

## The Board of Supervisors

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

**John Gioia**, 1<sup>st</sup> District  
**Candace Andersen**, 2<sup>nd</sup> District  
**Diane Burgis**, 3<sup>rd</sup> District  
**Karen Mitchoff**, 4<sup>th</sup> District  
**Federal D. Glover**, 5<sup>th</sup> District

## Contra Costa County



**David Twa**  
Clerk of the Board  
and  
County Administrator  
(925) 335-1900

March 29, 2018

Honorable Rudy Salas  
State Capitol  
P.O. Box 942849  
Sacramento, CA 94249-0032

Re: Assembly Bill 970 – California Department of Aging: Grants: Transportation: Support with Amendments

Dear Congressman Salas,

On behalf of the Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors, I am writing to thank you for bringing forward the visionary legislation, *AB 970 - California Department of Aging: Grants: Transportation*. The bill would provide grant funding for transportation programs to/from nonemergency medical services for older individuals and persons with a disability who reside in rural, desert, or mountain areas. The bill is timely, improvements to this type of transportation are critical if we are to improve emergency response to this vulnerable population.

Transportation services for this population have long been in need of improvement, your bill is an excellent response to those needs. Contra Costa County has been developing a similar proposal that would benefit the entire state, directly fund locally identified needs including in Assembly District 32, and is consistent with the intent of AB 970.

We have attached two documents which describe the proposal in detail. The first is an unbacked bill (*Transportation funding: services for seniors and persons with disabilities*) proposing a new program, and the second is a report (*Seniors/Persons with Disabilities State Transportation Funding Program Proposal*) establishing the rationale and describing the strategy for a statewide program.

In summary, the proposal leverages existing federal requirements for the development of *Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plans*. These plans are developed nationwide and are required to be, "...developed and approved through a process that includes participation by seniors, individuals with disabilities, representatives of public, private, and nonprofit transportation and human services providers and other members of the public..."

As suggested by the requirements, these *Coordinated Plans* establish specific local needs and define a strategic approach to transportation investments. The attached approach would leverage these plans resulting in 1) expedited implementation, and 2) a program that is inherently tailored to each locality complete with documented effectiveness and support.

The County respectfully requests that AB 970 be amended to incorporate the approach described in the attached documents and summarized below:

- There is a need for both capital and operations funding programs. The capital program would fund vehicle purchase as currently envisioned in AB 970.
- Funding should be provided statewide with eligible expenditures guided by the existing *Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plans*. These locally produced plans include recommendations reasonably forecasted<sup>1</sup> to simultaneously increase cost effectiveness, expand service, and increase service quality. Implementation of the *Coordinated Plans* is hampered by a lack of dedicated funding.
- The creation and operation of Consolidated Transportation Service Agencies (CTSAs) and other systemic or organizational improvements<sup>2</sup> should be an eligible expenditure of funding. The CTSA structure was authorized under the Social Service Transportation Act (AB 120 – 1979) and encourages coordination among transportation providers improving access, quality of service and cost-effectiveness. Implementation of the CTSA mechanism is hampered by a lack of dedicated funding.

If you have any questions or concerns on this request please don't hesitate to reach out to the County. Our staff and legislative advocate are available to provide assistance, John Cunningham, Principal Transportation Planner (john.cunningham@dcd.cccounty.us, (925) 674-7833) and Mark Watts (mwatts@swmconsult.com, (916) 446-5508).

Again, thank you for bringing this important bill forward.

Sincerely,



John Gioia, Chair  
Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors

cc: Hon. Adrin Nazarian, Chair - Assembly Aging and Long-Term Care Committee  
L. Vance Taylor, Chief - Office of Access and Functional Needs – Gov. Office of Emergency Services  
MTC Legislation Committee c/o Rebecca Long  
Erik Turner, Assembly District 32 Staff

#### Attachments

- *Seniors/Persons with Disabilities State Transportation Funding Program Proposal*
- *Transportation funding: services for seniors and persons with disabilities*

---

<sup>1</sup> Transportation Research Board/National Academy of Sciences: Report 91: Economic Benefits of Coordinating Human Service Transportation & Transit Services: “*Significant economic benefits — including increased funding, decreased costs, and increased productivity — can be obtained by coordinating human service transportation and transit services.*”

<sup>2</sup> Systemic operational or organizational improvements include the creation of new service models and organizations such as CTSAs, mobility management centers, one-call/one-click operations, nonprofit agencies, joint powers, technology investments that increase cost-effectiveness of operations, facilitate client payment accounting systems (supporting client/fund comingling and cost allocation), improve client ease-of-access (one call/one click, interactive voice response), and enhance/enable access to TNCs.

