

Napa Valley Transportation Authority

625 Burnell Street
Napa, CA 94559



Agenda - Final

Thursday, July 9, 2020
10:00 AM

MEETING LOCATION: REFER TO COVID-19 SPECIAL NOTICE

Paratransit Coordinating Council

COVID-19 SPECIAL NOTICE – PUBLIC MEETING GUIDELINES FOR PARTICIPATING VIA PHONE/VIDEO CONFERENCING

Consistent with Executive Orders No. N-25-20 and N-29-20 from the Executive Department of the State of California and Napa County's Shelter in Home Order issued March 18, 2020 and further extended, a physical location will not be provided for the Napa Valley Transportation Authority Paratransit Coordinating Council (PCC) meeting. The public is invited to participate telephonically or electronically via the methods below:

To observe the meeting by video conference, please click on the link below at the noticed meeting time:

<https://countyofnapa.zoom.us/j/92566827007>

Instructions on how to join a video conference are available at: <https://support.zoom.us/hc/en-us/articles/201362193-Joining-a-Meeting>

To observe the meeting by phone, please call at the noticed meeting time 1 (669) 900-6833, then enter Meeting ID 925 6682 7007 #. When asked for the participant ID or code, press #.

Instructions on how to join a meeting by phone are available at: <https://support.zoom.us/hc/en-us/articles/201362663-Joining-a-meeting-by-phone>

How to Submit a Public Comment:

Members of the public may submit a public comment in writing by emailing info@nvta.ca.gov by 5:00 p.m. the day before the meeting with **PUBLIC COMMENT** identified in the subject line of the email. For comments to be read into the record, emails with the equivalent of a maximum of 3 minutes, shall contain in the subject line “Public Comment – Not on the Agenda” or “Public Comment – Agenda Item # (include item number)”. All written comments should be 350 words or less, which corresponds to approximately 3 minutes or less of speaking time. All other written comments received will still be provided to the PCC and be included as part of the meeting record.

2. To comment during a virtual meeting (Zoom), click the “Raise Your Hand” button (found in the “Participants” tab) to request to speak when Public Comment is being taken on the Agenda item. You will then be unmuted when it is your turn to make your comment for up to 3 minutes. After the allotted time, you will be re-muted. Instructions for how to “Raise Your Hand” is available in the Attendee Controls information at <https://support.zoom.us/hc/en-us/articles/200941109-Attendee-controls-in-a-meeting>.

3. To comment by phone, press “ *9 ” to request to speak when Public Comment is being taken on the Agenda item. You will be unmuted when it is your turn to make your comment for up to 3 minutes. After the allotted time, you will be re-muted.

Acceso y el Titulo VI: La NVTA puede proveer asistencia/facilitar la comunicación a las personas discapacitadas y los individuos con conocimiento limitado del inglés quienes quieran dirigirse a la Autoridad. Para solicitar asistencia, por favor llame al número (707) 259-8633. Requerimos que solicite asistencia con tres días hábiles de anticipación para poderle proveer asistencia.

Ang Accessibility at Title VI: Ang NVTA ay nagkakaloob ng mga serbisyo/akomodasyon kung hilingin ang mga ito, ng mga taong may kapansanan at mga indibiduwal na may limitadong kaalaman sa wikang Ingles, na nais na matugunan ang mga bagay-bagay na may kinalaman sa NVTA Board. Para sa mga tulong sa akomodasyon o pagsasalina-wika, mangyari lang tumawag sa (707) 259-8633. Kakailanganin namin ng paunang abiso na tatlong araw na may pasok sa trabaho para matugunan ang inyong kahilingan.

1. Call To Order
2. Introductions
3. Public Comment
4. Committee Member and Staff Comments

Note: Where times are indicated for the agenda items they are approximate and intended as estimates only, and may be shorter or longer, as needed.

5. PRESENTATIONS

- 5.1 **Metropolitan Transportation Commission's (MTC's) Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan Update Presentation (Drennen Shelten, MTC) (Pages 8-23)**

Body: MTC staff will provide an overview of its Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan update.

Estimated Time: 10:10 a.m.

Attachments: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

6. CONSENT AGENDA

- 6.1 **Meeting Minutes of March 5, 2020 Paratransit Coordinating Council (PCC) Meeting (Kathy Alexander) (Pages 24-26)**

Recommendation: PCC action will approve the March 5, 2020 meeting minutes.

Estimated Time: 10:20 a.m.

Attachments: [Draft Minutes.pdf](#)

7. REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS

7.1 Transit Report (Alan Budde) (Pages 27-32)

Body: Staff will provide an update on the Vine Transit System.

Recommendation: Information only.

Estimated Time: 10:20 a.m.

Attachments: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

7.2 Draft Community Based Transportation Plan (CBTP) (Danielle Schmitz) (Pages 33-36)

Body: The draft CBTP will be provided for PCC review.

Recommendation: Information only.

Estimated Time: 10:30 a.m.

Attachments: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

7.3 Lifeline Transportation Program Cycle 6 (Diana Meehan) (Pages 37-40)

Body: That the PCC review and recommend that the NVTA Board of Directors approve the Lifeline Transportation Program Cycle 6 program of projects.

Recommendation: Information/Action

Estimated Time: 10:45 a.m.

Attachments: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

7.4 Clipper START Pilot Program (Alan Budde) (Pages 41-42)

Recommendation: Information only. The PCC will receive an overview of the Clipper START Program.

Estimated Time: 10:55 a.m.

Attachments: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

8. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**9. ADJOURNMENT****9.1 Approval of Next Regular Meeting Date of September 3, 2020 and Adjournment.**

I, Kathy Alexander, hereby certify that the agenda for the above stated meeting was posted at a location freely accessible to members of the public at the NVTA offices, 625 Burnell Street, Napa, CA by 5:00 p.m., on Thursday, July 2, 2020.

Kathy Alexander (e-sign) July 2, 2020

Kathy Alexander, Deputy Board Secretary

Glossary of Acronyms

AB 32	Global Warming Solutions Act	GGRF	Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund
ABAG	Association of Bay Area Governments	GTFS	General Transit Feed Specification
ADA	American with Disabilities Act	HBP	Highway Bridge Program
ATAC	Active Transportation Advisory Committee	HBRR	Highway Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation Program
ATP	Active Transportation Program	HIP	Housing Incentive Program
BAAQMD	Bay Area Air Quality Management District	HOT	High Occupancy Toll
BART	Bay Area Rapid Transit District	HOV	High Occupancy Vehicle
BATA	Bay Area Toll Authority	HR3	High Risk Rural Roads
BRT	Bus Rapid Transit	HSIP	Highway Safety Improvement Program
BUILD	Better Utilizing Investments to Leverage Development	HTF	Highway Trust Fund
CAC	Citizen Advisory Committee	HUTA	Highway Users Tax Account
CAP	Climate Action Plan	IFB	Invitation for Bid
Caltrans	California Department of Transportation	ITIP	State Interregional Transportation Improvement Program
CASA	Committee to House the Bay Area	ITOC	Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act	IS/MND	Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration
CIP	Capital Investment Program	JARC	Job Access and Reverse Commute
CMA	Congestion Management Agency	LCTOP	Low Carbon Transit Operations Program
CMAQ	Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program	LIFT	Low-Income Flexible Transportation
CMP	Congestion Management Program	LOS	Level of Service
CalSTA	California State Transportation Agency	LS&R	Local Streets & Roads
CTP	Countywide Transportation Plan	MaaS	Mobility as a Service
COC	Communities of Concern	MAP 21	Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21 st Century Act
CTC	California Transportation Commission	MPO	Metropolitan Planning Organization
DAA	Design Alternative Analyst	MTC	Metropolitan Transportation Commission
DBB	Design-Bid-Build	MTS	Metropolitan Transportation System
DBF	Design-Build-Finance	ND	Negative Declaration
DBFOM	Design-Build-Finance-Operate-Maintain	NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
DED	Draft Environmental Document	NOAH	Natural Occurring Affordable Housing
EIR	Environmental Impact Report	NOC	Notice of Completion
EJ	Environmental Justice	NOD	Notice of Determination
FAS	Federal Aid Secondary	NOP	Notice of Preparation
FAST	Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act	NVTA	Napa Valley Transportation Authority
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration	NVTA-TA	Napa Valley Transportation Authority-Tax Agency
FTA	Federal Transit Administration	OBAG	One Bay Area Grant
FY	Fiscal Year	PA&ED	Project Approval Environmental Document
GHG	Greenhouse Gas		

