrian Claims

☐ Evidence of environmental review for capital projects

__________________________________________________________

Local Agency Certification:

I certify that the information provided in this form is accurate and correct. I understand that if the required information has not been provided this form may be returned and the funding allocation may be delayed.

Signature ___________________________ Title: ___________________________ Date: 1.20.09

This TDA Claim Form has been prepared in accordance with the SCCRTC's Rules and Regulations, and Caltrans TDA Guidebook (http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/MassTrans/State-TDA.html).

\1\0\10\10.11\shared\GRANTS\TDAClaimFormBikePed.doc
Date: 1/18/10

To: Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee

From: Harlan Glatt, Senior Database Administrator
Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District

RE: BETA Testing of Metro Web Site

The Santa Cruz METRO website beta testing (open comment period) is continuing until March 18th, at which time we will switch over to the new site permanently, as well as roll out a redesigned headways, bus stop stickers, and wall posters at transit centers. As designs of those print materials become available, they will be viewable from the beta site and open for public comment as well.

Harlan Glatt will attend the February E&D TAC meeting to provide a brief presentation of the new Metro website.

The E&D TAC is welcome to visit the beta test site at http://beta.scmtd.com (while the old site is still at http://scmtd.com ) prior to the meeting. Instructions are provided when you click the link in the center of the homepage. If you would like assistance or to join the online discussion group and post or deliver your comments directly, call Harlan Glatt (or Cheri Callis).

Harlan Glatt
Senior Database Administrator
Santa Cruz Metro Transit District
hglatt@scmtd.com
(831) 426-4663
Lift Line, as the designated Consolidated Transportation Service Agency for Santa Cruz County, coordinates and directly provides paratransit transportation for low income seniors and disabled residents of the county through various programs funded by local, state and federal funding sources. Lift Line is a bilingual, bicultural transportation service program providing and coordinating transportation for the elderly, disabled, low income population of Santa Cruz County. Lift Line, a division of Community Bridges, has provided transportation services to the special needs community since 1978.

Community Bridges is a family of eight health and human service programs which are supported by centralized governance and administration. The broad reach and integrated structure of our organization enables Community Bridges to efficiently and effectively address community needs.

As identified by the Santa Cruz Regional Transportation Commission’s Transportation Funding Task Force assessment, many of the transportation needs of seniors and disabled individuals are unmet. In addition, low-income residents, many of which live in remote and rural areas, and non-English speaking residents are underserved. In order to better provide transportation needs of underrepresented populations, Community Bridges- Lift Line proposed to implement the Mobility OutReach and Education (MORE) Project.

Through the MORE grant, Lift Line conducted outreach forums and gathered information from underserved residents and identified their transportation needs. With that information, Lift Line is actively addressing new ways of providing transportation for the special needs community. As a continuing effort to brand the “MORE” project target populations, Lift Line has also committed to promoting accessible transportation through the MORE grant by advertising in local print media with print advertising through February 2010.

Reference materials attached to this report document Lift Line’s public workshops and meetings during which discussions with local officials, community leaders and stakeholders were held to review and discuss options and objectives to enhance mobility for underserved residents of the community.

In addition to public workshops and meetings, outreach information regarding the MORE grant project was shared using public service announcements, flyers, mailings, emails and telephone calls, as well as the above-mentioned print advertising.

Unconventional settings were also used to provide outreach and gather data from the underserved target population in order to further discuss and review transportation needs, mobility, reliability, safety, and efficiency of currently available transportation systems. Due to the unanticipated environment in private homes arranged by participating residents, distribution of the metro bus transportation vouchers described in original grant funding language were an expense that was not incurred.

The MORE Grant Project provided an opportunity to further identify our mission to improve mobility and quality of life to the residents of Santa Cruz County. Attached to this summary report is documentation that provides methodology and guidance for increasing the involvement of target population and to further address specific transportation needs as outlined in the MORE Grant Project.
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission  
(Community Bridges Lift Line/CTSA)  
Mobility Outreach & Education (MORE) Project  
DRAFT Final Report

What Was the Need?

