



**VENTURA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION (VCTC)
CITIZEN'S TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE/
SOCIAL SERVICES TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COUNCIL
(CTAC/SSTAC)**

TUESDAY, MAY 14, 2013 -- 1:30 PM – 3:30 PM

County Government Center - Hall of Justice
Cafeteria Pacific Meeting Room
800 South Victoria Avenue, Ventura 93003

- Item # 1.** Call to Order
- Item # 2.** Self Introductions
- Item # 3.** Public Comments for Items Not on the Agenda
- Item # 4.a.** Approval of 3/12/13 Meeting Summary
- #4.b.** Approval of 4/9/13 Meeting Summary
Responsible Staff: Mary Travis
- Item # 5.** Ranking of FY 13/14 Bicycle/Pedestrian Fund Requests (Additional copies of the request packet and evaluation forms will be available at the meeting)
Responsible staff: Mary Travis
- Item # 6** FY 13/14 Draft Findings from the Unmet Transit Needs Public Hearing
Responsible staff: Vic Kamhi
- Item # 7** Chairman's Report
- Item # 8.** Staff Report
- Item # 9.** Committee Member Reports
- Item # 10.** Adjournment

The next meeting will be Tuesday, June 11th - same time and place!

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act and Government Code Section 54954.2, if special assistance is needed to participate in a Commission meeting, please contact the Clerk of the Board at (805) 642-1591 ext 101. Notification of at least 48 hours prior to meeting time will assist staff in assuring that reasonable arrangements can be made to provide accessibility at the meeting.

**CTAC/SSTAC MEETING SUMMARY
March 12, 2013**

Item # 1 CALL TO ORDER

Susan White Wood, VCTC Chair, called the meeting to order at 1:35 PM, and welcomed everyone.

Item # 2 SELF INTRODUCTIONS

The committee members and staff introduced themselves..

Item # 3 PUBLIC COMMENTS (for items not on agenda)

There were no public comments.

Item # 4 REVIEW OF APPROVAL OF 12/11/12 MEETING SUMMARY

The meeting summary was approved as submitted.

Item # 5 REVIEW OF FY 13/14 APPLICATIONS FOR TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT (TDA) ARTICLE 3 BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN FUND APPLICATIONS

Mary Travis, VCTC staff, gave an overview of the schedule and process to evaluate and rank the applications for FY 13/14 TDA Article 3 bicycle/pedestrian funds. About \$638,000 will be available next fiscal year. 15% or about \$96,000 will be deducted and allocated to the cities/County for Class I Bike Trail maintenance. The balance of about \$542,500 will be disbursed to the projects as ranked by CTAC/SSTAC at the May 14th meeting.

Presentations about the applications were then made to the Committee by the cities of Camarillo, Fillmore, Moorpark, Ojai, Oxnard, Port Hueneme, Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks and the County of Ventura. San Buenaventura also submitted a request but could not be at the meeting; they will present at the April meeting instead. Questions about the applications were asked and additional information requested from Fillmore, Ojai, Thousand Oaks and the County; this additional information will be distributed at the April meeting when a general discussion about the applications will take place.

Item # 6 CONCEPTUAL REFINEMENT OF COUNTY TRANSIT PLAN AND INTERCITY SERVICE DELIVERY (Oral Report by Vic Kamhi, VCTC staff)

Because of time constraints, this item will be discussed at a future meeting.

Item # 7 CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

Chair White Wood thanked the committee for attending and urged members to call the cities/County if they have any questions about the Article 3 applications.

Item # 8 STAFF REPORT

There was no staff report.

Item # 9 COMMITTEE MEMBER REPORTS

There were not Committee member reports.

Item # 10 ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 3:45 PM.

CTAC/SSTAC MEETING SUMMARY
April 9, 2013

Item # 1 CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Chair Susan White Wood at 1:35 PM.

Item # 2 SELF INTRODUCTIONS

The committee members and audience introduced themselves.

Item # 3 PUBLIC COMMENTS (for items not on agenda)

There were no public comments.

Item # 4 MARCH 12, 2013 MEETING SUMMARY

The meeting summary was reviewed and approve.

Item # 5 PRESENTATION BY KRISTEN DECAS, CEO, PORT OF HUENEME

Port of Hueneme CEO Kristen Decas presented a summary of activities at the Port of Hueneme. This is the only deep-water port between Los Angeles and Oakland, and is also centrally located in the State. Because of the agricultural shipping in Ventura County, the location of the Port is also ideal for shipping goods. In 2012, the Port was involved in \$7 billion dollars in Goods Movement and Over \$1 billion dollars in economic activity.

The Port just celebrated its' 75th anniversary and is looking forward to operating expanded, and "greener" facilities in the future. Ms. Decas concluded by noting that, because of the success of the first Banana Festival, there will likely be more community based events in the future, and that the public is always invited to take the regular tours of the Port.

Item # 6 OVERVIEW OF FY 13/14 EAST COUNTY TRANSIT PLANS

Shaun Kroes, Moorpark City staff, presented an overview of the plan for the new East County cooperative transit operation. The new cooperative operation will link and better coordinate public bus services in Moorpark, Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks, Camarillo and nearby County unincorporated areas. It will be managed by a Memorandum of Agreement between the involved funding agencies and is expected to provide more local control over transit operations. Service will be guided by annual adoption of a service plan and funding commitment by the same agencies. The goal is better, more cost-effective bus services in the eastern area.

Item # 6 DISCUSSION ABOUT FY 13/14 CITY/COUNTY REQUESTS FOR TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT (TDA) ARTICLE 3 BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN FUNDS

The Committee briefly reviewed the projects under discussion, which will be ranked at the May meeting. Mary Travis, VCTC staff, reported that there will be a competition for the funds and the ranking will determine who gets money next fiscal year. However, she

noted that this is an annual program, and any project(s) not funded can always be submitted in the future. is enough money to support all requests but the projects will be ranked just in case the money doesn't materialize as expected.

Travis distributed a revised claim from the City of Fillmore guaranteeing their 50/50 match for funds. The County also responded to the question about traffic surveys in the El Rio area where their proposed sidewalk project will be implemented. The County said there were not traffic counts in this area but the last Census shows this area to be both low income and with a significant population under 18 or over 65, demonstrating the desperate need for sidewalks for safe pedestrian travel.

Rick Gallegos, San Buenaventura staff, presented the City's application for funding. He passed out detailed maps of the area where the proposed wheelchair curb cuts would be installed and answered questions about the project.

As the Committee discussed their field visits, it was noted that both Thousand Oaks and the County were rushed through their presentations in March because meeting room time constraints. It was suggested that in fairness, calls should be made to both these agencies if there are any questions that were asked before the Committee. As a final comment about the FY 13/14 process, Travis confirmed that there will NOT be any exceptions to the submittal or ranking procedures this year as there were in FY 12/13 when there was sufficient funding to handle exceptions. However, this will not happen again. The projects will be ranked next meeting and ranking forms will be sent out with the May agenda.

Item # 7 CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

Chair White Wood thanked everyone for attending also thanked those who visited the Article 3 request sites. She urged people to contact the cities/county if there were any questions about the article 3 projects.

Item # 8 STAFF REPORT

There was no staff report.

Item # 9 COMMITTEE MEMBER REPORTS

No comments were made.

Item # 10 ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 3:45 PM.



Item # 5
Action

May 14n 2913

TO: CTAC/SSTAC

FROM: VCTC STAFF

SUBJECT: RANK THE FY 13/14 APPLICATIONS FOR TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT (TDA) ARTICLE 3 BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN FUNDS

RECOMMENDATION:

- Using the adopted criteria, rank the applications from cities/County for FY 13/14 TDA Article 3 bicycle/pedestrian funds.

DISCUSSION:

Each year, under Article 3 of the State regulations governing the TDA, two percent of the TDA funds estimated to be available in Ventura County are taken "off the top" of the apportionment and set aside to be claimed for bicycle and pedestrian projects. This Article 3 money is discretionary funding allocated by VCTC according to policies and procedures formulated by CTAC/SSTAC and approved by the Commission.

The FY 13/14 TDA Article 3 fund estimate is a total of \$601,040. This is about \$37,000 less than originally estimated in March. If we continue to allocate about 10% of the funds (or \$60,100) for Class I Bike Trail Maintenance, there will remain \$540,940 for allocation.

Applications for the discretionary funding were received from the County and the cities of Camarillo, Fillmore, Moorpark, Ojai, Oxnard, Port Hueneme, San Buenaventura, Simi Valley and Thousand Oaks. The City of Santa Paula not apply. The applications total \$580,000. A chart summarizing the applications is Attachment # 1.

Use Attachment # 2 as the ranking forms. There is one copy of the form for each applicant - fill in the points you believe are appropriate for that project, using the adopted criteria. Then transfer your total points to the Packet Page I Summary table.

Bring your completed Summary Table and ranking forms (you should have ten of them or one for each applicant) to the meeting or send them to me, and I'll tally the results. If you have any questions, call or just come to the meeting, and assistance will be provided. I will also have extra copies of the application packets for anyone who needs one.

Recommendations approved by the CTAC/SSTAC today will then be presented to the Commission for consideration at their June 7, 2013 meeting.

FINAL**FY 13/14 TDA ARTICLE 3 BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN FUND APPLICATIONS**

AGENCY	ARTICLE 3 REQUEST	PROJECT NAME	OTHER FUNDS	TOTAL FUNDS
Camarillo	\$75,000	Calleguas Creek Bike Trail extension	\$75,000	\$ 150,000
Fillmore	30,000	City Hall pedestrian/ADA sidewalk access	30,000	60,000
Moorpark	30,000	Arroyo Drive Bicycle and Pedestrian Connectivity Study	-0-	30,000
Ojai	40,000	Ojai Valley Bike Trail street crossing safety improvements	10,000	50,000
Oxnard	75,000	Cloyne Street bicycle path and safety improvements	100,000	175,000
Pt. Hueneme	50,000	Ventura Road Bikeway upgrade to Class I standards	50,000	100,000
San Buenaventura	50,000	Downtown Ventura disabled access improvements	240,000	290,000
Simi Valley	75,000	Los Angeles Avenue bike lane and sidewalk	75,000	150,000
Thousand Oaks	55,000	Los Feliz Drive sidewalk	505,000	560,000
County	100,000	El Rio (Alvarado and Collins streets) pedestrian improvements	110,000	210,000
TOTAL	\$ 580,000		\$ 1,195,000	\$1,775,000
<i>Funding Available</i>	<i>\$ 540,940</i>			

May 14, 2013

TO: CTAC/SSTAC MEMERS/ALTERNATES
FROM: MARY TRAVIS, VCTC STAFF
SUBJECT: INSTRUCTIONS FOR ARTICLE 3 PROJECT RANKING FORMS

Here is a summary table for the ranking scores after evaluation of the FY 13/14 TDA Article 3 bicycle/pedestrian projects.

