



**Alameda CTC Joint Paratransit Technical Advisory Committee  
and Paratransit Advisory and Planning Committee  
Meeting Minutes  
Tuesday, October 24, 2011 at 12:30 p.m., 1333 Broadway,  
Suite 300, Oakland**

Attendance Key (A = Absent, P = Present)

TAC Members:

<u>  A  </u> Beverly Bolden	<u>  A  </u> Karen Hemphill	<u>  A  </u> Joann Oliver
<u>  A  </u> Melinda Chinn	<u>  P  </u> Kim Huffman	<u>  P  </u> Gail Payne
<u>  A  </u> Anne Culver	<u>  P  </u> Drew King	<u>  A  </u> Mary Rowlands
<u>  A  </u> Pam Deaton	<u>  A  </u> Jackie Krause	<u>  A  </u> Mia Thibeaux
<u>  A  </u> Louie Despeaux	<u>  P  </u> Kadri Kulm	<u>  P  </u> Laura Timothy
<u>  A  </u> Jeff Flynn	<u>  P  </u> Kevin Laven	<u>  A  </u> Kelly Wallace
<u>  P  </u> Shawn Fong	<u>  P  </u> Isabelle Leduc	<u>  A  </u> Mark Weinstein
<u>  A  </u> Brendalynn Goodall	<u>  P  </u> Wilson Lee	<u>  A  </u> Victoria Williams
<u>  A  </u> Brad Helfenberger	<u>  A  </u> Hakeim McGee	<u>  P  </u> David Zehnder
	<u>  A  </u> Cindy Montero	
	<u>  A  </u> Mallory Nestor	

PAPCO Members:

<u>  P  </u> Sylvia Stadmire, Chair	<u>  P  </u> Sandra Johnson- Simon	Hendrickson
<u>  P  </u> Will Scott, Vice-Chair	<u>  P  </u> Gaye Lenahan	<u>  P  </u> Michelle Rousey
<u>  P  </u> Aydan Aysoy	<u>  P  </u> Jane Lewis	<u>  P  </u> Clara Sample
<u>  P  </u> Larry Bunn	<u>  P  </u> Jonah Markowitz	<u>  P  </u> Harriette Saunders
<u>  A  </u> Herb Clayton	<u>  P  </u> Betty Mulholland	<u>  A  </u> Maryanne Tracy- Baker
<u>  P  </u> Shawn Costello	<u>  A  </u> Rev. Carolyn Orr	<u>  P  </u> Esther Waltz
<u>  P  </u> Herb Hastings	<u>  P  </u> Sharon Powers	<u>  P  </u> Renee Wittmeier
<u>  P  </u> Joyce Jacobson	<u>  P  </u> Vanessa Proee	<u>  P  </u> Hale Zukas
	<u>  P  </u> Carmen Rivera-	

**Staff:**

---

<u>  P  </u> Matt Todd, Manager of Programming	<u>  P  </u> Cathleen Sullivan, Nelson/Nygaard
<u>  P  </u> John Hemiup, Senior Transportation Engineer	<u>  P  </u> Krystle Pasco, Acumen Building Enterprise, Inc.
<u>  P  </u> Naomi Armenta, Paratransit Coordinator	<u>  P  </u> Vida LePol, Acumen Building Enterprise, Inc.

---

**1. Welcome and Introductions**

Paratransit Coordinator Naomi Armenta called the meeting to order at 12:35 p.m. The meeting began with introductions and a review of the meeting outcomes.

**Guests Present:** Jennifer Cullen, Senior Support Program of the Tri-Valley; Tammy Siu, City of Oakland; Jeff Weiss, Bay Area Community Services; David Zehnder, City of Newark

**2. Public Comment**

There were no public comments.

**3. Discussion on Draft Paratransit Implementing Guidelines**

Naomi introduced the Draft Paratransit Implementing Guidelines and gave a brief overview of the current agreement and guidelines process. She stated that these implementing guidelines supplement the new Master Programs Funding Agreements between the Alameda CTC, city-based mobility programs for seniors and people with disabilities, and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) paratransit providers that receive Measure B pass-through funding. She said these guidelines specify the rules that these programs must follow in their use of Measure B funds and, where applicable, the Vehicle Registration Fee (VRF) funds.