The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission conducted a county wide Transportation Funding Task Force (TFTF) and identified several areas of unmet needs for low-income, senior and disabled residents. Through extensive outreach, the TFTF project solicited and received a flood of ideas from the community about transportation problems and possible solutions through community meetings and a workbook available in public forums and on-line and through direct meetings with Task Force members. However, the needs of seniors and disabled individuals were significantly underrepresented in the TFTF outreach mechanisms, in many cases simply because people lacked the financial resources, were unable to obtain specialized rides necessary to attend the workshops, did not have the computer skills necessary to work online or because the workshops were held at night.

Our community has many of the same unmet needs as other communities, especially specialized transportation needs, and these are expected to increase as the population spike known as the “baby boomers,” age. Between 1990 and 2020, Santa Cruz County population over 85 years old is expected to increase substantially. California’s 65 and over population will more than double by 2030, with expectations that specialized transportation needs increase considerably to support seniors who cannot drive anymore.

What Was Our Goal?

The goal of the MORE project was to identify the transportation needs of low income, non-English speaking, underserved, elderly and/or disabled groups, as well as residents in hard-to-serve rural areas. The plan was to conduct community outreach and gather data to identify the transportation needs and methods to improve the mobility, reliability, safety, and efficiency of our current systems.

This project was initiated to create three outcomes:

- Identify unmet transportation issues, if any, for the underserved population, seniors and disabled residents.
- Collaborate with neighborhood planning groups to gather input on final recommendations.
- Complete a set of documents that clearly delineate “best practices” for increasing ways to involve these specific culturally diverse, underserved seniors and disabled residents in the MORE local planning effort.

What Did We Do?

The initial plan for outreach was to coordinate through identified community based groups and organizations at churches, community centers, and family resource centers to arrange follow up meetings. Simultaneously while conducting the MORE study, Lift Line also used already available outreach tools to make connections with organizations, stakeholders and several task force groups. Disappointingly, due to federal level statutes, regulations, and policies, many transportation and human service grant programs funds are restricted to certain service types and they have also been impacted by federal and state budget cuts. As such, many entities did not have the available funds to delegate agency representatives to assist with the MORE outreach process.

Our plan shifted to going directly to the groups that were identified through phone calls to identify the needs per a grant through Agriculture Workers Transportation Program (AWTP) study. Remarkably, the outcome of these calls brought staff into a series of community meetings at a south county Quick Stop, where the store manager coordinated evening meetings after the store closed. As an outcome of the meetings held at Quick Stop – during which we provided handouts, our MORE questionnaires, and our emergency information form – Lift Line staff were invited into homes of residents, many of whom were sharing housing with several families. Lift Line was completely trusted by the residents because their own family members, friends, roommates, and co-workers were helping us coordinate the meetings. During the course of these 139 in-home meetings, Lift Line personnel provided Spanish bi-
lingual/bi-literate assistance to review the questionnaire with those present. This resulted in identifying several targeted transportation needs as well as legal and human service needs. Some of these issues are outlined in the following unmet needs assessment.

When we conducted forums at locations such as Potter’s House ~ Casa del Alfarero, the majority language was an indigenous Oaxaca language and a local pastor translated and we additionally provided both English and Spanish to keep up with the conversations/questions and to keep the sessions efficiently flowing. This same process was used at locations that we were invited to attend where Japanese, Portuguese and other non English languages were spoken.

During this stage of the process flyers were not widely distributed as projected because outreach was done through personal invitations issued to Lift Line staff by the local residents, to neighborhood meetings at private homes. This personal approach eliminated the need to use public transit vouchers, but did increase substantially staff time, which is reflected in the attached worksheet. At these gatherings it was identified that many people could not come together to meet, and we were given their names and phone numbers to call them at a time the resident indicated they would be available. These calls were made at their convenience and helped create and build a culturally respectful relationship between community members and our staff. Throughout this several month project period, we attended meetings and gatherings frequently and received MORE and AWTP questionnaires daily. Lift Line is still being asked to come back to update community members on the outcome from the meetings and their responses to the MORE and AWTP based questionnaire. Lift Line conducted over 150 neighborhood site meetings and another 122 informational and outreach meetings at local service organizations, appointed commissions, government representatives and human service programs.