Glossary of Acronyms

P3 or PPP	Public-Private Partnership	SOV	Single-Occupant Vehicle
PCC	Paratransit Coordination Council	STA	State Transit Assistance
PCI	Pavement Condition Index	STIC	Small Transit Intensive Cities
PCA	Priority Conservation Area	STIP	State Transportation Improvement Program
PDA	Priority Development Areas	STP	Surface Transportation Program
PIR	Project Initiation Report	TAC	Technical Advisory Committee
PMS	Pavement Management System	TCM	Transportation Control Measure
Prop. 42	Statewide Initiative that requires a portion of gasoline sales tax revenues be designated to transportation purposes	TCRCP	Traffic Congestion Relief Program
PSE	Plans, Specifications and Estimates	TDA	Transportation Development Act
PSR	Project Study Report	TDM	Transportation Demand Management Transportation Demand Model
PTA	Public Transportation Account	TE	Transportation Enhancement
RACC	Regional Agency Coordinating Committee	TEA	Transportation Enhancement Activities
RFP	Request for Proposal	TEA 21	Transportation Equity Act for the 21 st Century
RFQ	Request for Qualifications	TFCA	Transportation Fund for Clean Air
RHNA	Regional Housing Needs Allocation	TIGER	Transportation Investments Generation Economic Recovery
RM2	Regional Measure 2 (Bridge Toll)	TIP	Transportation Improvement Program
RM3	Regional Measure 3	TIRCP	Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program
RMRP	Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Program	TLC	Transportation for Livable Communities
ROW	Right of Way	TLU	Transportation and Land Use
RTEP	Regional Transit Expansion Program	TMP	Traffic Management Plan
RTIP	Regional Transportation Improvement Program	TMS	Transportation Management System
RTP	Regional Transportation Plan	TNC	Transportation Network Companies
SAFE	Service Authority for Freeways and Expressways	TOAH	Transit Oriented Affordable Housing
SAFETEA-LU	Safe, Accountable, Flexible, and Efficient Transportation Equity Act-A Legacy for Users	TOD	Transit-Oriented Development
SB 375	Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act 2008	TOS	Transportation Operations Systems
SB 1	The Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017	TPA	Transit Priority Area
SCS	Sustainable Community Strategy	TPI	Transit Performance Initiative
SHA	State Highway Account	TPP	Transit Priority Project Areas
SHOPP	State Highway Operation and Protection Program	VHD	Vehicle Hours of Delay
SNTDM	Solano Napa Travel Demand Model	VMT	Vehicle Miles Traveled
SR	State Route		
SRTS	Safe Routes to School		



NAPA VALLEY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY PCC Agenda Letter

TO: Paratransit Coordinating Council
FROM: Kate Miller, Executive Director
REPORT BY: Alan Budde
(707) 259-8635 / Email: abudde@nvta.ca.gov
SUBJECT: Metropolitan Transportation Commission's (MTC's) Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan Update Presentation

RECOMMENDATION

That the Paratransit Coordinating Council receive the presentation for the purposes of consideration and discussion with an opportunity to provide additional, detailed feedback during the September PCC meeting.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

MTC is seeking comment on gaps in the transportation services and programs in Napa County, as well as the rest of the region.

FISCAL IMPACT

Is there a Fiscal Impact? No.

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) requires the MTC, as the regional metropolitan planning organization, to consult local communities in order to develop a coordinated public transit – human services transportation plan (“Coordinated Plan”). MTC is beginning the process of updating the most recent Coordinated Plan, adopted in 2018.

MTC is seeking input from PCC members and meeting attendees regarding gaps in transportation services, especially those related to older adults, people with disabilities and low-income populations. Feedback will be utilized by MTC in order to draft the updated Coordinated Plan which will recommend strategies and prioritize projects to fill the gaps which are identified through this process.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

Attachment: (1) MTC Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Plan Update



METROPOLITAN
TRANSPORTATION
COMMISSION

Bay Area Metro Center
375 Beale Street, Suite 800
San Francisco, CA 94105
415.778.6700
www.mtc.ca.gov

TO: Napa County Paratransit Coordinating Council DATE: July 9, 2020
FR: Drennen Shelton, Planner/Analyst
RE: MTC Coordinated Public Transit–Human Services Transportation Plan Update

Background

Since 2007, the Federal Transit Administration has required that metropolitan planning organizations adopt a locally developed coordinated public transit-human services transportation plan (“Coordinated Plan”) that establishes funding priorities and coordination strategies that will improve transportation for older adults, people with disabilities and low-income populations. This document must be updated every four years.

MTC is in the early stages of updating the Bay Area’s Coordinated Plan, which was last adopted in 2018. That Coordinated Plan is available online:

https://mtc.ca.gov/sites/default/files/MTC_Coordinated_Plan.pdf.

The goals of the Bay Area’s Coordinated Plan are to identify transportation gaps for older adults, people with disabilities, and low-income populations; prioritize solutions to address those gaps; and identify strategies for improving coordination between public transit and human service transportation providers.

Input Requested – September 3

MTC staff will attend your September 3 meeting to seek comments regarding transportation needs and programs in your area. MTC staff are particularly interested in comments regarding gaps in transportation services that older adults, people with disabilities, and people with low incomes encounter as they use the transportation services that are available to them. A summary of the gaps that were previously identified is provided as Attachment A. During the feedback session, MTC staff will also describe the priority strategies and recommendations that were identified in the 2018 plan.

Napa PCC members may also submit comments and questions about the Coordinated Plan Update to MTC staff by emailing Drennen Shelton (dshelton@bayareametro.gov).

Attachments

Documentation of Transportation Gaps, MTC 2018 Coordinated Plan

Transportation Gaps

#	Theme	Comment	County
1	Community Connection	Transportation programs should be expanded to ensure people with disabilities and seniors have opportunities to socialize.	Sonoma
2	Congestion	Congestion is a major problem. It makes it impossible for transit, paratransit and taxis to get around in a timely manner.	San Francisco
3	Congestion	TNCs are responsible for uptick in congestion.	San Francisco
4	Congestion	Double parking makes it difficult for transit, paratransit and taxis to get around in a timely manner.	San Francisco
5	Eligibility	Many people don't qualify for ADA Paratransit, but can't drive, walk to bus stops or have the option to take a city-based service.	Contra Costa
6	Eligibility	Criteria for individuals to qualify for assistance make it hard for people who may be slightly above the Medi-Cal level but still can't afford transit.	San Mateo
7	Enforcement	Cars parking at bus stops affect the access for seniors and people with disabilities. People have to board and disembark in the street. than full-size red zones at bus stops, since some marked bus stops are not actually large enough to be served easily by a 40-foot bus.	San Mateo
8	Equity	MTC needs to make sure that equity and access issues are addressed when planning and funding autonomous vehicles.	Sonoma
9	Fare Media	No RTC card center other than Oakland. Difficult for people to obtain.	Contra Costa
10	Fares	Fare structure for East Bay Paratransit is confusing.	Alameda
11	Fares	Transit is too costly. Need means-based testing for ADA and non-ADA paratransit.	Alameda
12	Fares	2012-2016 Area Agency on Aging Plan found that financial difficulty outweighs all other concerns about transportation in Contra Costa.	Contra Costa
13	Fares	Cost of local bus is not prohibitive, but the cost of BART is prohibitive.	Contra Costa
14	Fares	Cost of paratransit rides is difficult for low-income riders.	Contra Costa
15	Fares	Transit and paratransit is too expensive.	East Bay
16	Fares	Transit affordability is a major concern.	East Bay
17	Fares	It is difficult to access discounts - particularly youth discounts.	East Bay
18	Fares	Regional center reimbursement rates are very low so providers don't want to contract with them.	Regional