After you score each project on the following individual application forms, total the points awarded at the bottom of the each evaluation sheet. Then transfer the individual scores to the table below:

<u>AGENCY</u>	<u>TOTAL POINTS</u>
CAMARILLO _____	
FILLMORE _____	
MOORPARK _____	
OJAI _____	
OXNARD _____	
PORT HUENEME _____	
SAN BUENAVENTURA _____	
SIMI VALLEY _____	
THOUSAND OAKS _____	
COUNTY OF VENTURA _____	

Attachment # 2A

CAMARILLO PROJECT EVALUATION

1. Matching Funds (Yes or No)		2. Safety (30 points possible)	
<p>This criterion evaluates local support for the proposed project in terms of financial partnership. It is recommended but not mandatory that there be a minimum 50/50 match of the request.</p> <p>Is the City/County willing to match its request at 50 % or greater? If so, extra points should be awarded under #4 Special Considerations.</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>This criterion evaluates how the proposed project will effect safety at existing facilities or improve safety by building new facilities. When describing the project conditions include any accident statistics and how the project will improve or correct the situation.</p> <p>Will the proposed project improve safety or correct an existing safety problem including providing secure parking for bicycles?</p>	
3. Project Readiness (15 points possible)		4. Special Considerations (15 points possible)	
<p>This criterion evaluates deliverability of a proposed project. Please note that, funds not used within two years must be returned for redistribution the following year or a City and/or County may request that the project readiness be reevaluated so that the City and/or County may retain their allocation.</p> <p>Is this a new or continuing project and is the proposed project ready for construction in the fiscal year of allocation? Have past allocations been fully spent?</p>		<p>This criterion is designed to add flexibility and allows cities and/or agencies to be creative and discuss any other ways in which the proposed project will benefit City/County residents, for example, improving air quality, reducing VMT, serving older areas without recent improvements, making major improvements to accessibility and/or to serve lower income residents. When discussing this criterion please be specific!</p> <p>Does the proposed project provide a benefit to City/County residents that has not been discussed elsewhere?</p>	
5. Maintenance of Facility (10 points possible)		6. Connectivity (5 points possible)	
<p>This criterion evaluates whether a proposed project will be maintained at an appropriate level after the project is completed. Please discuss whether the proposed project has a long range maintenance plan associated with it.</p> <p>How will the proposed project be maintained?</p>		<p>This criterion evaluates the proposed project's relationship to regional and/or local planned pathway systems. When discussing this criterion please include an 8 1/2 " x 11" map illustrating the existing plan and the proposed project.</p> <p>Will the proposed project close a missing link in an existing local or regional bike or pedestrian plan?</p>	
7. Involvement of Other Agencies (10 points possible)		8. Traffic Generators (5 points possible)	
<p>This criterion evaluates whether the proposed project has local and/or regional significance. When discussing this issue please list all other agencies involved and their roles.</p> <p>Are any other agencies outside the applicant's jurisdiction involved in planning or constructing any phase of this proposed project?</p>		<p>This criterion evaluates the proposed project's usefulness in serving major traffic generators.</p> <p>Will the proposed project serve major bicycle or pedestrian traffic generators such as schools, libraries, work sites, downtown areas, retail centers, transit nodes?</p>	
9. Expected Utilization Rate (5 points possible)		10. Multi-Modal Interface (5 points possible)	
<p>This criterion evaluates the proposed project's usage. The project should be discussed in terms of the usage as a percentage of the applicant's population or as a percentage of the population the project affects.</p>		<p>This criterion evaluates the proposed project's connectivity to transit modes and other forms of transportation.</p> <p>How will the project encourage multi-modal travel?</p>	

Attachment # 2B

FILLMORE PROJECT EVALUATION

<p>1. Matching Funds (Yes or No)</p>		<p>2. Safety (30 points possible)</p>	
<p>This criterion evaluates local support for the proposed project in terms of financial partnership. It is recommended but not mandatory that there be a minimum 50/50 match of the request.</p> <p>Is the City/County willing to match its request at 50 % or greater? If so, extra points should be awarded under #4 Special Considerations</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>This criterion evaluates how the proposed project will effect safety at existing facilities or improve safety by building new facilities. When describing the project conditions include any accident statistics and how the project will improve or correct the situation.</p> <p>Will the proposed project improve safety or correct an existing safety problem including providing secure parking for bicycles?</p>	
<p>3. Project Readiness (15 points possible)</p>		<p>4. Special Considerations (15 points possible)</p>	
<p>This criterion evaluates deliverability of a proposed project. Please note that, funds not used within two years must be returned for redistribution the following year or a City and/or County may request that the project readiness be reevaluated so that the City and/or County may retain their allocation.</p> <p>Is this a new or continuing project and is the proposed project ready for construction in the fiscal year of allocation? Have past allocations been fully spent?</p>		<p>This criterion is designed to add flexibility and allows cities and/or agencies to be creative and discuss any other ways in which the proposed project will benefit City/County residents, for example, improving air quality, reducing VMT, serving older areas without recent improvements, making major improvements to accessibility and/or to serve lower income residents. When discussing this criterion please be specific!</p> <p>Does the proposed project provide a benefit to City/County residents that has not been discussed elsewhere?</p>	
<p>5. Maintenance of Facility (10 points possible)</p>		<p>6. Connectivity (5 points possible)</p>	
<p>This criterion evaluates whether a proposed project will be maintained at an appropriate level after the project is completed. Please discuss whether the proposed project has a long range maintenance plan associated with it.</p> <p>How will the proposed project be maintained?</p>		<p>This criterion evaluates the proposed project's relationship to regional and/or local planned pathway systems. When discussing this criterion please include an 8 1/2 " x 11 " map illustrating the existing plan and the proposed project.</p> <p>Will the proposed project close a missing link in an existing local or regional bike or pedestrian plan?</p>	
<p>7. Involvement of Other Agencies (10 points possible)</p>		<p>8. Traffic Generators (5 points possible)</p>	
<p>This criterion evaluates whether the proposed project has local and/or regional significance. When discussing this issue please list all other agencies involved and their roles.</p> <p>Are any other agencies outside the applicant's jurisdiction involved in planning or constructing any phase of this proposed project?</p>		<p>This criterion evaluates the proposed project's usefulness in serving major traffic generators.</p> <p>Will the proposed project serve major bicycle or pedestrian traffic generators such as schools, libraries, work sites, downtown areas, retail centers, transit nodes?</p>	
<p>9. Expected Utilization Rate (5 points possible)</p>		<p>10. Multi-Modal Interface (5 points possible)</p>	
<p>This criterion evaluates the proposed project's usage. The project should be discussed in terms of the usage as a percentage of the applicant's population or as a percentage of the population the project affects.</p>		<p>This criterion evaluates the proposed project's connectivity to transit modes and other forms of transportation.</p> <p>How will the project encourage multi-modal travel?</p>	

ATTACHMENT # 2C

MOORPARK PROJECT EVALUATION

<p>1. Matching Funds (Yes or No)</p>		<p>2. Safety (30 points possible)</p>	
<p>This criterion evaluates local support for the proposed project in terms of financial partnership. It is recommended but not mandatory that there be a minimum 50/50 match of the request.</p> <p>Is the City/County willing to match its request at 50 % or greater? If so, extra points should be awarded under #4 Special Considerations</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>This criterion evaluates how the proposed project will effect safety at existing facilities or improve safety by building new facilities. When describing the project conditions include any accident statistics and how the project will improve or correct the situation.</p> <p>Will the proposed project improve safety or correct an existing safety problem including providing secure parking for bicycles?</p>	
<p>3. Project Readiness (15 points possible)</p>		<p>4. Special Considerations (15 points possible)</p>	
<p>This criterion evaluates deliverability of a proposed project. Please note that, funds not used within two years must be returned for redistribution the following year or a City and/or County may request that the project readiness be reevaluated so that the City and/or County may retain their allocation.</p> <p>Is this a new or continuing project and is the proposed project ready for construction in the fiscal year of allocation? Have past allocations been fully spent?</p>		<p>This criterion is designed to add flexibility and allows cities and/or agencies to be creative and discuss any other ways in which the proposed project will benefit City/County residents, for example, improving air quality, reducing VMT, serving older areas without recent improvements, making major improvements to accessibility and/or to serve lower income residents. When discussing this criterion please be specific!</p> <p>Does the proposed project provide a benefit to City/County residents that has not been discussed elsewhere?</p>	
<p>5. Maintenance of Facility (10 points possible)</p>		<p>6. Connectivity (5 points possible)</p>	
<p>This criterion evaluates whether a proposed project will be maintained at an appropriate level after the project is completed. Please discuss whether the proposed project has a long range maintenance plan associated with it.</p> <p>How will the proposed project be maintained?</p>		<p>This criterion evaluates the proposed project's relationship to regional and/or local planned pathway systems. When discussing this criterion please include an 8 1/2 " x 11" map illustrating the existing plan and the proposed project.</p> <p>Will the proposed project close a missing link in an existing local or regional bike or pedestrian plan?</p>	
<p>7. Involvement of Other Agencies (10 points possible)</p>		<p>8. Traffic Generators (5 points possible)</p>	
<p>This criterion evaluates whether the proposed project has local and/or regional significance. When discussing this issue please list all other agencies involved and their roles.</p> <p>Are any other agencies outside the applicant's jurisdiction involved in planning or constructing any phase of this proposed project?</p>		<p>This criterion evaluates the proposed project's usefulness in serving major traffic generators.</p> <p>Will the proposed project serve major bicycle or pedestrian traffic generators such as schools, libraries, work sites, downtown areas, retail centers, transit nodes?</p>	
<p>9. Expected Utilization Rate (5 points possible)</p>		<p>10. Multi-Modal Interface (5 points possible)</p>	
<p>This criterion evaluates the proposed project's usage. The project should be discussed in terms of the usage as a percentage of the applicant's population or as a percentage of the population the project affects.</p>		<p>This criterion evaluates the proposed project's connectivity to transit modes and other forms of transportation.</p> <p>How will the project encourage multi-modal travel?</p>	

ATTACHMENT # 2D

OJAI PROJECT EVALUATION

<p>1. Matching Funds (Yes or No)</p>		<p>2. Safety (30 points possible)</p>	
<p>This criterion evaluates local support for the proposed project in terms of financial partnership. It is recommended but not mandatory that there be a minimum 50/50 match of the request.</p> <p>Is the City/County willing to match its request at 50 % or greater? If so, extra points should be awarded under #4 Special Considerations</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>This criterion evaluates how the proposed project will effect safety at existing facilities or improve safety by building new facilities. When describing the project conditions include any accident statistics and how the project will improve or correct the situation.</p> <p>Will the proposed project improve safety or correct an existing safety problem including providing secure parking for bicycles?</p>	
<p>3. Project Readiness (15 points possible)</p>		<p>4. Special Considerations (15 points possible)</p>	
<p>This criterion evaluates deliverability of a proposed project. Please note that, funds not used within two years must be returned for redistribution the following year or a City and/or County may request that the project readiness be reevaluated so that the City and/or County may retain their allocation.</p> <p>Is this a new or continuing project and is the proposed project ready for construction in the fiscal year of allocation? Have past allocations been fully spent?</p>		<p>This criterion is designed to add flexibility and allows cities and/or agencies to be creative and discuss any other ways in which the proposed project will benefit City/County residents, for example, improving air quality, reducing VMT, serving older areas without recent improvements, making major improvements to accessibility and/or to serve lower income residents. When discussing this criterion please be specific!</p> <p>Does the proposed project provide a benefit to City/County residents that has not been discussed elsewhere?</p>	
<p>5. Maintenance of Facility (10 points possible)</p>		<p>6. Connectivity (5 points possible)</p>	
<p>This criterion evaluates whether a proposed project will be maintained at an appropriate level after the project is completed. Please discuss whether the proposed project has a long range maintenance plan associated with it.</p> <p>How will the proposed project be maintained?</p>		<p>This criterion evaluates the proposed project's relationship to regional and/or local planned pathway systems. When discussing this criterion please include an 8 1/2 " x 11" map illustrating the existing plan and the proposed project.</p> <p>Will the proposed project close a missing link in an existing local or regional bike or pedestrian plan?</p>	
<p>7. Involvement of Other Agencies (10 points possible)</p>		<p>8. Traffic Generators (5 points possible)</p>	
<p>This criterion evaluates whether the proposed project has local and/or regional significance. When discussing this issue please list all other agencies involved and their roles.</p> <p>Are any other agencies outside the applicant's jurisdiction involved in planning or constructing any phase of this proposed project?</p>		<p>This criterion evaluates the proposed project's usefulness in serving major traffic generators.</p> <p>Will the proposed project serve major bicycle or pedestrian traffic generators such as schools, libraries, work sites, downtown areas, retail centers, transit nodes?</p>	
<p>9. Expected Utilization Rate (5 points possible)</p>		<p>10. Multi-Modal Interface (5 points possible)</p>	
<p>This criterion evaluates the proposed project's usage. The project should be discussed in terms of the usage as a percentage of the applicant's population or as a percentage of the population the project affects.</p>		<p>This criterion evaluates the proposed project's connectivity to transit modes and other forms of transportation.</p> <p>How will the project encourage multi-modal travel?</p>	

