



Alameda CTC Paratransit Technical Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, November 08, 2011, 9:30 a.m., 1333 Broadway, Suite 300, Oakland

Attendance Key (A = Absent, P = Present)

Members:

Table with 3 columns of member names and attendance status (A/P). Includes Beverly Bolden, Melinda Chinn, Anne Culver, Pam Deaton, Louie Despeaux, Jeff Flynn, Shawn Fong, Brendalynn Goodall, Brad Helfenberger, Karen Hemphill, Kim Huffman, Drew King, Jackie Krause, Kadri Kulm, Kevin Laven, Isabelle Leduc, Wilson Lee, Hakeim McGee, Cindy Montero, Mallory Nestor, Joann Oliver, Gail Payne, Mary Rowlands, Mia Thibeaux, Laura Timothy, Kelly Wallace, Mark Weinstein, Victoria Williams, David Zehnder.

Staff:

Table with 2 columns of staff names and attendance status (A/P). Includes Matt Todd, John Hemiup, Jacki Taylor, Naomi Armenta, Cathleen Sullivan, Richard Weiner, Krystle Pasco, Vida LePol.

1. Welcome and Introductions

Paratransit Coordinator Naomi Armenta called the meeting to order at 9:39 a.m. The meeting began with introductions and a review of the meeting outcomes.

Guests Present: Jennifer Cullen, Senior Support Services of the Tri-Valley; Jeff Weiss, Bay Area Community Services (BACS), Marlene Petersen, Senior Support Services of the Tri-Valley; Ron Caldwell, American Logistics

2. Public Comment

There were no public comments.

3. Review of October 11, 2011 Minutes

TAC members reviewed the meeting minutes from October 11, 2011 and by consensus approved them as written.

4. Discussion on the Funding Formula and Gap Policy

Naomi Armenta introduced the discussion on the funding formula and Gap Policy. She said the purpose of this discussion is to review the current formula and brainstorm ideas for developing a new formula that will determine the allocation of funds beginning in fiscal year 2012-2013 (FY 12-13). Naomi gave a presentation summarizing how the initial funding formula was adopted in 2003 and that the current version will expire in June 2012. Naomi

said the three principle issues to discuss were age, income, and disability, and the discussion was intended to determine whether age, income, and disability continue to be issues the formula should address and to discuss the validity of the data sources to support each element.

Richard Weiner provided a summary of the funding formula data sources available, the funding formula factors, and the allocation to the planning areas. He informed members that staff would like to gather input from TAC and convey it to PAPCO.

Age

Staff provided the following detail regarding age as an element of the funding formula:

- Staff stated that current age data is available at the zip-code level from the 2010 Census. (See additional age data comments under “Disability.”)

Income

TAC members and staff provided the following input regarding income as an element of the funding formula:

- Staff stated that income data is not available in the 2010 Census. Income data is available from the American Community Survey (ACS) for 2010, which provides 3-year samples of population for all places.
- Members asked the following:
 - From the perspectives of the ADA, is income relevant?
 - Is income tied to access?
- Members did not come to a consensus on whether or not to include income in the formula. For example, they stated that low-income people have access to transportation but conversely, income does give greater access to transportation. Having income in the funding formula, which has been considered in the past, does not guarantee that low-income people will benefit from it. Therefore, we should reconsider whether we should include income in the three elements of the funding formula. However, people need income to access transportation; therefore, Alameda CTC should include income in the formula.
- If you do not take income into consideration, then it doesn't necessarily mean that low-income planning areas will get the funding to offer the scholarship program to these people.
- It is very important that very low-income people have access to transportation due to quality of life issues.
- Since Alameda CTC has taken income out of the implementation guidelines, it should provide some form of scholarship for low-income people.
- Members stated that it is important to tie the access issue to transportation. They expressed concerns with not addressing access issues in the funding formula.
- Another member said that giving more funds to transportation doesn't mean that low-income people will have access to any of those funds.

Disability

Members and staff provided the following input regarding disability as an element of the funding formula:

- Staff stated that Alameda CTC can use neither 2010 Census data nor American Community Survey (ACS) 3-year samples for disability data, because data is not available at the zip-code level to cover every city and unincorporated area of the County. Social Security Administration data is no longer available at the zip-code level due to privacy concerns. Staff has explored other opportunities for identifying incidence of disability. ACS data is available annually, but this is based on a smaller sample than the Census data and is limited to jurisdictions of 65,000 people or more and only covers 75 percent of the county, not including small cities or unincorporated areas.
- To check the accuracy of this partial data, staff did an analysis of how the disability-related census data correlated to age in the census data. If the percentages are comparable in terms of population, then perhaps the disability data could still be used. This analysis showed differences in incidence of disability and aging by planning area. Staff said these discrepancies are even more exaggerated for the aging population, since a larger portion of North County's seniors are in urban areas, whereas a large portion of Central County's seniors are in unincorporated areas.
- Members wanted to know how ACS defines disability. Staff said previously ACS talked more about mobility in terms of "mobility disabilities," but suggested using the aging population over 65 years as a surrogate for disability.
- A member said there is high correlation between very low-income people and people with disabilities, and to them, the cost of a ride is very high and an issue that needs addressing. Staff stated that there seemed to be a consensus that linking the low-income issues to scholarships will address that issue.
- Another member stated that the discussion seems to be based more on service than formula. The money seems to go to the larger cities, because they have more low-income people. Staff stated that larger cities would get more money because of their population.
- A member stated that services that we deliver are not strictly based on the ADA programs. Staff stated that members should keep in mind that the funding factor has some limitations.
- Another member said if disability really doesn't matter for the funding formula, why make the effort when there is not a good data set for it?
- One member did not believe that Emeryville and Albany, the two smallest cities, will get a good chunk of funds because of their size. Since there are no data to determine that income and disability should be factors, as long as the factors are fair to small communities, the member will be happy with the decision.