What Did We Learn?

The customer base of transportation services has expanded greatly. Due to demographic shifts, changing job markets, increased pressure to find alternatives to the single occupancy vehicle and suburban and exurban land use patterns, the transportation needs of the population have changed and increased.

We found that the characteristics of travelers we spoke to include people with disabilities as well as low-income individuals. These groups are interested in using more independent modes of transportation services as well as improving the current system. Several of our workgroups felt generally the transportation services are sometimes fragmented and/or duplicative creating inefficiencies for customers and extra costs for programs needing transportation. Additionally, some of our transit and paratransit services stop at jurisdictional lines, due to funding restrictions and not connect with other modes or jurisdictions.

Professionals in transportation services as well as human services have been able to create transportation options to meet some of the needs of these consumer groups. We all agreed that there is a need to put the pieces of this puzzle together to create a coordinated network of rides that are available for those who need them. Mobility management addresses this need in a relatively non-threatening manner for both traditional public transit and other paratransit and specialized transportation.

Key Issues and Comments from Participants:
- "ParaCruz doesn’t have a vehicle to fit my mobility device."
- "Public transportation buses don’t come on time, including ParaCruz"
- "When I use METRO or ParaCruz and get to my Dr. Appointment late, the doctor’s are really strict and won't see me, then I have to wait for my scheduled pick up to go home. It is really hard on me with my medical issues, and I have to pay for the late ride or get a no show by my name"
- "I make too much money (to qualify) for Lift Line"
- "Allow us to transport baggage such as grocery bags, small suite case"
- "Paratransit riders are looked at as low income, we feel we are looked at as differently"
- "I am permanently disabled but my real disability is income"
- The round trip cost of ParaCruz ($6) is expensive for many people on a fixed income.
- Translation assistance needed for non-English speaking such as Japanese, Chinese, and Oaxaca residents.
- Coordination of general transportation needs
• Need help with on-line grocery orders (also provide subsidy of delivery charges for eligible residents) or other services that help avoid trips altogether
• Senior living communities “Neighborhood Shuttle” coordination. (See Improvement Request section below for details.)
• Need “One call” center for centralized information or travel training for transportation modes other than on public transportation, such as accessibility for various mobility devices to maneuver around shopping centers, medical centers or construction areas.

Unmet Needs: (Some of these needs are also on the County Unmet Needs list)
• Reliable Veteran’s transportation to out of county medical appointments. At this time Santa Cruz shares a mini-van with the northern bay area, this van is old an not reliable and breaks down often, it is also driven by volunteer drivers who often are sick or can not provide service on regular basis. On March 2, 2007 the Under Secretary for Health sent a letter to all Veterans office asking them to coordinate with member agencies of the federally assisted grantees to participate and coordinate with local human service agencies with regards to transportation.
• Availability of transportation services for special needs children attending school. Local school districts have their own buses, not enough to pick up all the students who need a specialized van to get to school on time, the families shared with us, and their children don’t like any more attention drawn to them. Also, schools do not cross district boundary lines this leaves students in foster care, or attending schools out of their district without specialized transportation.
• Availability of county residents who are out of the service area to access our public transportation, including ParaCruz specialized transportation, on weekend to in county medical appointments
• Reliable, safe transportation for farm agriculture workers.
• Transportation for early job hours for day laborers
• Continuing need for accessible paths for mobility devices in bike lanes, parking lots and sidewalks, in the county
• Reliable assistance at destinations such as “door to door” as well as currently needed for riders who need help inside a medical facility from floor to floor. (Volunteers)
• Reliable trained medical advocates, to assist with communication at medical appointments, keeping notes, helping with paperwork, etc.
• Reliable and continuous Paratransit service to cross county boundaries such as into Santa Clara County, or Monterey.