79731

02/12/19 09:16 AM  
RN 19 05897 PAGE 1

Transportation funding: services for seniors and persons with disabilities

An act to add Chapter 2 (commencing with Section 99100) to Part 11 of  
Division 10 of the Public Utilities Code, relating to transportation.



19058979731BILLMA14

## THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA DO ENACT AS FOLLOWS:

## SECTION 1. The Legislature finds and declares all of the following:

(a) The “aging tsunami,” brought about by the aging of the baby boomers has long been forecasted to increase the demand for public transportation services for seniors and persons with disabilities. This is a well-documented issue. The California State Plan on Aging indicates that by 2030 senior age groups will increase anywhere from 70 percent up to 274 percent. These age groups have cognitive and physical characteristics that either require public transportation services or results in the loss of ability to drive themselves, or both.

(b) In order for transportation programs and systems to adequately serve seniors and persons with disabilities (SPD) in the current regulatory environment, both of the following are required:

(1) An increase in funding for capital programs that enable efficiencies and reduce greenhouse gases (GHG).

(2) An increase in transportation operations funding to respond to the forecasted increase in demand for services.

(c) Increases in regional or local supplemental funding for these services have not been provided even as major new transportation sources have been enacted or approved, including Regional Measure 2 and Regional Measure 3 in the Bay Area, and Senate Bill 1 (Chapter 5 of the Statutes of 2017).

(d) Victims of wildfires are often disproportionately seniors and persons with disabilities. These outcomes can be related to limited access to quality transportation. However, with a significant level of new investment, coupled with better coordinated services the state can see significant, systemic improvements to transportation services for this population and this will indirectly but significantly improve emergency responses for this population. Any specific effort intended to directly improve emergency responses for this population will require a modern SPD transportation framework.

(e) There is a strong nexus between SPD transportation services and GHG production. This nexus supports the use of revenue from the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund for transportation services for the SPD population. This nexus is demonstrated by both of the following:

(1) Federal Highway Administration and American Public Transit Association data establish that paratransit shuttle operations are a significant source of GHGs.

(2) Operational improvements made possible by technology investments and administrative changes can demonstrably decrease GHGs production by increasing the number of shared trips in a demand-response or paratransit operation.

(f) It is appropriate to efficiently and effectively respond to the demographically driven expansion of the population being served and to increase the efficiency of this segment of the transportation system by providing additional funding for these services.

SEC. 2. Chapter 2 (commencing with Section 99100) is added to Part 11 of Division 10 of the Public Utilities Code, to read:



## CHAPTER 2. TRANSPORTATION SERVICES FOR SENIORS AND PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

99100. It is the intent of the Legislature that 5 percent of the annual proceeds of the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund be appropriated in the annual Budget Act for the purpose of the program established pursuant to this chapter to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in the state in accordance with the requirements of Section 39712 of the Health and Safety Code.

99101. The Controller shall establish a program for the purpose of providing funding for transportation services for seniors and persons with disabilities.

99102. The Controller shall annually allocate funds made available for the program established pursuant to this chapter on a formula basis as follows:

(a) Fifty percent of the funds to be allocated to local or regional transportation agencies that have sought and received voter approval of taxes or that have imposed fees, including uniform developer fees as defined by subdivision (b) of Section 8879.67 of the Government Code, which taxes or fees are dedicated solely to transportation improvements, and that provide transportation services to seniors and persons with disabilities.

(b) Fifty percent of the funds to be allocated to counties.

99103. (a) An entity that receives an allocation pursuant to Section 99102 shall provide grants from that allocation to a qualified service provider to provide transportation services to seniors and persons with disabilities.

(b) If an entity receives an allocation pursuant to Section 99102 whose source is the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund, the entity shall ensure that a grant provided to a qualified service provider is consistent with the guidelines adopted by the State Air Resources Board pursuant to Section 39715 of the Health and Safety Code.



## LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

Bill No. \_\_\_\_\_  
as introduced, \_\_\_\_\_.  
General Subject: Transportation funding: services for seniors and persons with disabilities.

Existing law provides various sources of funding for transportation purposes, including funding for paratransit and other transportation services for seniors and persons with disabilities.

The California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 designates the State Air Resources Board as the state agency charged with monitoring and regulating sources of emissions of greenhouse gases. The act authorizes the state board to include the use of market-based compliance mechanisms. Existing law requires all moneys, except for fines and penalties, collected by the state board as part of a market-based compliance mechanism to be deposited in the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund and to be available upon appropriation. Existing law continuously appropriates 35% of the annual proceeds of the fund for transit, affordable housing, and sustainable communities programs and 25% of the annual proceeds of the fund for certain components of a specified high-speed rail project.

This bill would state the intent of the Legislature that 5% of the annual proceeds of the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund be appropriated in the annual budget act to fund transportation services for seniors and persons with disabilities. The bill would require the Controller to establish a program for the purpose of funding transportation services to seniors and persons with disabilities. The bill would require the Controller to annually allocate funds made available to the program on a formula basis with 50% to be allocated to local or regional transportation agencies that meet certain requirements and 50% to be allocated to counties. The bill would require the entities that receive these allocations to provide grants to qualified service providers to provide transportation services to seniors and persons with disabilities.

Vote: majority. Appropriation: no. Fiscal committee: yes. State-mandated local program: no.



# Seniors/Persons with Disabilities State Transportation Funding Program Proposal

*Concept Approved by the Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors: September 25, 2018 (revised December 2018)<sup>1</sup>*

**Issue Summary:** In order for transportation programs and systems to adequately serve seniors and persons with disabilities (SPD) in the current regulatory environment, the following is required: **1)** an increase in funding for capital programs that enable efficiencies, and reduce greenhouse gasses (GHGs), and **2)** an increase in transportation operations funding to respond to the forecasted increase in demand for services. Both programs include incentives to implement more cost effective, user-friendly systems that reduce GHG production.

Both of these changes are necessary in order to efficiently and effectively respond to the demographically driven expansion of the population being served and to increase the efficiency of this segment of the transportation system. As described further in this proposal, there has been substantial *analysis* of these issues. However, no state or federal funding program makes use of that analysis and responds to the scale or complexity of the issue adequately.

The issue is best summarized in the *Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan* for the Bay Area although the stark assessment is applicable statewide as described in the **Statewide Need** section of this proposal:

*Current senior-oriented mobility services do not have the capacity to handle the increase in people over 65 years of age...the massive growth among the aging ...points to a lack of fiscal and organizational readiness...the closure and consolidation of medical facilities while rates of diabetes and obesity are on the rise will place heavy demands on an already deficient system.*

The “*already deficient system*” serving the SPD population requires a robust policy and funding response that is comparable to improvements seen in other transportation system sectors. California’s response to automotive congestion is justifiably robust and systematic, freeway widening, transit expansion, express lanes, etc. These activities all saw increased funding under the Road Repair and Accountability Act (SB 1 2017). Bicyclists are benefiting from substantially increased infrastructure investment with green lanes and separated bikeways as a result of the Complete Streets Act (AB 1358[2008]) and the creation of the Active Transportation Program (SB 99 [2013], Chapter 359 and AB 101[2013], Chapter 354). This proposal establishes some parity in transportation system investment and progress between the SPD population and the general public (which also reduces GHGs).

**Impacted Population:** Due to the overlapping disadvantaged factors (age, disability poverty, chronic conditions, etc.) defining a population figure is challenging. However, the growth in the senior population, and the associated characteristics of that population, are compelling as a standalone data point even without the addition of the population with disabilities (but not elderly).

During the 2010 to 2060 time period, California’s over 60 population will have a 166% increase. During the same period, the over age 85 population will increase by 489%. For comparison’s sake, the working age population (25-64) will increase just 21% during that time.<sup>2</sup> Actual population figures from the Department of Finance are as follows: Age 65+: 5,460,081 (2016), 10,371,162 (2036), 13,488,801 (2060).

