



**CITIZEN'S TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE/
SOCIAL SERVICES TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COUNCIL (CTAC/SSTAC)**

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 8, 2011 -- 1:30 PM – 3:30 PM

County Government Center – Hall of Justice Pacific Meeting Room
800 South Victoria Avenue, Ventura, CA 93009
Staff Contact: Mary Travis (805)642-1591 ext. 102 or mtravis@goventura.org

1. **CALL TO ORDER**
2. **SELF INTRODUCTIONS**
3. **PUBLIC COMMENTS FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA**
4. **APPROVAL OF 10/12/11 MEETING SUMMARY** Pg. 2
RESPONSIBLE STAFF: Mary Travis
5. **APPROVAL OF FY 12/13 UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS PUBLIC** Pg. 4
HEARING DEFINITIONS AND SCHEDULE
RESPONSIBLE STAFF: Mary Travis
6. **APPROVAL OF FY 12/13 TDA ARTICLE 3 BICYCLE AND** Pg. 8
PEDESTRIAN GRANT SCHEDULE AND RANKING CRITERIA
RESPONSIBLE STAFF: Mary Travis
7. **CHAIRMAN'S REPORT**
8. **STAFF REPORT**
9. **COMMITTEE MEMBER REPORTS**
10. **ADJOURNMENT**

The next meeting will be Tuesday, December 6TH - NOTE CHANGE TO FIRST TUESDAY!!!

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.



Item # 4.

**CTAC/SSTAC MEETING SUMMARY
October 11, 2011**

Item # 1 CALL TO ORDER

Jim White, 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 10/11/11 MEETING SUMMARY

The meeting summary was approved; there were no changes.

Item # 5 REVIEW OF FY 11/12 CTAC/SSTAC MEETING SCHEDULE

Mary Travis, VCTC staff, presented the FY 11/12 CTAC/SSTAC meeting schedule and reviewed the topics to be discussed over the fiscal year. She noted that the December meeting would be on the first Tuesday (December 6) not the second Tuesday as usual. She also highlighted the February 6, 2012 public hearing on unmet transit needs and noted it would likely replace the regular meeting that month.

Committee members are encouraged to suggest additional topics, and there might be other changes during the year. After discussion, the Committee asked that updates on the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and the Countywide Transportation Plan be added to future meetings (note: both these topics will be added to the December agenda). It was also asked that the County APCD appear at a future meeting to discuss their work (note: The Committee then approved the meeting schedule).

Item # 6 REVIEW OF VENTURA COUNTY PASSENGER RAIL OPERATIONS

Mary Travis, VCTC staff, reviewed the passenger rail operations ongoing in Ventura County, including Metrolink commuter rail, Amtrak intercity rail, and, Fillmore & Western excursion train services.

She noted Metrolink ridership has been slowly rebuilding the from the last year's drop in ridership. She also several initiatives by Metrolink to increase passengers on all routes including running weekend service and express weekday service on some lines. Because transportation funding is still limited, it is unlikely there will be service increases

on the Ventura Line in the near future. Travis also described safety improvements resulting from the September 12, 2008 Chatsworth accident, and noted that new, improved equipment has been ordered and is now being delivered.

In regard to new commuter train service between western Ventura County and Santa Barbara, Travis mentioned VCTC continues to work with representatives from the Santa Barbara Association of Governments and Caltrans Division of Rail to see if the existing Amtrak Pacific Surfliner schedule could be adjusted to run trains during “commuter friendly” hours until capital improvements to increase the track capacity could be implemented. These improvements such as adding sidings and automating signals are necessary before more trains can be added to the service area.

Travis concluded her presentation by mentioning ongoing efforts to increase revenues that come from activities on the VCTC owned Santa Paula Branch Line (SPBL). This 32-mile rail line runs from east Ventura to Rancho Camulos, with active rail service possible as far east as Piru. Currently, there is freight service to Santa Paula and special tourist trains mainly between Fillmore and Santa Paula. The weekend and holiday tourist trains operated by the Fillmore & Western Railway, who also maintain the SPBL under contract with VCTC.

Item # 7 CHAIRMAN’S REPORT

Chair White thanked the committee for attending and urged members to attend local and/or County meetings where transportation issues might be discussed. He also noted the update about the Countywide Transportation Plan should be an interesting discussion.

Item # 8 STAFF REPORT

Mary Travis, VCTC staff, mentioned the Mill Building opening in September. This historic building in Santa Paula on the Branch Line is now the home of the County Agricultural Equipment Museum. She also noted that the updated County Bicycle Map will be available in December.

Item # 9 COMMITTEE MEMBER REPORTS

Representative Morris wanted to emphasize how important the annual unmet transit needs public meeting/hearing process is and that it be integrated into the meeting schedule. Representative Minkler noted that Gold Coast Transit will be holding meetings on transit in October.

