

APPROVED MEETING NOTES

Shasta County
Regional Transportation Planning Agency

SOCIAL SERVICES TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COUNCIL

Shasta Senior Nutrition Programs
100 Mercy Oaks Drive
Redding, CA 96002
Wednesday, November 14, 2007
1:30 p.m.

(NOTE: These notes are not intended to serve as a transcript or verbatim record of the proceedings of the Social Services Transportation Advisory Council, but rather as a record of the meeting time, place, attendance, and the order and general nature of the Advisory Council discussion, deliberations, and actions taken, if any.)

The following members were present:

Sharon Howard	-	Department of Social Services
Cindy Dodds	-	Tri-Counties Community Network
Ray Duryee	-	Redding Area Bus Authority (RABA)
Virginia Webster	-	Shasta Senior Nutrition Program (SSNP)
Lisa White	-	Consolidated Transp. Service Agency (CTSA)
Debbie McClung	-	Shasta Senior Nutrition Program (SSNP)
Kay Hudelson	-	Golden Umbrella
Mike Evans	-	ACCA Faithworks

The following members were absent:

Larry Scarborough	-	Far Northern Regional Center
Janice Galloway	-	Shasta County Mental Health

The following nonmembers were present:

Sue Hanson	-	Redding Area Bus Authority (RABA)
Sue Crowe	-	Shasta County RTPA Staff
Janie Coffman	-	Shasta County RTPA Staff
John Rose	-	Shasta County Opportunity Center

1. Call to Order and Introductions:

Sharon Howard called the meeting to order at 1:45 p.m. Members, nonmembers, and RTPA staff made self-introductions.

2. Public Comment Period (Limit Three Minutes per Speaker)

There was no one who wished to speak during the Public Comment Period.

3. Consider Approval of the September 19, 2007 SSTAC Minutes:

By motion made and seconded the minutes passed unanimously.

4. Update on RABA Short and Long-Range Transit Plan:

Ray Duryee explained that the RABA Board had a public hearing on October 15 with half a dozen speakers who spoke in opposition to the dial-a-ride concept presented in the consultants Alternative B plan. The RABA Board held discussion with the end result being a no vote to move forward with Alternative B. The majority of the RABA Board voted for it, but Shasta Lake and Anderson voted against it, which stops it from moving forward. The Board action was to do nothing pending the City of Anderson and the City of Shasta Lake coming to some kind of terms of what they believe they could support. The Board also did not vote to move forward with Alternative A or C as well. RABA staff, following the Boards direction, has looked at Alternative A in the transit plan and reviewed comments that have been made at public meetings and hearings, and have been working on some type of a merge plan. The intent is to go back to the Board in December and see if they can get a consensus to schedule another public hearing to consider Alternative A, the staff hybrid, or something else. It would be January before the public hearing to know where they are going next.

Ray Duryee stated that RABA has recently completed their financial review of the prior fiscal year, with all indications that they will achieve an 18% farebox ratio, which is well on its way to reaching the goal of 19%. There are a couple of reasons why: The second phase part of their fare increase came into effect last July so they have additional revenue, and they have seen additional ridership in demand response and fixed routes. Ray thinks it is a result of being back in the press. They are back in the public eye with name recognition.

Discussion was held concerning changing the way criteria is reviewed by taking demand response out of the farebox calculation and going to rides per hour and only reviewing the fixed route by farebox, by performance measures, or by rides per hour.

5. Update on Transit Brochure Distribution - Location - Feedback:

Sue Crowe stated that the feedback on the brochures has been tremendous. They have already gone through 5000 of them and have 2500 on order. Public Health is using them for their functions and events as well as the Homeless Coalition put together a packet of services in the area and included the brochure. The DMV was very appreciative of the brochure.

Discussion was held concerning the brochure.

7. Other Business:

Sue Crowe noted that there are signs for Burney Express now.

Sue Crowe noted that there is new funding coming in with the passage of proposition 1B. There will be more money for capital for RABA. Job Access Reverse Commute/New Freedom money will be available on a competitive basis.

Discussion was held concerning the Job Access Reverse Commute/New Freedom money.

6. 08-09 Unmet Needs:

Mike Evans asked if there was a source for information on performance based versus farebox. He questioned how one frames a proposal to use those and is there something that could be used as a model. At some point they would need to have some sense of consensus of what they are recommending as the performance criteria. What would be the first, second or third most important priorities.

Ray Duryee answered that the Transportation Development Act manual has about 14 or 15 different performance criteria that RABA has to report on every year. There could be riders per hour, cost per hour, or cost per passenger. The hard part would be getting a peer agency to review.

Mike Evans suggested that they pick three criteria and rank them according to importance - first, second and third. If the RTPA or RABA have existing good statistics that the SSTAC could make a case with, it would save a lot of effort.

Ray Duryee noted that RABA has some and the RTPA has access to the State Controllers report.

Mike Evans noted that if they could make a case for doing demand response on performance criteria and fixed route on farebox return ratio and convince the decision makers that this is a first permissible thing to do and then secondly a completely rational thing to do because it shows the achievement of substantial success rate for fixed route and accounts for the huge difficulties you have in a wide spread county trying to provide demand response.

Sue Crowe stated she would look in the State Controllers report for something.

Sue Crowe noted that there is a section under the TDA on performance criteria which is how SSNP and CTSA are based.

Sharon Howard asked Mike Evans if he would draw up a draft and at the next meeting the rest of the SSTAC will come on board with him.

Mike Evans noted that they have no real change to the identified unmet needs and no direct evidence to show that they are reasonable to meet. Those have been the stumbling blocks for years. What they need to develop is some way to uncouple demand response from the farebox so

that there can be a growing of the system through increased advertising, more brochures, and a real outreach effort.

Mike Evans inquired if in the creation of the draft proposal to separate demand response from fixed route; is it appropriate to proceed to seek some letters of support from social service providers in our community? There are a lot of agencies out there with transportation issues.

Sharon Howard noted that she thought that was a good idea.

It was decided to have the next SSTAC meeting on January 16, 2008, 1:30 p.m. at SSNP.

Adjourn:

There being no further council business, Sharon Howard adjourned the meeting at 2:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Janie Coffman
Recording Secretary