



CHAPTER 7 – RECOMMENDED DIRECTION FOR WPCTSA

This final chapter presents the recommendations of the short range transit planning effort, looking first at trip demand estimates and then reviewing the plan's project-specific recommendations in terms of projected line-items. Funding tables for the recommended WPCTSA service alternatives are presented as a seven-year program with some discussion immediately. Appendix G includes some additional implementation tools.

How Many Specialized Transit Trips Does Placer County Need?

Underlying WPCTSA's future direction is the issue of trip demand – what levels of need for WPCTSA type services are likely to exist within Placer County and on behalf of its residents over the next decade? California Department of Finance (DOF) projects Placer County's 2020 population as 428,535, up 23% from its estimated 2010 population of 347,543 persons. The DOF 2010 estimate is very close the American Community Survey 2007-2009 total population estimate of 340,448 persons presented in Chapter 2 of this document.

The demographics update in Chapter 2 suggested that Placer County is seeing disproportionate growth among seniors – more residents coming into the county with increased proportions of these being seniors. This in-migration is coupled now with the first wave of aging baby boomers. But how many specialized transit trips will these persons and other Placer County residents need?

Demand Estimate for Placer's Specialized Transit Program

Table 11 updates a specialized trip demand estimation model that was initially prepared for the 2006 Placer County Dial-a-Ride study. This works with various subgroups of the target population, estimates initially presented in Chapter 2, Table 1. The model works with two adult groups under age 65 and three senior population groups over age 65:

- 1) persons 16 to 64 who are low-income or who report a disability
- 2) persons over age 65 who are low-income, report a disability or are in the older age ranges of 75 and older.

Table 12 develops a range of estimated specialized transit trips needed for Placer County residents, suggested as a low of 81,986 to a high of 279,883 one-way trips annually:

- **Trip Rates by Subgroup - Column A** various mean trip-rates-per-day are derived from the national literature on trip-making behavior.
- **Estimated Annual Trips - Column B** uses the mean trip-rates-per-day and multiplies these by the number of Placer County residents within the specific subgroup, to develop an



annual estimate of all trips taken by that group. These totals of 15.5 million to 66 million one-way trips taken annually are presented as a range given that there is some overlap within the census numbers – some individuals are likely both low-income and disabled and so cannot simply be added.

- **Percentage of Trips Taken on Public Transit - Column C** suggests the proportion of the total annual trips that might be taken on public transit, again working with state and national research to suggest the percentage of trips by sub-group possibly made on transit.
- **Annual Trips Taken on Public Transit - Column D** calculates that range of trips, working with the different trip-making rates by subgroup to suggest a range of 1.17 million to 3.99 million trips made annually on public transit by these target group individuals.
- **Annual Specialized Transit Trips - Column E** proposes that 7% of these trips required specialized transportation assistance of some type, presented as the range of almost 82,000 one-way trips to almost 280,000 one-way trips. This figure of 7% reflects the proportion of public transit trips currently made on specialized transit.

This model proposes a range of trips that could be made on specialized transit, between almost 82,000 one-way trips annually and up to almost 280,000. These would be trips taken by the targeted groups of low-income or disabled adults and seniors, trips that could be served by some form of specialized transportation.

Table 11, Demand - Target Population Specialized Transit Trips Needed in Placer County

Placer County Trips and Specialized Transit Demand for WPCTSA Target Populations, 2007-2009 American Community Survey		Column A Mean Trip Rates Per Day ¹¹	Column B Estimated Annual Trips, All Trips (Trip Rate * Target Population * 255 days)	Column C % Trip Made On Public Transit	Column D Annual Trips Potentially on Public Transit (Annual Trips * Public Transit Rate)	Column E Annual Trips Requiring Special Assistance @ 7% of Public Transit Trips [6]
Adults (age 16 – 64)						
Low Income Population - 4% of adult population ages 18-64 (13,508)		3.7 ¹¹	12,744,798	8.5% ¹³	1,083,308	75,832
Disabled population - 14% of adult population (47,335)		3.7 ¹¹	44,660,899	8.5% ¹³	3,796,176	265,732
Seniors (ages 65+)						
Seniors low-income - 1% of age 65+ (3,380)		3.4 ¹¹	2,930,460	3% ¹⁵	87,914	6,154
Seniors with disabilities - 48% of age 65+ (24,694)			21,409,303	3% ¹⁵	642,279	44,960
Seniors age 75+ when mobility issues become increasingly critical - 45% of age 65+ (23,546)		2.1 ¹²	10,072,194	2% ¹¹	201,444	14,101
Target Population Range for Placer County		Trip Making Estimates	Low 15,675,258 High 66,070,201	Low High	1,171,222 3,997,620	81,986 279,833
Specialized transit as proportion of all trips:					7.5% at Low End	
					to	6.1% at High End

[1] Bureau of Transportation Statistics, 2001 National Household Travel Survey - Trip rates for 65+, Not Employed; Medical Conditions Limiting Travel

[2] National Cooperative Highway Research Program "Estimating Impacts of the Aging Population on Transit Ridership", p. 17 (2006)

[3] Sacramento Area Council of Governments Household Travel Survey 1999, Senior & Disabled Mobility Study, 2006, p. 9.