The simple numerical increase in the senior population is compounded by demographic complexities, there will be more single and/or childless seniors (reduced ability to rely on close family members for transportation assistance), and the population as a whole will experience a *decreasing* number of working aging people supporting (financially, direct services) a *growing* number of elderly people.<sup>3</sup>

The impact of this broad systemic degradation of the State’s ability to support this population is described by the Public Policy Institute for California<sup>4</sup> as follows, “...a greater share of the state’s human and economic resources being used to provide health care and other types of support for this group.” This proposal is a strategic approach to allocating those resources.

---

<sup>1</sup> The proposal has been revised but is still consistent with the original intent as approved by the Board of Supervisors.

<sup>2</sup> Population figures from the California Department of Aging: [https://www.aging.ca.gov/data\\_and\\_statistics/facts\\_about\\_elderly/](https://www.aging.ca.gov/data_and_statistics/facts_about_elderly/)

<sup>3</sup> The “aged dependency ratio” (the ratio of the number of seniors to the number of people of working ages supporting [directly and financially]) is set to increase from 19 to 32, there will be fewer adults of prime working age relative to the senior population.

<sup>4</sup> Planning for California’s Growing Senior Population, August 2015, <https://www.ppic.org/publication/planning-for-californias-growing-senior-population/>

**Timeline:** The intent is to have this Seniors/Persons with Disabilities (SPD) Transportation Funding Program proceed in the 2019 legislative session. While there is no set timeline driving this effort, the aforementioned spike in demand for service, and the lack of progress in this field have been *observed* and *analyzed* for decades<sup>5</sup>. This proposal leverages *existing* tools to quickly operationalize strategies and actions that have long been identified but underdeveloped due to a lack of funding.

**Background:** The impending increase in the senior population and the transportation systems serving the same have been the subject of considerable analysis with limited action for some time<sup>5</sup>. This situation is summarized in the National Academy of Sciences sponsored report, “*Economic Benefits of Coordinating Human Service Transportation and Transit Services*”:<sup>6</sup>

*Ideas about coordinating human service transportation and public transit services should shift from the research arena to **operational** practice. Local transportation services for the disadvantaged are often delivered by a variety of nonprofit organizations, operated independently by multiple entities in a community, and result in duplicative, overlapping, and uncoordinated services. The analysis concludes that although coordination sounds like an easy and magical policy solution to be effective, state-level policies must, at a minimum, **target and fund the coordination process.***

This proposal **targets and funds the coordination process**. Nearly immediate **operational** implementation is possible by leveraging existing analysis and tools:

- The statewide inventory of locally developed *Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plans*<sup>7</sup> (hereafter “Coordinated Plans”) all include implementable recommendations. The Coordinated Plans are planning documents consistently produced throughout the state in response to federal requirements<sup>7</sup>. These documents include recommendations reasonably forecasted<sup>6</sup> to simultaneously increase cost effectiveness, expand service, and improve service quality.
- Consolidated Transportation Service Agencies: (CTSAs) were created under the Social Service Transportation Act (AB 120 – 1979). The Act required agencies throughout California to conduct regional inventory reports and prepare/implement action plans. The intent was to encourage coordination among social service transportation providers so existing transportation resources are used more effectively.

#### Issue Details:

- 1) **Fragmented/Inefficient Services:** This transportation sector is funded by numerous local, state, and federal programs across multiple governmental sectors (transportation, social services, public health, etc.). These programs, in many areas, have resulted in the unintended consequence of fragmented and duplicative programs.<sup>8</sup> In addition to the administrative and fiscal problems resulting from this fragmentation, these silos result in arbitrary transit service boundaries requiring unnecessary passenger transfers<sup>9</sup>. These transfers simultaneously increase costs, decrease safety, extend trip times, and significantly compromise service quality and ease of access for this categorically disadvantaged population<sup>10</sup>.

