

Metropolitan Transportation Commission Programming and Allocations Committee

December 12, 2007

Item Number 3a

Resolution No. 3787, Revised

Subject: Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan: Elderly and Disabled Component

Background: MTC has completed a Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan pursuant to requirements in the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act (SAFETEA). Starting in FY 2007, projects funded through three programs included in SAFETEA are required to be derived from a locally developed, coordinated public transit-human services transportation plan. These programs are (1) the Job Access Reverse Commute (JARC) program, which funds transportation projects benefiting low income populations, (2) the New Freedom program, a new program that will fund projects benefiting the disability community, and (3) the Formula Program for Elderly Individuals and Individuals with Disabilities, known as section 5310.

MTC adopted the low-income component of the Coordinated Plan in November 2006. This component of the plan is a synthesis of the planning results in low-income communities that MTC has sponsored, including welfare to work transportation plans in each of the nine counties, a regional welfare to work transportation plan and community-based transportation planning plans. Five community-based transportation plans (South and West Berkeley, San Francisco's Outer Mission and Civic Center, Roseland in Santa Rosa and Bay Point) have been completed since the low-income component was adopted. By way of this resolution revision, these executive summaries are added to Appendix 5.4 of the Plan.

MTC hired a consultant to complete the elderly and disabled component of the plan. This process included assessing existing transportation services, documenting transportation needs (through public outreach), and identifying potential solutions to address transportation gaps. In addition, the consultant reviewed the low-income component of the plan and included chapters that review the overlapping transportation needs of all three groups and identify potential strategies to enhance coordination.

The draft elderly and disabled component of the plan was reviewed with MTC's Elderly and Disabled Advisory Committee, MTC's Minority Citizens Advisory Committee, the Partnership Transit Coordinating Council's Accessibility Committee, the Regional Welfare to Work Transportation Working Group, the Transit Finance Working Group and the Transit Planners Working Group, and was available on-line for public comment.

Recommendation: Refer MTC Resolution No. 3787, Revised to the Commission to adopt the Elderly and Disabled Component of the Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan.

Attachments:

- 1) Attachment 1: Summary of Comments Received on the Draft Elderly and Disabled Component of the Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan
- 2) MTC Resolution No. 3787, Revised with excerpt from Attachment A: Executive Summary of Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan – Low Income Component and Elderly and Disabled

Summary of Comments

Following is a summary of the comments received on the Elderly and Disabled component of the Coordinated Plan, organized by topic. Nine comments did not request a change, but acknowledged appreciation for the project or provided information outside the scope of this plan, and are not included below.

General Comments

Topic	Comment	Response
Additions and corrections to Inventory	Almost 20 comments requested the addition of providers or corrected information in the transportation inventory (Appendix C).	All information included in inventory
Additions / corrections to County gaps	Two comments added information on County transportation gaps.	These comments duplicated information already in the report
Additions / clarification to Chapter 7	Five comments added information to Chapter 7, Solutions to Gaps.	All comments added
Meeting information corrections	Five comments corrected information on Outreach meetings, such as the number of people attending or the name of the host.	Meeting information updated
Terminology	Three comments asked for terminology changes.	All terminology changes made

Comments by Issue Area

Topic	Comment	Response
Access to transit	Two individuals made four comments asking that bus “bulb-outs” be added to Ch. 6, 7 and 8 as solutions to unsafe access to transit.	Added to the report
Accessible taxis	Nine comments on accessible taxis noted that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) there is a shortage of taxis, both accessible and not accessible b) fixed-route should be the first choice where it would work for disabled travelers c) there is a need for the creation of taxi voucher programs d) one form of financial assistance to accessible taxis would be to encourage transit agencies to purchase “trip levels” to support accessible taxis e) New Freedom funds should be used to subsidize accessible taxis f) Taxi service should be added as a solution to paratransit gaps aside from enhancing paratransit service itself. 	Comments a – e added to report Comment f – Taxis are already included in paratransit solutions
Additional / re-formatted information	Requests were made for county maps and a table of contents of the inventory.	A list of all agencies by County was added to the inventory. A map of the Bay Area was added to Chapter 3