[4] Freedom to Travel, U.S. DOT Bureau of Transportation Statistics (2002)

[5] Transportation Research Report, TCRP Report 82: Improving Public Transit Options for Older Persons (2002) and 2001 National Household Travel Survey (6%)

[6] Based on percent of actual public transit trips provided by demand response systems in Placer County FY 2009-10



How Many Specialized Transit Trips are Currently Provided?

The number of trips needed is meaningful only in relation to the level of trips currently being provided. Table 12 presents a current year report on the number of public transit trips provided within Placer County (see Appendix A for the detail on trips by operator). This total of almost 1.3 million trips represents fixed-route, including commuter and van pool trips, as well as the public demand response trips provided in the County. There were 87,909 specialized transit trips provided during this past year by the city and county demand response programs and through the WPCTSA program of pilot projects.

Table 12, Supply – Transit Trips Made in Placer County

SUPPLY	
Public Transit and Other Specialized Transit Trips Provided FY 2009/10	
<i>(Quarterly Ridership Trends by Transit Operator, Provided by PCTPA)</i>	
Public Bus, Fixed Route, Commuter and Vanpool (Included Operators)	
Auburn Transit (all services)	52,578
Lincoln Fixed-Route	30,686
Placer County Transit Fixed-Route	304,035
Placer County Transit Vanpool	31,258
Placer County Transit Commuter	74,929
TART (all services)	342,876
Roseville Transit Fixed-Route	258,493
Roseville Transit Commuter	109,584
Total	1,204,439
Public Demand Responsive (Included Operators)	
Lincoln DAR	8,445
Placer County Transit DAR	34,140
Roseville DAR	32,762
Western Placer CTSA NEMT	6,366
Western Placer CTSA Volunteer	6,196
Total	87,909
All Public Transit & Specialized Trips Reported	1,292,237
Specialized Transit Trips Reported	87,909
<i>Specialized Transit as % of All Trips</i>	<i>7%</i>

Notably, the current levels of trips provided, at almost 88,000 are above the 81,986 low-end of the trips needed range as presented previously in Table 11. This suggests that Placer County's various specialized transportation trip initiatives are meeting a basic floor threshold of need. Equally importantly, the high-end of the Table 13 range is almost 280,000 trips, more than three times the current level of trips provided. The specialized transit trips projected as needed (Table 11) are only 7% of the estimated annual trips made by the target groups, assuming that the vast majority of all trips are made by other modes including driving alone, driving with others, walking and bicycling.



Some of the estimated specialized transit trips are simply not taken currently, needed but not made, by individuals who cannot find a means of transport for life-sustaining or life-enriching trip purposes. For such persons, availability of increased quantities of trips will improve their quality of life and potentially the quantity of life. This analysis points to the key role of the WPCTSA in providing and seeing to the provision of increased quantities of specialized transportation trips for Placer County residents.

Measuring Trips Provided Over Time

An important measure of the trips provided to reflect changes over time is *trips per capita*. Table 12 previously reports a total of 1.292 million transit trips provided during FY 2009/10, of which almost 88,000 were specialized transit trips. These figures translate to a countywide indicator of 3.8 trips per capita for all trips taken in FY 2009/10 against the ACS 2009 population total of 340,448.⁶ For specialized transit trips taken, a subset of that total, this represents a trips per capita indicator of 0.26. Simply keeping level with an increasing population, including increased numbers of older persons, will mean providing more specialized transit trips. Monitoring the *trips per capita* indicator, for trips overall and for the subset of specialized transit trips, will be a useful tool for measuring the impact of WPCTSA programs.

Recommended WPCTSA Program

About the Recommended Initiatives

Table 13, following, summarizes the SRTP recommendations by initiative. This shows some moving several out of the “pilot” phase, introducing several new initiatives and suggesting some changes with cost-implications to existing activities. Table 13 identifies the individual program and its administering organization with day-to-day responsibility for its provision. In the case of new projects, the administering entity or partner may not yet be clear.

Developing new partnering roles will be the responsibility of the WPCTSA administrative staff. Responsibilities with regard to both new and existing partnership arrangements are an important function of the WPCTSA as partnering serves to extend the limited transit funding, by matching it with other resources. Partnering also helps to ensure that these specialized transit initiatives and the WPCTSA program overall will be communicated to the partners’ constituents and target groups.

⁶ In the 2007 Dial-a-Ride report, somewhat larger numbers of specialized transit trips were reported. Those annual trip figures are not used here, for comparative purposes because of that study’s finding that an unknown portion of those trips originated and ended outside of Placer County. While this timeframe specialized transit trip count of 87,909 trips provided is less than the 2007 Study, it is a solid count and will enable PCTPA to meaningfully report future changes to the *trips per capita* indicator.