ATTACHMENT # 2E

OXNARD PROJECT EVALUATION

<p>1. Matching Funds (Yes or No)</p>		<p>2. Safety (30 points possible)</p>	
<p>This criterion evaluates local support for the proposed project in terms of financial partnership. It is recommended but not mandatory that there be a minimum 50/50 match of the request.</p> <p>Is the City/County willing to match its request at 50 % or greater? If so, extra points should be awarded under #4 Special Considerations</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>This criterion evaluates how the proposed project will effect safety at existing facilities or improve safety by building new facilities. When describing the project conditions include any accident statistics and how the project will improve or correct the situation.</p> <p>Will the proposed project improve safety or correct an existing safety problem including providing secure parking for bicycles?</p>	
<p>3. Project Readiness (15 points possible)</p>		<p>4. Special Considerations (15 points possible)</p>	
<p>This criterion evaluates deliverability of a proposed project. Please note that, funds not used within two years must be returned for redistribution the following year or a City and/or County may request that the project readiness be reevaluated so that the City and/or County may retain their allocation.</p> <p>Is this a new or continuing project and is the proposed project ready for construction in the fiscal year of allocation? Have past allocations been fully spent?</p>		<p>This criterion is designed to add flexibility and allows cities and/or agencies to be creative and discuss any other ways in which the proposed project will benefit City/County residents, for example, improving air quality, reducing VMT, serving older areas without recent improvements, making major improvements to accessibility and/or to serve lower income residents. When discussing this criterion please be specific!</p> <p>Does the proposed project provide a benefit to City/County residents that has not been discussed elsewhere?</p>	
<p>5. Maintenance of Facility (10 points possible)</p>		<p>6. Connectivity (5 points possible)</p>	
<p>This criterion evaluates whether a proposed project will be maintained at an appropriate level after the project is completed. Please discuss whether the proposed project has a long range maintenance plan associated with it.</p> <p>How will the proposed project be maintained?</p>		<p>This criterion evaluates the proposed project's relationship to regional and/or local planned pathway systems. When discussing this criterion please include an 8 1/2 " x 11" map illustrating the existing plan and the proposed project.</p> <p>Will the proposed project close a missing link in an existing local or regional bike or pedestrian plan?</p>	
<p>7. Involvement of Other Agencies (10 points possible)</p>		<p>8. Traffic Generators (5 points possible)</p>	
<p>This criterion evaluates whether the proposed project has local and/or regional significance. When discussing this issue please list all other agencies involved and their roles.</p> <p>Are any other agencies outside the applicant's jurisdiction involved in planning or constructing any phase of this proposed project?</p>		<p>This criterion evaluates the proposed project's usefulness in serving major traffic generators.</p> <p>Will the proposed project serve major bicycle or pedestrian traffic generators such as schools, libraries, work sites, downtown areas, retail centers, transit nodes?</p>	
<p>9. Expected Utilization Rate (5 points possible)</p>		<p>10. Multi-Modal Interface (5 points possible)</p>	
<p>This criterion evaluates the proposed project's usage. The project should be discussed in terms of the usage as a percentage of the applicant's population or as a percentage of the population the project affects.</p>		<p>This criterion evaluates the proposed project's connectivity to transit modes and other forms of transportation.</p> <p>How will the project encourage multi-modal travel?</p>	

ATTACHMENT # 2F

PORT HUENEME PROJECT EVALUATION

1. Matching Funds (Yes or No)		2. Safety (30 points possible)	
<p>This criterion evaluates local support for the proposed project in terms of financial partnership. It is recommended but not mandatory that there be a minimum 50/50 match of the request.</p> <p>Is the City/County willing to match its request at 50 % or greater? If so, extra points should be awarded under #4 Special Considerations</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>This criterion evaluates how the proposed project will effect safety at existing facilities or improve safety by building new facilities. When describing the project conditions include any accident statistics and how the project will improve or correct the situation.</p> <p>Will the proposed project improve safety or correct an existing safety problem including providing secure parking for bicycles?</p>	
3. Project Readiness (15 points possible)		4. Special Considerations (15 points possible)	
<p>This criterion evaluates deliverability of a proposed project. Please note that, funds not used within two years must be returned for redistribution the following year or a City and/or County may request that the project readiness be reevaluated so that the City and/or County may retain their allocation.</p> <p>Is this a new or continuing project and is the proposed project ready for construction in the fiscal year of allocation? Have past allocations been fully spent?</p>		<p>This criterion is designed to add flexibility and allows cities and/or agencies to be creative and discuss any other ways in which the proposed project will benefit City/County residents, for example, improving air quality, reducing VMT, serving older areas without recent improvements, making major improvements to accessibility and/or to serve lower income residents. When discussing this criterion please be specific!</p> <p>Does the proposed project provide a benefit to City/County residents that has not been discussed elsewhere?</p>	
5. Maintenance of Facility (10 points possible)		6. Connectivity (5 points possible)	
<p>This criterion evaluates whether a proposed project will be maintained at an appropriate level after the project is completed. Please discuss whether the proposed project has a long range maintenance plan associated with it.</p> <p>How will the proposed project be maintained?</p>		<p>This criterion evaluates the proposed project's relationship to regional and/or local planned pathway systems. When discussing this criterion please include an 8 1/2 " x 11" map illustrating the existing plan and the proposed project.</p> <p>Will the proposed project close a missing link in an existing local or regional bike or pedestrian plan?</p>	
7. Involvement of Other Agencies (10 points possible)		8. Traffic Generators (5 points possible)	
<p>This criterion evaluates whether the proposed project has local and/or regional significance. When discussing this issue please list all other agencies involved and their roles.</p> <p>Are any other agencies outside the applicant's jurisdiction involved in planning or constructing any phase of this proposed project?</p>		<p>This criterion evaluates the proposed project's usefulness in serving major traffic generators.</p> <p>Will the proposed project serve major bicycle or pedestrian traffic generators such as schools, libraries, work sites, downtown areas, retail centers, transit nodes?</p>	
9. Expected Utilization Rate (5 points possible)		10. Multi-Modal Interface (5 points possible)	
<p>This criterion evaluates the proposed project's usage. The project should be discussed in terms of the usage as a percentage of the applicant's population or as a percentage of the population the project affects.</p>		<p>This criterion evaluates the proposed project's connectivity to transit modes and other forms of transportation.</p> <p>How will the project encourage multi-modal travel?</p>	

ATTACHMENT # 2G

SAN BUENAVENTURA PROJECT EVALUATION

<p>1. Matching Funds (Yes or No)</p> <p>This criterion evaluates local support for the proposed project in terms of financial partnership. It is recommended but not mandatory that there be a minimum 50/50 match of the request.</p> <p>Is the City/County willing to match its request at 50 % or greater? If so, extra points should be awarded under #4 Special Considerations</p>	YES	<p>2. Safety (30 points possible)</p> <p>This criterion evaluates how the proposed project will effect safety at existing facilities or improve safety by building new facilities. When describing the project conditions include any accident statistics and how the project will improve or correct the situation.</p> <p>Will the proposed project improve safety or correct an existing safety problem including providing secure parking for bicycles?</p>	
<p>3. Project Readiness (15 points possible)</p> <p>This criterion evaluates deliverability of a proposed project. Please note that, funds not used within two years must be returned for redistribution the following year or a City and/or County may request that the project readiness be reevaluated so that the City and/or County may retain their allocation.</p> <p>Is this a new or continuing project and is the proposed project ready for construction in the fiscal year of allocation? Have past allocations been fully spent?</p>		<p>4. Special Considerations (15 points possible)</p> <p>This criterion is designed to add flexibility and allows cities and/or agencies to be creative and discuss any other ways in which the proposed project will benefit City/County residents, for example, improving air quality, reducing VMT, serving older areas without recent improvements, making major improvements to accessibility and/or to serve lower income residents. When discussing this criterion please be specific!</p> <p>Does the proposed project provide a benefit to City/County residents that has not been discussed elsewhere?</p>	
<p>5. Maintenance of Facility (10 points possible)</p> <p>This criterion evaluates whether a proposed project will be maintained at an appropriate level after the project is completed. Please discuss whether the proposed project has a long range maintenance plan associated with it.</p> <p>How will the proposed project be maintained?</p>		<p>6. Connectivity (5 points possible)</p> <p>This criterion evaluates the proposed project's relationship to regional and/or local planned pathway systems. When discussing this criterion please include an 8 1/2 " x 11" map illustrating the existing plan and the proposed project.</p> <p>Will the proposed project close a missing link in an existing local or regional bike or pedestrian plan?</p>	
<p>7. Involvement of Other Agencies (10 points possible)</p> <p>This criterion evaluates whether the proposed project has local and/or regional significance. When discussing this issue please list all other agencies involved and their roles.</p> <p>Are any other agencies outside the applicant's jurisdiction involved in planning or constructing any phase of this proposed project?</p>		<p>8. Traffic Generators (5 points possible)</p> <p>This criterion evaluates the proposed project's usefulness in serving major traffic generators.</p> <p>Will the proposed project serve major bicycle or pedestrian traffic generators such as schools, libraries, work sites, downtown areas, retail centers, transit nodes?</p>	
<p>9. Expected Utilization Rate (5 points possible)</p> <p>This criterion evaluates the proposed project's usage. The project should be discussed in terms of the usage as a percentage of the applicant's population or as a percentage of the population the project affects.</p>		<p>10. Multi-Modal Interface (5 points possible)</p> <p>This criterion evaluates the proposed project's connectivity to transit modes and other forms of transportation.</p> <p>How will the project encourage multi-modal travel?</p>	

ATTACHMENT # 2H

SIMI VALLEY PROJECT EVALUATION

1. Matching Funds (Yes or No)		2. Safety (30 points possible)	
<p>This criterion evaluates local support for the proposed project in terms of financial partnership. It is recommended but not mandatory that there be a minimum 50/50 match of the request.</p> <p>Is the City/County willing to match its request at 50 % or greater? ? If so, extra points should be awarded under #4 Special Considerations</p>	YES	<p>This criterion evaluates how the proposed project will effect safety at existing facilities or improve safety by building new facilities. When describing the project conditions include any accident statistics and how the project will improve or correct the situation.</p> <p>Will the proposed project improve safety or correct an existing safety problem including providing secure parking for bicycles?</p>	
3. Project Readiness (15 points possible)		4. Special Considerations (15 points possible)	
<p>This criterion evaluates deliverability of a proposed project. Please note that, funds not used within two years must be returned for redistribution the following year or a City and/or County may request that the project readiness be reevaluated so that the City and/or County may retain their allocation.</p> <p>Is this a new or continuing project and is the proposed project ready for construction in the fiscal year of allocation? Have past allocations been fully spent?</p>		<p>This criterion is designed to add flexibility and allows cities and/or agencies to be creative and discuss any other ways in which the proposed project will benefit City/County residents, for example, improving air quality, reducing VMT, serving older areas without recent improvements, making major improvements to accessibility and/or to serve lower income residents. When discussing this criterion please be specific!</p> <p>Does the proposed project provide a benefit to City/County residents that has not been discussed elsewhere?</p>	
5. Maintenance of Facility (10 points possible)		6. Connectivity (5 points possible)	
<p>This criterion evaluates whether a proposed project will be maintained at an appropriate level after the project is completed. Please discuss whether the proposed project has a long range maintenance plan associated with it.</p> <p>How will the proposed project be maintained?</p>		<p>This criterion evaluates the proposed project's relationship to regional and/or local planned pathway systems. When discussing this criterion please include an 8 1/2 " x 11" map illustrating the existing plan and the proposed project.</p> <p>Will the proposed project close a missing link in an existing local or regional bike or pedestrian plan?</p>	
7. Involvement of Other Agencies (10 points possible)		8. Traffic Generators (5 points possible)	
<p>This criterion evaluates whether the proposed project has local and/or regional significance. When discussing this issue please list all other agencies involved and their roles.</p> <p>Are any other agencies outside the applicant's jurisdiction involved in planning or constructing any phase of this proposed project?</p>		<p>This criterion evaluates the proposed project's usefulness in serving major traffic generators.</p> <p>Will the proposed project serve major bicycle or pedestrian traffic generators such as schools, libraries, work sites, downtown areas, retail centers, transit nodes?</p>	
9. Expected Utilization Rate (5 points possible)		10. Multi-Modal Interface (5 points possible)	
<p>This criterion evaluates the proposed project's usage. The project should be discussed in terms of the usage as a percentage of the applicant's population or as a percentage of the population the project affects.</p>		<p>This criterion evaluates the proposed project's connectivity to transit modes and other forms of transportation.</p> <p>How will the project encourage multi-modal travel?</p>	