Topic	Comment	Response
Connecting land use to transit	Comments (7) indicated support for recognizing the importance of this issue, and for siting social services and housing near transit to the point of requiring this through zoning. One comment suggested that siting services near housing might limit the location of housing options for seniors and disabled.	No change to report, as these comments primarily supported text already included in this section
Coordination between transit agencies	Many transit agencies are not limited to a particular county; inter-agency transfers are an agency issue rather than a county issue.	Added to report
Demographic Information	Break out senior demographics into finer categories (rather than 65 and older)	The intent of this section of the plan to provide a general overview of the older adult population in the Bay Area. For detailed demographics and analysis, refer to the <i>Older Adults Transportation Study</i> , MTC, 2002
Funding	Several (5) comments said the plan did not recognize the shortage of funds for the proposed projects and transportation in general. There was some confusion about how funds would be combined and used for specific populations. There were also requests for clarifying statements about funding sources and how Medi-Cal funds can be used for transportation. Others suggested developing a list of funding sources for recommended projects and a worksheet to help Section 5310, JARC, and New Freedom Program grant applicants	Additional and clarifying information was added. Comments for worksheets and tables will be forwarded to funding programs as a suggestion to be included in calls for projects
Information	Minor changes and additions to Tables 7-3, 7-4 and 7-5 on feasibility and information at bus stops	Changes and additions made
Plan Process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Two comments questioned how the low-income component would be integrated with the Elderly and Disabled component. b) One comment asked to clarify that this plan informs the 2009 RTP update in 2013. c) One person commented that the plan process should have included more outreach to private for-profit transportation companies such as cab companies. 	<p>Comment a is covered in Chapter 6</p> <p>Comments b and c added</p>
Program examples	Two comments questioned the choice of the peers used as best practice examples, what the selection criteria were, and whether Monument Corridor was a good choice. A program in the Philadelphia Plan was recommended as an example of a volunteer driver program in which older drivers who carried other seniors could accumulate credit for when they are no longer able to drive.	<p>Information was added on the criteria for selecting peer programs.</p> <p>The examples suggested for statewide coordination will be forwarded to the state's mobility action planning project as referenced in Chapter 8.</p> <p>Language was added to illustrate the example of senior volunteer driver programs.</p>

Topic	Comment	Response
Program suggestions	Eight comments were received suggesting changes or additions to programs, including paid (vs. volunteer) travel escorts, travel training (including safety), wheelchair breakdown service and clarification about the Lifeline Program funding cycles.	Added to Chapters 7 and 8
Regional mobility management	Five comments addressed regional coordination as follows: a) Request that MTC allow a mobility management center to be eligible for Federal funding programs (listed on p 1-3) b) Ease navigation of inter-jurisdictional and inter-modal travel using a regional travel coordinator c) Clarify and add information about Consolidated Transportation Service Agencies	Comment a added Clarifications/information added for b and c
Solution evaluation	Three comments expressed concern about the emphasis in evaluating solutions, specifically over- and under-emphasis on cost-effectiveness, lack of emphasis on encouraging people to take fixed-route transit, and the lack of emphasis on the “community” element.	Projects will be prioritized in competitive selection processes for funding. Evaluation criteria in the report is not prioritized or weighted

Date: November 15, 2006
W.I.: 1311
Referred by: PAC
Revised: 12/19/07-C

ABSTRACT

Resolution No. 3787, Revised

This resolution adopts the Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan.

The following attachment is provided with this resolution:

Attachment A— Low-Income Component of the Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan. Attachment A will be amended at a later date and will include the elderly and disabled component of the plan, as well as a section focused on coordinated solutions to address the transportation needs of the low-income, elderly and disabled populations in the Bay Area.

This resolution was revised on December 19, 2007 to add the elderly and disabled component of the plan to Attachment A.

Attachment A – Low Income Component and Elderly and Disabled Component of the Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan

Discussion of this plan is included in the Programming and Allocations Summary sheets dated November 8, 2006 and December 12, 2007.

Date: November 15, 2006
W.I.: 1311
Referred by: PAC
Revised: 12/19/07-C

Attachment A
MTC Resolution No. 3787

Coordinated Public Transit Human Services Transportation Plan

Low Income Component

and

Elderly and Disabled Component

Both components of the plan are incorporated by reference. The low-income component of the plan is available on-line at http://www.mtc.ca.gov/planning/pths/Low-Income_Component_Coord_Plan.pdf. The elderly and disabled component of the plan is available on-line at [http://www.mtc.ca.gov/planning/pths/Elderly and Disabled Component Coord Plan.pdf](http://www.mtc.ca.gov/planning/pths/Elderly_and_Disabled_Component_Coord_Plan.pdf). Both components and their appendices are also available in the MTC/ABAG Library.