Table 13, WPCTSA Recommended Programs and Initial Direction

Project Title/ Administrator	SRTP Funding Recommendations
<p>1. Health Express – NEMT Trips and Mobility Management Program <i>Administrator: Seniors First</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Continued funding for NEMT trips, while developing mechanisms to reduce unit costs; modest COLA increases annually; contributions to rising fuel expense. ➤ Recognition of mobility management role by tracking mobility management developments across state. ➤ Funding partners meeting to discuss and secure continued partnering levels of financial support and development of contract tools to enhance cost-effectiveness.
<p>2. Volunteer Door-to-Door <i>Administrator: Seniors First</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Continued funding of project with a one percent increase annually for inflation
<p>3. Voucher-Last Resort Trip Program <i>Administrator: Seniors First</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Slight increase in funding level given careful utilization of this resource but in recognition of the service gap it meets, often inter-community.
<p>4. Public Transit Demand Response CTSA NEMT Trip Reimbursement <i>Administrator: WPCTSA</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Reimbursement of CTSA NEMT trips allocated by the Call Center to Public Dial-a-Ride services. Use existing unused DAR capacity during off-peak hours only. CTSA NEMT trips are above and beyond required complimentary ADA paratransit trips. Will need a DAR maintenance-of-effort agreement with public operators. DAR services expand the ability of WPCTSA to provide NEMT services. Assists in meeting overall increased NEMT ridership goals.
<p>5. Transit Ambassador Program <i>Administrator: City of Roseville</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ CTSA share provided from grant funding set-aside. ➤ Determine with program how to promote activities and more actively engage the community to grow transit use or consider revising the travel training model now in use.
<p>6. Rural Placer County Mileage Reimbursement Program <i>Administrator: To be determined</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Set-aside funds to match with potential partner funds, including volunteer drivers, for a limited initiative; annual funding reliant upon identifying match dollars.
<p>7. Bus Pass Subsidy Program <i>Administrator: To be determined</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Set aside small funding base for a bus pass distribution project, once a host partner is determined.
<p>8. Capital - Non-Profit Vehicle Replacement Program <i>Administrator: WPCTSA</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Establish modest line-item support for detailing of surplus vehicles and assurance of basic road-worthiness.
<p>9. Capital – Bus Stop/ Access/ Community Enhancement <i>Administrator: WPCTSA</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Conduct a bus stop inventory on accessibility and prioritize for support to specific bus stop or path-of-access improvements that will demonstrably benefit the target populations.
<p>10. Capital - NEMT Vehicle Tracking & Upgrade <i>Administrator: WPCTSA/ Seniors First</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Tracking device and software to enable Call Center to locate NEMT vehicles and manage usage and capacity.
<p>11. Contingency Reserve <i>Administrator: WPCTSA</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Maintain a budgeted reserve of 15 percent, to address special, circumstances and/or seed one-time projects.



Funding WPCTSA's Seven-Year Service Plan

Tables 14 and 15, shown over six pages, a projected service plan for the next seven-year period. This is presented in two scenarios; one projecting program expenses at the current CTSA LTF revenue draw of 4% and the second projecting program expenses in relation to an increased CTSA LTF allocation of 5%. This provides a planning framework for WPCTSA expenditures and revenues for all current and future projects.

For WPCTSA Administrative Costs (see Tables 14A & 15A), an increase of 50% in staff time began in FY 2011/12 and includes an inflationary increase through FY 2017/18. This line item now represents essentially one full-time equivalent position, although the work is spread across several PCTPA staff. Direct expenses increase in FY 2011/12 to allow for increased costs associated with the implementation of the new Mobility Management Pilot initiatives such as local travel, training, and supplies.

For WPCTSA Existing CTSA Program Operations (see Tables 14A & 15A), there are four existing CTSA programs recommended to go forward. A fifth, the Taylor Road Shuttle is being discontinued due to low general public ridership and relocation of a principal rider destination location. Following is a list of programs in this group:

- Health Express NEMT Program, administered by Seniors First
- Volunteer Door-to-Door Program, administered by Seniors First
- Transit Pass /Voucher Program, administered by Seniors First
- Transit Ambassadors Program, administered by City of Roseville

Also in this category are expense allocations for consulting services to assist in implementing the new pilot projects and for the completion of a future SRTP document.

For Operating Reserves (see Tables 14A & 15A), the Government Finance Officers Association (GFOA) recommends an operating budget reserve of up to 15 percent for its members. A base amount of \$165,000 was allocated to initiate the first reserve deposit. Additional reserve deposits are made in annual increments when necessary to maintain 15 percent of that year's operating budget.

The New Mobility Management Initiatives Section (see Tables (14A & 15A), presents the proposed three new initiatives and budgeted project costs for each. These are collectively designed to improve mobility options for disabled, senior and low-income populations and expand partnerships to better address gaps in the public transit network. They are:

- Public Transit Demand-Response NEMT Trip Reimbursement Program, through the Transportation Call Center, administered by WPCTSA.