Unmet Need Workshops for Seniors to:
• Assist individuals to maintain healthy lifestyles that will prolong their ability to drive safely
• Provide better outreach so residents know about the AARP Safe Driving class for seniors
• Help individuals make decisions about when to change driving habits or stop driving
• One Call Center would make it easier to coordinate rides for personal and medical appointments
• Create a wallet size card with one number to call for a ride. No matter where the rider goes they could call this number.
• Create a program where people can sell or donate their cars in exchange for a pre-paid “smart card” for specialized transportation rides.
• Allow paratransit services to bill private insurance directly for medical transportation. (It was identified that insurance is available for specialized transportation though, Lift Line has not done a full analysis on this process.
• Establish specialized van for shared rides such as a daily shuttle from senior living communities for shopping, church and events. Drivers could be trained community volunteers
• Promote information about the Volunteer Center Transportation Program
• Reimburse volunteers for driving individuals to the doctors, events or grocery shopping in personal vehicles.
• Revoked license program perhaps a one month bus pass and new training for a person whose license was unexpectedly revoked
Improvement requests for better Public Transportation:

- Public transportation buses don’t come on time, including Para Cruz
- Expand hours of public transportation service
- Expanded transportation hours to accommodate work hours of farm laborers
- Expand geographic service area
- Lower the cost of public transportation
- Expand existing Emergency Ride Home (ERH) programs -- in which employees, at some participating work places, who can use transit can receive taxi voucher in case of an emergency – to seniors, people with disabilities and low income individuals using transit
- Reliable taxi service for scrip users
- Assist in coordinating community “Neighborhood Shuttles” where a bus goes in a more local loop on specific days to the store, mall, medical facilities

Results and What’s Next?

The objective of the initial outreach process was to take community input from residents, and based on their unmet transportation needs, create a county wide and neighborhood MORE (Mobility Out Reach and Education) Program. This project will aid local transportation committees to identify the need for establishing jurisdictional North, Central and South County Mobility Management Centers or one single center.

As identified in the workshops unmet needs analysis, the residents, and their families, who participated in this study referenced a similar county program the Child Care Switchboard where people call for any questions in reference to child care centers. An easily accessible center would provide easy access for one-stop or central information points so clients can find out about and receive help with referrals to transportation options available to them. Some of the residents stated they would be willing to add a one fourth percent property tax increase to support the mobility needs, included in the study, to prepare for future transportation needs of the community as a whole. Please note, that many of the residents who participated in the study are not homeowners. The Mobility Management Centers, as an ongoing process, would identify ways to improve mobility, accessibility, reliability, safety, and/or efficiency of the transportation system for low-income, seniors and people with disabilities.

An important next step would be to educate residents on how to access these choices of transportation services and to be aware of the processes. Additionally, further research is needed from other mobility management centers to determine the best practices to best meet needs of this community.

The MORE data will provide a look at creative approaches to resolving these fragmented systems to a more seamless network with a customer-focused mindset. The information and graphs developed for this study can be used to help implement Mobility Management Centers. This new approach will improve efficiency in County transportation services to this study’s targeted population. Clearly, the need for transportation for target special groups will be an on-going issue, especially while needs will continue to grow due to our aging population and funding remains constrained.

Some changes have already been implemented that were identified through the MORE processes.

- As of September 2009 the local Red Cross and Lift Line, as the CTSA, consolidated duplicate services in dispatching and coordinating out of County medical transportation.
- Another new initiative that arose from the MORE outreach was the development, production and distribution of magnets for participants to senior dining sites with the transportation services phone number. This allows the seniors to schedule their rides directly and not go through the meal sites, as a third party.
- While the Veterans Administration was able to provide limited transportation to facilities in Palo Alto, one need that was clearly identified through the MORE process was the lack of transportation for veterans to the facilities in Monterey County. Lift Line was able to secure a combination of operational funding through the Monterey Peninsula Foundation and the Section 5317 for this needed service. The local Veterans Administration is providing staff support for this operation.