Data Sources and Formula Discussion

Members and staff also discussed the data sources and provided this input:

- Has Alameda CTC looked at how the Census data has changed by area over time? Staff has looked at the 2000 Census in comparison but is concerned that people might ask why they looked at 2000 Census when it is almost 2012.
- A member asked if Alameda CTC will use the formula to make any decisions about distributions across the areas. Which is the most reliable data set to use? Another member thinks historical data is very informative; therefore, Alameda CTC should use it. Has Alameda CTC considered using any data from ACS in terms of trying to get disability and income data at the zip code level?
- Another member stated that in Berkeley, many young, disabled people use paratransit programs, so factoring by age will not include that group.
- Rather than go with a formula that excludes a portion of North County, use the age formula. Staff stated that we want to use one formula across the whole county.
- If the formula is based on overall total population, larger cities will benefit. Staff stated that PAPCO does not like to take disability out of the formula. However, we could use age instead of disability, because we have good age data.
- Could we just take the overall population as one factor rather than go by age? Staff stated that if we use the overall population, it will dilute the impact on North County.
- A member voiced support for using the total population. He said the large cities will have the largest numbers of seniors, people with disabilities, and probably the poorest people.
- Why can't we use the data sources that we know are most reliable at the zip code level—population and age—because those are available at the zip code level?
- Members discussed the weighting issue for individuals over 80 years old.
- Staff asked if the formula should represent the 80+ population, 70+, 65+, or overall population.
- A member said the funding formula previously included kids. The City of Fremont is the only city that serves kids under 18. Do the programs serve people under 18, or if the programs do not serve that age range, why should we incorporate it in the program?
- Some members voiced support for using 70+ figures.

Gap Policy for Allocation to Planning Areas/Distribution to City Programs

Cathleen introduced the Gap Policy topic and asked if it would make sense to distribute funding at the planning level. Naomi gave a brief description of the Gap Grant program, including the four funding cycles. She said the table in the memo is an example of programs that PAPCO considered important enough to continue on. Some programs are located in a city, some are the planning areas, and some are countywide. She said that Gap funding fills specific gaps and is flexible. Naomi said staff has proposed to allocate some pass-through

funding at the planning level as an option for some of the Gap planning area projects. She asked TAC members if they want to use this option.

Members and staff provided the following input:

- Should the 1.43 percent that goes to Gap be broken down by planning area? Staff said no, we are still talking about the pass-through funding. If we want different programs to coordinate, then we will have to look at all these programs together, and some of these programs are probably allied with pass-through programs rather than with a Gap Grant.
- Members stated that they did not understand the differences between the funding. One member said the City of Alameda has not benefited from the Gap money and wants to know how they can tap into the fund so they feel it's fair for the City of Alameda. Staff stated that Gap grants should be available equitably, while pass-through funding is distributed based on the formula. Staff does not recommend to fund all planning areas but to prioritize programs and consider how to fund them over the long term. At some point, we need to have these conversations about the Gap funds and instead of postponing that discussion, staff is trying to incorporate it with the funding formula because the topics are related. Some programs will go away; some are appropriate for Gap funding; some can transition into other programs. Some city programs can expand to more of the planning area.
- Members expressed concerns about funding reductions. Staff suggested that this would supplement their programs. For example, a program like the countywide taxi program serves the needs of people throughout the area, and decreases the need for other services. To make this type of program effective requires coordination and looking at what's available at the planning-area level, and determining how to supplement individual cities to make sure a full suite of services is available for every consumer.
- Members felt strongly that Gap money should be used around the planning areas to be cost-effective; there are some equity issues, because not all cities get Gap Grants; and Gap Grant funds should be kept separate and not take money away from good quality programs.

5. Review of the Revised Mid-Year Report Form

Staff asked members to review and provide any comments later.

6. Update of HDTS/WSBTS

Staff asked members to review the presentation handout for an update on the Hospital Discharge Transportation Service/Wheelchair Scooter Breakdown Transportation Service (HDTS/WSBTS).

7. Technical Exchange

- A. Mobility Management**
- B. Preparedness**
- C. Ask a TAC Member**
- D. Other Technical Exchange Items**

A technical exchange did not occur due to time constraints.

8. Information Items

A. CWTP-TEP Status

None due to time constraints.

B. SRAC Update

None due to time constraints.

C. PAPCO Update

Staff said the next PAPCO meeting is scheduled for November 28, 2011 and encouraged all members to attend.

D. TAC Committee Member Announcements

The AC Transit Board Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Mandated Services meeting is scheduled for November 16, 2011. Kim Huffman invited all members to attend.

E. Alameda CTC Staff Report

Staff stated that the Draft Paratransit Implementing Guidelines approved by PAPCO, along with the Master Programs Funding Agreement template are going to the Commission for approval on December 1, 2011.

F. Outreach

Krystle Pasco reported on this outreach event:

- 11/05/11 – ACCESS Resource Fair in Alameda

G. Other Staff Updates

Naomi said the Joint Subcommittee meeting is scheduled for December 5th, 2011, from 11 a.m. to 2 p.m., and she invited all TAC members to attend.

9. Breakout Sessions on North County Taxi Uniformity; Central County Taxi Expansion

Members separated into groups and discussed the uniformity of the North County Taxi Program and expansion of the Central County Taxi Program, both of which are Countywide Mobility Management Planning pilots.

10. Draft Agenda Items for Next Meeting

- A. Funding Forumula and Gap Policy Discussion
- B. Breakout – North County Taxi Uniformity; Central County Taxi Expansion

11. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 11:25 a.m.