Transportation Gaps

#	Theme	Comment	County
19	Fares	Transit is not affordable for a lot of people	San Francisco
20	Fares	Transit is unaffordable for many low-income people.	San Mateo
21	Fares	Transit, paratransit and same day paratransit service is very expensive	Santa Clara
22	Fares	Same day paratransit services at VTA is 4x the regular fare. This is too expensive for most people in an emergency.	Santa Clara
23	Fares	Transit is too costly.	Solano
24	Fares	Transit too expensive for students.	Sonoma
25	Fares	Transfers between fixed-route and paratransit are costly - double fares are charged.	Sonoma
26	Fares	Paratransit and transit fares are unaffordable	Sonoma
27	Funding	City and County departments are very constrained in who they can serve due to funding.	Contra Costa
28	Funding	Match requirements are high for non-profits.	Alameda
29	Funding	Not enough funding for transportation programs that serve seniors and people with disabilities.	Alameda
30	Funding	There is a concern with rising costs that transit providers may roll back paratransit service to strict ADA rules, excluding seniors.	Contra Costa
31	Funding	Not enough funding for services beyond ADA.	Contra Costa
32	Funding	Existing funding doesn't allow for everyone to be served.	Contra Costa
33	Funding	Funding gaps - primary through grants; expectation that successful programs will become self-sufficient after the grant period.	Contra Costa
34	Funding	Biggest expenses are bus passes and maintenance of their fleet.	Santa Clara
35	Funding	The majority of funding comes through public grants. There is very limited private investment.	Santa Clara
36	Funding	There is not enough money for solutions.	Solano
37	Funding	Funding that is available is limited in its eligibility.	Solano
38	Funding	5310 funding delay (2 years) is too long.	Solano
39	Funding	TDA funding is limited because of the 10% farebox recovery requirement; they're dealing with low-income seniors; want to be able to count the volunteer labor as revenue.	Solano

Transportation Gaps

#	Theme	Comment	County
40	Funding	Not enough funding for all the needs.	Sonoma
41	Funding	Lack of funding for free transit for students pilot, advocated for by student groups at Sonoma State (couldn't identify funding to make up the farebox recovery requirement).	Sonoma
42	Healthcare Access	Difficult and scarce options for transportation to medical centers.	Contra Costa
43	Healthcare Access	Rides home from dialysis should be shorter.	Contra Costa
44	Healthcare Access	Non-emergency medical trips should be cheaper or free.	East Bay
45	Healthcare Access	Non-emergency medical trips should be prioritized.	East Bay
46	Healthcare Access	Insufficient transit service outside the City of Napa, particularly Lake Berryessa, Middletown and Pope Valley. Also, St. Helena to Kaiser Hospital does not have service and there is no form of transit East of St. Helena. Note: Calistoga just put in a shuttle bus service from Santa Rosa to Calistoga due to two large developments. Interest by these employers to provide to employees. \$18 per rider, seems expensive.	Napa
47	Healthcare Access	Not enough paratransit and fixed transit for people in nursing homes trying to get to doctors. If person does not qualify (ADA) there is insufficient transit service and taxi services may cost up to \$100 per trip. Person may take ambulance instead, very costly.	Napa
48	Healthcare Access	Non-emergency medical transportation, specifically dialysis trips continue to be a huge need.	Regional
49	Healthcare Access	Dialysis transportation continues to be a tremendous need. A more flexible transportation option, other than paratransit should be made available.	San Francisco

Transportation Gaps

#	Theme	Comment	County
50	Healthcare Access	East Palo Alto individuals do not have direct, fixed-route service to San Mateo Medical Center. A transfer and drop off is located at El Camino Real and 37th Avenue, but patients are still required to walk the remaining distance up a hill to the SM Medical Center (County Hospital). The cost of this trip and transfers is a great hardship for low- income individuals. Craig added that getting to this medical facility is a hardship for many people because of the distance to the stop and the terrain.	San Mateo
51	Healthcare Access	Health Plan of San Mateo County patients lack fixed-route service to that location, which is a significant hardship for people without cars. The Genentec option does not work well for them.	San Mateo
52	Healthcare Access	Non-emergency medical transportation is lacking.	Santa Clara
53	Healthcare Access	VTA should serve all the hospitals and schools.	Santa Clara
54	Healthcare Access	Number one request for rides is to medical appointments.	Solano
55	Healthcare Access	Veterans at Travis Air Force Base being transported to Martinez for medical; more referrals to Sacramento.	Solano
56	Healthcare Access	Limited funding sources available for their program; trying to get hospitals to share some of the costs (some have community benefit funds).	Solano
57	Healthcare Access	Unable to meet weekly need for dialysis patients (particularly early morning or repeat trips).	Solano
58	Housing & Land Use	Focus on populations within 2-miles of BART stations, but housing often costly in these zones.	Alameda
59	Housing & Land Use	Affordable housing mainly in transit sparse areas.	Contra Costa
60	Housing & Land Use	Many residents age in place in inaccessible neighborhoods and don't have options to move into more affordable housing.	Marin

Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan (2018)
 Transportation Gaps

#	Theme	Comment	County
61	Information and I&R Services	Lack of knowledge of how to bicycle, or how to combine bicycling with transit.	Alameda
62	Information and I&R Services	2012-2016 Area Agency on Aging Plan found that knowledge of services available is low.	Contra Costa
63	Information and I&R Services	Automated voice information on transit should be louder.	San Francisco
64	Information and I&R Services	Automated voice information on transit should announce that seats are reserved for seniors and people with disabilities.	San Francisco
65	Information and I&R Services	511 information service is useful for individuals who use paratransit, as well.	San Mateo
66	Information and I&R Services	Privately operated, but publically funded tech shuttles are open to the public. It is difficult to understand which shuttles are open to the public.	Santa Clara
67	Information and I&R Services	Info kiosks should provide real time status info for bus lines.	Sonoma
68	Information and I&R Services	511 not working for all systems.	Sonoma
69	Information and I&R Services	There should be real time information for paratransit - like NextBus.	Sonoma
70	Job Access	Lack of access to transportation options within Oakland for job access, targeted to low- income individuals.	Alameda

Transportation Gaps

#	Theme	Comment	County
71	Job Access	Provide a door-to-door taxi service to assist job applicants in getting to interviews and first two weeks of job (20 free rides through CalWorks), but still have difficulty accessing work thereafter - uses MTC's LIFT funding (main source of program funding with 50% match).	Contra Costa
72	Level of Service	Escorted door to door service is necessary.	Regional
73	Level of Service	Some people with disabilities need personalized assistance (escort service) that is not available.	San Mateo
74	Level of Service	Courtesy stops or ride wait (for pharmacy trips, etc.) should be available.	San Mateo
75	Mobility Management	Many shelters and community-based services are often overwhelmed with transportation assistance.	Santa Clara
76	Mobility Management	Lack of knowledge on the part of transit operators of other accessible services. They don't refer riders who don't qualify for paratransit.	Contra Costa
77	Mobility Management	County level documentation doesn't address travel needs that go outside county lines.	Contra Costa
78	On-time Performance	Long waits, often late arrivals, for paratransit pick-ups.	Contra Costa
79	On-time Performance	Transit services are often late - is driver training needed?	San Mateo
80	Paratransit (ADA)	Between 2 and 3 p.m. there are service capacity issues. Trips are provided but timing of trips can be impacted.	Marin
81	Paratransit (ADA)	Conditional eligibility is an important aspect of ADA paratransit.	Contra Costa
82	Paratransit (ADA)	The ADA paratransit eligibility process should be easier.	Regional
83	Paratransit (ADA)	Paratransit service should go beyond requirements of ADA.	Contra Costa
84	Ped/Bike	Topography causes accessibility issues for seniors and persons with disabilities (valley/ hills are challenging).	Marin
85	Ped/Bike	Mobile home parks also currently don't have sidewalks.	Marin

Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan (2018)
 Transportation Gaps

#	Theme	Comment	County
86	Ped/Bike	Bicycle & Ped Plans. Sidewalks don't necessarily exist where needed. Difficult for persons with disabilities and some seniors. NVRTA staff indicated they will be embarking on a Bus Stop Improvement Plan as new Planning staff are hired soon. In addition, NVRTA staff will embark on a comprehensive operational analysis to review every transit service they operate. They will see how senior/low-income persons use fixed-route transit.	Napa
87	Ped/Bike	Heller Street in Redwood City does not have curb cuts at many points. In general the sidewalks in Redwood City are in poor condition	San Mateo
88	Ped/Bike	At Perimeter Road at CSM, there are no curb cuts to cross the road.	San Mateo
89	Ped/Bike	Many cities in San Mateo County allow people to park on rolled curbs (sidewalks), blocking access to pedestrians.	San Mateo
90	Ped/Bike	In Burlingame non-intersection crosswalks are being identified with extra signs and lights.	San Mateo
91	Ped/Bike	Many sidewalks in the county are uneven and inaccessible to individuals using mobility devices.	San Mateo
92	Ped/Bike	Audible crossing signal from El Camino is needed.	San Mateo
93	Ped/Bike	Some portions of the Coastal Trail are in poor repair and inaccessible to individuals with mobility issues.	San Mateo
94	Ped/Bike	Auto countdown signals are preferable for people who are disabled.	Sonoma
95	Ped/Bike	Longer time to cross streets.	Sonoma
96	Ped/Bike	Pedestrian improvements - even streets and curb cuts.	Sonoma
97	Planning/Study	The coordinated plan needs to give any solution for people in wheelchairs a higher priority.	East Bay
98	Planning/Study	The way that the current plan separates out low-income and people with disabilities is problematic because many people with disabilities are low-income.	East Bay
99	Planning/Study	If the inventory is not going to be in the next Plan, can it be stored and maintained elsewhere? It is very helpful when creating county inventories.	Regional

Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan (2018)
 Transportation Gaps

#	Theme	Comment	County
100	Providers	Concerned that VTA's paratransit service will be diminished by the cancelation of the Outreach contract.	Regional
101	Public Transit - Access	Sidewalks are lacking in many places.	East Bay
102	Public Transit - Accessibility	Crowding is a problem for people with mobility devices.	East Bay
103	Public Transit - Accessibility	There needs to be stronger policies for transit agencies to announce to free up space for riders with disabilities.	East Bay
104	Public Transit - Accessibility	Devices are getting bigger; transit agencies need to provide more space for people with disabilities.	East Bay
105	Public Transit - Accessibility	When transit agencies solve problems for one group of disabled group, it may be causing problems for another disabled group. For instance, tactile strips on the ground make it hard for people in wheelchairs.	East Bay
106	Public Transit - Accessibility	Over packed buses are difficult for seniors and people with disabilities.	Regional
107	Public Transit - Accessibility	Bathroom access at transit centers crucial for people with disabilities.	Sonoma
108	Public Transit - Accessibility	More wheelchair positions on fixed-route - flip seats.	Sonoma
109	Public Transit - Accessibility	Sidewalks and places to sit at bus stops.	Sonoma
110	Public Transit - Amenities	Bus stops are in poor condition, hardly any shelter for seniors and people with disabilities. Hard to recommend/increase public transportation ridership when the basic amenities aren't there.	Contra Costa
111	Public Transit - Amenities	Transit experience for the North bay is not good. Long wait times, lack of well lit, clean shelters with trash cans.	Regional
112	Public Transit - Amenities	The bus stop at El Camino and Trousdale in Burlingame is poorly lit and blocked by overgrown vegetation.	San Mateo
113	Public Transit - Amenities	Bus shelters at Daly City Kaiser (395 Hickey Blvd.) have been missing.	San Mateo

Transportation Gaps

#	Theme	Comment	County
114	Public Transit - Amenities	A walk of two blocks is needed to get from the closest bus stop in Menlo Park to the Ravenswood Family Health Clinic. The bus stop lacks a bench, shelter, and busy cross- traffic makes using fixed-route service from the clinic very difficult.	San Mateo
115	Quality of Service	Drivers are under pressure to keep on time. This causes jerking and speed ups that are hard on seniors and people with disabilities.	Regional
116	Regulation	Shelter has a Conditional Use Permit with the City that requires them to be able to transport clients out of the area when the shelter is not open/available (they must have transportation services available).	Santa Clara
117	Safety	Safety concerns for riders (re: public transportation mainly).	Contra Costa
118	Senior Sensitivity	Western Contra Costa County has a need for services to assist the frail elderly and disabled by noting the need for door thru door services and attendant or companion support services.	Contra Costa
119	Spatial Gap	East county is isolated. Hardly any way to get over the hill in transit.	Alameda
120	Spatial Gap	Paratransit Tri-Valley to inner East Bay should be easier.	Alameda
121	Spatial Gap	More housing in Emeryville. Will transit serve it?	Alameda
122	Spatial Gap	Western Contra Costa needs Greater connectivity from West County to destinations in Martinez, Berkeley and Oakland, especially for medical appointments.	Contra Costa
123	Spatial Gap	High demand for rides outside of service.	Contra Costa
124	Spatial Gap	Unincorporated areas are underserved.	Contra Costa
125	Spatial Gap	No volunteer driver program in West County.	Contra Costa
126	Spatial Gap	Geography of Contra Costa is challenging.	Contra Costa
127	Spatial Gap	There are parts of eastern and southern Alameda County that don't have very good transit service.	East Bay
128	Spatial Gap	There are places that paratransit-dependent riders cannot visit because transit doesn't reach those areas.	East Bay
129	Spatial Gap	There's not enough transit service in south Alameda County - near Fremont.	East Bay

Transportation Gaps

#	Theme	Comment	County
130	Spatial Gap	Access to and from West Marin (including communities such as Bolinas, Point Reyes Station and Nicasio) is difficult, with limited or no public transit available.	Marin
131	Spatial Gap	There is no transportation or paratransit service in the Pt. San Pedro area.	Marin
132	Spatial Gap	Express buses make it difficult to visit neighborhoods between stops.	Regional
133	Spatial Gap	Since the study was last done, many seniors have moved into older adult communities on the Coastsides, so outreach to educate about available transit resources to seniors in that area is greatly needed.	San Mateo
134	Spatial Gap	East Palo Alto does not have a city-wide shuttle service at this time.	San Mateo
135	Spatial Gap	More access to the College of San Mateo is needed. There is no direct service to Canada and other local colleges from the Coastsides.	San Mateo
136	Spatial Gap	Demand-response service is available to residents of Pescadero, La Honda, and other Coastsides communities, but more is needed.	San Mateo
137	Spatial Gap	Transit service in south county is lacking.	Santa Clara
138	Spatial Gap	Disabled transportation to Travis is limited.	Solano
139	Spatial Gap	There is no direct service between some cities in the county.	Solano
140	Spatial Gap	Can't address work/commute trips.	Solano
141	Spatial Gap	Distances between homes and medical centers is becoming greater (particularly in Solano County).	Solano
142	Spatial Gap	Transit doesn't go to/from where students need to go (affordable housing far from transit).	Sonoma
143	Spatial Gap	Transit doesn't serve the needs of seniors who are housed in centers far from transit or need access to services far from transit.	Sonoma
144	Station Access	Improve BART station elevators; need regular maintenance and cleaning	Alameda
145	Taxi/TNC - Accessibility	Not enough accessible taxis.	Contra Costa
146	Taxi/TNC - Accessibility	TNCs don't provide wheelchair service.	Contra Costa
147	Taxi/TNC - Accessibility	Uber-type services don't serve wheelchair-dependent riders.	East Bay

Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan (2018)
 Transportation Gaps

#	Theme	Comment	County
148	Taxi/TNC - Accessibility	Marin needs accessible taxi service. Taxi service in Novato is no longer serving Novato as North Bay Taxi Company shut down.	Marin
149	Taxi/TNC - Accessibility	There is a strong need for accessible taxis in the County	San Mateo
150	Taxi/TNC - Accessibility	There is a great need for accessible taxis.	Santa Clara
151	Taxi/TNC - Accessibility	There is a need for accessible vehicles that can accommodate large mobility devices.	Santa Clara
152	Taxi/TNC - Accessibility	There are agencies in the county who have accessible vehicles that are not being used after hours -- should be coordinated with other programs.	Solano
153	Taxi/TNC - Accessibility	Taxis - accessible and available.	Sonoma
154	Taxi/TNC - Accessibility	Need smart phone for TNC vehicles.	Sonoma
155	Taxi/TNC - Accessibility	TNC vehicles not accessible.	Sonoma
156	Taxi/TNC - Accessibility	There are parts of the county that have only one cab. There is a great need for accessible taxis and more taxis in general.	Sonoma
157	Temporal	Public transit hours should be extended so that paratransit can also be extended	Alameda
158	Temporal	Paratransit doesn't serve Sunday religious services and weekends.	Contra Costa
159	Temporal	Paratransit service hours and locations are too restrictive.	Contra Costa
160	Temporal	Time spent on transit is the biggest barrier to getting employment and staying employed, particularly for low-income parents who must chain/link trips.	Contra Costa
161	Temporal	Limited service on weekends (i.e. WestCAT)	Contra Costa
162	Temporal	Need funding for affordable local transportation service from 5-10pm (M-F), Saturdays and Sundays.	Contra Costa
163	Temporal	Owl service doesn't exist for disabled riders.	East Bay

Transportation Gaps

#	Theme	Comment	County
164	Temporal	There is a shuttle service called Stagecoach in West Marin, but provides limited service.	Marin
165	Temporal	Temporal remains the same as in the 2013 Coordinated Plan. New information provided that weekend service stops at 8:00 pm so there are then no other transportation alternatives.	Marin
166	Temporal	In Tiburon, transit service ends at 7:30 pm	Marin
167	Temporal	There is limited weekend transit service after 6pm. The only services available are in St. Helena and Calistoga through the Chamber of Commerce, due to tourism demand.	Napa
168	Temporal	Weekend/evening service is lacking for paratransit service users.	Regional
169	Temporal	Weekend fixed-route service is lacking.	Santa Clara
170	Temporal	There are limited times you can travel on transit in the county.	Solano
171	Temporal	Reverse commute from SF is difficult - no Owl service.	Solano
172	Temporal	Paratransit should be extended beyond regular service hours.	Solano
173	Temporal	There is a need for evening, weekend and owl fixed-route/paratransit.	Sonoma
174	Temporal	The paratransit service area is very limited outside of local bus hours.	Sonoma
175	Transfers	Connections among providers are not very good, long waits between them (over an hour, in some cases).	Contra Costa
176	Transfers	Transfers between paratransit systems is very difficult. There are long wait times and sometimes an SUV is used and it is uncomfortable.	East Bay
177	Transfers	Transfers into San Mateo County continue to be very difficult. SFMTA and SamTrans need a cost sharing agreement.	San Francisco
178	Transfers	Single vehicle (one seat ride) paratransit from the county of origin to other parts of the Bay Area would be helpful.	San Mateo
179	Transfers	Inter-county paratransit transfers are difficult. Currently VTA has agreements with SamTrans and East Bay Paratransit.	Santa Clara
180	Transfers	Transfers on paratransit are difficult and expensive.	Solano
181	Transfers	Transfers between Sonoma County transit operators, as well as intercountry transfers, can be difficult. There are long wait times, there's poor lighting and transfer opportunities are infrequent.	Sonoma

Transportation Gaps

#	Theme	Comment	County
182	Transfers	Paratransit transfers for short trips between operators.	Sonoma
183	Transit Access	Fixed-route bus stops are often not accessible or safe for on- and off-boarding with wheelchairs.	Contra Costa
184	Transportation Options	Without transit options, constituents also lack personal vehicles; EHS offers a self- funding auto loan program.	Contra Costa
185	Transportation Options	Only 10% of shelter individuals have a vehicle.	Santa Clara
186	Volunteer Driver	Volunteer Driver program - mileage reimbursement for drivers. Restricted to medical necessity rides. Have to be in rural area with no transit access whatsoever. Honor system. Molly's Angels also provides volunteer's to and from medical appointments, shopping, etc. in Napa Valley.	Napa
187	Volunteer Driver	Reimbursement given to driver. Should there be a cap on subsidy per year?	Napa
188	Volunteer Driver	Rural counties depend on volunteer driver programs. There is a need for centralized recruitment and training of volunteers.	Sonoma
189	Volunteers	Don't have volunteer driver capacity to say yes to all trip requests (number of denials is rising, forcing seniors to hold onto their licenses longer than would be safe).	Solano
190	Volunteers	Last surviving volunteer program in Solano County; must shoulder all demand.	Solano
191	Youth	Transportation gaps also exist for low-income youth; they would like to work more with schools and neighborhood-based community centers to reach parents and children at the same time (funding gaps for parental population; more funding available for low- income youth).	Alameda

**Meeting Minutes - Draft
Paratransit Coordinating Council**

Thursday, March 5, 2020

10:00 AM

JoAnn Busenbark Board Room

1. Call To Order

Chair Weir called the meeting to order at 10:03 a.m. noting that there was not a quorum at that time.

Present: 4 - Tom Collette
Member Victor Hurtado
Julie Spencer
Doug Weir

Absent: 2 - Beth Kahiga
Randy Kitch

2. Introductions

Chair Weir invited all in attendance to introduce themselves.

Also present:
Julia Orr
Betty Rhodes
Linda Leonard
Peggy Klick
Jeannie Cervone

3. Public Comment

None.

4. Committee Member and Staff Comments

None.

5. CONSENT AGENDA

5.1 Meeting Minutes of November 7, 2019 (Kathy Alexander) (Pages 7-9)

Chair Weir noted that the November 7, 2019 Minutes would be taken when quorum was met.

6. REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS

6.1 Executive Director Report (Kate Miller) (Pages 10-11)

NVTA staff member Danielle Schmitz provided updates on the following project:
Soscot Junction - State Route (SR) 29/221
Countywide Transportation Plan
Vine Bus Maintenance Facility
Vine Trail Calistoga-St. Helena segment

Imola Park and Ride

[Member Spencer in attendance at 10:10 a.m.]

Chair Weir stated that Item 5.1, November 7, 2019 PCC Meeting Minutes would be taken at this time as there was now a quorum.

MOTION by WEIR, SECOND by COLLETTE to APPROVE the November 7, 2019 PCC Meeting Minutes as presented. Motion was unanimously approved.

6.2 Senior Transportation Collaborative Update (Diana Meehan) (Pages 12-14)

NVTA staff member, Diana Meehan, provided an overview of the Senior Transportation Collaborative, a group of stakeholders from multiple groups with an interest in addressing senior transportation needs that met a couple of times. She also reported that at the last meeting duplication of efforts was discussed, and the meeting participants were encouraged to join the Paratransit Coordinating Council.

Ms. Meehan also provided a detailed review of the Vine family of services and programs that are available for seniors.

Julia Orr, Executive Director of Molly's Angels, provided an overview of their services. Molly's Angels has approximately fifty (50) volunteer drivers that provide approximately three hundred (300) rides per month (their maximum capacity), however, only two (2) drivers will provide rides out of town. Additionally, they have about forty (40) volunteers that provide phone support.