Executive Summary

Introduction/Background

This plan has been developed on behalf of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), and its local stakeholders with an interest in human service transportation programs. MTC is both the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) and the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area, and in this capacity also serves as a designated recipient of federal transportation funding. This element of the Coordinated Plan focuses on transportation needs of older adults and persons with disabilities. It serves as a parallel effort to the low-income component already completed by MTC, and together they comprise the Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan for the San Francisco Bay Area.

As described further in this document, the plan also fulfills a federal requirement enacted in 2005 through the passage of the Safe, Accountable Flexible Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), which stipulates that starting in Fiscal Year 2007, projects funded through three SAFETEA-LU programs - the Job Access and Reverse Commute Program (JARC, Section 5316), the New Freedom Program (Section 5317) and the Formula Program for Elderly Individuals and Individuals with Disabilities (Section 5310) - are required to be derived from a locally developed, coordinated public transit-human services transportation plan. SAFETEA-LU guidance issued by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) described the plan as a “unified, comprehensive strategy for public transportation service delivery that identifies the transportation needs of individuals with disabilities, older adults, and individuals with limited income, laying out strategies for meeting these needs, and prioritizing services.”

This Plan is intended to meet the federal planning requirements as well as to provide MTC and its regional partners with a range of strategies and a “blueprint” for implementing them, which are intended to promote and advance local efforts to improve the status of transportation for persons with disabilities, older adults, and those of low-income status.

Project Methodology

The methodology used to develop the plan included the following steps:

Conduct Literature Search and Review Best Practices: A review was conducted of recent local studies, which have examined transportation needs in the Bay Area, particularly those of elderly and disabled individuals. Secondly, a peer review was completed of other coordination activities nationwide. Findings are documented in Appendices A and B, respectively.

Establish Demographic Profile: A demographic profile of the service area was prepared using census data and other relevant planning documents. This step established the framework for better understanding the local characteristics of the study area, with a focus on persons with disabilities and older adults.

Document Existing Transportation Services: This step involved documenting the range of public transportation services that already exist in the Bay Area. These services include public fixed route and paratransit services, and transportation services provided or sponsored by social service agencies. Information about public transit and paratransit was obtained from existing resources as specified in the report, and information regarding services provided by social service agencies was collected through an inventory completed as part of this project. Appendix C provides the complete inventory results.

Conduct Outreach: Stakeholder involvement and public participation was implemented in a three-pronged approach through public outreach, stakeholder interviews, and convening a focus group to examine coordination issues in detail. Through this step, transportation gaps were identified or confirmed. Stakeholders provided input on existing barriers to coordination as well as possibilities for improvement.

Assess Needs: The needs assessment provides the basis for recognizing where—and how—service for the population groups of concern needs to be improved. The results of the needs assessment are summarized in Chapter 6, and comprehensive lists of unmet needs identified in each county are included in Appendix D.

Identify Solutions: Coupled with the need to identify service gaps is the need to identify corresponding potential service solutions. These are documented in Chapter 7.

Develop Coordination Strategies: Beyond identifying which projects or solutions could directly address transportation gaps, the final step was to consider how best to coordinate services so that existing resources can be used as efficiently as possible. These strategies outline a more comprehensive approach to service delivery with implications beyond the immediate funding of local projects, which may be short-term in nature.

A range of potential coordination strategies was identified primarily through direct consultation with a number of key stakeholders already involved in the planning and implementation of human service transportation.

Key Findings

Key findings emerging from the study are identified below.

Population Characteristics

Older Adults: In 2005, just over 11% of the Bay Area population was aged 65 or older. By the year 2030, this population is expected to increase by 162%¹.

Individuals with a Disability: While approximately 12% of the region's population reports a disability, 22% are living in low-income households earning less than 150% of the federal poverty level compared to only 15% of the general population.

¹ Association of Bay Area Governments, Projections 2005

Additional demographic information about the Bay Area's elderly and disabled populations, including data by county, is detailed in Chapter 3.

