



MEETING ATTENDEES

Attendance Key (A = Absent, P = Present)

PAPCO Members:

- A Sylvia Stadmire,
Chair
- P Will Scott,
Vice-Chair
- P Larry Bunn
- P Shawn Costello
- P Herb Hastings

- A Joyce
Jacobson
- P Sandra
Johnson-Simon
- A Jonah Markowitz
- A Rev. Carolyn Orr
- P Sharon Powers

- A Vanessa Proee
- A Carmen Rivera-
Hendrickson
- P Michelle Rousey
- P Harriette
Saunders
- P Esther Waltz
- P Hale Zukas

ParaTAC Members:

- P Diane Atienza
- P Dana Bailey
- P Jessica Cutter
- P Pam Deaton
- P Shawn Fong
- A Brad
Helfenberger
- A Rashida Kamara
- A Jackie Krause

- A Kadri Klm
- A Isabelle Leduc
- P Wilson Lee
- P Hakeim McGee
- A Scott Means
- A Mallory Nestor
- P Julie Parkinson
- A Gail Payne
- P Kim Ridgeway

- A Sandra Rogers
- A Sid Schoenfeld
- A Leah Talley
- A Laura Timothy
- A Jonathan Torres
- A Rochelle
Wheeler
- A David Zehnder

Staff:

- P Jacki Taylor, Program Analyst
- P Naomi Armenta, Paratransit Coordinator
- P Terra Curtis, Paratransit Coordination Team
- P Krystle Pasco, Paratransit Coordination Team
- P Richard Weiner, Paratransit Coordination Team
- P Laurel Poeton, Alameda CTC Staff
- P Christina Ramos, Project Controls Team

Guests:

Susan Bonnett, Care Neighborhood; Sharon Coleman, Care Neighborhood/Paratransit Rider; Monica Davis, City of Hayward; Dr. Aki Eejima, San Mateo County PCC; Cynthia Fong, Alameda County APS; Jon Gaffney, Marin Transit; Alice Kennedy, Care Neighborhood; Sundeeep Kumar, A-Paratransit; Mary Lawrence, Disabled Rider; Mike Levinson, San Mateo County PCC Chair; Erin McAuliff, Marin Transit; Angela O'Brien, Care Neighborhood; Penny Powers, Public Member; John Sanderson, SamTrans; Rebeca Servin, Center for Independent Living; Jennifer Shelton, ACCA/Allen Temple B.C.; Marc Soto, Transdev/SF Paratransit; Victoria Williams, Mobility Matters

MEETING MINUTES

1. Welcome and Introductions

Naomi Armenta, Paratransit Coordinator, called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. and notified members that a quorum had not yet been established. The meeting began with introductions and a review of the meeting outcomes.

2. Same Day Accessible Trips Presentation

Terra Curtis, with Nelson\Nygaard Consulting Associates, gave a presentation on same day accessible trips in Alameda County. She reviewed the existing same day accessible programs currently available in Alameda County as well as national programs that also provide same day accessible transportation.

3. Same Day Accessible Trips Discussion

Richard Weiner gave a presentation on strategies and opportunities to address the issue of same day accessible transportation in Alameda County. He then facilitated a discussion regarding these strategies and opportunities with the meeting attendees.

Questions and feedback from PAPCO, ParaTAC and members of the public:

- General Comments
 - A Committee member noted that Medi-Cal and Medicare trips are only available for specific trips outside of the

patient's city of residence. She also noted that the reason why the Hospital Discharge Transportation Service is not seeing more ridership is due to the lack of awareness of people who might need the program. Hospital staff members are not sharing information regarding this service. She also noted that in order for companies like Uber to utilize Measure B or BB funding she thinks they would need to be based in Alameda County.

- A guest asked where we can find the contact information for the programs discussed. There is a table next to the sign in table that includes information for Alameda CTC's mobility programs.
- Marin Transit staff gave an update on their Catch-A-Ride program and their accessible vehicles. They noted that as of last week there are no longer any accessible taxis operating in the County. Initially there were four vehicles that were purchased by the program and one operating through the local cab company. However, the largest cab company closed their business with little notice and one driver decided to continue the business and provide rides. Initially the new provider continued providing accessible rides. Unfortunately, due to the low demand and the cost of operating an accessible vehicle, the driver decided to stop providing rides, leaving Marin County with no accessible taxicab options. And although the vehicles are rather old, they are still operational. The program is still able to provide many trips to those that are able to transfer.
- A Committee member noted that when the Tri-City Taxi program was being administered by the Alameda CTC, there were reportedly a lot of wheelchair accessible trips being provided. However, consumers would be calling the taxi service provider and would book trips a day ahead of time so ultimately when consumers couldn't book a return trip on paratransit they would call the taxi service. This is not necessarily a same day accessible trip. Additionally, that taxi provider did not necessarily have wheelchair accessible trips, they owned another company that was a for profit business that happened to provide wheelchair

accessible vans for transportation. This is not necessarily the way we want to provide accessible service to our consumers. It is important to know that when we talk about this issue that we understand there is a variety of accessible services for users in mobility devices. Also we should talk about the access and equitability of our non-same-day accessible transportation options.