Member Spencer suggested a survey to determine interest for transportation to the St. Helena Hospital.

Member Hurtado provided information on Napa County Alliance for Senior Education's (NCASE's) senior services informational event scheduled June 12 at the Napa Valley College.

6.3 Vine Transit Update (Rebecca Schenck) (Pages 15-18)

NVTA staff member Rebecca Schenck provided report on the current operational performance of the Vine services and update on the January 5, 2020 changes to the system.

6.4 UpValley Ridership Discussion and VineGo Overview (Danielle Schmitz) (Pages 19-25)

NVTA staff member Jonathan Spencer provided Vine Go ridership statistics for the Up Valley region.

A lengthy discussion followed regarding encouraging the utilization of the Vine family of services and how to solve unmet transportation needs among seniors and disabled persons.

Issues discussed included:

- Longer trips that are outside the Vine System service area
- Need for physical assistance with boarding/off boarding
- Need for paratransit transportation for non-Vine Go clients who had a health incident, and are released from a care facility while still lacking mobility. These types of releases often happen with notice of 24 hours or less.

Suggested solutions included:

- Monthly transit training to individuals

- Training volunteers to provide transit training, possibly including Napa Valley College and Pacific Union College students,
- Enhanced marketing of the programs NVTA provides
- Working with Collabria Care and HAPI on senior/disabled transportation needs.

7. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

- Draft Community Based Transportation Plan
- Transit Ambassador Program Update/Train the Trainer Needs Assessment

8. ADJOURNMENT

8.1 Approval of Next Regular Meeting Date of May 7, 2020 and Adjournment.

The next Regularly Scheduled meeting is May 7, 2020.

Chair Weir adjourned the meeting at 11:50 a.m.



NAPA VALLEY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY PCC Agenda Letter

TO: Paratransit Coordinating Council
FROM: Kate Miller, Executive Director
REPORT BY: Alan Budde, Transit Manager
(707) 259-8635 / Email: abudde@nvta.ca.gov
SUBJECT: Transit Update

RECOMMENDATION

Information Only.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report will provide an update on the operational performance of Vine family of services during the third and fourth quarter of Fiscal Year (FY) 2019-20. The report will also provide an update on the operational and service changes that went into effect in March and April related to the COVID-19 pandemic, including the launch of local On-Demand service for the City of Napa.

FISCAL IMPACT

Is there a Fiscal Impact? No.

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION

NVTA instituted a series of Vine Transit service modifications in response to the COVID-19 pandemic and public health orders issued by the State of California and the County of Napa. Starting in March, NVTA reduced service hours, suspended fare payment, and limited bus seat capacity. Riders also started rear-door boarding to limit interaction and exposure to drivers.

In mid-March, Local Napa City Routes (A-H) began operating on a Saturday schedule. Routes 10 & 11 began operating on a Saturday schedule while service on 10X and 11X was suspended. Routes 21 and 29 continued to operate on the normal Monday – Friday schedules. NVTA reduced Community Shuttle hours in American Canyon, St. Helena,

Yountville, and Calistoga. Vine service discontinued transit service at specific stops including the Veterans Home and Napa Valley College.

On April 27, local fixed route services in the City of Napa (A-H) were suspended and Vine began operating only On-Demand service for local trips Monday through Saturday, 7:30 AM to 5:30 PM. The service is available between any two existing bus stops within the City that had fixed route service prior to this change. Riders can schedule a trip by using the Ride The Vine mobile app or call dispatch directly. Reservations can be made for same day service or trips can be ordered in real time.

On May 13, following the County of Napa's revised Shelter at Home order, NVRTA posted notices requiring use of face coverings by passengers and staff while on board vehicles. During the first week, operators were given spare masks to assist passengers who did not yet have their own or who might be unaware of the new rule. Spare face masks are provided on Vine Go paratransit vehicles for passengers that need them.

Ridership

Vine ridership has reacted strongly to recent events. While some services have seen higher declines, all have seen significant downward trends over the past months. Prior to March, however, ridership had generally been on an upward trajectory in response to January service changes.

During the third quarter (January-March), every service except Route 21 (as well as 10X and 11X) saw a quarter-to-quarter ridership decrease. However, when comparing January and February to the prior year, ridership had been on track for a 7% year over year increase. The 7% increase was largely due to increased ridership on local Napa routes during the first two months of 2020. Ridership on prior routes 1-8 is not strictly comparable to the new routes A-H due to the service changes that were made effective on January 5, 2020, however, total ridership on local routes was increasing prior to COVID-19. A precipitous fall in ridership in March turned comparative ridership for the quarter negative.

Regional routes were on track to see a modest increase in ridership until March brought the trend negative. Community Shuttles also ended lower after initial gains in January and February. Ridership on Vine Go, finished down (-19.0%) compared to the prior year's quarter.

June ridership was not available at the date of this report, however, daily ridership continued to decline through April and May. May daily ridership across all Vine services totaled 23.5% of average daily ridership in February, the last full pre-pandemic month. Vine Go ridership declined by 87.7% from over 2,000 riders in January to 247 in May.

On-Demand Service in Napa

After launch of the On-Demand service to replace local fixed route service in late April, ridership has remained steady with an upward trend into May and June. In May, the first full month of service there were 3,182 rides, averaging 133 per weekday and 104 on Saturdays. During the first four weeks of June, 3,945 passenger rides were completed, averaging 174 per weekday and 117 on Saturdays. Average wait time and average ride times were both under 10 minutes. To date, passengers using wheelchairs completed 85 trips. The majority of trips (64.5%) were scheduled through calls to Vine dispatch, with 17.7% made directly by riders through the mobile app.

First Responders - Emergency Operations Center (EOC) Work

Napa Valley Transportation Authority is an arm of the Napa County Emergency Operations Center (EOC) under the Operations – Transportation Branch. On March 19 NVTA was activated for the COVID-19 pandemic. Emergency transportation services to date are as follows:

- On March 27 Vine Transit began delivering meals to shelter occupants and isolation sites three times a day.
- On March 29 Vine Transit started providing transportation to the County's high risk congregate living clients in the Winter and South shelters to a prevention motel site. This site is to protect the county's vulnerable population and to curb the spread of the virus.
- On March 30 Vine Transit started delivering lunch to EOC staff at various EOC sites in the county.
- Vine Transit is on standby to move individuals who do not have access to transportation or have mobility needs to the COVID-19 testing site.
- NVTA is assisting in delivering food and other supplies to food pantries and other vulnerable populations across the county
- NVTA staff is on standby for other transportation needs that arise in the EOC.

Cleaning/Disinfecting Procedures

Vine Transit and NVTA are taking many precautions in protecting the riding public, Vine drivers, and staff. Procedures include the following:

- Rear door boarding
- No fare collection
- Vehicle sanitizing – disinfecting all high-touch points nightly
- Require facemasks for all riders
- 6 passengers per transit vehicle
- Mandatory driver Personal Protective Equipment
- Social Distancing Measures at the Soscol Gateway Ticket Office and on-board buses

- Provide all drivers with individual hand sanitizers and facemasks
- NVTA Office closed to the public
- Require masks inside NVTA building

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

Attachment: Vine Service Ridership Tables

Vine Ridership Tables for 2020

Table 1. January-April Trips by Month for Local City of Napa Service

	January	February	March	April	January	February	March	April
Route A	-12.3%	35.8%	-10.5%	-31.8%	-180	466	-165	-566
Route B	57.4%	59.3%	-49.4%	-61.7%	2,225	2,130	-2,212	-2,882
Route C	38.5%	39.2%	-68.6%	-75.7%	1,875	1,912	-3,747	-4,008
Route D	-21.7%	-9.8%	-82.3%	-78.1%	-1,024	-439	-4,057	-3,354
Route E	-2.8%	1.2%	-53.0%	-49.0%	-117	45	-2,339	-2,159
Route F	67.1%	64.8%	-52.5%	-57.5%	2,005	1,789	-1,626	-1,870
Route G	241.0%	265.1%	50.2%	-12.3%	2,798	2,874	631	-179
Route H	-58.2%	-46.0%	-85.8%	-86.9%	-4,219	-2,950	-6,743	-7,287
Total	11.0%	20.7%	-61.2%	-66.5%	3,363	5,827	-20,258	-22,305

