

Needs Assessment Study

of West County Measure J-Funded Services for
Seniors and People with Disabilities



APPENDICES

February 2018

Prepared by

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Glossary

Appendix B: List of Prior Studies

Appendix C: Outreach Survey

Appendix D: Outreach Flyer

Appendix E: Outreach PPT

Appendix F: Stakeholder Interview Summary

Appendix G: Stakeholder Comments Received on Draft Report

APPENDIX A

Glossary

Appendix A Glossary

Term	Description
ADA-mandated paratransit service	“Comparable transportation service required by the Americans with Disabilities Act for individuals with disabilities who are unable to use fixed-route transportation systems” ¹
Adult daycare	“Adult Day Care Centers are designed to provide care and companionship for older adults who need assistance or supervision during the day” ²
Concierge	In the context of this report, a liaison between seniors and people with disabilities and mobility service providers
Coordination/Cooperation	Coordinated transportation services are achieved when multiple entities work together in delivering one or more components of a transportation service so they can increase their capacity to provide trips. Coordination activities can range from sharing passenger trips and vehicles to collaborating on facilities, training, purchasing, or maintenance. Fully coordinated services may evolve into an integrated brokerage in which one entity schedules and collects payment for trips performed by several providers or into full consolidation of several transportation services under one agency. ³
Coverage area / service area	The geographic boundaries associated with a mobility service or program. These geographic boundaries may be co-located with jurisdictional boundaries (e.g. San Pablo) or may be independent of them (e.g. a zone within the City of Richmond).
Coverage gap / service area gap	Geographic, temporal, or demographic-based gaps in mobility coverage.
Curb-to-curb services	“The transit vehicle picks up and lets off passengers at the curb or driveway in front of their home or destination. In curb-to-curb service the driver does not assist the passenger along walks or steps to the door of the home or other destination.” ⁴
Door-to-door services	Passenger assistance is provided between the vehicle and the door of the passenger’s home or other destination. ⁵

¹ Federal Transit Administration. <https://www.transit.dot.gov/regulations-and-guidance/civil-rights-ada/part-37-transportation-services-individuals-disabilities#sec.37.3>

² U.S. Administration on Aging. https://eldercare.acl.gov/public/resources/factsheets/adult_day_care.aspx

³ National Center for Mobility Management. <https://nationalcenterformobilitymanagement.org/by-topic/coordination/>

⁴ Easter Seals Project Action. <http://www.projectaction.com/glossary-of-disability-and-transit-terms/>

⁵ Ibid.

Term	Description
Fixed-route transit	Transit services where vehicles run on regular, pre-determined, pre-scheduled routes, with no variation. ⁶ Fixed-route modes of service include, but are not limited to, local bus, express bus, commuter bus, bus rapid transit, light rail, subway, commuter rail, and passenger ferry. ⁷
Measure J	“In November 2004, Contra Costa County voters approved Measure J with a 71% vote. The measure provided for the continuation of our county’s half-cent transportation sales tax for 25 more years beyond the original expiration date of 2009.” ⁸
Measure J Program 15	Measure J Countywide Transportation for Seniors and People with Disabilities Program (5% of overall revenues)
Measure J Program 20b	West County Additional Transportation Services for Seniors and People with Disabilities Program - Sub-Regional Program (35% of Program 15 funds)
Microtransit	A relatively new term developed to describe flexible, demand-response shared transit operations, typically provided by private operators in smaller format vehicles and incorporating new hailing, scheduling, trip pooling, and dispatching technologies
Mobility Management	A strategic approach to service coordination and customer service which enhances the ease of use and accessibility of transportation networks ⁹
On-time performance	A measure, usually expressed as a percentage, of how well a service conforms to schedule
Ride-hailing services	Another term for a “transportation network company” (see below). Ride-hailing is the term preferred by the Associated Press. ¹⁰
Senior living facility	A housing facility for seniors; often accompanied by services and programs specific to senior needs
Service span	Times of day between which a mobility service is active and offering passenger service
Shared-ride services	Mobility services that are designed such that trips between independent travelers may be shared
Subsidized fare/voucher programs	A program in which all or part of the cost of a mobility service is covered by a sponsoring agency or organization; the method for delivery of the subsidy varies between programs

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Federal Transit Administration. <https://www.transit.dot.gov/regulations-and-guidance/civil-rights-ada/title-vi-fixed-route-transit-requirements-video-transcript>

⁸ Contra Costa Transportation Authority. <http://www.ccta.net/sources/detail/2/1>

⁹ Easter Seals Project Action. <http://www.projectaction.com/glossary-of-disability-and-transit-terms/>

¹⁰ Associated Press. <https://www.facebook.com/apstylebook/posts/886253348064419>