ATTACHMENT # 21

THOUSAND OAKS PROJECT EVALUATION

1. Matching Funds (Yes or No)		2. Safety (30 points possible)	
<p>This criterion evaluates local support for the proposed project in terms of financial partnership. It is recommended but not mandatory that there be a minimum 50/50 match of the request.</p> <p>Is the City/County willing to match its request at 50 % or greater? ? If so, extra points should be awarded under #4 Special Considerations</p>	YES	<p>This criterion evaluates how the proposed project will effect safety at existing facilities or improve safety by building new facilities. When describing the project conditions include any accident statistics and how the project will improve or correct the situation.</p> <p>Will the proposed project improve safety or correct an existing safety problem including providing secure parking for bicycles?</p>	
3. Project Readiness (15 points possible)		4. Special Considerations (15 points possible)	
<p>This criterion evaluates deliverability of a proposed project. Please note that, funds not used within two years must be returned for redistribution the following year or a City and/or County may request that the project readiness be reevaluated so that the City and/or County may retain their allocation.</p> <p>Is this a new or continuing project and is the proposed project ready for construction in the fiscal year of allocation? Have past allocations been fully spent?</p>		<p>This criterion is designed to add flexibility and allows cities and/or agencies to be creative and discuss any other ways in which the proposed project will benefit City/County residents, for example, improving air quality, reducing VMT, serving older areas without recent improvements, making major improvements to accessibility and/or to serve lower income residents. When discussing this criterion please be specific!</p> <p>Does the proposed project provide a benefit to City/County residents that has not been discussed elsewhere?</p>	
5. Maintenance of Facility (10 points possible)		6. Connectivity (5 points possible)	
<p>This criterion evaluates whether a proposed project will be maintained at an appropriate level after the project is completed. Please discuss whether the proposed project has a long range maintenance plan associated with it.</p> <p>How will the proposed project be maintained?</p>		<p>This criterion evaluates the proposed project's relationship to regional and/or local planned pathway systems. When discussing this criterion please include an 8 1/2 " x 11" map illustrating the existing plan and the proposed project.</p> <p>Will the proposed project close a missing link in an existing local or regional bike or pedestrian plan?</p>	
7. Involvement of Other Agencies (10 points possible)		8. Traffic Generators (5 points possible)	
<p>This criterion evaluates whether the proposed project has local and/or regional significance. When discussing this issue please list all other agencies involved and their roles.</p> <p>Are any other agencies outside the applicant's jurisdiction involved in planning or constructing any phase of this proposed project?</p>		<p>This criterion evaluates the proposed project's usefulness in serving major traffic generators.</p> <p>Will the proposed project serve major bicycle or pedestrian traffic generators such as schools, libraries, work sites, downtown areas, retail centers, transit nodes?</p>	
9. Expected Utilization Rate (5 points possible)		10. Multi-Modal Interface (5 points possible)	
<p>This criterion evaluates the proposed project's usage. The project should be discussed in terms of the usage as a percentage of the applicant's population or as a percentage of the population the project affects.</p>		<p>This criterion evaluates the proposed project's connectivity to transit modes and other forms of transportation.</p> <p>How will the project encourage multi-modal travel?</p>	

ATTACHMENT # 2J

COUNTY OF VENTURA PROJECT EVALUATION

<p>1. Matching Funds (Yes or No)</p>		<p>2. Safety (30 points possible)</p>	
<p>This criterion evaluates local support for the proposed project in terms of financial partnership. It is recommended but not mandatory that there be a minimum 50/50 match of the request.</p> <p>Is the City/County willing to match its request at 50 % or greater? ? If so, extra points should be awarded under #4 Special Considerations</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>This criterion evaluates how the proposed project will effect safety at existing facilities or improve safety by building new facilities. When describing the project conditions include any accident statistics and how the project will improve or correct the situation.</p> <p>Will the proposed project improve safety or correct an existing safety problem including providing secure parking for bicycles?</p>	
<p>3. Project Readiness (15 points possible)</p>		<p>4. Special Considerations (15 points possible)</p>	
<p>This criterion evaluates deliverability of a proposed project. Please note that, funds not used within two years must be returned for redistribution the following year or a City and/or County may request that the project readiness be reevaluated so that the City and/or County may retain their allocation.</p> <p>Is this a new or continuing project and is the proposed project ready for construction in the fiscal year of allocation? Have past allocations been fully spent?</p>		<p>This criterion is designed to add flexibility and allows cities and/or agencies to be creative and discuss any other ways in which the proposed project will benefit City/County residents, for example, improving air quality, reducing VMT, serving older areas without recent improvements, making major improvements to accessibility and/or to serve lower income residents. When discussing this criterion please be specific!</p> <p>Does the proposed project provide a benefit to City/County residents that has not been discussed elsewhere?</p>	
<p>5. Maintenance of Facility (10 points possible)</p>		<p>6. Connectivity (5 points possible)</p>	
<p>This criterion evaluates whether a proposed project will be maintained at an appropriate level after the project is completed. Please discuss whether the proposed project has a long range maintenance plan associated with it.</p> <p>How will the proposed project be maintained?</p>		<p>This criterion evaluates the proposed project's relationship to regional and/or local planned pathway systems. When discussing this criterion please include an 8 1/2 " x 11" map illustrating the existing plan and the proposed project.</p> <p>Will the proposed project close a missing link in an existing local or regional bike or pedestrian plan?</p>	
<p>7. Involvement of Other Agencies (10 points possible)</p>		<p>8. Traffic Generators (5 points possible)</p>	
<p>This criterion evaluates whether the proposed project has local and/or regional significance. When discussing this issue please list all other agencies involved and their roles.</p> <p>Are any other agencies outside the applicant's jurisdiction involved in planning or constructing any phase of this proposed project?</p>		<p>This criterion evaluates the proposed project's usefulness in serving major traffic generators.</p> <p>Will the proposed project serve major bicycle or pedestrian traffic generators such as schools, libraries, work sites, downtown areas, retail centers, transit nodes?</p>	
<p>9. Expected Utilization Rate (5 points possible)</p>		<p>10. Multi-Modal Interface (5 points possible)</p>	
<p>This criterion evaluates the proposed project's usage. The project should be discussed in terms of the usage as a percentage of the applicant's population or as a percentage of the population the project affects.</p>		<p>This criterion evaluates the proposed project's connectivity to transit modes and other forms of transportation.</p> <p>How will the project encourage multi-modal travel?</p>	



May 14, 2013

**MEMO TO: VENTURA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION CITIZEN'S
TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE/SOCIAL SERVICES
TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COUNCIL**

FROM: VICTOR KAMHI, BUS TRANSIT DIRECTOR

**SUBJECT: FISCAL YEAR 2013/14 TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT UNMET TRANSIT
NEEDS DRAFT FINDINGS**

RECOMMENDATION

- Approve the Unmet Transit Needs Findings.
- Adopt Resolution NO. 2013-XX

BACKGROUND

VCTC has been designated by the State as the Transportation Planning Agency (TPA) for Ventura County. One of the TPA responsibilities is administration of the Transportation Development Act (TDA) which is a major source of transportation funding for the cities and County of Ventura.

Each year, Public Utilities Code (PUC) Section 99401.5 (c) requires the transportation planning agency (VCTC) to hold at least one public hearing pursuant to Section 99238.5 to solicit comments on the Unmet Transit Needs that may exist within the jurisdictions and that may be reasonable to meet by establishing or contracting for new public transportation, or specialized transportation, or by expanding existing services.

All Unmet Transit Needs that are reasonable to meet must be funded before any allocation is made from TDA funds to the cities/County for streets and roads pursuant to PUC Section 99401.5 (e). Under Section 99238 (c) (2), the Public Utilities Code specifies that the area's social service transportation advisory council, the Citizen's Transportation Advisory Committee/Social Service Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC/SSTAC) in our county, has the responsibility to participate in the annual process and must review and recommend action by VCTC on the findings. While other VCTC advisory committees (such as TRANSCOM) may review the findings, this is done at the discretion of VCTC and is not required by statute. A panel consisting of a number of the VCTC Commissioners is appointed annually by the VCTC Chairman to act as the hearing board. The full VCTC then considers all the input from these sources and adopts the findings.

According to the California Public Utilities Code (PUC) Section 99401.5 (d) the Commission must find by adopting a resolution that either:

- There are no Unmet Transit Needs;

- There are no Unmet Transit Needs that are reasonable to meet; or,
- There are Unmet Transit Needs, including needs that are reasonable to meet.

The resolution approving the findings must include information that provides the basis for the Commission decision. In accordance with PUC Section 99401.5 (c) the Commission adopted definitions of “Unmet Transit Need” and “Reasonable to Meet” at the January 5, 1996 VCTC meeting and reaffirmed these definitions at its December 7, 2012 meeting.

The VCTC held its public hearing on transit needs for FY (Fiscal Year) 2012/13 on February 4, 2013 at the Camarillo City Council Chambers. Approximately 19 people attended the meeting, with the VCTC Hearing Board consisting of Commissioners Sharkey, Long, Fernandez, and White. Ten people testified at the hearing and some supplemental written comments, as well as several written statements were submitted. A total of sixteen persons had submitted written/e-mailed, or telephoned testimony, which staff summarized for the record. VCTC also held two evening “listening sessions” at which staff took public comments. The evening session in Oxnard on January 24th had five people attend and comment, while the evening session in Moorpark on January 23rd had eight persons attend. VCTC and local transit staffs also attended both evening sessions and the hearing. VCTC also attended two community meetings, one in Fillmore and one in Santa Paula, to obtain community input.

The Unmet Transit Needs public comment period was open through February 11, 2013. By the time the hearing was closed, 139 individuals and groups had attended the meetings and/or submitted material to VCTC, including letters, e-mails, phone calls, and comments at the public hearing, or attended Unmet Transit Needs meetings. A total of 675 comments were received.

While some testimony was very specific about a particular problem in one area, most of the testimony fell into several broad categories. This was in good part due to the active participation of community advocate organizations outreach activities focused in the West County. As a result, VCTC received a substantial number of comments which were extremely general in scope and substance, while reflecting an overall interest in have improved transit. Many of the comments were vague enough to not be an Unmet Transit Needs; the major issues appeared to have revolved around two issues. The first issue was the loss of the high capacity-high quality buses which VISTA operated until the contractor bankruptcy and short term replacement of the over the road coaches with standard transit vehicles. The second significant issue was the desire for more capacity and responsiveness of the community transit services in the Heritage Valley.

In some cases, there were comments requesting specific transit trip services which already exist. Where the commenter was available, staff worked to resolve the issue and while listed as a comment received, it is specifically to disclose all comments received.

A number of the comments received request transit service outside the county, in some cases, substantial distances outside the county. TDA funds are specifically for transit services inside the county, and the Commission works with neighboring counties to jointly fund services (such as Metrolink and the VISTA Coastal Express), or provide reciprocal services (such as the Conejo Connection into Los Angeles County and the Metro 161/LA DOT 422-423 into Ventura County).

Because of the timeframe of the Unmet Transit Needs process, sometimes requests/comments are received regarding services already in existence or in the process of being implemented. During the process, Gold Coast Transit initiated a demonstration project which provides service on Channel Islands Blvd. between Saviers and Victoria, and then travels up Victoria to Ventura. This provides a much more direct service between South Oxnard and Port Hueneme and Ventura, including Ventura College. This not only address a comment received this year, but continues to improve on a service which was only partially addressed from prior hearing cycles. The same thing issue exists with the VISTA 126 late evening services. VCTC initiated late evening service Eastbound on VISTA 126 in the fall of 2012; however there were a number of requests for later service on received for that route.

VCTC will be releasing a request for proposals for a long term intercity transit provider, scheduled to begin on July 1, 2014. The request will be for a return to predominately large capacity-high speed over the road coaches. This will address a substantial number of comments/complaints received (37, including more bike carrying capacity). It will also reduce some of the crowding issues which occur sporadically on several VISTA routes.

VCTC has also been working with the Cities of Fillmore, Santa Paula, and the County to develop a sustainable plan to continue and expand the community transit services in the Heritage Valley. The existing dial-a-ride service has been very effective; however, due to a full expenditure of TDA funds for transit by Fillmore, and the agreements to minimize subsidization by other agencies, the service has not been able to expand to meet demand. VCTC has also heard requests for a scheduled fixed route service in the Heritage Valley communities. A plan has been developed and presented to the affected agencies which provides for (1) a continuation of communitywide general purpose dial-a-ride services to insure access for all parts of the communities, (2) a fixed route "circulator" to provide additional capacity and services without the need to make a reservation, (3) the creation of a local management agency by the three agencies to provide more accessible management, and (4) a sustainable fiscal plan, including the programming of VCTC Proposition 1B transit capital funds to purchase vehicles and reduce ongoing annual costs. This service is targeted to also begin on July 1, 2014.

The City of Thousand Oaks and the City of Moorpark have both developed demonstration projects to provide expanded service and been awarded Congestion Mitigation-Air Quality (CMAQ) grants from VCTC. Both grants are pending authorization by the Federal Transit Administration. The City of Camarillo is also in the process of an analysis of possible service expansions, which should be completed later this year. Finally, the "East County Cities" (Camarillo, Moorpark, Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks) are working on a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) which will serve as the template for "core" uniform hours of operation, and other actions to improve coordination of services in the East County. VCTC should receive a report and recommendations from the agencies later this year.

State legislation is currently under consideration which, if enacted, will replace the Gold Coast Transit agency with a transit district. If successful, the district will begin functioning on July 1, 2014.

Finally, VCTC has included in the draft 2013-14 budget funds to develop a Short Range Transit Plan. The last one was completed in 1999, and covered the years through 2004. Along with that planning effort, the budget includes a proposal to revise the definitions and "unmet transit needs" process.