Santa Cruz County has a large agricultural population and while conducting our Agricultural Worker Transportation Program (AWTP) study, concurrently with the MORE study, several of the participants were the same people in both workgroups. We identified some of the unmet needs from the AWTP analysis report and identified in our unmet needs.
AGENDA: February 2010

TO: Bicycle Committee  
Elderly/Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee

FROM: Grace Blakeslee, Karena Pushnik and Rachel Moriconi, Transportation Planners

RE: Draft 2010 Regional Transportation Plan Update

RECOMMENDATION

This item is for information only.

BACKGROUND

The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission is in the process of updating its long range plan, the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The RTP is a state-mandated document that identifies transportation needs in Santa Cruz County over the next twenty-five years. It estimates the amount of funding that will be available and identifies planned transportation projects. The plan is an essential first step in securing funding from federal, state and local sources. As required by state law, the RTP includes discussion of highways, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, transit services, specialized transportation services for seniors and people with disabilities, and airports.

The last update of the RTP was completed in 2005. Due to federal deadlines, the RTC decided to make the 2010 RTP a minor update, with a more extensive update planned for 2012, which will incorporate forthcoming green house gas emissions targets from Senate Bill 375.

DISCUSSION

The Draft 2010 Regional Transportation Plan and Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (DSEIR) are scheduled for release for public review from March 1-April 15, 2010. The documents will be available for review on the Commission’s website, www.scrtc.org/rtp.html. The RTC is tentatively scheduled to hold a public hearing on the draft plan at its April 1, 2010 meeting.

Since the next committee meeting does not take place until immediately before the close of the public comment period, staff wanted to give the committee advanced notice and recommend that committee members be prepared to review and provide comments on the document at its April meeting or before the April 15, 2010 deadline.

What is an RTP?

The RTP consists of four main elements:

1. A description of the existing transportation system
2. Policy Element
3. Action Element
4. Financial Element

The Policy Element identifies the goals, policies, and evaluation measures that guide transportation funding decisions and prioritization. The Action Element of the RTP identifies specific projects, programs, and actions necessary to implement the policy element of the RTP. The Financial Element identifies funds available to the region, lists the additional funding needs over the next 25 years, distinguishes between dedicated and discretionary funds and explains uses of both.

Staff presented and received comments on the draft policies and project lists at committee meetings in 2009.

SUMMARY

The draft 2010 Regional Transportation Plan and Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report will be released for public review before the next committee meeting. Comments on the draft documents are due April 15, 2010. Staff wanted to give the committee advanced notice and recommend that committee members be prepared to review the document once it is released and provide comments on the document at its April meeting or before the April 15, 2010 deadline.
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AGENDA: April 8, 2008

TO: Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee

FROM: Karena Pushnik, RTC Staff

RE: 2009 Annual Report for the Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee and Unmet Needs List Plan

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee:

1. Review the plan and schedule for the 2009 Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E&D TAC) Annual Report; and
2. Provide input into the Draft Unmet Specialized Transportation and Transit Needs List.

BACKGROUND

In general, each year the Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee prepares an Annual Report (Attachment 1) outlining the Committee’s accomplishments from the last year, as well as current and anticipated unmet transportation needs.

The last Annual Report was prepared two years ago for 2007. The RTC decided that an Annual Report and preparation of an Unmet Needs List for 2008 was unnecessary due to the extensive outreach and input associated with the Transportation Funding Task Force activities.

DISCUSSION

Staff plans to provide a draft of the Annual Report for E&D TAC review at the April 13 meeting. The Annual Report will be organized to include the following topics: transportation-related projects; funding oversight; monitoring specialized transportation needs in the region; regional issues and concerns; internal committee issues; unmet transportation needs summary; and list of Unmet Specialized Transportation/Transit Needs.

Also attached, is a draft of the Unmet Needs List. The E&D TAC is requested to review and amend the list at the February meeting, and distribute it to the community to solicit input. Following the February meeting, RTC staff will forward the list to the Metro for their input as well as request input from the community at large. It is recommended that the April E&D TAC meeting be held at a mid-county location to encourage countywide input. The final Unmet Needs list will be adopted by the RTC at their May meeting.