Item # 10 ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 3:45 PM.



Item # 5

November 8, 2011

MEMO TO: CTAC/SSTAC

FROM: MARY TRAVIS, MANAGER OF TDA & RAIL PROGRAMS

SUBJECT: FY12/13 TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT (TDA) UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS PUBLIC HEARING SCHEDULE, PROCEDURES AND DEFINITIONS OF "UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS" AND "REASONABLE TO MEET"

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- Review and approve the schedule, procedures and definitions of "Unmet Transit Needs" and "Reasonable to Meet" for the FY 12/13 Unmet Transit Needs Public Hearing.

DISCUSSION:

Each year, the State Transportation Development Act (TDA) requires a public hearing be held to discuss public transit. The purpose of the annual public hearing is to take testimony on local and/or regional transit needs, and then develop findings that ensure that all reasonable transit needs are satisfied before TDA funds can be allocated for street and road purposes. The testimony is reviewed against adopted definitions describing what are "unmet transit needs" and what is "reasonable to meet".

A schedule for the FY 12/13 public hearing is attached. A Hearing Board will be appointed by the VCTC Chair, and they will hold the public hearing Monday, February 6, 2012 at 1:30 PM at Camarillo City Hall, and then, review the testimony and draft staff findings/recommendations at the same time and place on April 23, 2012. The procedures for the hearing will be the same as in past years, that is, testimony will be collected from the public and local agencies interested in transportation. Testimony can be submitted by letter, email, telephone call to VCTC's toll-free "800" number, by appearing at an East County or West County public meeting and/or at the public hearing. The testimony will be reviewed by VCTC staff and transit providers and analyzed in the context of the adopted definitions of "unmet transit needs" and "reasonable to meet".

Three years ago, a thorough discussion took place at VCTC's Citizen's Transportation Advisory Committee/Social Services Transportation Advisory Council (CTAC/SSTAC) about the required definitions used in the hearing process. Included as part of the discussion was a review of how other counties define the terms, and it was reassuring to discover that Ventura is setting the model for many other areas. Accordingly, staff is recommending the definitions stay basically the same.

"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) paratransit plans and/or in the Regional Transportation Plan that have not yet been implemented or funded.

“Reasonable to Meet”:

Following is the VCTC adopted definition of "Reasonable to Meet" including the recommended benchmarks for the passenger farebox recovery ratio for new transit services in Ventura County.

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 meet the scheduled passenger fare ratio standards as described in the recommended benchmarks for the passenger farebox recovery ratio for new transit services in Ventura County.
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 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 need (as defined) and which requires evaluation against this definition of “reasonable to meet”.*

(2) *The lack of available resources shall not be the sole reason for finding that a transit need is not reasonable to meet.*

**RECOMMENDED BENCHMARKS FOR PASSENGER FAREBOX RECOVERY RATIO FOR
NEW TRANSIT/PARATRANSIT SERVICES IN VENTURA COUNTY.**

The State has established a basic requirement in Section 99268 of the Public Utility Code for all proposed transit services in urban areas. This requirement is to achieve a 20% passenger fare ratio by the end of the third year of operation. A similar targeted passenger fare ratio of 10% exists for special services (i.e. elderly and disabled) and rural area services.

VCTC has established more detailed interim passenger fare ratio standards, which will be used to evaluate services as they are proposed and implemented, which are described below. Transit serving both urban and rural areas, per state law, may obtain an "intermediate" passenger fare ratio. (1)

END OF TWELVE MONTHS

Performance Level		<u>Recommended Action</u>
<u>Urban Service</u>	<u>Rural/Special Services</u>	
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		<u>Recommended Action</u>
<u>Urban Service</u>	<u>Rural/Special Services</u>	
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		<u>Recommended Action</u>
<u>Urban Service</u>	<u>Rural/Special Services</u>	
Less than 15%	Less than 7%	Provider may discontinue service
15-20%	7-10%	Provider may consider modifying and continuing 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 ratio 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.