As noted, the majority of the comments fell into several broad categories. These were:

1. Operational improvements including additional stops or increased frequency on existing services. These do not represent unmet transit needs, but are referred to the operators to review and consider in light of funding and operational data.
2. Request for extended hours or days of service. There were a number of requests throughout the County, but these were limited in number and general in nature, and do not constitute an Unmet Transit Need.
3. Comments about vehicles and facilities. A number of comments were received requesting increased bike capacity on buses, and improved numbers and quality shelters (protection from elements) at bus stops, and the quality of the buses themselves. These are not Unmet Transit Needs, but VCTC and the operators have on-going efforts to address these concerns.
4. Request for better coordination. These are operational improvements to make the services more convenient and attractive, and will be referred to TRANSCOM for on-going review.
5. Request for reduced fares and changes to fare restrictions. These are not Unmet Transit Needs, and in some cases could adversely affect the TDA fare box requirements.
6. Requests for multi-county transit services. Because TDA funds are specifically for use within counties, and VCTC is not able to direct the use of TDA funds in other counties, comments asking for multi-county services are not considered unmet needs. VCTC will continue to work with neighboring counties to forge alliances and shared funding where projections of ridership appear to justify potential joint funded transit services.

7. Comment regarding driver performance. A number of comments were received regarding driver performance. These are not Unmet Transit Needs, but do represent an operational concern and were therefore referred to the appropriate operators.

The recommendations, draft findings, and matrix were reviewed for technical accuracy by the VCTC Transit Operators Advisory Committee (TRANSCOM) on May X, 2013. The TRANSCOM supported the recommended findings. The Citizens Transportation Advisory Committee/Social Service Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC/SSTAC) met on May X, 2013 and after review, approved the recommended findings. The Hearing Board recommended on May X, 2013 for a final review of the draft findings before the Commission considers its' action on June 7, 2013.

The draft findings are attached. A matrix of the complete testimony given was reviewed by the CTAC/SSTAC and the Hearing Board, and is available on the VCTC website "Goventura.org" or at the Commission office.

VENTURA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

FY 2013/14 UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS FINDINGS



May X, 2013

VENTURA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

FY 2012/2013 UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS FINDINGS

BACKGROUND

Public Utilities Code (PUC) Section 99401.5 (c) requires the transportation planning agency (VCTC) to hold at least one public hearing pursuant to Section 99238.5 to solicit comments on the Unmet Transit Needs that may exist within the jurisdiction and that may be reasonable to meet by establishing or contracting for new public transportation, or specialized transportation, or by expanding existing services.

All Unmet Transit Needs that are reasonable to meet must be funded before any allocation is made to streets and roads pursuant to PUC Section 99401.5 (e). Under Section 99238 (c) (2), the Public Utilities Code specifies that the social service transportation advisory council, Citizen's Transportation Advisory Committee/Social Service Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC/SSTAC) in our county, has the responsibility to participate in the annual process and must review and recommend action by VCTC on the findings. This is done at the discretion of VCTC and is not required by statute. A panel consisting of a number of the VCTC Commissioners is appointed annually by the VCTC Chairman to act as the hearing board. The full VCTC then considers all the input from these sources as well as the public and adopts the findings.

According to the California Public Utilities Code (PUC) Section 99401.5 (d) the Commission must find by adopting a resolution that either:

- There are no Unmet Transit Needs;
- There are no Unmet Transit Needs that are reasonable to meet; or,
- There are Unmet Transit Needs, including needs that are reasonable to meet.

The resolution approving the findings must include information that provides the basis for the Commission decision. In accordance with PUC Section 99401.5 (c) the Commission adopted definitions of "Unmet Transit Need" and "Reasonable to Meet" at the January 5, 1996 VCTC meeting and reaffirmed these definitions at its December 7, 2012 meeting.

Following are the adopted definitions of "Unmet Transit Need" and "Reasonable to Meet":

UNMET TRANSIT NEED

"Unmet Transit Needs are, at a minimum, those public transportation services that have been identified by substantial community input through the public hearing process or are identified in a Short Range Transit Plan; in local Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) plans; in other area/local paratransit plans; and/or in the Regional Transportation Plan and have not yet been implemented or funded."

Following is the adopted definition of "Reasonable to Meet", and "Attachment A" which establishes the passenger fare ratio for new transit services in Ventura County.

REASONABLE TO MEET

An Unmet Transit Need shall be considered reasonable to meet if the proposed service ⁽¹⁾ is in general compliance with the following criteria;

Equity

1. The proposed service will not cause reductions in existing transit services that have an equal or higher priority.
2. The proposed service will require a subsidy generally equivalent to other similar services.

Timing

1. The proposed service is in response to an existing rather than future transit need.

Feasibility

1. The proposed service can be provided within available funding. ⁽²⁾
2. The proposed service can be provided with the existing fleet or under contract to a private provider.

Performance

1. The proposed service will not unduly affect the operator's ability to maintain the required passenger fare ratio for its system as a whole.
2. The proposed service will not meet the scheduled passenger fare ratio standards as described in Attachment A.
3. The estimated number of passengers to be carried will be in the range of other similar services, and/or the proposed service provides a "link" or connection that contributes to the effectiveness of the overall transit system.

Community Acceptance

1. The proposed service has community acceptance and/or support as determined by the Unmet Transit Needs public hearing record, inclusion in adopted programs and plans, adopted governing board positions and other existing information.

(1) Proposed Service is defined as the specific transit service identified as an Unmet Transit Need (as defined) and which requires evaluation against this definition of "reasonable to meet."

(2) Per state law, the lack of available resources shall not be the sole reason for finding that a transit need is not reasonable.

ATTACHMENT A

It is desirable for all proposed transit services in urban areas to achieve a 20% passenger fare ratio by the end of the third year of operation. A passenger fare ratio of 10% is desired for special services (i.e. elderly and disabled) and rural area services. (1) More detailed passenger fare ratio standards, which will be used to evaluate services as they are proposed and implemented, are described below. Transit serving both urban and rural areas, per state law, may obtain an “intermediate” passenger fare ratio.

**END OF TWELVE MONTHS
Performance Level**

Urban Service	Rural Service	Recommended Action
Less than 6%	Less than 3%	Provider may discontinue service
6% or more	3% or more	Provider will continue service, with modifications if needed

**END OF TWENTY-FOUR MONTHS
Performance Level**

Urban Service	Rural Service	Recommended Action
Less than 10%	Less than 5%	Provider may discontinue service
10% or more	5% or more	Provider will continue service, with modifications if needed

**END OF THIRTY-SIX MONTHS (2)
Performance Level**

Urban Service	Rural Service	Recommended Action
Less than 15%	Less than 7%	Provider may discontinue service
15-20%	7- 10%	Provider may consider modifying and continue service
20% or more	10% or more	Provider will continue service, with modifications if needed

(1) Per statute the VCTC may establish a lower fare for community transit (dial-a-ride) services.

(2) A review will take place after 30 months to develop a preliminary determination regarding the discontinuation of proposed services.

Consistent with Public Utilities Code Section 99401.5, the Commission must use the adopted definitions of “Unmet Transit Need” and “Reasonable To Meet” and give special consideration to the transit needs of senior citizens, the mentally/physically challenged and persons of limited means. Also consistent with Public Utilities Code Section 99401.5, the hearing board shall not make its recommendation, nor shall the Commission make its determination of needs that are reasonable to meet, by comparing Unmet Transit Needs with the need for streets and roads. PUC Section 99401.5 (c) also states that the fact that an identified transit need cannot be fully met based on available resources shall not be the sole reason for finding that a transit need is not reasonable to meet.

In addition to all verbal and written testimony submitted and staff responses to testimony submitted, and to meet the requirements of PUC Section 99401.5(b)(1)(2)(3), the following information is available at VCTC’s office, and was used in developing the findings:

- TDA rules and regulations

Local and regional plans, including the following (Note that SCAT is the former name of Gold Coast Transit):

- Short Range Transit Plans and budget information for transit operators (1999)
- FTA Section 15 (National Transit Data Base) reports
- Ventura County Congestion Management Plan (2006)
- Ventura County Congestion Management Plan (2009)
- Ventura County Comprehensive Rail Plan (1995)
- SCAG Regional Transportation Plan
- SCRRA’s (Metrolink) 1402 Plan
- SCRRA’s Draft Strategic Plan
- SCRRA’s FY 2011/12 Budget
- Caltrans State Rail Plan for the Pacific Surfliners
- Coast Rail Corridor Plan
- Ventura/Santa Barbara Rail Study Final Report – SCAG (March 2008)
- VCTC AB 120 Plan (last amended 2001)
- Simi Valley Transit Five Year Service and Funding Plan 2005-2010 (2005)
- VCTC Countywide Human Services Transportation and Transit Services Coordination Study (2007)
- VCTC Countywide Human Services Transportation and Transit Services Coordination Study update (2012)
- Proposal Paper for Coordinated Paratransit Service Plan for Western Ventura County
- SCAT’s Coordinated Paratransit Service Plan for Western Ventura County
- SCAT Public Transit Service Delivery Plan (April 2000)
- City of Thousand Oaks March 2, 2002 Memorandum regarding expansion of the Thousand Oaks Transportation (TOT) System
- Ojai Valley Transit Needs Assessment (June 2004) Final Report
- SCAT Origin/Destination and Transfer Study final report (July 2004)
- SCAT System wide Fare Policy Study (April 2003)
- VCTC Title VI Civil Rights Program (April 2009)
- Santa Paula Branch Line Rail Study – SCAG/VCTC (March 2007)
- SCAG 2008 Regional Transportation Plan
- VCTC Title VI Program (February 6, 2009)
- VCTC Title VI VISTA Proposed Fare Increase Evaluation (2009)
- VCTC Limited English Proficiency Plan (2011)
- Ventura County Transit Investment Study (December 4, 2009)
- VISTA 2012 Onboard Rider Survey
- City of Moorpark Transit Evaluation (December 2010)

- County of Ventura/City of Thousand Oaks documents Consolidation of Dial-a-Ride Services in Unincorporated Areas. (2010)
- City of Thousand Oaks Transit Action Plan (April 2010)
- Gold Coast Transit Vineyard Avenue and Wells Road Community Based Transit Plan (December 30, 2010)
- City of Ojai Report of Recommendations from the Ad Hoc Transit Committee (Dec 2011)
- Gold Coast Transit 2010 TDA Triennial Performance Audit
- VCTC 2010 TDA Triennial Performance Audit
- California Lutheran University Public Transportation Needs Assessment Survey Analysis (2012) and Employee home locations and trip times spreadsheet
- VCTC Heritage Valley Transit Study Final Report March 2013

In addition to the documentation in the files of Ventura County Transportation Commission (listed above), information provided through the existing programs has also been reviewed by VCTC such as:

- Dial-A-Ride Center
- Ventura County Passport (Smart Card) Program
- Go Ventura Internet Program
- Senior Nutrition Program
- East County Paratransit Transfer program
- VCTC Social Service Token (ticket) Program
- VISTA Ongoing Transit Services
- TDA Financial Audits, Article 8(c)

The resolution approving the findings must include information that provides the basis for the Commission decision. In accordance with PUC Section 99401.5 (c) the Commission adopted definitions of “Unmet Transit Need” and “Reasonable to Meet” at the January 5, 1996 VCTC meeting and reaffirmed these definitions at its December 7, 2012 meeting.

The VCTC held its public hearing on transit needs for FY (Fiscal Year) 2012/13 on February 4, 2013 at the Camarillo City Council Chambers. Approximately 19 people attended the meeting, with the VCTC Hearing Board consisting of Commissioners Sharkey, Long, Fernandez, and White. Ten people testified at the hearing and some supplemental written comments, as well as several written statements were submitted. A total of sixteen persons had submitted written/e-mailed, or telephoned testimony, which staff summarized for the record. VCTC also held two evening “listening sessions” at which staff took public comments. The evening session in Oxnard on January 24th had five people attend and comment, while the evening session in Moorpark on January 23rd had eight persons attend. VCTC and local transit staffs also attended both evening sessions and the hearing. VCTC also attended two community meetings, one in Fillmore and one in Santa Paula, to obtain community input.

The Unmet Transit Needs public comment period was open through February 11, 2013. By the time the hearing was closed, 139 individuals and groups had attended the meetings and/or submitted material to VCTC, including letters, e-mails, phone calls, and comments at the public hearing, or attended Unmet Transit Needs meetings. A total of 675 comments were received.