- Bus Pass Subsidy Program, administrator to be determined.
- Placer County Rural Mileage Reimbursement Project, administrator to be determined.

Implementation tools associated with the mileage reimbursement program and a bus stop inventory initiative are included as Appendix G. These Implementation Fact Sheets provide additional detail as to start-up activities for these projects.

The Operating Revenues (see Tables 14B & 15B), are heavily dependent on TDA Article 4.5 CTSA LTF funding, which is presented in two scenarios, at four percent and five percent of the remaining LTF apportionment for Placer County, after several other programs are funded per PCTPA Board recommendations.

Considerable contributions from non-profit partner agencies, including Seniors First, help to make the Non Emergency Medical Transportation (NEMT) program and Volunteer Door-to-Door programs financially sustainable. Similar contributions from partnering agencies will also be required to implement and sustain the new Mobility Management Initiatives.

Notably, although there is significant operating revenue resulting from the annual carryover of unused funds from the prior year's budget, in the first year of this plan, this slowly decreases over the course of the seven year timeframe.

The revenue projections also include an early contribution of New Freedom rural and urban grants and the State Transit Assistance Prop 1B PTMISEA and TSSDRA capital project grants of several years duration. These are grants are now-in hand. Similar future-year grant funding may or may not be possible.

The Capital Expenditures Section (see Table 14C & 15C) includes budgets for one continuing and two new initiatives. The Surplus D-A-R vehicle project is funded at a higher level, per SRTP recommendations, to include both the purchase of the vehicles at Blue Book values and to detail and perform some additional, basic maintenance to ensure the road-worthiness of the refurbished vehicles.

The bus stop improvement/ path of access project is a new initiative. Appendix G provides implementation guidance. The intent of the bus stop/ path of access inventory initiative is to ensure that high priority projects have been identified and can be described as the funding becomes available. The second new initiative would provide for vehicle tracking for Health Express vehicles to help improve productivity. Notably, WPCTSA capital projects are all funded with state bond funding. Future capital projects may be funded if additional bond money is available.



Table 14-A
Seven Year Western Placer CTSA Program FY 2010 through FY 2018, Operating Expenditures –
4% TDA Article 4.5 Scenario

	FY 2011/2012 (Amended Budget)	FY 2012/2013 (Proposed)	FY 2013/2014 (Proposed)	FY 2014/2015 (Proposed)	FY 2015/2016 (Proposed)	FY 2016/2017 (Proposed)	FY 2017/2018 (Proposed)
Operating Expenditures							
Existing PCTPA Administration							
PCTPA Staff Administration MOU	\$ 92,075	\$ 93,000	\$ 93,930	\$ 94,870	\$ 95,820	\$ 96,780	\$ 97,750
Direct Expenses	\$ 11,125	\$ 11,240	\$ 11,350	\$ 11,460	\$ 11,570	\$ 11,690	\$ 11,810
Subtotal PCTPA Administration	\$ 103,200	\$ 104,240	\$ 105,280	\$ 106,330	\$ 107,390	\$ 108,470	\$ 109,560
Existing CTSA Programs							
Non-Emergency Medical Transportation (NEMT)	\$ 500,000	\$ 550,000	\$ 550,000	\$ 550,000	\$ 550,000	\$ 550,000	\$ 550,000
Volunteer Door-to-Door Program	\$ 97,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 101,000	\$ 102,010	\$ 103,030	\$ 104,060	\$ 105,100
Voucher Program	\$ 7,500	\$ 10,000	\$ 10,100	\$ 10,200	\$ 10,300	\$ 10,400	\$ 10,500
Transit Ambassador Program & Other Mobility Management Measures	\$ -	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000
Taylor Road Shuttle Enhancement	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Transit Planning	\$ 21,393	\$ 7,500	\$ 7,500	\$ 7,500	\$ 7,500	\$ 35,000	\$ 7,500
Subtotal Existing Programs	\$ 625,893	\$ 697,500	\$ 698,600	\$ 699,710	\$ 700,830	\$ 729,460	\$ 703,100
Existing Operating Reserve							
Operating Reserve Base Year	\$ 165,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Additional Operating Reserve Accumulation to 15%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 539	\$ 478	\$ 480	\$ 4,543	\$ -
Subtotal Operating Reserve	\$ 165,000	\$ -	\$ 539	\$ 478	\$ 480	\$ 4,543	\$ -
New Mobility Management Initiatives							
Public Transit Demand Response CTSA NEMT Trip Reimbursement	\$ -	\$ 82,500	\$ 82,500	\$ 82,500	\$ 82,500	\$ 82,500	\$ 82,500
Bus Pass Subsidy Program	\$ -	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,500	\$ 51,010	\$ 51,520	\$ 52,040	\$ 52,560
Rural Placer County Rural Mileage Reimbursement Program	\$ -	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,500	\$ 51,010	\$ 51,520	\$ 52,040	\$ 52,560
Subtotal New Initiatives	\$ -	\$ 182,500	\$ 183,500	\$ 184,520	\$ 185,540	\$ 186,580	\$ 187,620
Total WPCTSA Program Costs	\$ 894,093	\$ 984,240	\$ 987,919	\$ 991,038	\$ 994,240	\$ 1,029,053	\$ 1,000,280