Human Service Transportation Inventory

To document transportation service currently provided in the Bay Area, an inventory was created to identify agencies that provide social service transportation, and to collect basic information about the programs. A survey was sent to public transit agencies providing ADA paratransit, as well as a range of public and private agencies providing transportation for clients, program participants, specific populations (such as older adults), or the general public. Responses were received from 75 of the 83 agencies contacted (a 90% response rate). The inventory is intended to serve as a tool to support coordination by identifying the existing transportation resources in the region as well as documenting current service parameters, geographic coverage and beneficiaries. Service duplication or gaps in service are also noted.

Needs Assessment

Several key themes emerged from the outreach efforts, stakeholder consultation, and previous planning projects. These include:

Enhanced Fixed Route Services: For persons who can and do use the fixed route system, there is a need for additional service in rural and suburban areas, and for more direct service to key activity centers that older adults and persons with disabilities need to access. Customers also would like increased frequency to avoid long waits, and service longer into the evening and on weekends.

Enhanced Paratransit Services: Paratransit users sometimes need a level of service above and beyond what is required by the ADA, such as service provided on the same day it is requested, where and when the fixed route service does not operate, or the ability to accommodate "uncommon" wheelchairs or other mobility devices.

Connectivity: The need for better connectivity was expressed, both for inter- and intra-county travel, whether using paratransit or fixed route service. Customers also mentioned the need for better shelters and bus stops as well as other amenities at transfer sites. Some wheelchair users have difficulty making effective use of the fixed-route system and referred to needs to enhance accessibility of vehicles and the relating infrastructure, such as shelters and stops.

Information and Other Assistance: There is a need for education so that older adults and persons with disabilities can learn how to use public transit and their accessible features, and the need to provide information in a variety of formats. Likewise, there is a need to ensure drivers, dispatchers and other transit personnel are sensitive to passenger needs, and know how to provide assistance on-board the vehicle.

Pedestrian Access and Land Use Coordination: The need to improve accessibility to and from bus stops and transfer centers (sidewalks, curb cuts, curb ramps, crosswalks) was widely voiced

throughout the outreach meetings. Meeting attendees also mentioned the need to better coordinate land use development with the provision of transit service, especially in lower-density communities. The location of housing and facilities serving people with disabilities or older adults in areas that are inaccessible by transit was also cited as a source of concern.

Overlapping Transportation Needs

The transportation needs and gaps of older adults and persons with disabilities, as well as those of the region's low-income population (as identified in the low-income component of the Coordinated Plan) were reviewed. There is significant overlap or consistency in the barriers and gaps expressed by all three populations of concern. A comprehensive list of the overlapping needs is found in Chapter 6.

Potential Solutions

Potential solutions are identified to address the gaps that emerged from the outreach process and review of local plans. These suggested solutions are grouped into five categories:

- Additions or improvements to paratransit service that exceed ADA requirements
- Additions or improvements to demand-responsive services other than ADA paratransit
- Additions or improvements to transit services
- Improved access to fixed-route transit services
- Information and assistance

These solutions represent categories of potential projects, which could be eligible for SAFETEA-LU funds subject to this plan, or other local sources of funding. Chapter 7 of the report describes the solutions in more detail, including implementation steps.

Strategies to Enhance Human Service Transportation Coordination

In addition to considering which projects or solutions could directly address transportation gaps, it is important to consider how best to coordinate services so that existing resources can be used as efficiently as possible. The following proposed strategies offer opportunities to improve coordination of service delivery, and were developed with input from key stakeholders already involved in the planning and implementation of human service transportation.

- Enhance land use and transportation coordination
- Promote enhanced pedestrian access to public transit and other alternative modes of travel
- Promote coordinated advocacy and improve efforts to coordinate funding with human service agencies

- Improve interjurisdictional and intermodal travel
- Develop and implement mobility management approaches

Successful implementation of the coordination strategies will require the joint cooperation and effort of multiple entities that may or may not have coordinated in the past. Often, a champion is needed to assume leadership and manage implementation efforts; this “champion” may vary from case to case. As illustrated in Figure ES-2, implementing some strategies may require leadership on the part of cities or other local jurisdictions, while others may be assumed by social service agencies, transit agencies, Congestion Management Agencies (CMAs), advocacy groups, MTC or designated mobility managers.