Staff recommends that the E/D TAC review the draft list of unmet specialized transportation needs and suggest revisions at the meeting.

SUMMARY

Comments on the Draft Unmet Needs List are requested from the E&D TAC at the February meeting.

Attachment 1: Draft Unmet Needs List
2008-2010 Draft
Unmet Specialized Transportation/Transit Needs List
Adopted by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission at their 6/5/08 meeting.

Prioritized:
H - High priority items are those items that fill a gap or absence of service. The Metro Transit District noted three levels of High priority with H1 being the top priority.

M - Medium priority items are items that supplement existing service.

L - Low priority items should become more specific and then be planned for, as funds are available.

General

1. H - Expanded publicity necessary about existing specialized transportation services including ADA paratransit, non-ADA paratransit, Medi-Cal rides and mobility training for people to use regular fixed route buses

2. H - Lack of fully accessible transit stops and safe travel paths between senior and/or disabled living areas, medical facilities, educational facilities, employment locations, entertainment venues and bus stops (examples: Capitola Road and side streets, trailer park at Antionelli, Pleasant Care, Santa Cruz County Nursing facility)

3. H - Shortage of transportation services for low-income children and their families, including a lack of transportation for people transitioning from welfare to work

4. H - Availability of accessible local taxi services for seniors and disabled persons

5. M - Expansion of the program currently in place in some jurisdictions to all jurisdictions in the county that requires homeowners to make improvements to sidewalks adjacent to their property when the property is sold

6. M - Amend local taxi ordinances to facilitate improved service to seniors and individuals with disabilities

7. M - Lack of direct paratransit and accessible transit connections with neighboring counties — including Monterey (Pajaro), San Benito, Santa Clara and other points north

Paratransit/Specialized Transportation

8. H - Shortage of projected funding for all specialized transportation (including fixed route, ADA and non-ADA Paratransit) to meet the needs of the senior population expected to increase over the next 15 to 30 years

9. H - Lack of specialized transportation for all areas outside the ADA Paratransit service area, with special emphasis on priority destinations
10. **H** - Need for coordinated and seamless-to-the-public system of specialized transportation with a Mobility Management Center (central information point, one stop shop)

11. **H** - Lack of transportation for dialysis and other medical appointments

12. **M** - Shortage of programs and operating funds for 'same day' medical trips on paratransit

13. **M** - Shortage of programs and operating funds for ‘same day’ non-medical trips

14. **M** - Shortage of volunteer drivers in Santa Cruz County including for the Volunteer Center Transportation Program and the American Red Cross out-of-county medical ride program, particularly in south county

15. **M** - Shortage of affordable special care trips and gurney vehicles for medically fragile individuals and those needing “bed to bed” transportation

16. **M** - Provide transportation for all senior meal sites in the county to meet unmet needs

17. **M** - Assure the availability of taxi scrip to meet need for “safety net” services

18. **L** - Need for the Consolidated Transportation Services Agency to acquire an improved operations and maintenance facility

19. **L** - Need for Ongoing provision of ADA Paratransit certification, provided by Metro, at group facilities

**Transit**

20. **H1** - Complete MetroBase Facility Phase 1 and Phase 2 including Operations Building and Parking Structure.

21. **H2** - Redevelop Santa Cruz Metro Center as mixed use facility incorporating local transit service, regional transit service, paratransit service, intercity bus service, commercial office functions, passenger service facilities, parking facilities, and both market rate and affordable housing and potentially for child-care facilities.

22. **H2** - Funding to maintain existing services and facilities.

23. **H2** - Complete conversion of vehicles (revenue and non-revenue) to alternate fuels.

24. **H2** - Four (4) small fixed route replacement buses for rural service.

25. **H2** - Fourteen (14) full sized fixed route replacement buses.

26. **H2** - Replace thirty-four (34) paratransit vans with larger capacity minibuses.