While some testimony was very specific about a particular problem in one area, most of the testimony fell into several broad categories. This was in good part due to the active participation of community advocate organizations outreach activities focused in the West County. As a result, VCTC received a substantial number of comments which were extremely general in scope and substance, while reflecting an overall interest in have improved transit. Many of the comments were vague enough to not be an Unmet Transit Needs, the major issues appeared to have revolved around two issues. The first issue was the loss of the high capacity-high quality buses which VISTA operated until the contractor bankruptcy and short term replacement of the over the road coaches with standard transit vehicles. The second significant issue was the desire for more capacity and responsiveness of the community transit services in the Heritage Valley.

In some cases, there were comments requesting specific transit trip services which already exist. Where the commenter was available, staff worked to resolve the issue and while listed as a comment received, it is specifically to disclose all comments received.

A number of the comments received request transit service outside the county, in some cases, substantial distances outside the county. TDA funds are specifically for transit services inside the county, and the Commission works with neighboring counties to jointly fund services (such as Metrolink and the VISTA Coastal Express), or provide reciprocal services (such as the Conejo Connection into Los Angeles County and the Metro 161/LA DOT 422-423 into Ventura County).

Because of the timeframe of the Unmet Transit Needs process, sometimes requests/comments are received regarding services already in existence or in the process of being implemented. During the process, Gold Coast Transit initiated a demonstration project which provides service on Channel Islands Blvd. between Saviers and Victoria, and then travels up Victoria to Ventura. This provides a much more direct service between South Oxnard and Port Hueneme and Ventura, including Ventura College. This not only address a comment received this year, but continues to improve on a service which was only partially addressed from prior hearing cycles. The same thing issue exists with the VISTA 126 late evening service. VCTC initiated late evening service Eastbound on VISTA 126 in the fall of 2012, however there were a number of requests for later service on received for that route. VCTC will be releasing a request for proposals for a long term intercity transit provider, scheduled to begin on July 1, 2014. The request will be for a return to predominately large capacity-high speed over the road coaches. This will address a substantial number of comments/complaints received (37, including more bike carrying capacity). It will also reduce some of the crowding issues which occur sporadically on several VISTA routes.

VCTC has also been working with the Cities of Fillmore, Santa Paula, and the County to develop a sustainable plan to continue and expand the community transit services in the Heritage Valley. The existing dial-a-ride service has been very effective, however, due to a full expenditure of TDA funds for transit by Fillmore, and the agreements to minimize subsidization by other agencies, the service has not been able to expand to meet demand. VCTC has also heard requests for a scheduled fixed route service in the Heritage Valley communities. A plan has been developed and presented to the affected agencies which provides for (1) a continuation of communitywide general purpose dial-a-ride services to insure access for all parts of the communities, (2) a fixed route "circulator" to provide additional capacity and services without the need to make a reservation, (3) the creation or a local management agency by the three agencies to provide more accessible management, and (4) a sustainable fiscal plan, including the programming of VCTC Proposition 1B transit capital funds to purchase vehicles and reduce ongoing annual costs. This service is targeted to also begin on July 1, 2014.

The City of Thousand Oaks and the City of Moorpark have both developed demonstration projects to provide expanded service and been awarded Congestion Mitigation-Air Quality (CMAQ) grants from VCTC. Both grants are pending authorization by the Federal Transit Administration. The City of Camarillo is also in the process of an analysis of possible service expansions, which should be completed later this year. Finally, the "East County Cities" (Camarillo, Moorpark, Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks) are working on a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) which will serve as the template for "core" uniform hours of operation, and other actions to improve coordination of services in the East County. VCTC should receive a report and recommendations from the agencies later this year.

State legislation is currently under consideration which, if enacted, will replace the Gold Coast Transit agency with a transit district. If successful, the district will begin functioning on July 1, 2014.

Finally, VCTC has included in the draft 2013-14 budget funds to develop a Short Range Transit Plan. The last one was completed in 1999, and covered the years through 2004. Along with that planning effort, the budget includes a proposal to revise the definitions and "unmet transit needs" process.

As noted, the majority of the comments fell into several broad categories. These were:

1. Operational improvements including additional stops or increased frequency on existing services. These do not represent unmet transit needs, but are referred to the operators to review and consider in light of funding and operational data.
2. Request for extended hours or days of service. There were a number of requests throughout the County, but these were limited in number and general in nature, and do not constitute an Unmet Transit Need.
3. Comments about vehicles and facilities. A number of comments were received requesting increased bike capacity on buses, and improved numbers and quality shelters (protection from elements) at bus stops, and the quality of the buses themselves. These are not Unmet Transit Needs, but VCTC and the operators have on-going efforts to address these concerns.
4. Request for better coordination. These are operational improvements to make the services more convenient and attractive, and will be referred to TRANSCOM for on-going review.
5. Request for reduced fares and changes to fare restrictions. These are not Unmet Transit Needs, and in some cases could adversely affect the TDA fare box requirements.
6. Requests for multi-county transit services. Because TDA funds are specifically for use within counties, and VCTC is not able to direct the use of TDA funds in other counties, comments asking for multi-county services are not considered unmet needs. VCTC will continue to work with neighboring counties to forge alliances and shared funding where projections of ridership appear to justify potential joint funded transit services.
7. Comment regarding driver performance. Some number of comments were received regarding operational performance of some transit services. These are not Unmet Transit Needs, but do represent an operational concern and were therefore referred to the appropriate operators.

The recommendations, draft findings, and matrix were reviewed for technical accuracy by the VCTC Transit Operators Advisory Committee (TRANSCOM) on May X, 2013. The TRANSCOM supported the recommended findings. The Citizens Transportation Advisory Committee/Social Service Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC/SSTAC) met on May X, 2013 and after review, approved the recommended findings. The Hearing Board recommended on May X, 2013 for a final review of the draft findings before the Commission considers its' action on June 7, 2013.

The draft findings are attached. A matrix of the complete testimony given was reviewed by the CTAC/SSTAC and the Hearing Board, and is available on the VCTC website "Goventura.org" or at the Commission office.

RECOMMENDED FINDINGS:

1. Continue all existing bus services substantially as they exist.
2. Continue all public senior and disabled services in all jurisdictions in the County substantially as they exist. Work to implement the recommendations of the VCTC Countywide Human Services Transportation and Transit Services Coordination Study.
3. If awarded grants, monitor the proposed service demonstrations on the VISTA 126 (expanded hours) and the Gold Coast Transit Channel Islands Blvd./Victoria Ave. (new route) to determine if a transit need which is reasonable to meet exists.
4. If awarded grants, monitor the proposed service demonstrations expansions in transits service in both the City of Thousand Oaks and the City of Moorpark.
5. Receive a status report from the East County Cities on process to improve coordination and rationalization of transit services.
6. Receive a status report on the City of Camarillo's service review and any recommendations which come from the service review.

7. Continue the Ventura County interagency bus transfer program.
8. Assist the Heritage Valley communities in developing an organizational structure, acquiring vehicles, and implementing the Heritage Valley transit study.
9. Issue and award a long term VCTC contract for intercity VISTA services.

After adopting the recommendations listed above, and based on the analysis of the written and verbal testimony provided to the Commission:

10. Find by VCTC Resolution #2013-XX that there are no Unmet Transit Needs that are reasonable to meet.

In addition to the above findings, VCTC will continue efforts to meet the following goals from prior hearings:

- A. Continue to pursue and identify funding to allow local agencies to install more bus benches and shelters, and transit information signs, where warranted and feasible.
- B. Continue to improve schedule coordination and transfer connections between different bus systems where operationally feasible.
- C. Continue to adjust fixed route transit services, stops and schedules throughout Ventura County as needed and operationally feasible.
- D. Continue community outreach and marketing efforts to increase awareness of the availability of transit services for the general public, seniors, and disabled, to be coordinated by VCTC.
- E. Continue operation of NEXTBUS countywide and provide additional NEXTBUS signs at appropriate locations.
- F. Continue to ensure that bus stops and bus signage, vehicles, and operations are all in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements.
- G. Continue to assist social service agencies in obtaining grant funding for equipment and rolling stock, utilizing Federal Section 5310, Section 5316 and any other funds available for those purposes.
- H. Encourage cities, transit providers, and social service agencies to implement elements of the VCTC Countywide Human Services Transportation and Transit Services Coordination Study.
- I. Continue discussions and possible studies cooperatively with the City of Santa Clarita to determine the potential demand and feasibility for transit services connecting Fillmore, Santa Paula, and San Buenaventura with Santa Clarita.
- J. Initiate a VCTC short range transit plan.
- K. Revise the VCTC Unmet Transit Needs definitions and process.
- L. Continue to encourage AMTRAK and Caltrans Division of Rail to adjust the schedule times of the Surfliner to better serve commuters traveling between Ventura and Santa Barbara Counties.
- M. Formally comment during the CEQA process regarding the potential difficulties and costs of

providing transit services to low income housing and other public facilities with high transit dependent use which are not sited at locations served or easily served by public transit.

- N. Support cost-effective actions to increase bike capacity on the transit system.
- O. Encourage transit trips over auto usage during this time of heightened public awareness of the cost of fuel.
- P. Seek financial support from the cities/County to provide subsidized fares for low income passengers who are transferring between local transit systems and VISTA.
- Q. Work with LOSSAN, Caltrans, Amtrak, and Metrolink to improve rail safety and maintain or increase speeds on the rail services.
- R. Encourage VCTC and the ADA providers in the county continue to improve transfers and transfer locations for inter-agency ADA trips.
- S. Continue to integrate evening meetings in different parts of the county as part of future Unmet Transit Needs process.
- T. Work to improve customer service on weekends and evening.

After adopting the recommendations listed above, and based on the analysis of the written and verbal testimony provided to the Commission:

Find by VCTC Resolution #2013-XX that there are no Unmet Transit Needs, including needs that are reasonable to meet.

Following is a discussion of the comments received, organized by operator, and if appropriate, the recommended "Finding" associated with each issue. Specific responses to each of the comments received are contained in the Testimony Matrix. All operational improvements will be forwarded to the appropriate agency for consideration in upcoming service adjustments. In the case of the VISTA service improvement recommendations and comments, the different VISTA route advisory groups will be informed.

1. **Gold Coast Transit**

Improvements during the year. A significant change in Gold Coast Transit service occurred mid-year, with the implementation of Route 21 with a grant awarded by VCTC. This route provides service on Channel Islands Blvd. and Victoria, with service into Ventura. This directly or indirectly addresses several of the comments received this year, and enhances service to Via Victoria, an area which was identified in prior "Unmet Transit Needs" processes.

Improved service quality. Seventeen persons wanted an increase in bus servicing current stops, or the creation of new stops on existing routes. There were three people who wanted later service to RiverPark, and no other route or comment was made by more than one person. Several of the services already exist, and appear to be unfamiliar to the commenter. These are not Unmet Transit Needs. Even if it were an Unmet Transit Need it is not reasonable to meet since it does not meet the following criteria:

Performance

- The estimated number of passengers to be carried will be in the range of other similar services.
- The proposed service would not unduly affect the operator's ability to maintain the required passenger fare ratio for its system as a whole.

Equity

- The proposed service will require a subsidy generally equivalent to other similar services.

Although not Unmet Transit Needs that are reasonable to meet, the comments are forwarded to Gold Coast Transit for inclusion in their analysis of service and future modifications.

One person wants Gold Coast Transit service “on Holidays”, although specific routes and holidays was not provided. This is not an Unmet Transit Needs. Even if it were an Unmet Transit Need it is not reasonable to meet since it does not meet the following criteria:

Performance

- The estimated number of passengers to be carried will be in the range of other similar services.
- The proposed service would not unduly affect the operator’s ability to maintain the required passenger fare ratio for its system as a whole.

Equity

- The proposed service will require a subsidy generally equivalent to other similar services.

One person wanted the service to the Ventura Marina re-instated. The service was terminated after a four year effort to replace the route which had served the area unsuccessfully through the 1990s and early 2000s. Although Gold Coast marketed and modified the service schedule, it was never able to attract enough riders. This is not an Unmet Transit Needs. Even if it were an Unmet Transit Need it is not reasonable to meet since it does not meet the following criteria:

Performance

- The estimated number of passengers to be carried will be in the range of other similar services.
- The proposed service would not unduly affect the operator’s ability to maintain the required passenger fare ratio for its system as a whole.

Equity

- The proposed service will require a subsidy generally equivalent to other similar services.

Finally, one person was unhappy with the provision of the GCT ACCESS service. This is an operational complain, and not an unmet transit need.