Figure ES-2: Implementation Steps for Coordination Strategies

Enhanced Land Use and Transportation Coordination	Partners/Stakeholders
Provide documentation of the issue	TBD
Document examples of policies that have effectively addressed locational decisions	TBD
Engage key stakeholders in the development of a regional strategy.	JPC, CMAs
Build on the regional FOCUS program to incentivize positive locational decisions	JPC, CMAs through T-Plus program
Promote Alternative Modes of Travel, including Improved Pedestrian Access to Transit	Partners/Stakeholders
Build upon previous MTC planning work specific to pedestrian safety, and disseminate the results to other partner organizations.	Local jurisdictions
Encourage pedestrian-related planning at the community level through community-based transportation plans (CBTPs).	MTC, CMAs
Encourage the development of countywide taxi ordinances that would enhance the provision of accessible taxi programs	Counties, CMAs
Distribute and share the results of the recently completed Marin County Enhanced Taxi Services Project with EDAC, transit and paratransit program staff and other interested stakeholders.	Marin County, PTCC Accessibility Committee, EDAC, Counties and Cities
Promote Coordinated Advocacy and Improve Efforts to Coordinate Funding with Human Service Agencies	Partners/Stakeholders
Develop a comprehensive legislative platform to address improved human service transportation coordination	MTC, Bay Area Partnership, transit agencies and other local stakeholders
Re-initiate previous MTC legislative efforts to promote human service transportation in California.	MTC, Advisory Committees, Bay Area Partnership, human service agencies, other local stakeholders
Identify a legislator willing to sponsor statewide legislation intended to address the platform defined above.	MTC, elected official(s)
Actively seek the support of partner organizations such as National Council of Independent Living (NCIL), The World Institute on Disability (WID), the Transportation and Land Use Coalition (TALC) and others to place greater emphasis on elderly and disabled transportation needs in their advocacy efforts.	Local advocacy organizations, MTC Advisory Committees
Improved Interjurisdictional Travel	Partners/Stakeholders
Prioritize connectivity improvements at transit hubs	MTC, MTC Advisory Committees, transit agencies, human service agencies
Prior to full implementation, test key connectivity improvements such as improved wayfinding signage, or 511 improvements to ensure their accessibility for senior and disabled populations.	MTC, MTC Advisory Committees, transit agencies, human service agencies
Review the status of the SB 1474 Plan (MTC Resolution 3055) to ensure respective coordination policies, such as the paratransit interagency guidelines, are accurate and being implemented.	MTC, MTC advisory committees, transit operators, PTCC Accessibility Committee, human service agencies
Mobility Management	Partners/Stakeholders
Encourage the development of Mobility Managers	TBD
Research and share examples of mobility manager models of excellence established elsewhere.	MTC, human service agencies, Transit and Paratransit Operators, PCCs
Test and implement technology that could track individual client activity on a vehicle supported with multiple fund sources.	MTC, local stakeholders

Conclusion/Next Steps

The next steps in completing this planning process include the following:

Adopt the Coordinated Plan

In November 2006, the Commission adopted MTC Resolution 3787, which documented the transportation needs and strategies specific to low-income persons. The plan built upon previous planning efforts undertaken by MTC in support of improving transportation in Bay Area communities of concern. As a first step, MTC staff will seek amendment of MTC Resolution 3787 to include the results of this planning effort. Together, they will comprise MTC's Coordinated Public Transit-Human Service Transportation Plan.

Inform SAFETEA-LU Funding Decisions

As the designated recipient of JARC and New Freedom funds for the San Francisco Bay Area Urbanized Area, MTC is required to select projects with these funds that are (1) derived from this plan, and (2) selected through a competitive procurement process. The State Department of Transportation (Caltrans) will continue to administer and be responsible to select projects for use of Section 5310 funds. Chapter 1 of this report discusses eligible uses for and recipients of these funds.

In addition, local entities can develop the transportation solutions proposed in the plan to respond to SAFETEA-LU, as well as other funding opportunities.

Plan Update

Federal guidelines indicate that at a minimum, the coordinated plan should follow the update cycles for the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). MTC will next update its RTP in 2009, which would provide an opportunity to directly link the development of the coordinated plan with the RTP. Because projects must be derived from the plan, it may also be necessary to update or amend the list of projects to coincide with the Lifeline Transportation funding cycles, or other funding cycles specific to fund sources subject to this Plan.