- Staff from San Francisco's paratransit program shared that there is a \$10.00 financial incentive given to taxi drivers who transport paratransit riders in wheelchairs using a ramped taxi. On average approximately \$8,000-9,000 a month is paid out for these financial incentives. The taxi companies are also rewarded through a formula for the average number of wheelchairs that are transported per medallion. Their staff believes that their participation in promoting the taxi program is also critical to the program's success. All of this data is generated through computer tracking of the paratransit rides. There is also another incentive to bypass the line at the airport if drivers go outside of the central area of the city to pick up a person in a wheelchair. The program does not have a way to provide incentives for non-paratransit riders, although when this program started taxi drivers were only receiving \$5.00 incentive per trip but the staff offered them \$10.00 per trip to incentivize the drivers to offer rides to non-paratransit wheelchair riders like tourists that are visiting the city and want to get around. Regarding the Transportation Network Companies (TNCs), their services were created with only the ambulatory population in mind. Addressing the ways in which this service can benefit wheelchair users was an afterthought. There is currently no data that supports any of the supposed efforts that the TNCs are making to provide accessible service. Lastly, the ramp medallions for San Francisco are not being sold. They are currently free to qualified drivers who are willing to operate them, however the cost of the vehicles poses a challenge. One of the potential initiatives is a partnership with a credit union that will help finance the regular taxi medallion as well as the vehicles perhaps at a

reduced interest rate for those who are willing to operate the ramp medallions to serve the disabled community. Another initiative, when there is another taxi fare increase, could put \$0.05 or \$0.10 towards funding the ramped taxi program or capital for vehicles. An initiative like CIL's partnership with Lyft could also be expanded.

- Countywide Needs Assessment
 - A Committee member noted that in the 1990s there was a DART bus that provided same day service from bus stop to bus stop from 10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. and it was very beneficial. Unfortunately, that service lost funding and was discontinued.
 - A Committee member noted there needs to be a study to identify the actual need for same day accessible service.
 - A Committee member noted that the Tri-City Taxi program was intended to provide a same day service for both ambulatory and accessible consumers in the Tri-City area, however, what staff members realized is that the program was actually preferred by consumers due to its convenience. We need to look at the necessity for same day need versus choice for travelling same day. Also due to the historical limitations of same day service, consumers may have gotten accustomed to planning their trips ahead of time.
 - A Committee member noted that if a Countywide Needs Assessment will be done it is important to point out that seniors may have different needs than younger, working individuals. There would need to be categories identified for different needs. Also working with CRIL and CIL would be very beneficial in getting more in depth information.
 - A guest reminded the attendees of how the disabled movement and the efforts around the Americans with Disabilities came to be and what events took place at the capitol (when people with disabilities crawled up the Capitol steps in 1990). She urged the committee members to take actions based on what the disabled community actually wants.

- A guest agreed with the previous speaker regarding the voice of the disabled community. She noted that the senior and disabled community could do something to make sure that committee members are aware of what they face on a day-to-day basis. There was also not enough information provided on what would be discussed at today's meeting regarding same day accessible transportation but our community does want to have the availability and flexibility to be able to use transportation for reasons that are not just medical. A solution may be identifying paratransit vehicles and drivers that are available on the weekends and providing them additional financial incentives to drive during these times.
- A guest noted that in the presentation Nelson/Nygaard pointed out that the programs that worked the best were programs where the County or City government ran the regulation as well as the transit system. That is an astute observation. When working with East Bay Paratransit years ago, I had wished that Alameda County would take over the oversight of all of the taxis in Alameda County. This would've been a more efficient and effective way to have control of the entire industry without having to go to thirteen different cities and jurisdictions. I urge members of the Committee to consider the viability of this change and consider it a first step to making the taxi industry more robust in Alameda County.
- A Committee member noted that it seems like there is some confusion around the necessity versus convenience of same day service. What are the actual different needs of the community and who would benefit the most from this service?
- A Committee member suggested that perhaps a survey be done with existing taxi drivers to ask whether they would be willing to operate a wheelchair accessible vehicle with a possible incentive. Therefore the driver incentive or loan purchase programs might be able to thrive.
- Feasibility of TNCs