2. City of Oxnard.

One person wanted more service on the Oxnard Harbors and Beaches Dial-A-Ride (OHBDAR), including Sunday service. Ridership on the service has been sufficient to continue operations, but has not significantly increased in the past decade, which would provide an indication of increasing demand. Sunday service was discontinued due to extremely low ridership. Even if it were an Unmet Transit Need it is not reasonable to meet since it does not meet the following criteria:

Performance

- The estimated number of passengers to be carried will be in the range of other similar services.
- The proposed service would not unduly affect the operator’s ability to maintain the required passenger fare ratio for its system as a whole.

Equity

- The proposed service will require a subsidy generally equivalent to other similar services.

Four people wanted a bus bench or shelter at the bus stop near Wendys in El Rio, and one wanted a bus bench or shelter at the stop at 501 Cuesta Del Mar. These are not unmet transit needs; however, they are being referred to the City of Oxnard for analysis and possible future actions.

3. City of Port Hueneme

One person wanted a bus bench or shelter at the bus stop at the Port Hueneme parking lot. This is not an unmet transit need; however, it is being referred to the City of Port Hueneme for analysis and possible future actions.

4. City of Ventura

One person wanted the passenger shelter at the Ventura Transit Center (Pacific View Mall) modified to protect waiting passengers from the rain. This is not an unmet transit need; however, it is being referred to the City of Ventura for analysis and possible future actions.

5. City of Camarillo

Four people wanted increased weekend transit service in Camarillo (currently service is provide 8-4 Saturday, no Sunday service). One person wanted evening transit service (currently until 9 pm weeknights) in Camarillo. These are not Unmet Transit Needs. Even if it were an Unmet Transit Need it is not reasonable to meet since it does not meet the following criteria:

Performance

- The estimated number of passengers to be carried will be in the range of other similar services.
- The proposed service would not unduly affect the operator's ability to maintain the required passenger fare ratio for its system as a whole.

Equity

- The proposed service will require a subsidy generally equivalent to other similar services.

The City of Camarillo is preparing an analysis of a possible trial/demonstration of expanded hours of DAR service. Once completed, the City should report to the VCTC the results of its analysis and any actions it will take.

One person wanted the Camarillo service to increase the number of fixed routes instead of the Citywide Dial-a-Ride (DAR) service. This is not an unmet transit need. The city reduced the fixed route service and shifted to in the 1990s to (successfully) increase access and improve ridership and efficiency.

One person was unhappy with the Camarillo Dial-a-Ride (DAR) service dispatching, while praising the drivers. This is not an unmet transit need. This complaint is being provided to the city for their review.

One person complained that a driver had denied them a ride because they were in a wheelchair. Immediately after the hearing where the complaint was first made, the City staff worked with the rider and the driver to remedy this situation. This is not an unmet transit need. It was a potential ADA violation which the city, immediately upon receipt, address to insure there would be no future recurrences.

6. City of Thousand Oaks

Two people requested later service in Thousand Oaks until 10 pm (currently 8 pm weekdays). This is not an Unmet Transit Needs. Even if it were an Unmet Transit Need it is not reasonable to meet since it does not meet the following criteria:

Performance

- The estimated number of passengers to be carried will be in the range of other similar services.
- The proposed service would not unduly affect the operator's ability to maintain the required passenger fare ratio for its system as a whole.

Equity

- The proposed service will require a subsidy generally equivalent to other similar services.

One person (a senior) commented regarding problems completing a trip from Oxnard to Thousand Oaks ("last mile"). The City of Thousand Oaks staff worked with the rider to get them a city Senior Transit identification card and arrange travel from the Thousand Oaks Transit Center. This was a situation where the service existed and staff was able to facilitate the rider's use of the services.

The City of Thousand Oaks was awarded a grant by VCTC to provide demonstration of weekend transit service. The grant is pending approval by the Federal Transit Administration. The City should provide status reports to the Commission on the demonstration once initiated.

7. City of Moorpark

One person wants a new bus stop between two existing bus stops. This is an operational modification, and has been referred to the city. The requested stop is on a State Highway, and the city cannot stop at the location without an approved permit from CALTRANS.

One person wants the Moorpark DAR to operate until 10 PM. This is not an Unmet Transit Needs. Even if it were an Unmet Transit Need it is not reasonable to meet since it does not meet the following criteria:

Performance

- The estimated number of passengers to be carried will be in the range of other similar services.
- The proposed service would not unduly affect the operator's ability to maintain the required passenger fare ratio for its system as a whole.

Equity

- The proposed service will require a subsidy generally equivalent to other similar services.

The city of Moorpark was awarded a grant by VCTC to provide demonstration of extend weekday transit service until 8 pm, and a add Saturday service. It also will fund ADA paratransit to Thousand Oaks and Simi Valley on Saturdays. The grant is pending approval by the Federal Transit Administration. The City should provide status reports to the Commission on the demonstration once initiated.

8. City of Simi Valley

One person wanted Simi Valley transit to "expand" service. This is not an Unmet Transit Needs.

9. Simi Valley/Thousand Oaks/Moorpark intercity ADA service.

Two people wanted direct service for ADA (and Senior DAR) between Moorpark and Simi Valley and Thousand Oaks, including direct service to medical facilities (instead of transfers). This is not an Unmet Transit Needs. Even if it were an Unmet Transit Need it is not reasonable to meet since it does not meet the following criteria:

Performance

- The estimated number of passengers to be carried will be in the range of other similar services.
- The proposed service would not unduly affect the operator's ability to maintain the required passenger fare ratio for its system as a whole.

Equity

- The proposed service will require a subsidy generally equivalent to other similar services.

One person wants a "more safe" transfer location for intercity ADA trips than the current on at the Simi Valley Towncenter. This is not an unmet transit need; and there is no record of any incidents at the location where VISTA and Simi Valley buses stop, as well as the ADA transfers.

10. Simi Valley/Thousand Oaks/Moorpark intercity service.

Two people request direct transit service between Simi Valley and Cal Lutheran (CLU) College. This is not an Unmet Transit Needs. Even if it were an Unmet Transit Need it is not reasonable to meet since it does not meet the following criteria:

Performance

- The estimated number of passengers to be carried will be in the range of other similar services.
- The proposed service would not unduly affect the operator's ability to maintain the required passenger fare ratio for its system as a whole.

Equity

- The proposed service will require a subsidy generally equivalent to other similar services.

Analysis of data for employees and students travel patterns does not support any feasible transit, although CLU should be encouraged to continue working with VCTC ridesharing program in the creation of carpools and vanpools.

11. City of Ojai

One person requested that the Ojai Trolley cuts be restored. During the past year, the Ojai trolley routes were modified to improve overall efficiency; and Gold Coast Transit services were terminated and then reinstated through the City of Ojai. At this time, there are no significant cut in either Ojai trolley or Gold Coast Transit services in Ojai to restore. This is not an unmet transit need.

12. VISTA Service

Seven people complained about wanted VISTA drivers. One person wanted the Wifi problems to be fixed. One person wanted “security” on the VISTA buses. These are operational complains, not unmet transit needs.

Thirty-three comments were received calling for a return of the “bigger” (over the road motor coaches) with better seats, more capacity, storage, and restrooms. In addition, six people wanted more bike capacity on the buses (comments not specific to VISTA). These are not unmet transit needs. The services have been maintained although the vehicle types have changed. As VCTC develops a long term contract to replace the “emergency” services obtained to continue service subsequent to the bankruptcy of the long term intercity transit provider, it is expected that there will be an improvement in the fleet.

One person wanted hourly VISTA service, and one person want all VISTA buses to stop at all stops. These are not unmet transit needs, they are operational adjustments.

13. VISTA 126

Three people wanted longer hours of VISTA 126 transit service. In the fall of 2012, eastbound service was extended until almost 10 pm. This is not an unmet transit need, because it already exists.

One person wanted VISTA 126 service from Fillmore to Piru. Service is provided until 8 pm by the VISTA Heritage Valley DAR to Piru daily, and a VISTA 126 trip leaving Fillmore at 7:05 pm and 8:05 pm have existed for several years. This is not an unmet transit need, because transit service already exists.

One person wanted VISTA 126 service to operate on Holidays. This is not an Unmet Transit Needs. Even if it were an Unmet Transit Need it is not reasonable to meet since it does not meet the following criteria:

Performance

- The estimated number of passengers to be carried will be in the range of other similar services.
- The proposed service would not unduly affect the operator’s ability to maintain the required passenger fare ratio for its system as a whole.

Equity

- The proposed service will require a subsidy generally equivalent to other similar services.

One person wanted VISTA 126 service to add a stop in Fillmore. This is not an unmet transit need, but an operational improvement. VCTC staff is analyzing the potential of a “West Fillmore” stop on Highway 126, and if feasible, will work to obtain a CALTRANS permit to allow a stop.

Four people wanted “more service” on VISTA 126. Four people wanted westbound VISTA 126 service after 9 pm, and tow people wanted additional westbound VISTA 126 service in the afternoon. These are not Unmet Transit Needs. Even if they were an Unmet Transit Need it is not reasonable to meet since it does not meet the following criteria:

Performance

- The estimated number of passengers to be carried will be in the range of other similar services.
- The proposed service would not unduly affect the operator’s ability to maintain the required passenger fare ratio for its system as a whole.

Equity

- The proposed service will require a subsidy generally equivalent to other similar services.

Two people wanted fixed route transit service between Santa Paula and Fillmore. This is not an unmet transit need, since VISTA 126 already provides this 7 days a week.

14. VISTA 101/Conejo Connection

One person wanted an increase in Conejo Connection service to the Warner Center, including Sunday service. One person wanted an increase in VISTA service to Camarillo (from where not stated), and one person wanted more VISTA 101 trip (from where to where, or when not stated). These are not Unmet

Transit Needs. Even if they were an Unmet Transit Need it is not reasonable to meet since it does not meet the following criteria:

Performance

- The estimated number of passengers to be carried will be in the range of other similar services.
- The proposed service would not unduly affect the operator's ability to maintain the required passenger fare ratio for its system as a whole.

Equity

- The proposed service will require a subsidy generally equivalent to other similar services.

15. VISTA Coastal Express

One person wanted additional Coastal Express bus service to Oxnard. One person wanted later northbound trips on the Coastal Express. These are not an Unmet Transit Need. Even if it were an Unmet Transit Need it is not reasonable to meet since it does not meet the following criteria:

Performance

- The estimated number of passengers to be carried will be in the range of other similar services.
- The proposed service would not unduly affect the operator's ability to maintain the required passenger fare ratio for its system as a whole.

Equity

- The proposed service will require a subsidy generally equivalent to other similar services.

16. VISTA Heritage Valley Dial-a-Ride

The VISTA Heritage Valley Dial-a-Ride (DAR) service has been impacted for several years, due to the full expenditure of all available transit funds by the City of Fillmore and the funding arrangement which limits interagency subsidies between the three agencies who fund the DAR. As a result, VCTC has recently completed a plan for sustainable service into the future. The plan calls for a limited fixed route service in Santa Paula and another in Fillmore and Piru, supplemented by general purpose DAR. This is expected to provide more capacity and relieve both the impacted DAR service and the associated call center. In FY 2013 a new agreement among the three agencies (Cities of Fillmore, Santa Paula, and the County) will be approved, VCTC will provide Prop 1B funds to support capital acquisition, and a contract awarded to provide the modified service.

Three people commented that the DAR call center was impacted and difficult to access. Two people complained that a driver was "rude". One person wanted more storage on the DAR vehicles. These are operational issues, and not unmet transit needs.

Three people wanted DAR service to be extended until 9 pm. These are not an Unmet Transit Need. Even if it were an Unmet Transit Need it is not reasonable to meet since it does not meet the following criteria:

Performance

- The estimated number of passengers to be carried will be in the range of other similar services.
- The proposed service would not unduly affect the operator's ability to maintain the required passenger fare ratio for its system as a whole.

Equity

- The proposed service will require a subsidy generally equivalent to other similar services.

Four people want "more" DAR service. It has been noted that the current DAR service is impacted during peak hours, and a plan is in place to relieve that. These are not an Unmet Transit Need. Even if it were an Unmet Transit Need it is not reasonable to meet since it does not meet the following criteria:

Performance

- The estimated number of passengers to be carried will be in the range of other similar services.
- The proposed service would not unduly affect the operator's ability to maintain the required passenger fare ratio for its system as a whole.

Equity

- The proposed service will require a subsidy generally equivalent to other similar services.

Three people wanted fixed route service for school trips. Fillmore currently has school bus service, including service to Piru and Rancho Camulos. Public transit is prohibited by Federal law and Californian regulations from providing “school bus service”, however, it cannot prohibit students from riding public transit services. These are not an Unmet Transit Need. Even if it were an Unmet Transit Need it is not reasonable to meet since it does not meet the following criteria:

Performance

- The estimated number of passengers to be carried will be in the range of other similar services.
- The proposed service would not unduly affect the operator’s ability to maintain the required passenger fare ratio for its system as a whole.