Fiscal Year 12/13 Unmet Transit Needs Public Hearing and Process Schedule

November 8, 2011	CTAC/SSTAC reviews FY 12/13 unmet transit needs public hearing definitions
December 2, 2011	VCTC approves FY 12/13 unmet transit needs public hearing schedule and definitions
December 12, 2011	Letters/flyers are sent to community groups, social service agencies, transit operators, and the general public to announce the public hearing and information is posted on the www.goventura.org website
January 6, 2012	Legal notice for public hearing published
January 9 and 23, 2012	Display advertisements on public hearing published in local English and Spanish language newspapers
January 17, 2012	East County public meeting, 6:30 PM, in Moorpark
January 18, 2012	West County public meeting, 6:30 PM, in Oxnard
January 23, 2012	Reminder notices on the public hearing sent to agencies/citizens
February 6, 2012	Public Hearing, 1:30 p.m. at Camarillo City Hall
February 13, 2012	5 p.m. hearing record closed - no further public testimony accepted
March 15, 2012	Transit Operators Advisory Committee (TRANSCOM) reviews testimony and makes recommendations regarding the staff proposed findings
March 22, 2012	(Tentative Date) Managers Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC) reviews testimony and makes recommendations regarding the proposed findings
April 10, 2012	CTAC/SSTAC reviews testimony and makes recommendations regarding the staff proposed findings
April 23, 2012	1:30 p.m. at Camarillo City Hall - Hearing Board reviews and approves findings
May 4, 2012	9 a.m. at Camarillo City Hall - VCTC adopts Unmet Transit Needs Public Hearing Findings
May 7, 2012	Adopted findings are forwarded to the State for review
August 15, 2012	Deadline for State review of findings



Item # 6

November 8, 2012

MEMO TO: CTAC/SSTAC

FROM: MARY TRAVIS, VCTC STAFF

SUBJECT: APPROVAL OF FY 12/13 SCHEDULE AND EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT (TDA) ARTICLE 3 BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN FUND APPLICATIONS

RECOMMENDATION:

Review, adjust and approve the schedule and evaluation criteria for the applications from cities/County for FY 12/13 TDA Article 3 bicycle/pedestrian funds.

DISCUSSION:

Pursuant to California PUC Section 99233.3, each year a portion of the available Transportation Development Act (TDA) Local Transportation Funds each year must be used for planning, maintaining and constructing facilities for the exclusive use of pedestrians and bicyclists. In FY 12/13, we expect about \$530,000 will be available for these purposes. About 20% or \$106,000 of the total will be allocated to the cities/County based on the Class I Bike Trail mileage the agency maintains under the Commission's Class I Bicycle Trail Maintenance program. After this is deducted, there should be about \$430,000 remaining for allocation to the cities and County of Ventura for local bicycle or pedestrian projects on a competitive basis.

VCTC has established an annual process for the cities/County to submit projects and compete for the available funds; please see the recommended FY 12/13 Article 3 allocation schedule (Attachment # 1) and project evaluation criteria (Attachment #2). VCTC has assigned the responsibility to the Citizen's Transportation Advisory Committee/Social Services Transportation Advisory Council (CTAC/SSTAC) for reviewing the applications and making application ranking order recommendations to the Commission.

Each city and the County is allowed to submit one project for funding consideration. The applicants are informed that it is strongly recommended they provide a 50/50 match with local and/or other grant funds to augment the Article 3 funds being requested. Every application must include a written response to the each of evaluation criteria as part of the request for funds and a location map of the project is requested to facilitate field visits. Applicants are also asked to report on the status of projects for which they were awarded past Article 3 allocations.

In discussing past allocations, CTAC/SSTAC felt the submittals were mostly for routine projects such as curb cuts. While this example is a worthwhile activity, the Committee felt the Article 3 funds should be used for more innovative and exciting projects, and also, for bigger projects that might involve more than one city or just the County. This point will therefore be emphasized when the FY 12/13 application packets are distributed in January.

**FY 12/13 TDA ARTICLE 3
BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN FUND ALLOCATION SCHEDULE**

November 8, 2011	CTAC/SSTAC reviews draft FY 12/13 schedule and evaluation criteria
December 2, 2011	VCTC reviews/approves schedule and evaluation criteria
January 17, 2012	County Auditor estimates FY 12/13 TDA funds available
January 20, 2012	Article 3 application packets sent to cities/County for their consideration
<u>February 27, 2012</u>	<u>Noon - City/County applications due at VCTC office</u> (Note: resolutions authorizing the claims may be submitted at a later date but must be received at the VCTC before any funds will be allocated to the claimant.)
March 13, 2012	CTAC/SSTAC meeting to review project applications/ interviews project applicants
April 10, 2012	CTAC/SSTAC meeting with general discussion of projects and field visits
May 8, 2012	CTAC/SSTAC meeting to rank projects and make funding recommendation to VCTC
June 1, 2012	VCTC reviews recommendation and approves FY 12/13 Article 3 project funding allocations
November, 2012	Instructions sent to County Auditor allocating FY 12/13 Article 3 funds

TDA ARTICLE 3 GRANT EVALUATION CRITERIA

<p>1. Matching Funds (Yes or No)</p>		<p>2. Safety (25 points possible)</p>	
<p>This criterion evaluates local support for the proposed project in terms of financial partnership. It is 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?</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 (20 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>	