Term	Description
Transportation Network Company (TNC)	Companies that “provide prearranged transportation services for compensation using an online-enabled application or platform (such as smart phone apps) to connect drivers using their personal vehicles with passengers” ¹¹
Travel training	Short-term, one-to-one or group-based intensive instruction designed to teach people with disabilities and seniors to travel safely and independently on fixed-route public transportation in their community ¹²
Unincorporated area	A region of land that is not governed by a local municipal corporation ¹³
Volunteer driver programs	“A network of volunteers that provides one-way, round-trip, and multi-stop rides. These programs are provided free of charge, on a donation basis, through membership dues, or at a minimal cost, and typically have an eligibility process and advance reservation requirements.” ¹⁴

¹¹ California Public Utilities Commission. <http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/tncinfo/>

¹² Easter Seals Project Action. <http://www.projectaction.com/glossary-of-disability-and-transit-terms/>

¹³ Wikipedia. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Unincorporated_area

¹⁴ Easter Seals Project Action. <http://www.projectaction.com/glossary-of-disability-and-transit-terms/>

APPENDIX B

List of Prior Studies

Appendix B List of Prior Studies

Prior Study	Online Link
Internal Audit of Paratransit Operations, City of Richmond, 2008	http://sireweb.ci.richmond.ca.us/sirepub/cache/2/qkb0laltvzrgtg2z3ifvj/8587402042018083505516.PDF
Transit Sustainability Project, Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), 2012	https://mtc.ca.gov/sites/default/files/TSP-May23-Commission.pdf
Coordinated Public Transit - Human Services Transportation Plan, Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), 2013	https://mtc.ca.gov/our-work/plans-projects/other-plans/coordinated-public-transit-human-services-transportation-plan
Contra Costa County Mobility Management Plan, Central Contra Costa Transportation Transit Authority (CCCTA), 2013	http://countyconnection.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/Final-Draft-Mobility-Management.pdf
San Pablo Paratransit Study, City of San Pablo, 2013	<i>May be requested from the City of San Pablo.</i>
Bay Area Mobility Management Roadmap Study (Draft), Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), 2016	<i>Not publically available.</i>
Measure X Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP), Contra Costa Transportation Transit Authority (CCTA), 2016	http://64.166.146.245/docs/2016/BOS/20160802_795/26484_CCTA-TEP_Ballot_English_July%2027%20Corrected%20Final.pdf
White Paper on Accessible Transportation, Contra Costa Transit Authority (CCTA)County, 2017	http://www.contracosta.ca.gov/6131/Accessible-Transit-Services-Resources
Draft Coordinated Public Transit - Human Services Transportation Plan Update, Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), 2018	https://mtc.ca.gov/our-work/plans-projects/other-plans/coordinated-public-transit-human-services-transportation-plan
First Mile/Last Mile Transportation Strategic Plan, City of Richmond, in process (being prepared by Nelson/Nygaard)	<i>Not yet publically available.</i>

APPENDIX C

Outreach Survey

Fall 2017

The West Contra Costa Transportation Advisory Committee (WCCTAC) is trying to find out more about the transportation needs of the region's seniors and people with disabilities. Please take a couple minutes to fill out the survey below. Thank you!

1. Which modes of transportation do you USUALLY use? (Check all that apply)

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> BART | <input type="checkbox"/> Walk | <input type="checkbox"/> Family, neighbor, or hired help |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bus | <input type="checkbox"/> East Bay Paratransit | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (<i>please specify</i>): |
| <input type="checkbox"/> My own car | | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Taxi | <input type="checkbox"/> WestCAT Paratransit | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bicycle | | |

2. Which modes of transportation did you use TODAY? (Check all that apply)

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> BART | <input type="checkbox"/> Walk | <input type="checkbox"/> Family, neighbor, or hired help |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bus | <input type="checkbox"/> East Bay Paratransit | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (<i>please specify</i>): |
| <input type="checkbox"/> My own car | | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Taxi | <input type="checkbox"/> WestCAT Paratransit | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bicycle | | |

3. What is the purpose of your most frequent travels? (Check all that apply)

- | | | |
|--|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Go to a medical appointment | <input type="checkbox"/> See friends or family | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (<i>please specify</i>): |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grocery Shopping | <input type="checkbox"/> Attend a class | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Go to non-medical appointment | <input type="checkbox"/> Go to the Senior Center | |

4. Which of these destinations are most difficult for you to get to? (Check all that apply)

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Medical appointments | <input type="checkbox"/> See friends or family | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (<i>please specify</i>): |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grocery Shopping | <input type="checkbox"/> Attend a class | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Non-medical appointments | <input type="checkbox"/> Go to the Senior Center | |

5. Where do you receive the majority of your medical care?

- ☐ Martinez
- ☐ Oakland
- ☐ Berkeley
- ☐ Richmond

- ☐ Pinole
- ☐ San Pablo
- ☐ Other (*please specify*): _____

6. Has your ability to obtain medical care changed since the closure of Doctors Medical Center in San Pablo?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