27. **H2** - Identify and obtain funding to support the future levels of paratransit service that will be required.

28. **H2** - Revise and improve web site to enhance effectiveness and visibility.

29. **H2** - Increased frequencies for Route 71 evening service: 2x an hour until 9PM vs. 7PM.
30. **H2** - Acquire and develop permanent operation and maintenance facility for ParaCruz to accommodate increased fleet size and growth in future service.


32. **H3** - Implement “yield to bus” program to improve travel times.

33. **H3** - Extend highway 17 service to Watsonville.

34. **H3** - Add AM/PM and weekend Route 79 service.

35. **H3** - Purchase Automated Vehicle Location/Passenger (AVL) Counting System.

36. **H3** - Installation of Transponders on all buses for Preemptive Signal Control on major corridors improving traffic flow, reducing travel time, and improving on-time performance.

37. **H3** - Increase weekend Hwy 17 service frequencies.

38. **H3** - Add early morning Route 70 service to Cabrillo College.

39. **H3** - Additional night UCSC service, including Route 20.

40. **H3** - Extension of Highway 17/Amtrak service to UCSC at key times.

41. **H3** - East/West Express service to UCSC and Cabrillo and from Watsonville on 69W.

42. **H3** - Express service between San Lorenzo Valley and both UCSC and Cabrillo College.

43. **H3** - Expanded service between UCSC and Westside University activity centers such as Long Marine Lab, Wrigley building offices, Texas Instruments building offices.

44. **H3** - Service from the UC Inn to UCSC.

45. **H3** - Restore service to Gault Street and La Posada, Blackburn Street (Santa Cruz), Independence Square (Watsonville), simultaneously with the restoration of service to senior residences and centers and areas of high density concentrations of mobility-challenged individuals.

46. **H3** - Expanded service to new residential and commercial areas in Watsonville.

47. **H3** - Continue to improve bus stops to be ADA accessible.

48. **H3** - Purchase Smart Card Fare Collection System, coordinated with Monterey-Salinas Transit, to allow persons with lower incomes to take advantage of multi-ride purchase discounts.

49. **H3** - Route 66 using 7th Avenue inbound and outbound (between Capitola Road and Soquel Avenue).

50. **H3** - Add early morning Route 35 service.

51. **H3** - Implement circulator service in Santa Cruz, Watsonville, Capitola, and Scotts Valley.
52. **H3** - Service from Santa Cruz County to Los Gatos.

53. **H3** - Expanded bicycle capacity and access on the fixed route system by promoting the Folding Bikes in Buses Program to complement the recently-installed 3-position bike racks on all fixed route service.

54. **H3** - Increase window of service on Route 4.

55. **H3** - Equip ParaCruz Vehicles with Mobile Data Terminals (MDT) for improved manifest display, immediate additions/deletions/confirmations to trips, improved communication and tracking.

56. **H** - Continued need for transit to unserved low income and senior housing areas in south county (examples: Stonecreek Apartments in Watsonville and the San Andreas Migrant Labor Camp)

57. **H/M** – Bus and ParaCruz service on all holidays

58. **M** - Expanded evening and late night service on major fixed routes to improve service accessibility.

59. **M** - Implement automated "Reminder" phone call system for ParaCruz to remind riders of scheduled trip in advance, reducing "missed trips" and improve efficiency.

60. **M** - Web-based Trip Planner for fixed route bus service to improve customer trip planning capability via computer.

61. **M** - Automated phone-based trip planning providing Metro route information and or trip planning coordination via telephone and voice activated menu.

62. **M** - Install bus shelters at high usage stops.

63. **M** - Need to prioritize bus shelter replacement based on high usage by seniors and people with disabilities

64. **M** - 30-minute peak frequencies on collector and arterial routes.

65. **M** - Braille and raised numbers on bus signage at bus stops indicating which bus routes are being offered at each stop.

66. **L** - Install audio and video surveillance system for all buses.

67. **L** - Bi-directional service on local Watsonville routes.

68. **L** - Fare free service to students under the age of 13.