Equity

- The proposed service will require a subsidy generally equivalent to other similar services.

One person wanted the Dial-a-Ride service to provide intercity trips between Santa Paula and Fillmore. VISTA 126 provides intercity fixed route service between the communities. This is not an Unmet Transit Need. Even if it were an Unmet Transit Need it is not reasonable to meet since it does not meet the following criteria:

Performance

- The estimated number of passengers to be carried will be in the range of other similar services.
- The proposed service would not unduly affect the operator’s ability to maintain the required passenger fare ratio for its system as a whole.

Equity

- The proposed service will require a subsidy generally equivalent to other similar services.

17. Direct intercity services

One person wanted direct bus between Oxnard and Santa Paula, one person wanted direct service between Oxnard and Camarillo, two people want direct transit service between Santa Paula and Moorpark, and two people want direct service between Fillmore and Moorpark. One person wants direct transit service between the Heritage Valley and Moorpark. These are not an Unmet Transit Need. Even if it were an Unmet Transit Need it is not reasonable to meet since it does not meet the following criteria:

Performance

- The estimated number of passengers to be carried will be in the range of other similar services.
- The proposed service would not unduly affect the operator’s ability to maintain the required passenger fare ratio for its system as a whole.

Equity

- The proposed service will require a subsidy generally equivalent to other similar services.

As part of the VCTC Heritage Valley transit study, the Commission analyzed the work trips between the Heritage Valley and various locations in the county, and did not identify any corridors which would generate enough trips to sustain a viable direct route. The Commission should continue to make ridersharing support available throughout the county.

Three persons wanted direct transit services connecting the three Community Colleges (Moorpark, Oxnard, and Ventura Colleges). These are not an Unmet Transit Need. Even if it were an Unmet Transit Need it is not reasonable to meet since it does not meet the following criteria:

Performance

- The estimated number of passengers to be carried will be in the range of other similar services.
- The proposed service would not unduly affect the operator’s ability to maintain the required passenger fare ratio for its system as a whole.

Equity

- The proposed service will require a subsidy generally equivalent to other similar services.

18. Intercity ADA services

Two people wanted improved east county ADA connections; and two people wanted direct ADA trips between Santa Paula and Ventura (without transfer), including one who wanted the trips to be on demand. These are not an Unmet Transit Need. Even if it were an Unmet Transit Need it is not reasonable to meet since it does not meet the following criteria:

Performance

- The estimated number of passengers to be carried will be in the range of other similar services.
- The proposed service would not unduly affect the operator's ability to maintain the required passenger fare ratio for its system as a whole.

Equity

- The proposed service will require a subsidy generally equivalent to other similar services.

One person wanted a non-emergency intercity ADA paratransit trip for people on gurnies. This is not an unmet transit need, because transit service already exists.

One person wanted VISTA 126 service to operate on Holidays. This is not an Unmet Transit Needs. Even if it were an Unmet Transit Need it is not reasonable to meet since it does not meet the following criteria:

Performance

- The estimated number of passengers to be carried will be in the range of other similar services.
- The proposed service would not unduly affect the operator's ability to maintain the required passenger fare ratio for its system as a whole.

Equity

- The proposed service will require a subsidy generally equivalent to other similar services.

Two people had specific concerns regarding the use of intercity ADA services. In both cases, because the service commented on all ready exists, VCTC and local transit operators staffs worked with the commenter to insure that they were understood the service and how to use it. The comments are included because although address, were received in the process.

19. ADA services/Senior Services

One person wanted county intercity ADA rate improvements. Currently the rates for the Intercity ADA service are relatively complicated and may vary depending on the direction of travel, since the trips are provided by different agencies, with different fares, depending on where the trip originates. This is not an Unmet Transit Needs. Even if it were an Unmet Transit Need it is not reasonable to meet since the Transportation Development requires individual services to achieve required farebox recovery rates, which are based on each agency's performance. The transit providers participating in the intercity ADA transfer are studying ways to improve the operation of the intercity ADA services, and if any recommendations are developed, should be reported to the VCTC for possible implementation.

One person wanted a countywide card for seniors, instead of having to acquire a senior identification card for each transit provider in the county. This would facilitate use by seniors of the various DAR senior services in the county, and comply with TDA regulations and FTA statute that the services funded with TDA and FTA funds be available to everyone. While not an unmet need, this is being referred to TRANSCOM for consideration, and a report back to the Commission.

Two people wanted a uniform countywide senior age to reduce the confusion for seniors riding multiple transit systems in the County. This is not an unmet transit need. The VCTC adopted a policy to encourage the use of the age of 65 for seniors to public transit as part of the VCTC Countywide Human Services Transportation and Transit Services Coordination Study adopted in 2007; however, VCTC cannot mandate a countywide age.

One person wanted a countywide DAR for seniors. This is not an Unmet Transit Needs. Even if it were an Unmet Transit Need it is not reasonable to meet since it does not meet the following criteria:

Performance

- The estimated number of passengers to be carried will be in the range of other similar services.

- The proposed service would not unduly affect the operator's ability to maintain the required passenger fare ratio for its system as a whole.

Equity

- The proposed service will require a subsidy generally equivalent to other similar services.

One person wanted a senior "Not For Profit transport" program to be created in the county. While VCTC supports any enhancements to the existing services, this is not an unmet transit need.

One person support Mediride service provided by the Ventura County Area Agency on Aging with grant support from VCTC. One person wants the "towncar" (Mediride) to be restricted to women drivers for women, and also wants the service not to be a shared ride service. These are not unmet transit needs.

One person wanted travel training for seniors and disabled. This service is currently provided through grants from VCTC.

One person wanted easier ADA certification process. VCTC has an ADA certification process which complies with the ADA statutes and regulations. This is not an unmet transit need.

One person complained about not being certified. This is not an unmet transit need. In compliance with ADA statutes and regulations, VCTC has an appeals process to insure that all ADA applications are addressed within the legal requirements.

20. Intercounty services

VCTC received a number of request for new or expanded intercounty services. The Transportation Development Act funding was established to provide transit services within individual counties. VCTC has been successful in developing some services with neighboring counties, either through joint funding or reciprocal services.

Seven people requested service between the Heritage Valley and Santa Clarita/Valencia. The analysis of the potential for this service in the recently completed VCTC Heritage Valley Transit Study Final Report March 2013 did not indicate sufficient ridership at this time to sustain a viable operation. Discussions with Santa Clarita Transit staff support this analysis. At this time, Santa Clarita does not find that a cost sharing of service between the Heritage Valley and Santa Clarita/Valencia would be a reasonable expenditure of their funds. These are not Unmet Transit Needs. Even if they were an Unmet Transit Need it is not reasonable to meet since it does not meet the following criteria:

Performance

- The estimated number of passengers to be carried will be in the range of other similar services.
- The proposed service would not unduly affect the operator's ability to maintain the required passenger fare ratio for its system as a whole.

Equity

- The proposed service will require a subsidy generally equivalent to other similar services.

Two people wanted intercounty service to medical facilities in Santa Barbara and Los Angeles County. VCTC, in partnership with the Santa Barbara County Association of Governments, provides transit service during peak hours to Santa Barbara Cottage Hospital; and with the Conejo Connection, provides service to Kaiser Woodland Hills. VCTC provided funding to the City of Thousand Oaks to provide a 3 year demonstration of off-peak service to Kaiser – which was unable to achieve half of the farebox requirements. These are not Unmet Transit Needs. Even if they were an Unmet Transit Need it is not reasonable to meet since it does not meet the following criteria:

Performance

- The estimated number of passengers to be carried will be in the range of other similar services.
- The proposed service would not unduly affect the operator's ability to maintain the required passenger fare ratio for its system as a whole.

Equity

- The proposed service will require a subsidy generally equivalent to other similar services.

One person wanted the Santa Barbara airport bus to stop in Ventura. The Santa Barbara airbus is a private operation, which begins outside Ventura County and terminates at the Los Angeles International Airport (LAX) in Los Angeles County. There is a private operation from Ventura and Oxnard, the Ventura County Airbus, which is available, in addition to a number of shuttle providers to LAX. This is not an Unmet Transit Needs. Even if it were an Unmet Transit Need it is not reasonable to meet since it does not meet the following criteria:

Performance

- The estimated number of passengers to be carried will be in the range of other similar services.
- The proposed service would not unduly affect the operator's ability to maintain the required passenger fare ratio for its system as a whole.

Equity

- The proposed service will require a subsidy generally equivalent to other similar services.

One person wanted a bullet train from LA to Seattle. This is not an unmet transit need.

One person wanted improved ADA connections with LA Access. Ventura County transit providers continue to work to improve connections with LA Access in both the Conejo Valley (Westlake/Agoura Hills) and the San Fernando Valley, however, LA Access is an independent agency in another county, and not under the guidance of VCTC. This is not an unmet transit need, although Ventura County transit providers continue to work to improve cross-county connections.

One person wanted a bus from Santa Barbara to Agoura Hills near Chesebro Road on Saturdays. This is not an unmet transit need. Both the origin and destination are outside of Ventura County.

One person wanted a intercity county bus system. VISTA provides intercity bus service to most locations in Ventura County, and connections to Gold Coast Transit service to the remaining cities in the county not directly served by VISTA. This is not an unmet transit need.

21. Metrolink

Two people wanted Metrolink weekend service to Camarillo (with shuttle service to the outlet mall). Two people wanted a mid-day Metrolink train to Los Angeles. In addition to the lack of documented demand sufficient to meet farebox and operating costs, the rail lines from Moorpark north are owned by the Union Pacific, and VCTC does not have any agreement, contract, or authorization to increase passenger rail service on that segment. These are not Unmet Transit Needs. Even if they were an Unmet Transit Need it is not reasonable to meet since it does not meet the following criteria:

Performance

- The estimated number of passengers to be carried will be in the range of other similar services.
- The proposed service would not unduly affect the operator's ability to maintain the required passenger fare ratio for its system as a whole.

Equity

- The proposed service will require a subsidy generally equivalent to other similar services.

Timing

- The proposed service can be provided with the existing fleet or under contract to a private provider.

One person wanted the Metrolink 10 ride ticket reinstated. This not an unmet transit need, it is a Metrolink operations activity.

22. General and unspecific comments

Twenty-five people wanted "more transit service" but provides no specifics regarding where or when they wanted the increase. This is not an unmet transit need.

One person wanted more transit service for students but provides no specifics regarding where or when they wanted the increase. This is not an unmet transit need. Federal Transit Law and regulations prohibit transit agencies from providing "school bus services".

Eight people wanted lower fares, in some cases, specifically for students. This is not an Unmet Transit Need. TDA law requires transit services to achieve a level of fare support to review funds. Most operations in Ventura County only achieve that level. Also, fares are an important part of the operating revenues – lower fares would potentially cause a reduction in service and failure to meet TDA operating requirements.

One person wanted better transit connections but provides no specifics regarding where or when. This is not an unmet transit need. VCTC and the community transit operators continue to work to improve connections, however, with the relatively long headways this is continues to be a goal the Commission supports.

One person wanted guiderides at all stops, and one person wanted more bus shelters and heaters at all stops. These are not an unmet transit needs. VCTC has a goal of support the provision of appropriate bus stop amenities.

One person was unhappy with the overall state of transit in Ventura County. This is not an unmet transit need.

Two people wanted additional transit marketing. While not a specific request, VCTC and a number of the community operators do have active marketing programs. This is not an unmet transit need.

One person wanted the customer service center open on weekends (not specific about which customer service center). This is not an unmet transit need. However, VCTC and the community transit operators recognize the desirability of have more transit rider customer services available, and a new goal is recommended.

Two people wanted an “improved definition of unmet transit needs. While not an unmet transit need, and accepted by the State to be in compliance with state requirements, VCTC has committed to review and potentially revised the Unmet Transit definitions as part of the FY 2013-14 work program. One person wanted the unmet meeting at night. Currently VCTC has been holding two evening unmet transit needs meetings in the evening, one in West County and one in East County.

One person, representing the City of Moorpark, encouraged VCTC to coordinate with large employers, colleges, etc, to encourage commuting via transit. VCTC currently does this through its Regional Rideshare outreach.

One person wanted VCTC to partner with private transportation providers to develop more frequent shuttle van networks. This is not an unmet transit need.

One person wanted VCTC to enact a transportation sales tax to support transit. This is not an unmet transit need.