---

<sup>5</sup> Government Accountability Office (GAO) reports 109878, 591707, 650079, 658766, 660247, 667361, et al: “...duplication of effort and inefficiency in providing transportation when agencies do not coordinate...”, “...state and local agencies are unaware that they are...providing transportation services identical and parallel to those of another agency”...transit agency officials that we spoke with said that they would like to implement coordination efforts, but have been unable to get various parties to come together...”, “continuing challenges such as insufficient leadership at the federal level and limited financial resources and growing unmet needs at the state and local level.”, “...state and local officials expressed concern about their ability to adequately address expected growth in elderly, disabled, low-income, and rural populations.”, “...agencies providing similar transportation services to similar client groups may lead to duplication and overlap when coordination does not occur.”

<sup>6</sup> Transportation Research Board of the National Academy of Sciences: Transit Cooperative Research Program, *Report 91: Economic Benefits of Coordinating Human Service Transportation and Transit Services*: “Significant economic benefits — including increased funding, decreased costs, and increased productivity — can be obtained by coordinating human service transportation and transit services.”

<sup>7</sup> A 2004 Executive Order resulted in federal transit law requiring that eligibility for certain funding streams be established through “...a locally developed, coordinated public transit-human services transportation plan,” and that the plan be “developed and approved through a process that included participation by seniors, individuals with disabilities, representatives of public, private, and nonprofit transportation and human services providers and other members of the public”. As a result, throughout the country there are consistently developed and adopted coordinated plans. These plans identify the transportation needs of individuals with disabilities, older adults, and people with low incomes and provide strategies for meeting these needs, and prioritize transportation services for funding and implementation.

<sup>8</sup> GAO: Transportation Coordination: Benefits and Barriers Exist, Planning Efforts Progress Slowly: “As HHS and FTA have recognized, the lack of coordination among human services transportation providers and public transit operators contributes to the duplication or overlapping of transportation services...particular clients may be left unserved or underserved...”

<sup>9</sup> Martin Wachs, Professor Emeritus of Urban Planning, testified at a December 5, 2018 CPUC hearing (TNC Access for All Act) that problems with making cross county trips for this population have been discussed since the 1960s.

<sup>10</sup> GAO: Opportunities to Reduce Potential Duplication in Government Programs, Safe Tax Dollars, and Enhance Revenue., “...GAO and others have reported



In summary, current arrangements are a lose-lose-lose scenario with all parties suffering sub-optimal outcomes, the client population experiencing inadequate service, the agency providing the service is logistically and fiscally overwhelmed, and the tax paying public receives a poor return on their investment.

- 2) Demographically Driven Increase in Demand:** The “aging tsunami”<sup>11</sup>, brought about by the aging of the baby boomers has long been forecasted to increase the demand for the subject transportation services. This is a well-documented issue, the California State Plan on Aging indicates that by 2030 senior age groups will increase anywhere from 70% up to 274%. These age groups have cognitive and physical characteristics that either require this type of service and/or results in the loss of ability to drive themselves. These increases will magnify the negative fiscal impact of the fragmented systems mentioned above.

**Proposal/Solution Details:** The two identified issues, administrative/operations fragmentation and demographically driven increases in demand are addressed by two components of this proposal: **1) a Capital** program focused on efficiency-improving, GHG reducing investments, and **2) an Operations** program with allocations based on population served by the program and subsequently indexed to the growth (or contraction) in the same population.

This proposal exclusively serves disadvantaged individuals that is not only consistent with, but above and beyond the definition of disadvantaged communities in Senate Bill 535 (2012 – DeLeón).

### 1) Capital

Capital funding will be disbursed through competitive grants to projects which are included in the applicable Coordinated Plan or meet other program requirements. Projects will implement systemic operational or organizational improvements proven to result in more efficient use of resources, improve service quality, increase shared trips, and reduce GHGs.

Eligible activities include but are not necessarily limited to **planning** including study and/or creation of new service models and organizations such as CTAs, mobility management centers, one-call/one-click operations, nonprofit agencies, joint powers, other service area consolidation activities, **technology investments**<sup>12</sup> including software/hardware solutions that increase cost-effectiveness of operations, facilitate client payment accounting systems (supporting client/fund comingling and cost allocation), improve client ease-of-access (one call/one click, interactive voice response), enable access to shared and autonomous mobility services, and support coordination or consolidation of separate operations or jurisdictions.