Table 2. January-April Trips by Month for Regional Routes

	Percent Change				Numerical Change			
	January	February	March	April	January	February	March	April
Route 10	-16.4%	-4.3%	-68.4%	-73.1%	-3,187	-758	-13,543	-15,035
Route 11	-9.7%	3.5%	-62.6%	-66.2%	-1,979	668	-13,460	-14,284
Route 10X	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	167	1,019	462	N/A
Route 11X	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	553	1,589	882	N/A
Route 21	96.3%	98.9%	-12.6%	-27.9%	1,516	1,484	-211	-531
Route 29	2.3%	0.2%	-30.2%	-51.1%	126	11	-1,642	-3,044
Total	-6.0%	9.2%	-56.8%	-65.9%	-2,804	4,013	-27,512	-33,002

Table 3. January-April Trips by Month for Community Shuttles

	Percent Change				Numerical Change			
	January	February	March	April	January	February	March	April
Calistoga Shuttle	42.1%	41.1%	-43.8%	-82.9%	592	519	-769	-1,497
St. Helena Shuttle	-13.2%	-15.1%	-57.6%	-92.6%	-183	-235	-1,073	-1,385
Yountville Trolley	-2.8%	9.3%	-50.4%	-96.9%	-31	121	-670	-1,516
American Canyon Transit	14.7%	46.1%	-33.6%	-83.5%	264	884	-696	-1,481
Total	6.0%	21.5%	-46.8%	-89.3%	357	1,295	-3,347	-6,332

Table 4. January-April Trips by Month for VineGo

	Percent Change				Numerical Change			
	January	February	March	April	January	February	March	April
Vine Go	-3.2%	2.5%	-52.4%	-90.4%	-67	48	-1,156	-2,012



NAPA VALLEY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

PCC Agenda Letter

TO: Paratransit Coordinating Council
FROM: Kate Miller, Executive Director
REPORT BY: Danielle Schmitz, Director of Capital Development and Planning
(707) 259-8636 / Email: rschenck@nvta.ca.gov
SUBJECT: Draft Napa Valley Community Based Transportation Plan (CBTP)

RECOMMENDATION

Information Only.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Napa Valley Transportation Authority (NVTA) staff began the Community Based Transportation Plan (CBTP) update in spring 2018. The purpose of the CBTP is to identify Communities of Concern, based on census data and criteria, and conduct specific outreach to those communities to identify transportation gaps and needs.

Eight COCs were identified in Napa County and NVTA staff conducted over 13 public outreach events to gain knowledge about what transportation improvements are important to them. In addition, NVTA formed a CBTP Steering Committee made up of social service and community-based organizations to vet projects and programs and to gain further input on local needs. NVTA collected specific projects and overall programmatic themes that were identified by the community. The Draft CBTP was released for public review at the June 17 Board meeting.

NVTA has only received minor non-substantive edits and has made those changes accordingly.

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION

The purpose of the CBTP is to improve mobility options and close transportation gaps for low-income and disadvantaged communities in Napa County. To establish the foundation for the plan, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) evaluates census data to identify communities of concerns (COCs). NVTA staff expanded that effort and

identified four additional communities of concern (COC), beyond the four COCs identified by MTC. The primary focus of the Community-Based Transportation planning process is to directly engage with disadvantaged Napa County residents to identify missing transportation needs not currently being met.

COCs are defined as geographic areas that have concentrated populations in four of the following eight categories:

1. Minority Population
2. Low income (<200% of Poverty) Population
3. Limited English Proficiency Population
4. Zero-Vehicle Households
5. Seniors 75 or Over
6. Population with a Disability
7. Single-Parent Families
8. Cost-burdened Renter

Table 1. Napa Communities of Concern

Census Tract	Neighborhood Name
2002.02	South Downtown Napa
2006.02	Northeast Napa (Vintage)
2007.07	Northwest Napa (Linda Vista)
2008.04	Westwood Neighborhood
2009	East Imola
2012	Unincorporated Yountville
2016.01	South St. Helena
2020	Calistoga

Outreach

NVTA staff has conducted outreach to eight COCs in Napa County to gain knowledge about what transportation improvements are important to them. In addition, NVTA formed a CBTP Steering Committee made up of social service and community-based organizations to vet projects and programs and to gain further input on local needs. The intent of the outreach is to identify projects that meet the following criteria:

- 1) Are developed through a collaborative and inclusive planning process
- 2) Improve transportation choices
- 3) Address and identify transportation gaps
- 4) Focus on transportation needs specific to elderly, disabled, and low-income communities

Based on input from the Steering Committee, staff identified outreach events to ensure equitable and appropriate outreach in all communities. Staff issued press releases and coordinated with local jurisdictions prior to all outreach events. The scheduled outreach events began in September of 2018 and concluded in December of 2018.

The CBTP outreach has helped to educate the public about the transportation options in the Napa Valley. NVTA staff prepared a draft list of CBTP recommended projects based on feedback and comments from the outreach events.

Evaluation of Transportation Proposals

NVTA staff, in coordination with the Steering Committee, created criteria to evaluate proposals to ensure that they adequately addressed community needs identified through the outreach process. The Steering Committee reviewed and validated the evaluation criteria at its February 27, 2019 meeting. The five criteria used to evaluate projects included:

1. Project Lead:

Existence of a “program champion,” an agency (or agencies) that takes a leadership role in securing funding, staffing and other resources devoted to the proposed service or project.

2. Community Identified:

Does the proposal address transportation needs identified through public outreach? Ultimately, all proposed projects addressed transportation needs identified by the community.

3. Implementation:

Based on anticipated barriers to implementation (such as funding, resource allocation, and project development), the group placed proposals in implementation timeframes:

- Near-Term (to be implemented in 1-2 years)
- Mid-Term (to be implemented in 3-5 years)
- Long-Term (to be implemented in 6 years or more)

4. Cost/Funding

When funding might be available to plan, construct, and maintain the proposed projects and services. Availability of on-going funding/sources, especially for transit service operations, must also be considered when evaluating the sustainability of a proposal. Although the group did consider the possible costs to develop and implement each proposal, proposals were not ranked based on their costs.

5. Benefit:

Lastly, whether each proposal is easy for potential customers to use in addressing Lifeline Transportation barriers:

- Safety
- System Performance (in addition to helping the community, does the project improve system performance)
- Emissions reduction
- Improved mobility
- Improved Health Outcomes

Identified Projects

Based on the feedback from residents in the COCs, NVTA worked with the Steering Committee on ranking specific projects in the CBTP. Specific projects are identified below:

1. Hunt Avenue Sidewalks/Pedestrian Improvements*
2. Pope Avenue Sidewalks Pedestrian and Lighting Improvements
3. Bike Facility on Trancas from Jefferson Street to Soscol Avenue
4. Expanded TaxiScript and Commute Options
5. Bus shelter/benches at high usage stops
6. Enhanced Pedestrian Crossing at Jefferson St. and Rubicon Street
7. Enhanced Pedestrian Crossing at Jefferson St. and El Capitan
8. Enhanced Pedestrian Crossing on Trancas St. at Valle Verde
9. Transit service from St. Helena to Angwin and St. Helena Hospital
10. Transit service from Calistoga to Santa Rosa Kaiser
11. Expanded evening Hours on Local Transit

*City of St. Helena completed project

In addition to the above listed projects, many programmatic themes were identified in the outreach to COCs and NVTA cataloged those in the Plan.