If yes, how has it changed? _____

7. Are there locations in West County you would like to go, but are unable to get to due to lack of convenient transportation?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

If yes, where would you like to go? _____

8. What transportation services do you need that you do not currently receive? (Check all that apply)

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Same-day trips | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreational/group trips |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Wheelchair accessible trips | <input type="checkbox"/> Accessible sidewalks, curb ramps, bus stops, etc. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Out of area medical trips | <input type="checkbox"/> Travel information or training |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Assistance entering or exiting home/destination | <input type="checkbox"/> Access to meals/food |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Evening or weekend trips | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (<i>please specify</i>): _____ |

RIDER INFORMATION

9. Where do you live?

- ☐ El Cerrito
☐ Richmond
☐ San Pablo

- ☐ Pinole
☐ Hercules
☐ El Sobrante

- ☐ Kensington
☐ Other (*please specify*): _____

10. Do you travel with any of the following? (Check all that apply)

- ☐ Folding wheelchair
☐ Power wheelchair
☐ Scooter
☐ Oxygen tank
☐ Walker/Rollator

- ☐ Service animal
☐ Care provider/attendant
☐ Other (*please specify*): _____

11. What is your age?

- ☐ Younger than 18
☐ 18 – 55
☐ 55 – 65

- ☐ 65 – 75
☐ 75 – 85
☐ 85 and older

- ☐ I prefer not to answer

12. Are you certified as disabled with East Bay Paratransit, WestCAT, or under the Regional Transportation Connection (RTC) program?

☐ Yes

☐ No

13. Do you use a cell phone?

☐ Yes

☐ No

14. Is your cell phone a smart phone (can you look at the internet on it)?

☐ Yes

☐ No

15. If you're interested in staying informed about local transportation services for seniors and people with disabilities, please provide your contact information below:

Name: _____

Email address: _____ Phone Number: _____

APPENDIX D

Outreach Flyer

West Contra Costa Transportation Study Workshop



Wednesday, October 25th

10:00am to 11:00am @ Senior Center

FREE continental breakfast and giveaways!!

We are seeking 30-40 people (riders and non-riders welcome) to join us for this important workshop to let your voice and transportation needs be heard.

City of El Cerrito is part of the West County Accessible Transportation Study being conducted by consulting firm Nelson Nygaard and WCCTAC.

The study will focus on West County transportation needs and gaps in service for seniors and people with disabilities and possible solutions.

**Must register with the front office staff
Space is limited!**

**El Cerrito Senior Center
6500 Stockton Avenue El Cerrito, CA 94530 (510) 559-7677**



APPENDIX E

Outreach PPT

A Closer Look at Transportation Challenges for Senior And Disabled Residents in West Contra Costa County

November 2017



Background: Who is WCCTAC?

2

- WCCTAC is a regional transportation planning and funding agency in Contra Costa County created in 1988 when voters approved Measure C – the ½ cent transportation sales tax (succeeded by Measure J in 2004);
- Our mission is to improve local transportation in West Contra Costa through plans, projects, programs and policies.

Reason for Outreach Today

3

Conducting a Needs Assessment Study of Senior and Disabled Services in West County:

- ▣ *Complete Study by December 2017*
- ▣ *Outreach Piece – visit local communities – survey and feedback*
- ▣ *Make recommendations for improving current services and identifying new services*

Today's Goal

4

- ▣ Discuss Current Services
- ▣ Discuss Possible Future Services
- ▣ Identify Issues/Challenges
- ▣ Propose new ideas
- ▣ Get information
- ▣ Have Fun – always!



Paratransit Programs in West County

5

- ADA-mandated service providers in West Contra Costa County:
 - East Bay Paratransit (BART and AC Transit)
 - WestCAT Dial-A-Ride
- City-based, “non-ADA” services are also provided
 - Easy Ride Paratransit Service (El Cerrito)
 - R-Transit (Richmond and parts of Unincorporated West Co)
 - San Pablo Senior Transportation & Paratransit (San Pablo)

Getting Around

6



What about Lyft and Uber?