### 2) Operations

- Operations funding will be appropriated annually, on a continuing basis, with funding levels reflecting:
  - The population served and responding to the growth or contraction of that population over time (See **Proposal Notes**), and
  - An incentive program with substantial increases in funding for operations that serve countywide (or larger<sup>13</sup>) service areas (no-transfer), and/or co-mingling of different populations, ADA Paratransit, senior, Medicaid, general public, etc.<sup>14</sup> (See **Proposal Notes** for geographic and

---

*that the variety of federal programs providing transportation services to the transportation disadvantaged has resulted in fragmented services that can be difficult for clients to navigate and narrowly focused programs that may result in service gaps”*

<sup>11</sup> California State Plan on Aging 2017-2021: “The impact of an aging population, described by some as an “age wave” and others as an “aging tsunami,” will be felt in every aspect of society. The economic, housing, **transportation**, health, and social support implications of this phenomenon must also be viewed in the context of the State’s tremendous population growth, which continues to challenge the State’s overall infrastructure planning.”

<sup>12</sup>Technology investments are sizable immediate and ongoing costs. These investments are **only** cost and operationally effective in larger geographic areas with diverse and comingled passenger categories. With every service silo and geographic contraction, these investments have a substantially reduced return on investment.

<sup>13</sup>Larger service areas are more efficient in a demand response system for several reasons. The ability to build shared trips (critical for cost and GHG savings) requires a critical mass of riders not possible in a small service area or with exclusive clientele (Medicaid for example) . Second, technology to build shared rides is expensive to purchase/maintain and is not cost effective on smaller scales.

<sup>14</sup> Transportation Research Board, National Academy of Sciences: TCRP, Report 91: Economic Benefits of Coordinating Human Service Transportation and Transit Services: “There are numerous viable strategies for coordinating the operations of human service transportation and public transit operations ...strategies generate significant economic benefits: When transit agencies coordinate with human service agencies to provide trips to human service agency clients, the transit agencies can realize significant additional funds... human service agencies typically receive substantial trip cost savings....Coordinated cost reduction strategies generated impressive savings...Transit authorities can receive substantial cost savings through contracts with other agencies that may have more freedom to combine trips or to use volunteers and may provide service at lower cost....arrangements often lead to significantly increased revenues for the other transportation providers...when human service agencies coordinate or consolidate their separate transportation services to create

operational restrictions)

- Agencies should be granted provisional eligibility for operations funding under the following scenarios:
  - The programs and projects seeking funding are found to be consistent with the applicable Consolidated Plan. The legislative body that originally approved the Consolidated Plan will pass a resolution in a noticed hearing making that determination.
  - Consolidated Transportation Services Agencies (CTSAs) that are active and otherwise in good standing (as confirmed by the original, approving authority) are categorically eligible for operations funding.
- Provisional eligibility will be subsequently confirmed by the State (see **Proposal Notes** below)

### **Emergency Services: Repatriation Fund**

The Program would close an existing gap in emergency response funding and programs. *Evacuation* activities for seniors/persons with disabilities (referred to as “access & functional needs” [AFN] population in the emergency services profession) are categorically eligible for disaster relief funding. However, there is no funding or authority to *return (repatriate)* the AFN population to their origin during the post-disaster period. The transportation needs of this population can vary greatly from the general population often requiring special vehicles and staff to accommodate mobility/medical devices or support individuals with cognitive or physical limitations. A Repatriation Fund within the SPD Program will fund these activities and make any statutory changes necessary to authorize reimbursement.

The Repatriation Fund is not integral to the intent of the SPD Transportation Funding Program but is being included as this initiative may be an expeditious mechanism to close this gap in services.

### **Revenue Options**

#### **Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund (GGRF)**

There is a strong nexus between SPD transportation services and GHG production. This nexus supports the use of GGRF revenue for transportation services for the SPD population when expenditures are made consistent with the **Proposal/Solution Details** section above.

#### **High Paratransit GHG Production Levels:**

The United States Department of Energy, Office of Energy Efficiency & Renewable Energy uses Federal Highway Administration and American Public Transit Association data to establish that paratransit shuttle operations are a significant source<sup>15</sup> of greenhouse gasses (GHGs).

#### **Capacity for SPD Program to Reduce GHG Production:**

Operational improvements made possible by technology investments and administrative changes have a demonstrable<sup>16</sup> ability to decrease GHGs production by way of increasing the number of shared trips in a demand-response or paratransit operation.