- A Committee member wanted more information about the impact of TNCs on the local taxi industry in Alameda County.
- A guest that works with the local Yellow Cab and Veterans Cab companies noted that they have a broad perspective when it comes to transportation as they also contract with East Bay Paratransit and other local agencies. He noted that the impact of the TNCs on their taxi company is pretty strong. It's causing a lot of the existing drivers to look elsewhere. Furthermore, TNCs are not as well regulated as taxi companies so they are free to do what they please. The insurance requirements are also different as are the fees involved in operating a taxi vehicle. The TNCs have obviously found a loophole to operate in cities where they don't have permits. Unless the local governments can help the taxi industry in a way that will allow them to continue competing with the TNCs, these companies will continue to thrive. Although TNCs are a great way to provide service, they are definitely impacting the taxi industry. The other difference is that taxi companies including paratransit contractors have to undergo extensive training (i.e. first aid, CPR) whereas TNC drivers do not. Safety and reliability are not well accounted for with TNCs.
- A Committee member asked if general taxi drivers (i.e. those not working with paratransit riders) have to receive training on first aid and CPR? The same guest answered that general taxi drivers are not required to receive these types of trainings but some of them are certified.
- A Committee member asked if there is data on TNCs drivers that are providing wheelchair accessible rides? Staff replied that there is currently one individual that has come forth about providing wheelchair accessible trips for both Lyft and Uber. This information was shared on the Berkeley Disabled email list serve. Naomi and Terra will be testing out this opportunity in the near future. The Committee member wondered if there is a way to market to folks that have those vehicles and might choose to drive for the same reasons that other folks may choose to drive for TNCs. Is

there enough market share? The Committee member continued that if we talk about safe streets and improving pedestrian safety, then we should be talking about everyone including those in wheelchairs. We should acknowledge this as a baseline for transportation service especially same day service. Staff noted that at last year's Workshop there were representatives from Lyft and Lift Hero. Lift Hero is a smaller company that serves senior trip needs. Both representatives discussed the strategy of getting individuals who own their wheelchair accessible vehicles to drive on their platforms. They both concluded that there is not enough supply in the community to sustain that type of service. The next step that was discussed was identifying where there is an underused supply of unused accessible vehicles that could be recruited onto the platform.

- A Committee member noted that the taxis in San Francisco are really hurting from the TNCs.
- A Committee member noted that she doesn't really understand why there is such a problem with the availability of same day service such as taxi services. There are still many larger questions about the issue in general.
- A Committee member noted that a lot of these programs are mobile application based and for seniors that is more difficult to navigate and can be considered a barrier for seniors. A staff member added that some mobile application companies and nonprofits are starting to offer training sessions on how to use various mobile applications.
- Feasibility of grant/loan program
 - Have staff members looked into Montgomery County's (in Maryland) experience with accessible taxis? Staff will look into this.
 - A Committee member noted that when their program looked at putting money towards purchasing accessible vehicles for taxi companies, there was some concern from the City attorney's office regarding risk management and liability. There might be more flexibility and political will on a county level to get things implemented on a local level. If a local jurisdiction is funneling clients to a private, for-profit

service there is a higher duty of care. The legal department that we spoke with wanted to see a higher level of insurance. These are just some barriers that we encountered.

- A Committee member noted that it seems easy to just get a group of individuals to start a co-op and run this service for the benefit of people in wheelchairs. However, is there funding available for this type of service? Staff noted that in Alameda County there is currently no funding available for this type of business effort.
- Staff asked what is the current cost of an accessible vehicle? A guest that works with SF Paratransit replied that there are different factors that are considered when estimating a cost for an accessible vehicle including whether the vehicle is side or rear loading and a new or used vehicle. They can range from \$39,000 to \$42,000 on the high end and as low as \$29,000. Also as a comparison, a used crown Victoria for a taxi driver costs only about \$7,000. Other costs to consider, including the capital costs, are the operational costs for an accessible vehicle. Unfortunately, accessible vehicles are not currently available as hybrids so from a fuel perspective they are harder to operate. Although the insurance may be about the same the maintenance will also be higher.
- Feasibility of driver incentive program
 - A Committee member noted that would be a positive idea to get more drivers to provide accessible service.
 - A Committee member noted that when talking with car manufacturers, they mentioned having particular incentives for purchasing accessible vehicles that are a part of their fleets.
 - A Committee member noted that LAVTA still has their Dial-A-Ride vans even though they do not currently have the funding to operate them. They should be available for this type of use. If vehicles are not operating full time, they could be used for other purposes. Another grant could make this possible.
- Feasibility to contract same-day provider