She stated that the Measure B Expenditure Plan does not provide program development, but it does specify funding allocations in the planning areas. She stated that PAPCO was responsible for allocating the funding between those cities. PAPCO has set up several review processes including a semi-annual report and program planning application every year. PAPCO has review subcommittees, and staff talks to program managers individually about their

proposed plan. These programs get a high level of scrutiny, more than any other pass-through program that Measure B funds.

In 2006, PAPCO implemented Minimum Service Level guidelines for city-based programs to provide a baseline of service for the consumer, similar to the ADA programs. The committee wanted to make sure that there is a baseline of consistent service for everyone in the county.

Also in 2006, PAPCO worked on new paratransit agreements, which are about to expire, so Alameda CTC is developing new Master Programs Funding Agreements for all pass-through fund programs, and plans to make these agreements more uniform across programs.

Cathleen thanked all members for their extensive comments and input on the implementing guidelines, and stated that they had an opportunity at the subcommittee meeting last week to spend over 3 hours with TAC and PAPCO members to discuss the guidelines. Cathleen stated that via PAPCO recommendation and the Alameda CTC Board approval, the Commission can revise these guidelines without amending the Master Programs Funding Agreements.

Cathleen stated that these guidelines are mandatory; therefore all programs funded partially or in full by Measure B revenue must abide by these guidelines. Programs must be in full compliance with the guidelines by the end of fiscal year 2012-2013. Any new service that starts after adoption of these guidelines must abide by the guidelines.

Cathleen led the Paratransit Implementing Guidelines discussion, and introduced the minimum service levels as well as each topic within the draft implementing guidelines (see Attachment 03: Paratransit Implementing Guidelines). PAPCO and TAC members provided input on the following topics.

### **Taxi Subsidy Services**

Member input and staff responses:

- Under taxi services, programs must subsidize a minimum 50 percent of taxi fare. Why is the program imposing a cap on total subsidy per person? Staff stated that the subsidy is at the minimum level, but

programs can do more if they wish. Staff has removed the previous recommendation of \$3.

- Others members stated that everyone does not have ready cash all the time to take taxi. Staff stated that it is up to the cities to decide how much funding they will use for their taxi services.
- For taxi programs, the North County plans to explore the voucher system. If so, what is left for the pilot program to do? Staff stated that the pilot program only serves the North County, and we are in the process of exploring some of these issues.
- Members were concerned about the accessible taxis with meters. One member stated she has had lengthy conversations with taxis drivers regarding meters and wheelchairs. Taxi drivers do not want to waste time putting wheel chairs in their taxis since they are not being paid for their time. She is disappointed that ramp taxis are not mandated. Another member stated that lift-equipped/accessible vans should all have meters, and Alameda CTC should write this into the guidelines for taxi vehicles that want to be in this program. Staff stated that we could work toward some of these programs in the future.

### **City-based Door-to-Door Services**

Member input and staff responses:

- A member raised concerns over the “Time & Days of Service” in the guidelines for the door-to-door services. Service is available five days per week between the hours of 8 a.m. and 5 p.m. (excluding holidays). The member stated that Emeryville has one bus and one driver, and Emeryville cannot do the 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. program, since the program is mandatory. The member wanted to know how to resolve this issue. Staff informed members that Alameda CTC has about a year to work things out. Members asked for exceptions to be allowed. Staff stated that there is room for exceptions, and the guidelines reflect that.
- Another member said the door-to-door service is just like AC transit. The member stated that there is a huge group of consumers who use the service but are not ADA eligible. The Member asked that a statement be put in the guidelines to clarify that this service is for people who are not ADA eligible. A member stated that maybe they could change the second sentence to “Cities may provide service to consumers who are younger than age 80, but not younger than 70 years old.”

- A member asked about the ADA clientele and accessible vans, and taxis that do support wheel chairs. The member stated that the idea is to have accessible vans and taxis that can support wheelchairs, and if that can be accomplished, then it does not matter if they are ADA-certified or not, because everybody that has a need for the service will be able to use those services. Staff stated that accessible vans and taxis are definitely an allowable expense. Staff stated the availability of these accessible vans and taxis that support wheelchairs is an issue that needs to be worked on. Staff also stated that programs should expand availability to accessible vans and taxis as much as possible.