Table 14-B
Seven Year Western Placer CTSA Program FY 2010 through FY 2018, Operating Revenues
4% TDA Article 4.5 Scenario

	FY 2011/2012 (Budget)	FY 2012/2013 (Proposed)	FY 2013/2014 (Proposed)	FY 2014/2015 (Proposed)	FY 2015/2016 (Proposed)	FY 2016/2017 (Proposed)	FY 2017/2018 (Proposed)
Operating Revenue							
LTF Article 4.5 @ 4% CTSA Allocation	\$606,514	\$612,720	\$619,004	\$625,351	\$631,761	\$638,236	\$644,775
Interest Income	\$ 2,189	\$ 2,084	\$ 2,490	\$ 2,031	\$ 1,595	\$ 1,183	\$ 643
State Transit Assistance	\$ 62,916	\$ 63,545	\$ 64,181	\$ 64,822	\$ 65,471	\$ 66,125	\$ 66,787
Prior Year Deferred Revenue	\$ 233,046	\$ 213,866	\$ 305,045	\$ 221,100	\$ 141,382	\$ 65,899	\$ -
Excess Operating Reserve to Revenue	\$ -	\$ 17,364	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,634
Non-Profit Agency Match (@ 25%) for NEMT	\$ 125,000	\$ 137,500	\$ 137,500	\$ 137,500	\$ 137,500	\$ 137,500	\$ 137,500
Non-Profit Agency Match (@ 25%) for Mobility Initiatives	\$ -	\$ 25,000	\$ 25,250	\$ 25,505	\$ 25,760	\$ 26,020	\$ 26,280
Non-Profit Agency Match for Volunteer Door-to-Door Program	\$ 53,000	\$ 55,000	\$ 55,550	\$ 56,110	\$ 56,670	\$ 57,240	\$ 57,810
FFY 2009/10 FTA 5317 Urban New Freedom Grant	\$ -	\$ 162,206	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
FFY 2009/10 FTA 5317 Rural New Freedom Grant	\$ 25,294	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total Operating Revenue	\$1,107,959	\$1,289,285	\$1,209,019	\$1,132,420	\$1,060,139	\$992,202	\$937,428
Operating Revenue to Operating Expenditure Comparison							
Operating Reserve Accumulation	\$ 165,000	\$ 147,636	\$ 148,175	\$ 148,653	\$ 149,133	\$ 153,676	\$ 150,042
Fund Balance	\$ 213,866	\$ 305,045	\$ 221,100	\$ 141,382	\$ 65,899	\$ (36,851)	\$ (62,852)



Table 14-C
Seven Year Western Placer CTSA Program FY2010 through FY2018, Capital Expenditures and Revenues
4% TDA Article 4.5 Scenario

	FY 2011/2012	FY 2012/2013	FY 2013/2014	FY 2014/2015	FY 2015/2016	FY 2016/2017	FY 2017/2018
Capital Expenditures							
Surplus D-A-R Vehicle Project for Social Service Non-Profits	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10,000	\$ 10,000	\$ 10,000
NEMT Vehicle Tracking & Upgrade	\$ 15,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 13,500
Community Transit Enhancements Projects	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total Capital Expenses	\$ 15,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10,000	\$ 10,000	\$ 23,500
Capital Revenue (Allocations)							
Prop 1B PTMISEA	\$ 15,000	\$ 15,000	\$ 15,000	\$ 15,000	\$ 15,000	\$ 15,000	\$ 22,787
Prop 1B TSSSDRA	\$ 8,356	\$ 8,356	\$ 8,356	\$ 8,356	\$ 8,356	\$ 8,356	\$ 8,356
Total Capital	\$ 23,356	\$ 23,356	\$ 23,356	\$ 23,356	\$ 23,356	\$ 23,356	\$ 31,143
Capital Revenue to Capital Expenditure Comparison							
Fund Balance Allocated to Jurisdictions	\$ 8,356	\$ 23,356	\$ 23,356	\$ 23,356	\$ 13,356	\$ 13,356	\$ 7,643



Table 15-A
Seven Year Western Placer CTSA Program FY 2010 through FY 2018, Operating Expenditures
5% TDA Article 4.5 Scenario