Programmatic Themes:

- Improve Pedestrian Safety
- Improve Pedestrian Access to Schools and Transit
- Improve Transportation Options to Healthcare
- Expand Mobility Options for Low-Income, Senior, and Disabled Residents
- Increase Local Transit Evening Frequencies
- Increase Transit Amenities
- Decrease Transit Fares for Low-Income Individuals
- Increase Transit ADA Access

Moving Forward

NVTA has created a robust set of baseline data for each COC that will be used for planning efforts. Staff will review data trends in how COCs are doing in meeting identified needs and periodically update the data set. NVTA is already using the COC data to update the equity section of the Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP), *Advancing Mobility 2045*. The CBTP will also guide transportation investments for funding programs like the Lifeline Transportation Program that funds a wide range of transportation improvements that primarily benefit Communities of Concern.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

- (1) Draft CBTP <https://www.nvta.ca.gov/CBTP>



NAPA VALLEY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY PCC Agenda Letter

TO: Paratransit Coordinating Council
FROM: Kate Miller, Executive Director
REPORT BY: Diana Meehan, Senior Planner
(707) 259-8327 / Email: dmeehan@nvta.ca.gov
SUBJECT: Lifeline Transportation Program Cycle 6

RECOMMENDATION

Information Only.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Napa Valley Transportation Authority (NVTA) issued a notice for Letters of Interest for the Lifeline Transportation Program on June 22, 2020. There is \$156,129 in federal transit funds available to public transit operators, community based organizations and non-profits, and other local government agencies for lifeline transportation projects. Lifeline funds address transportation gaps or barriers identified in community-based transportation plans or other local planning efforts in low-income communities.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

Is there a fiscal impact? No, however NVTA Board approval will make \$156,657 available for programming.

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION

The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) makes funding available to improve mobility of low-income communities through the Lifeline Transportation Program (LTP). LTP funds are distributed to counties based on a low-income population formula and are administered by each county transit operator. The Napa Valley Transportation Authority (NVTA) serves as the Transit Operator for Vine Transit. NVTA issued a notice for all interested parties to submit Letters of Interest for lifeline funding.

The program is intended to fund projects included in community-based transportation plans or other planning efforts, including projects that: 1) Are developed through a collaborative and inclusive planning process; 2) improve transportation choices; 3) address transportation gaps identified in the Community Based Transportation Plans (CBTP) or other local planning efforts; and 4) focus on transportation needs specific to elderly and disabled residents of low income communities.

Eligible Applicants:

Public agencies, county social service agencies, cities and counties, and non-profit organizations are eligible applicants. However, since Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5307 funds are all statutorily restricted to eligible public transit agencies, applicants must partner with NVRTA to access the revenues.

Available Funding:

Table 1. Lifeline Fund Sources

Fund Source	Amount		Total
	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	
FTA Section 5307 Funds	\$77,528	\$79,129	\$156,657

Local Matching Fund Requirement:

LTP Cycle 6 requires a minimum match of 20% of the total project cost.

Two exceptions to the 20% requirements:

- 1) FTA Section 5307 operating projects require a 50% match.
- 2) All auto-related projects require a 50% match.

Local match for FTA funds can be federal funds providing they are not Department of Transportation Funds.

Eligible Projects:

The program goal is to improve mobility for low-income communities in Napa County. Eligible Projects under FTA Section 5307 include:

- New and existing transportation and transit services
- Capital and operating projects

Projects that comply with the requirements above may include, but are not limited to:

- Late-night & weekend service
- Guaranteed ride home service
- Shuttle service
- Expanding fixed route public transit routes, including hours of service or coverage
- Demand-responsive van service
- Ridesharing and carpooling activities
- Transit-related aspects of bicycling(such as first-mile/last-mile connections to transit)
- Administration and expenses for voucher programs
- Local car loan programs
- Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS)
- Marketing
- Mobility management

Statutory restrictions and eligibility for revenues included in the Lifeline program can be found at the following website:

https://www.transit.dot.gov/sites/fta.dot.gov/files/docs/FINAL_FTA_circular9030.1E.pdf

FTA Section 5307

Projects will be selected based on -

- 1) Community-identified priority/ local support
- 2) Implementation plan/project readiness
- 3) Ability to provide required match
- 4) Accountability and Reporting
- 5) Cost effectiveness
- 6) Project budget/sustainability

Project Priority is given to projects addressing the four overarching priorities identified in the CBTP:

- Improve Pedestrian Safety – Improve conditions to reduce traffic incidents and increase pedestrian safety
- Mobility-options that expand mobility for low-income, senior and disabled residents
- Transit related-increase local transit evening frequencies, increase amenities, decrease fares for low-income individuals
- Americans with Disabilities-Increase transit ADA access

Project Delivery Requirements:

For projects receiving FY 2018-19 funds, the project must be complete by August 2023, and August 2024 for FY 2019-20 funds.

Table 2. Application/Lifeline Transportation Program Schedule

June 22, 2020	NVTA issues request for Letters of Interest
July 3, 2020	LOI due to NVTA
July 6, 2020	NVTA staff review for CBTP consistency and staff recommendation
August 1, 2020	NVTA submit Draft Lifeline Project(s) to MTC
August 19, 2020	NVTA Board Approval

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

Attachment:

None – information about the Lifeline Transportation Program Cycle 6, including program guidelines can be found at:

https://www.nvta.ca.gov/sites/default/files/Lifeline%20Cycle%206%20Program%20Guidance_RE_S-4416_Signed_0.pdf



NAPA VALLEY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY PCC Agenda Letter

TO: Paratransit Coordinating Council
FROM: Kate Miller, Executive Director
REPORT BY: Alan Budde, Transit Manager
(707) 259-8635 / Email: abudde@nvta.ca.gov
SUBJECT: Clipper START Pilot Program

RECOMMENDATION

Information Only.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

MTC currently administers the Clipper program, which is a fare media card used by all Bay Area transit operators, including NVTA's Vine Transit. MTC introduced the Clipper START pilot program to subsidize single transit trips for low income adults. MTC has set aside \$5 million from the region's \$1.3 billion in Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act (CARES Act) to expand the program.

FISCAL IMPACT

Roughly \$40,000 annually for the first year and up to roughly \$80,000 in future years if MTC discontinues its subsidies.

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION

The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) initiated the Clipper card, originally called Translink in 2002, which is an integrated transit fare card, to create a more seamless experience for Bay Area transit riders. All Bay Area Transit systems now offer Clipper to its riders as fare media. In May 2018, MTC established the Clipper START, which is a pilot program offering 20% or 50% fare discounts to low-income adults on four large transit systems. MTC is proposing to use a \$5 million set-aside from the Bay Area's Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act (CARES Act) funds to expand the pilot program to smaller transit operators.

Because the Clipper card limits the number of fares and transfer rules, the program clusters transit properties in various groups to ensure consistent rules between coordinated/connecting systems. The NVTA Vine is in the Solano/Napa group which includes Soltrans, Fairfield-Suisun FAST Transit, and Vacaville City Coach. The Clipper START discount must be consistent among these operators; and the Solano group is interested in pursuing the 20% Clipper START discount.

NVTA estimates that it collects roughly \$400,000 each year in fares from low income adults. The cost to the agency to reduce low income fares by 20% is roughly \$80,000 per year but with the MTC subsidy, the cost would be reduced to \$40,000, at least for the first year. There is no guarantee that MTC will continue to subsidize the program.

Staff believes that there are potentially some additional benefits beyond supporting the Valley's low income residents. These include:

- 1) The potential for drawing new riders to the system given the reduced cost.
- 2) The program incentivizes low income riders to sign up for a Clipper card - which over time could lead to eliminating cash fares and significantly reduce costs associated with managing cash.
- 3) The Clipper Card uses transponders that can be placed away from drivers reducing the transmission of disease.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

Attachment: MTC Clipper START Letter