- A Committee member noted that working with Bell Transit in San Leandro for same day accessible service has been a bit of a challenge as they are not able to accommodate requests on a timely basis.
- A Committee member noted that it would be great to have a conversation with the various providers. She also noted that the competition of the private wheelchair companies takes away the ability to foster and nurture accessible taxis. She is currently not sure how to approach the situation given the market share as it exists today.
- Support travel training and promote accessible transit
 - A Committee member noted that in Livermore there needs to be more promotion of using fixed route transit. The travel training program needs more outreach in the community. There is also a lack of funding for this type of work.
 - A Committee member noted that having a travel ambassador program can also be very beneficial for one-on-one and group trainings.
 - A Committee member noted that we should continue our efforts for travel training users in wheelchairs and scooters. In southern Alameda County, she noted that individuals in mobility devices are more likely to be successfully trained to use public transit in a suburban community since the bus stops are not close together. However, it is not so successful for individuals in manual wheelchairs. The accessibility of bus stops in different geographic locations should be evaluated in order to make travel training programs in the County generally more useful.
 - A Committee member noted that the City of Pleasanton has a beta travel training program that helps people get onto the Downtown Route Shuttle or the door-to-door services. The program is a little broader and does not just focus on fixed route transit.
 - A Committee member noted that having to call for transportation a day in advance is like wearing a straight jacket and with proper travel training those who can use fixed route transit will learn these services can provide more freedom.

- Feasibility of using accessible shuttles and vans for same-day trips along common paths
 - A Committee member noted that in the City of Pleasanton there exists an accessible shuttle. The group that started using the shuttle in the very beginning is still using the shuttle even though they are less mobile and many use mobility devices. The residents from the local senior housing facilities are using the accessible shuttle the most.
 - A Committee member noted that in the City of San Leandro there exists a fixed route shuttle that is accessible but it doesn't eliminate the need for same day trips as those individuals still need the door-to-door program as they are not able to get to the bus stops. Individuals who are able to get to the shuttle route benefit from the service the most as the buses are not allowed to deviate from the route. Another consideration is the amount of time it will take the shuttle to make a complete route. The shuttle in San Leandro takes about an hour and any additional stops forces riders to wait on the bus that much longer.
 - A Committee member noted that although this is a great idea, the successes of the Cities of Pleasanton and San Leandro are focused in a concentrated area. When the City of Fremont tried to do something similar ten years ago there was no success as the area was too large and the senior housing complexes were too spread out. Even with a designated shuttle service on a specific route it was too complicated to make happen. The rider base was also not there. Shuttles work best with small, concentrated cities or areas.
 - A Committee member noted that the City of Pleasanton shuttle does not work with residents of the general area that includes City of Dublin residents. Even though the BART is located at the border of Dublin and Pleasanton, the accessible shuttle still doesn't make a stop at the BART station.
- Refine HDTS program
 - A Committee member noted that staff should look back at the statistics and recognize that a majority of the rides

come from Central County, where the transportation provider is located. It is fairly impossible for someone to get service in the Tri-Valley in a reasonable amount of time. Perhaps the resources used for this program to serve that part of the County could be transferred over to the Para-Taxi service to provide more local and timely service to Tri-Valley residents.

- A Committee member noted the hospital staff may need to have additional training as they are not fully familiar with the program qualifications. The City of San Leandro is seeing a number of folks at the Senior and Community Center, after having recently been discharged that are looking for a ride home.
- A Committee member noted that there should be an agreement with the local hospitals in the Tri-Valley area and with the local paratransit program to better assist with these hospital discharges. Staff noted that it is often difficult to schedule a return paratransit ride in advance when an individual is not always aware of their discharge time.
- A Committee member noted that consumers do not know about the HDTS program and that's why ridership is so low. More outreach needs to be done for this program. Also would these efforts take away some of our existing programs like the Wheelchair Scooter Breakdown Transportation Service program? Staff noted that these efforts are not meant to take away service. These efforts are looking at ways to go above and beyond the basic programs we provide today.
- A Committee member noted that from the Tri-Valley area most people go to Kaiser Walnut Creek for medical care. Unfortunately, this hospital is not in Alameda County. Most of the time, riders are able to get a ride to Kaiser Walnut Creek but not a return trip. Also individuals are not often told about their transportation reimbursements through Medi-Cal until after they've already made arrangements for transportation.
- Potential accessible option for the Guaranteed Ride Home (GRH) program

