

# The Board of Supervisors

County Administration Building  
651 Pine Street, Room 106  
Martinez, California 94553-1293

**John Gioia**, 1st District  
**Gayle B. Uilkema**, 2nd District  
**Millie Greenberg**, 3rd District  
**Mark DeSaulnier**, 4th District  
**Federal D. Glover**, 5th District

# Contra Costa County



**John Sweeten**  
Clerk of the Board  
and  
County Administrator  
(925) 335-1900

March 16, 2004

The Honorable Amy Worth, Chair  
CC Transportation Authority  
3478 Buskirk Ave #100  
Pleasant Hill CA 94523

Dear Chair Worth,

On March 16, 2004, the Board of Supervisors discussed the Draft Final Paratransit Improvement Study and how the recommendations in the study could be addressed in the reauthorization of Measure C. The Board authorized me to forward our comments to the Authority. This letter summarizes our comments.

**The Board finds a number of the recommendations in the draft study encouraging, but believes that steps should be taken to ensure implementation.** It is our opinion that Measure C represents an excellent opportunity to make some positive changes in the provision of paratransit, and a promising start in positioning the county to respond to the impending increase in demand for services directed to seniors and persons with disabilities.

The Board embraces the findings in the study and proposes that the recommendations be implemented in a reauthorized Measure C as a part of a "Paratransit Improvement Program". The funding of these specific recommendations would be **in addition to funding for paratransit operations**. Funding of this recommendation would be minimal and would ensure the Measure C funds provided for operations will be spent cost effectively.

The following are the recommendations that the Board finds most promising along with comments that are intended to ensure that the recommendations are implemented and effective:

- 1. Develop a Comprehensive Technology Plan (Recommendation 7.3):** Funding for implementation and ongoing staffing, support and maintenance of this program needs to be provided. We are aware that the consultant highlighted this need during discussions with the Technical Advisory Committee but neglected to include it in the Draft Final Report and Action Plan.
- 2. Integrating Sedans into the Fleet Mix (Recommendation 7.1.1):** Funding could be made available in a reauthorized Measure C to subsidize the purchase of sedans by transportation providers.
- 3. Establish a Coordination/Mobility Manager Function (Recommendation 7.6):** This recommendation is promising in that it represents the beginnings of increased expansion of coordination activities. As the senior and disabled populations grow, these types of activities will be necessary if not compulsory. Given the likely demands placed on this function during the life of a reauthorized Measure C, the Board believes that the funding burden listed in the study is an underestimate.
- 4. Establish an Advisory Committee on Accessible Transportation (ACAT) (Recommendation 7.7):** This committee is an excellent candidate to oversee the implementation and long-term responsibility for the plan's recommendations. Considering the changes that are to occur in the paratransit landscape during the life of the Measure, this Committee will need a budget for planning activities. The composition of this committee should be structured to include, at a minimum, representatives from the operators, and appointees from the regional transportation planning committees.

Other considerations to take into account to ensure effectiveness and implementation of the aforementioned recommendations:


5. **Cost Survey:** A cost survey should be done to verify and provide greater detail on the amount of funding needed to implement the recommendations found in the study and discussed above.
6. **Long-Term Relevance:** The recommendations of the study must be relevant during the life of a reauthorized Measure C. It is the Board's suggestion that the study and the recommendations be amended and/or updated as appropriate by the ACAT or its functional equivalent.

In regards to the amount of paratransit operations funds that should be allocated in a reauthorized Measure C, it is the Board's opinion that paratransit operations should be funded at a level greater than what is currently being provided. The Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) may also wish to consider making paratransit operations funding available to transportation providers' subject to their participation on ACAT and in the implementation of the recommendations in the Paratransit Study.

It is the Board's hope that our suggestions can generate some discussion on this matter so that a well-planned, effective approach to address paratransit issues may be developed for inclusion in a reauthorized Measure C.

The Board of Supervisors commends the CCTA for their proactive role in addressing paratransit issues by sponsoring and conducting the paratransit study. It is precisely because of this effort that we, as a county, can now begin to take a strategic approach to addressing transportation issues for seniors and persons with disabilities in the reauthorization of Measure C.

Sincerely,



Federal D. Glover, Chair  
Contra Costa County  
Board of Supervisors

FDGVC

c: Members, PCC  
Advisory Council on Aging

# CONTRA COSTA COUNTY PARATRANSIT COORDINATING COUNCIL

Hookston Square  
3478 Buskirk Avenue, Suite 100  
Pleasant Hill, CA 94523  
(925) 939-9PCC

March 23, 2004

Amy Worth, Chair  
Contra Costa Transportation Authority  
3478 Buskirk Avenue, #100  
Pleasant Hill, CA 94523

**RE: Paratransit Improvement Study Recommendations**

Dear Chairwoman Worth:

At its meeting of March 22, 2004, the Paratransit Coordinating Council reviewed and discussed the recommendations of the subject study. The following summarizes the Council's conclusions.

The Council supports the following study recommendations:

- 7.1.1 Use of sedans for paratransit.
- 7.2.1 Use of a 30 minute "window".
- 7.3 Technology Plan.
- 7.5.2 Fare Incentives.
- 7.6 Mobility Manager
- 7.7 Advisory Committee on Accessible Transportation (ACAT).

The Council gave conditional support to the following recommendations:

- 7.4 Lifeline Transit, but pointed out that needs exist for paratransit service outside ADA service limits.
- 7.5.1 Travel Training, without additional funding as this is already done by the operators.

The Council was opposed to the following recommendations:

- 7.1.2 Use of taxis, because of very poor experience with taxi operators and drivers (who do not have requisite drug and other clearances), and with the lack of taxi companies in many parts of the County.
- 7.2.2 Overbooking, because of the many service denials generated by this practice.

Amy Worth  
March 23, 2004  
Page Two

In addition to the above, the Council approved the following motion:

*Regarding the telephone survey component of the Paratransit Study, the PCC is pleased to note that the 57% of the respondents who were identified as regular paratransit users had a high level of satisfaction with the services. However we find that there should be greater follow-up research and analysis on those 43% of the respondents who either don't use paratransit or use it less than 10 days per year, as to the reasons for their non-use or infrequent use of paratransit.*

Other discussion included concerns that paratransit services be significantly funded using current and future Measure C funds, and that transfer trips were not adequately addressed in the study.

We hope this information will be useful as the CCTA Board considers the recommendations of this study. Please contact me if you desire additional information.

Sincerely,

Janet Abelson  
PCC Chair