	FY 2011/2012 (Amended Budget)	FY 2012/2013 (Proposed)	FY 2013/2014 (Proposed)	FY 2014/2015 (Proposed)	FY 2015/2016 (Proposed)	FY 2016/2017 (Proposed)	FY 2017/2018 (Proposed)
Operating Expenditures							
Existing PCTPA Administration							
PCTPA Administration MOU	\$ 92,075	\$ 93,000	\$ 93,930	\$ 94,870	\$ 95,820	\$ 96,780	\$ 97,750
Direct Expenses	\$ 11,125	\$ 11,240	\$ 11,350	\$ 11,460	\$ 11,570	\$ 11,690	\$ 11,810
Subtotal PCTPA Administration	\$ 103,200	\$ 104,240	\$ 105,280	\$ 106,330	\$ 107,390	\$ 108,470	\$ 109,560
Existing CTSA Programs							
Non-Emergency Medical Transportation (NEMT) @ 5%	\$ -	\$ 687,500	\$ 687,500	\$ 687,500	\$ 687,500	\$ 687,500	\$ 687,500
Volunteer Door-to-Door Program	\$ 97,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 101,000	\$ 102,010	\$ 103,030	\$ 104,060	\$ 105,100
Voucher Program	\$ 7,500	\$ 10,000	\$ 10,100	\$ 10,200	\$ 10,300	\$ 10,400	\$ 10,500
Transit Ambassador Program & Other Mobility Management Measures	\$ -	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000
Transit Planning	\$ 21,393	\$ 7,500	\$ 7,500	\$ 7,500	\$ 7,500	\$ 35,000	\$ 7,500
Subtotal Existing Programs	\$ -	\$ 835,000	\$ 836,100	\$ 837,210	\$ 838,330	\$ 866,960	\$ 840,600
Existing Operating Reserve							
Operating Reserve Base Year	\$ 165,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Additional Operating Reserve Accumulation to 15%	\$ -	\$ 10,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 499	\$ 6,206	\$ -
Subtotal Operating Reserve	\$ 165,000	\$ 10,500	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 499	\$ 6,206	\$ -
New Mobility Management Initiatives							
Public Transit Demand Response CTSA Trip Reimbursement	\$ -	\$ 103,125	\$ 103,125	\$ 103,125	\$ 103,125	\$ 103,125	\$ 103,125
Bus Pass Subsidy Program	\$ -	\$ 62,500	\$ 63,125	\$ 63,763	\$ 64,400	\$ 65,050	\$ 65,700
Rural Mileage Reimbursement Program	\$ -	\$ 62,500	\$ 63,125	\$ 63,763	\$ 64,400	\$ 65,050	\$ 65,700
Subtotal New Initiatives	\$ -	\$ 228,125	\$ 229,375	\$ 230,650	\$ 231,925	\$ 233,225	\$ 234,525
Total WPCTSA Program Costs @ 5%	\$ -	\$ 1,177,865	\$ 1,170,755	\$ 1,174,190	\$ 1,178,144	\$ 1,214,861	\$ 1,184,685



Table 15-B
Seven Year Western Placer CTSA Program of Projects FY 2010 through FY 2018, Operating Revenues
5% TDA Article 4.5 Scenario

	FY 2011/2012 (Budget)	FY 2012/2013 (Proposed)	FY 2013/2014 (Proposed)	FY 2014/2015 (Proposed)	FY 2015/2016 (Proposed)	FY 2016/2017 (Proposed)	FY 2017/2018 (Proposed)
Operating Revenue							
LTF Article 4.5 @ 5% CTSA Allocation	\$ -	\$765,900	\$773,755	\$781,689	\$789,702	\$797,795	\$805,969
Interest Income	\$ -	\$ 908	\$ 2,627	\$ 2,323	\$ 2,052	\$ 1,814	\$ 1,458
State Transit Assistance	\$ -	\$ 79,431	\$ 80,225	\$ 81,028	\$ 81,838	\$ 82,656	\$ 83,483
Prior Year Deferred Revenue	\$ -	\$ 213,866	\$ 302,570	\$ 247,410	\$ 198,126	\$ 154,318	\$ 83,362
Excess Operating Reserve to Revenue	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,700
Non-Profit Agency Match (@ 25%) for NEMT	\$ -	\$ 171,875	\$ 171,875	\$ 171,875	\$ 171,875	\$ 171,875	\$ 171,875
Non-Profit Agency Match (@ 25%) for Mobility Initiatives	\$ -	\$ 31,250	\$ 31,563	\$ 31,881	\$ 32,200	\$ 32,525	\$ 32,850
Non-Profit Agency Match for Volunteer Door-to-Door Program	\$ 53,000	\$ 55,000	\$ 55,550	\$ 56,110	\$ 56,670	\$ 57,240	\$ 57,810
FFY 2009/10 FTA 5317 Urban New Freedom Grant	\$ -	\$ 162,206	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
FFY 2009/10 FTA 5317 Rural New Freedom Grant	\$ 25,294	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total Operating Revenue	\$ -	\$ 1,480,435	\$ 1,418,165	\$ 1,372,316	\$ 1,332,462	\$ 1,298,222	\$ 1,241,506
Operating Revenue to Operating Expenditure Comparison							
Operating Reserve Accumulation	\$ 165,000	\$ 175,000	\$ 175,000	\$ 175,000	\$ 175,499	\$ 181,705	\$ 177,005
Fund Balance	\$ -	\$ 302,570	\$ 247,410	\$ 198,126	\$ 154,318	\$ 83,362	\$ 56,821