- A Committee member noted that she was not aware of this program in Alameda County.
- Consider Alameda County taxi regulation
 - A Committee member asked if this effort is about looking into overall taxi regulation by the County or are we looking at some other level where we would be able to implement within the current ordinances to have an accessible vehicle requirement for their fleets. Staff is willing to look into both options.
 - What would occur on a county level that is more effective than a local jurisdiction? Staff replied that more incentives would be offered to taxi companies and there would be more vehicles in the market in general and more specifically there could be requirements to provide more accessible vehicles in the respective fleets. This is ultimately different from the TNCs.
 - A Committee member noted that in the City of Berkeley this type of ownership and governance is already the case. It would be interesting to see what their roadblocks are and how this structure is working for them.
 - A Committee member noted that one of the biggest challenges for larger cities that are doing both regulations of taxi companies as well as drivers is that they are receiving all of the revenue. How might changing this structure to a countywide level affect jurisdictions like the City of Berkeley and other processes that are currently in place?
 - A Committee member noted that the proposed changes might be unfavorable with the taxi drivers given the current situation and their loss of productivity.
 - A Committee member noted that in the City of Oakland the taxi regulations are done through the City Administrator's office through their special permits division. He noted that the City of Oakland revised their taxi ordinance a couple years back to ensure that a ratio of 1:20 accessible ramped taxis be available in any given fleet.

- A Committee member noted that the ratio in the City of Fremont for accessible taxis in a given fleet is 1:8.

Committee members expressed interest in refining the strategies and opportunities at another meeting.

4. Public Comment

Penny Powers, Sharon Power's daughter, expressed the difficulty of making arrangements for transportation for Sharon's medical appointments. As a result, an ambulance was used. Unfortunately, the HDTS program does not have an agreement with Washington Hospital in Fremont. Staff is looking into refining the program to change these types of barriers. A member noted that some individuals are also forced to use gurney transportation or ambulance services if the medical provider deems it medically necessary to do so and it is covered by insurance. If the providers are not doing that then it is coming out of the pocket of the consumers.

Marc Soto, as an Alameda County resident, expressed gratitude for Naomi and the Alameda CTC's work to address these very important issues in the County. He also noted that there is still a lot to consider with the TNC and taxi industries with regards to how the California PUC will respond to this larger issue. Lastly, with regards to the benefits of having County oversight of the taxi industry, the uniform regulations across the thirteen jurisdictions in Alameda County would make things easier as well as standardized enforcement coming from one entity. The community really needs to open up to the concept and identify a champion. There is a lot of potential for people that could champion this issue including Nate Miley and Scott Haggerty.

Jon Gaffney, with Marin Transit, would be interested in the areas that are requiring a certain number of accessible taxi vehicles. Does anyone have any information on operating statistics on whether or not they are actually on the road 24 hours a day? Marin Transit purchased 4 vehicles and most of them sat in the taxi company's parking lot as they were not being rented. Also are there any regulations that require taxi companies to actually generate productivity with their accessible vehicles? In the City of Fremont, there are no taxi

companies that have gone over the required threshold for accessible vehicles so there is not necessarily enough business for that to happen. If there was more funding going into this purpose, there might be more market share including if driver permits were paid for by the local jurisdiction and other financial incentives were in place.

A guest noted that opening up same day service to everyone could open up additional funds to the overall program. Members of the public are willing to pay for the service just as long as the County staff members are willing to listen to the consumers. This is potentially a revenue generating program.

5. Information Items

5.1. Member Announcements

Jessica Cutter, with the City of San Leandro, announced that Diane Atienza will be doing more work with paratransit moving forward.

5.2. Staff Updates

There were no staff updates.

6. Draft Agenda Items for November 23, 2015 PAPCO Meeting

6.1. Quarterly Paratransit Strategic Planning Workshop Feedback

6.2. Draft Implementation Guidelines and Performance Measures Review

6.3. Gap Grant Cycle 5 Program Report: Tri-City Taxi Program

6.4. Gap Grant Cycle 5 Program Report: Central County Taxi Program

6.5. East Bay Paratransit Report

7. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m. The next ParaTAC meeting is scheduled for November 10, 2015. The next PAPCO meeting is scheduled for November 23, 2015. Both meetings will take place at Alameda CTC's offices located at 1111 Broadway, Suite 800, in Oakland.