#### **Significant Co-Benefits**

**Disadvantaged Communities:** In addition to being explicitly consistent with the core principle of the Cap-and-Trade Program (GHG reduction) the SPD program *specifically* serves a categorically and acutely disadvantaged population statewide without geographic restrictions.

Currently, there are **no** GGRF revenues **specifically** dedicated to this population other than the broad preference for projects in disadvantaged communities in limited areas. The Low Carbon Transit Operations Program (LCTOP) is **silent** on service to seniors/persons with disabilities, this proposal addresses that gap.

---

*larger transportation services, the typical benefits to human service agencies include reduced unit costs; improved quality of service; and increased efficiency, effectiveness, and cost effectiveness...creates much lower per trip costs, thus generating real savings for public transit operators...can provide substantial economic benefits...provide very substantial economic benefits."*

<sup>15</sup> U.S. Department of Energy: [Maps and Data - Average Annual Vehicle Miles Traveled of Major Vehicle Categories: Average Annual Vehicle Miles Traveled of Major Vehicle Categories](#); Ranking of highest VMT categories (highest to lowest): *Class 8 Truck, Transit Bus, Refuse Truck, Paratransit Shuttle, Delivery Truck, School Bus, Police, Light Truck, Light-Duty Vehicle, Car, Motorcycle.*

<sup>16</sup> University of California, Berkeley, Institute of Transportation Studies, "Evaluating the Impact of ITS on Personalized (demand response/paratransit) Public Transit" **"Benefits of ITS: They describe the following benefits of ITS implementation. • Increase in the percent shared rides (the percentage of time that there are two or more requests in vehicle) from 38% to 55% • 13% savings in the unit transportation cost per passenger mile • Total personnel salaries decreased by 28%"**

**Public Health:** Given the fragile nature of the target population, and the fact that the lack of transportation is a common barrier to routine medical appointments<sup>17</sup>, mobility improvements from this program are reasonably assumed to increase public health and quality of life.

**Operational Cost Savings:** An increase in shared trips, in addition to reducing GHGs, also reduces operational costs as established by the Institute of Transportation Studies – *Benefits of Intelligent Transportation Systems* citation<sup>16</sup>. Considering the oft-cited high costs of operating demand responsive paratransit service, this is only a “co-benefit” in the GGRF context but would be considered a substantial primary benefit in any other context.

**Emergency Response Capacity:** Victims of wildfires are often disproportionately seniors and persons with disabilities. These outcomes can be related to limited access to quality transportation. This proposal does not *directly* address this situation (with the exception of the **Repatriation Fund** which addresses after-incident activities). However, this proposal will make significant, systemic improvements to transportation services for this population and will indirectly but significantly improve emergency response to this population. Any specific effort intended directly improve emergency response to this population will require a modern SPD transportation framework, as described in this proposal, if it is to be effective.

**Proposal Notes:** In order to administer the programs in this proposal the State would have obligations to administer this proposal:

1. Technology investments can be sizable in both immediate and ongoing costs. These investments are **only** cost and operationally effective in larger geographic areas with diverse and comingled passenger categories. With every service silo and geographic contraction, these investments have a substantially reduced return on investment. There should be substantial incentive for service areas which are county level (or larger) and systems which co-mingle different passenger types and funding programs. Smaller geographic operational areas and service to a siloed passenger population should not be eligible for funding.
2. The State Auditor, with assistance from the Department of Transportation, should conduct a meta-analysis of the numerous state and federal studies (see note below) on this topic for the purpose of identifying best practices and establishing metrics by which systemic improvements and operations are evaluated. **No new/original study is warranted.**
3. As mentioned in this document, there is a wealth of research on optimizing and improving this transportation service sector in addition to the CTSA and Coordinated Plan mechanisms. In particular, recommendations from *Economic Benefits of Coordinating Human Service Transportation and Transit Services*, (TCRP Report 91, 2003), *Sharing the Costs of Human Services. Volume 1: The Transportation Services Cost Sharing Toolkit* (TCRP Report 144, Transit Cooperative Research Program, 2011), and other resources available here: <https://nationalcenterformobilitymanagement.org/by-topic/coordination/>
4. A maintenance of effort requirement shall be imposed, SPD funds will not supplant existing revenue streams.
5. Included in the meta-analysis recommendation above should be the identification of statutory, administrative or other barriers to coordination (specifically the co-mingling of different client types and revenue streams) and identification of solutions.
6. Entities receiving funding under this program should be subject to a) a review of CTSA and Coordinated Plan eligibility and effectiveness, and b) performance audits (with an obligation to implement corrective actions). Program implementation should be a dynamic and iterative process.
7. The Department of Finance should establish a mechanism to index operations funding to the target population.