Table 15-C
Seven Year Western Placer CTSA Program FY2010 through FY2018, Capital Expenditures and Revenues
5% TDA Article 4.5 Scenario

	FY 2011/2012	FY 2012/2013	FY 2013/2014	FY 2014/2015	FY 2015/2016	FY 2016/2017	FY 2017/2018
Capital Expenditures							
Surplus D-A-R Vehicle Project for Social Service Non-Profits	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10,000	\$ 10,000	\$ 10,000
NEMT Vehicle Tracking & Upgrade	\$ 15,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 13,500
Community Transit Enhancements Projects	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total Capital Expenses	\$ 15,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10,000	\$ 10,000	\$ 23,500
Capital Revenue (Allocations)							
Prop 1B PTMISEA	\$ 15,000	\$ 15,000	\$ 15,000	\$ 15,000	\$ 15,000	\$ 15,000	\$ 22,787
Prop 1B TSSSDRA	\$ 8,356	\$ 8,356	\$ 8,356	\$ 8,356	\$ 8,356	\$ 8,356	\$ 8,356
Total Capital	\$ 23,356	\$ 23,356	\$ 23,356	\$ 23,356	\$ 23,356	\$ 23,356	\$ 31,143
Capital Revenue to Capital Expenditure Comparison							
Fund Balance Allocated to Jurisdictions	\$ 8,356	\$ 23,356	\$ 23,356	\$ 23,356	\$ 13,356	\$ 13,356	\$ 7,643



Basic Assumptions for operating expenditures are listed below:

- PCTPA Staff Administration funds represents on full time equivalent position although PCTPA responsibilities are spread among several PCTPA staff.
- An annual inflationary increase of 1% for all administrative expenses beginning FY 2012/13, the Volunteer Door-to-Door Program, Voucher Program, Bus Pass Subsidy Program, and Placer County Rural Mileage Reimbursement Program beginning FY 2013/14.
- WPCTSA programs are shown at 4% and 5% level of Article 4.5 funds; an increase to 5% level represents a 25% overall increase in funds available.
- Transit planning consulting services contract applied in FY 2011/12 to assist with implementation of new pilot projects. Forecast expenses include various planning activities and a future SRTP update.
- NEMT: increase in budget to match NEMT ridership goal; about 800 – 1000 trips per month.
- Transit Ambassador amount covering a six year period; based on historical annual cost of about \$30,000
- Establishment of a contingency reserve of 15% of the annual operating budget in FY 2010/11 and sustained with annual contributions as operating expenditures increase.

Basic Assumptions for operating revenues are listed below:

- Local Transportation Fund (LTF) Article 4.5 current base draw for CTSA services is four percent of the remaining Placer County LTF allocation after Board directed expenses are funded.
- LTF annual inflation increment(s) are calculated at one percent of the LTF base through.
- Interest income is calculated at 0.55% of annual contingency reserve and fund balance.
- The future of the STA fund is not certain. PCTPA recommends that all transit claimants take into account the uncertainty of this funding source.
- Seniors First match to continuing transportation projects are based on MOU guidelines for each service but increase to account for 25% of the total cost for each program.
- Partner agency match for new projects assume an annual contribution of 25% of the total project costs.
- New Freedom urban and rural grants were two-year grants for FY 2010/11 and 2011/12. Future funding from this grant program as well as FTA Section 5316 JARC, and Section 5310 capital grant may be pursued in future years.
- Contingency reserve accumulation amount is based on withholding 15% of the annual operating budget each year.



Basic Assumptions for capital expenditures and revenues are listed below:

- An increase in funding for Dial-A-Ride vehicle refurbishment begins in FY 2011/12.
- Revenues from STA Proposition 1B funding are applied for and tied to capital improvement projects. Prop 1B funds may be accumulated but must be spent within five years of award.
- Community Transit Enhancements: these are prior year awarded funds for bus stop safety & security improvements (emphasis on seniors & disabled riders) to be allocated to jurisdictions
- Capital Fund Balance: CTSA claims only funds needed; remaining capital funds (Prop 1B) get allocated to jurisdictions annually for transit use.

WPCTSA New Program Policy and Procedure Development

Among the anticipated activities of the WPCTSA is a new reimbursement program to underwrite some portion of the non-emergency medical trips (NEMT) provided by the county's demand responsive providers. To successfully implement this activity and to ensure that dollars are spent consistent with the WPCTSA's mission and goals, the following must be addressed:

- ***Define eligible trips and/or eligible riders for WPCTSA reimbursement*** – With regard to trips, this will likely mean gathering trip purpose information at the time of the trip request; and/or with regard to individuals, this could mean determining mechanisms beyond ADA certification by which to ascertain those members of the three target populations (seniors, persons with disabilities or persons of low-income) for whom their non-emergency medical trips can be reimbursed by WPCTSA.
- ***Ensure that ADA trips that are currently the obligation of the local fixed-route provider remain so and are not shifted to WPCTSA reimbursement*** – As noted in Chapter 5, the WPCTSA is not responsible for provision of ADA complementary paratransit services, although it must ensure that its programs overall are accessible to those who are substantially disabled. Procedures must be developed to ensure that ADA complementary paratransit trips are provided by the responsible transit provider and not deemed to be NEMT trips eligible for reimbursement.
- ***Determine the reimbursement structure*** – For trip eligible for reimbursement, will these be reimbursed based upon a flat rate per trip, based upon the revenue miles associated with that trip or some other reimbursement mechanism.