### **City Accessible Fix Route Shuttles**

Member input and staff responses:

- A member talked about AC Transit changing routes, and diminishing bus lines, further decreasing the coverage area. The member wanted to know if consumers will lose accessibility to AC Transit. The member also stated that AC Transit needs to change its handicap stickers and put them where people can see them.
- Members were concerned about how policies will affect these new guidelines. Staff stated that Alameda CTC can pursue these in the future.
- A member stated that Berkeley was able to target and subsidize low-income people for their taxis rides. He stated that it takes about 10 years to be able to get a billable taxi permit to use accessible vans and taxis that support wheelchair programs. The member stated that Berkeley creates some incentive for taxi drivers who bring accessible van and taxis that support wheelchairs into their city. Staff stated that they are hoping that we can dive into some of these issues with the Coordination and Mobility Management Planning program.
- A member stated that because Albany is a small city, it has one accessible van, but can fit several programs in. Staff stated that we will try and provide technical assistance for programs through next year.
- A member said that actual rides are more expensive than the funded paper tickets that East Bay Paratransit provides. Staff stated that funds have a limit on how many tickets consumers can purchase.
- Another member stated that sometimes Gap money has gone to nonprofit organizations that do not receive grant funding, and do not have master agreements in place. Therefore, if they do not have the

master agreement in place for Measure B funding, do the guidelines still apply? Staff stated that changes to the Implementing Guidelines will be attached to the Master Programs Funding Agreement that goes to the jurisdictions for approval, and this will make the process easier to make guidelines changes in the future. The desire is to have the new agreement and guidelines in place by April 1, 2012. Gap grant awards follow specific grant program guidelines that are a separate document from the Implementing Guidelines.

*Esther Ann Waltz made a motion to approve and move the Implementing Guidelines to the Board, with one change on page 3 (change “and” to “and/or” in the second to last sentence of “Service Description”). Shawn Costello seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously (10-0).*

#### **4. Quarterly Education and Training – Input on Draft Transportation Expenditure Plan**

Cathleen introduced Holly Kuljian to the group who opened the discussion. She explained that Alameda CTC recently prepared a draft Countywide Transportation Plan (CWTP) that identifies current and future transportation needs. With community input, Alameda CTC is also developing a Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP). The TEP will contain a package of transportation improvements around the county to be funded by an extension and possible increase of the current sales tax dedicated for this purpose. She stated that the TEP will be submitted to the voters of Alameda County for approval.

If the plan appears on the 2012 ballot, as anticipated, it will require a two-thirds majority to pass. The existing Measure B will continue to be collected until 2022, unless it is replaced by a new measure. She stated that Alameda CTC is considering a reauthorization of the TEP because the current Measure B capital projects are under construction or soon to be built, and the economic downturn has reduced funding for many programs supported by Measure B.

She passed a questionnaire around to all members for them to fill out and return to her. She stated that the answers will help set priorities for the projects included in the TEP. She also said that there are many community workshops going on right now, and members who are interested should see her after the meeting.

#### Member input and staff responses:

- Members wanted to know: What percentage will go to the group of seniors and people with disabilities? Which programs that receive current funding are in the plan? Staff stated that their understanding is that additional funding will not be allocated to new projects under the new measure.
- A member asked if there will be emergency funds, so that the city does not have to shut down. Another member stated she is having a problem understanding the current measure, which will expire in 2022. She said it's written in the fact sheet that the existing Measure B will continue to be collected until 2022, unless it is replaced by a new measure. Staff stated that current funding will stay as is. The input they are gathering now is about how to implement future funds. Staff stated that the language in the fact sheet will need to be corrected if a new measure passes in 2012.
- A member wanted to know what is in the new measure for students and seniors. Another member wanted to know if county funds will be reduced. She needs ongoing funds to cover her county programs. Other members wanted to know that if the new half-cent measure passes, will the new half cent be added to the old half cent to make it one cent? Staff stated it will be two separate measures. The current measure will stay as is until 2022, at which point, it will expire. Based on the current proposal, the new measure will add another half cent on top of the old measure. After 2022, it will extend to one full cent. The new half cent will extend to 2042.
- Members also voiced concern about not understanding the new measure B as well as additional concerns about how the funds will be exhausted and why seniors will get small percentage of the funds, when senior are in dire need of more funds for their programs; and how difficult it is to get transportation after 5 p.m.

#### **5. Draft Agenda Items for Next Meeting**

- A. Conflicts of Interest and Ethics Discussion
- B. Recommend Continuing Annually Renewed Paratransit Contract
- C. Revised Mid-Year Report Forms
- D. Countywide Transportation Plan and Transportation Expenditure Plan (CWTP-TEP) Input

- E. Report from EBP – Interactive Voice Response Grant
- F. Gap Grant Reports – Shuttles

## **6. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 2:20 p.m.