---

<sup>17</sup> Health Outreach Partners, “Overcoming Obstacles to Health Care: Transportation Models That Work”.

**Statewide Need:** The following excerpts from Coordinated Plans throughout the state demonstrate the need:

- **Kings County:** *“Increasing revenue resources: Identified as the core issue...an efficient coordination process must be established...there are many benefits to consolidating on a large scale...there has been no movement towards consolidating transportation entities...The greatest barrier to coordination is lack of funding...There is simply not enough money available to meet all transportation needs for the target population...human service agencies piece meal together trips for the most critical needs.”*
- **Kern County:** *“Priorities for the 2007 Coordinated Plan were identified as... Identify and pursue new funding sources...Barriers Identified: insufficient agency funding for Transportation...Very limited transportation funding was reported...difficulty in securing operating dollars to expand or develop new services in both rural communities and Metropolitan Bakersfield...transit systems are operating at their limits of their present funding base is among the most significant of constraints...”*
- **Los Angeles County:** *“Roadblocks to further coordination. Several were identified, including the following: Funding restrictions; capacity constraints...”*
- **Butte County:** *“Top-ranked barriers to accessing needed transportation: Funding challenges for directly operating or contracting for transportation...”*
- **Inyo-Mono Counties:** *“The greatest barrier to coordination for all rural counties is lack of funding. There is simply not enough money available to meet all transportation needs for the target population... particularly in light of the dispersed communities and long travel distance...as such, the various human service agencies piece meal together trips for the most critical needs. Lack of funding/resources contributes to the limited staff time available for all agencies to pursue further coordination efforts”*
- **Lake County:** *“PRIORITY 1 – Critical: Pursue and secure funding to support, maintain, improve safety and enhance the Lake County public transportation network...”*, *“...Continued priority must be placed on securing new funding sources...”*
- **Madera County:** *“The greatest barrier to coordination for many smaller counties is lack of funding. There is simply not enough money available to meet all transportation needs for the target population, particularly in light of the dispersed development pattern and long travel distance in Madera County”*
- **Metropolitan Transportation Commission (San Francisco Bay Area):** *“Current senior-oriented mobility services do not have the capacity to handle the increase in people over 65 years of age...the massive growth among the aging ...points to a lack of fiscal and organizational readiness...the closure and consolidation of medical facilities while rates of diabetes and obesity are on the rise will place heavy demands on an already deficient system.”*
- **Sacramento Area Council of Governments:** *“...gaps in service remain due to geography, limitations in fixed-route and demand responsive services, program/funding constraints, eligibility limitations, knowledge and training.”*
- **San Bernardino:** *“...Coordinated Plan strategies can be supported with 5310 funds ...however, this competitive funding source is modest...”*, *“...agencies and their transit programs need for assistance continues as they face funding uncertainties “*, *“...First Priority Strategies: Secure funding...to maintain, enhance and expand transit and specialized transportation services...”*
- **San Diego:** *“...gaps in service remain due to geography, limitations in transit service, funding constraints, eligibility, knowledge, and training...”*
- **Shasta County:** *“...limited resources in the form of staff availability, interest, leadership, service and/or capital capacity, funding, and time...”*,
- **Stanislaus Council of Governments:** *“While public transportation services do receive Local Transportation Funds...and State Transit Assistance (STA) funds, it is generally not sufficient to address many of the service challenges, such as limited frequencies and longer service hours, which were common themes...”*
- **Ventura County:** *“...limited funds suggest that it will be critically important to seek other funding sources to address many of the proposed strategies. Such additional funding sources could include but are not limited to...State cap and trade funding...”*