- **Define the method by which trips can be limited or rationed to reflect the budgeted dollars available** – At present, if an average trip cost is \$75, which is possible given the likelihood of longer trip-lengths, an estimated 120 one-way passenger trips could be reimbursed monthly given the proposed budget. Issues to be considered could include: equity (how many trips reimbursed per operator), of distance (how many longer, inter-community trips are reimbursed versus shorter, intra-community trips), and passenger type (target group member; ADA versus non-ADA). Mechanisms for a maintenance-of-effort (MOE) should be established for participating public transit demand response operators.
- **Procedures by which the Call Center dispatchers determine whether or not to accept an NEMT trip and then to which provider to assign such a trip** – This will begin with determining trip purpose, a question not currently asked with most ADA services or with community dial-a-rides where trip provision depends not upon the type of trip but whether or not the requesting rider is an eligible passenger.

These policy and procedural issues should be addressed and agreed upon in advance of program implementation. The agreements should be set forth in writing, possibly through a Memorandum of Understanding. As this is a new program, its early implementation should be watched carefully and evaluated in terms of its early experience.

Project Identification and Selection Criteria

Future projects, beyond those presented here, may be considered in the future. Discussions in this document speaks to identifying projects in terms of identifying partners with willingness and ability to provide matching resources in order to undertake transportation projects targeted to unmet transit needs. This is the fundamental underpinning of the WPCTSA organization. It works from the assumption that CTSA-based transportation services cannot single-handedly meet all unmet transportation needs of the target groups but must do so in partnership with other organizations, usually human services agencies, with overlapping missions.

This is not a competitive process so much as a negotiated process. It anticipates that the WPCTSA is seeking new partnership arrangements that may address the project possibilities put forth. And it anticipates that WPCTSA is open to other organizations proposing partnership arrangements. Competitive processes directly by the WPCTSA are not anticipated at this time, although its partner agencies may need to go forward with competitive procurements for provision of services, as has been necessary with the Seniors First organization. There may be future instances where targeted procurements are indicated, but that will be only when and if significantly greater funding becomes available or if there are few identifiable partners.



Other project selection and project design criteria to be addressed include:

1. Projects must meet stated funding source goals.
2. Projects must not supplant other, dedicated funding for this purpose but extend and enhance any previously existing initiative.
3. Projects must not duplicate existing public transportation programs or services.
4. Projects must identify why this type of service or trips cannot now be provided on the existing transportation network.

Other criteria are likely to be identified as the WPCTSA program develops and matures. It will be important for the organization's staff and board of directors to revisit these periodically, to see where changes may be indicated.

Tracking and Measuring WPCTSA Performance

Assessment of the current transportation services sponsored by WPCTSA identified a need for more thorough and consistent monitoring and reporting of the individual services and contracts. Performance assessment is proposed on an individual initiative basis, with performance goals established for each at the outset. Performance must be measured against project-specific goals, given the highly individualized nature of these and the fact that they provide a range of services, from direct provision of trips to travel training and outreach assistance by ambassadors.

This process begins with the definition of goals by the administrators of each initiative, in consultation with WPCTSA staff. From selected goals, appropriate measures can be identified and reporting systems established that are timely and reliable. At present, the reporting formats are problematic, as was discussed in Chapter 3 of this document, and require both some standardization and some attention to the definition of reported elements.

The particular performance indicators against which programs will assess themselves over time will vary from project to project but may include:

- Operating cost per passenger trip
- Subsidy cost per passenger trip
- Operating cost per mile
- Operating cost per vehicle revenue hour
- Cost per unit of service (e.g. travel training costs per trainee; mobility management cost per contact)
- Percentage of match funding provided, to leverage WPCTSA funds
- Passengers per vehicle revenue hour
- No shows and cancellation rates
- Complaints per 1,000 vehicle miles or per 1,000 passenger trips



Process indicators should include reporting on all relevant items, such as vehicle revenue hours and miles, one-way passenger trips, volunteer hours, mobility management agency contacts and mobility management rider contacts, one-number telephone contacts, travel training contacts and training sessions. Reporting forms developed for various JARC and New Freedom project reporting can be adapted to WPCTSA purposes, both to reflect the goals to be established by individual projects and to ensure a standardized reporting procedure.

Finally, overall reporting for WPCTSA should be reviewed to enable policy-makers to assess progress against regional level goals, most notably in relation to trips-per-capita.

Such individual program-level reporting and overall agency reporting will put WPCTSA in a strong position to both monitor and report on individual projects against their prior performance and to more accurately and meaningfully report on the WPCTSA program as a whole.