7

58% of adults 65+ don't have a smartphone and over half of the ones that do have one, never downloaded an app before

Average cost of a trip is \$14.12

What We Already Know

8

- The existing senior and disabled transportation services do not meet the demand and needs of the users
- The amount of money/funding is limited
- More people are aging and wanting to live at home
- Medical services in West County are limited
- New transportation technology and inventions occurring rapidly

Feedback on Existing Services

9

- How are current programs working (for example East Bay Paratransit, WestCAT Dial-A-Ride, city-based programs)?
- What are some of the needs in transit or paratransit service that exist today? i.e. Medical trips to Martinez or Oakland?
- Do you have suggestions to address these needs?
See survey

Other Transportation Options

10

- Community shuttles
- Private transportation providers – Taxi, Lyft, Uber
- Private vehicle
 - Riding with family and friends
- Volunteer Driver Programs
- Travel training on how to use local transit
- Autonomous Vehicles – not yet
- Subsidy for Lyft and Uber type services

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION

WCCTAC

West Contra Costa
Transportation
Advisory Committee

Complete survey online

12

<https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/WCCTACneedsassessment>

APPENDIX F

Stakeholder Interview Summary

Appendix F Stakeholder Interview Summary

Jurisdiction/Agency	Key Findings
City of El Cerrito	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Need for transportation options that can get riders outside of El Cerrito ▪ Medical Care is typically at Richmond Kaiser or in Oakland ▪ Biggest trips are medical trips or trips to visit family and friends ▪ Largest service span gap is during midday and increasingly in the early morning ▪ Largest coverage gap is getting people from top of hill (easier to connect people in the flats) ▪ All drivers are part time (helps with cost effectiveness, but limits funding for full driver benefits) ▪ Coordination between paratransit agencies should be more seamless (people in region should be able call one number to book a trip through any agency)
WestCAT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ WestCAT would like to travel further outside area ▪ Closure of Doctors Medical Center has not changed ridership ▪ WestCAT is not opposed to additional coordination, but does not want to create more logistical challenges ▪ One concern about the system is that transfers between WestCAT and other fixed route services could be better
City of San Pablo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Existing programs are disconnected and siloed (poor collaboration between regional and city services) ▪ Area is geographically challenging ▪ Coverage gaps for unincorporated areas of San Pablo ▪ Users should be able call one number to book a trip through any agency (like Whistlestop) ▪ City of San Pablo works closely with City of El Cerrito, but has had occasional difficulty communicating with City of Richmond ▪ Closure of Doctors Medical Center has led to more trip requests to Oakland, Berkeley ▪ Desire for a Mobility Manager for all of West County

Jurisdiction/Agency	Key Findings
Mobility Matters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Facilitates two programs: Rides for Seniors, Rides for Vets MM works closely with San Pablo, but not Richmond (MM would like better relationship with all West County providers) MM provides service for seniors who need door through door assistance (to close gap in municipal services) After Doctors Medical Center closure, there was a big increase in requests for trips to Martinez, Alta Bates in Berkeley, and San Ramon, but calls subsided last year Vets need service to Martinez (MM is in early stages of feasibility study for shuttle service)
Center for Independent Living (CIL)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CIL created manual, train the trainer course for West County (5310 project) Difficult to travel between West County cities The farther out (e.g. Hercules) the harder it is to get trip Difficult for wheelchairs – curbs, bus stops, infrastructure Would like to work more with youth In Emeryville, CIL matches senior with middle/high school student to teach seniors to use apps CIL helps seniors use ride-hailing services Important to give people paper info AND provide help accessing online info
Contra Costa County Department of Conservation and Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> County and Board of Supervisors are considering a comprehensive study of paratransit improvements Countywide (due to potentially rising costs and multiple services) ADA Paratransit programs are understandably concerned, as they have ADA obligations that cannot be compromised Lack of coordination, no seamless travel in West County West County should study whether or not a single/unified program would improve service and/or be more cost effective. Concerns with Richmond's paratransit service
Board of Supervisors District I	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Closure of Doctors Medical Center was major setback Paratransit service gap in Kensington Information in services should be more readily available at Employment Development Department, hospitals, health centers, urgent care centers, etc. Pinole, El Sobrante, unincorporated areas need help, as they have less money than nearby cities Seniors and family members are unaware of the many transportation resources at their disposal Difficult to book East Bay Paratransit rides (long waits on phone, next day appointments are hard)

Jurisdiction/Agency	Key Findings
City of Richmond Community Services Director	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Difficult to get an R-Transit ride at desired time due to low staffing ▪ Disabled persons program has two vans <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Serves people with learning, physical, and mental disabilities ○ Teach musical therapy, life skills ○ Use vans for excursions, shopping, life skills ▪ Residents do not know R-Transit service options, how to locate information, etc. ▪ Need better outreach, better service scheduling rides, senior buddy program to run errands ▪ Sidewalks in Richmond in general – old sidewalks, cars, not sure of industrial Richmond, where the flea market is
East Bay Paratransit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Travel to West County is far away from the core of EBP service area ▪ No significant change in regional trip patterns due to the closure of Doctors Medical Center ▪ Need a secured yard in the San Pablo/Richmond/El Cerrito area where vehicles can park overnight (biggest impediment to improving EBP service to West County residents)

APPENDIX G

Stakeholder Comments Received on Draft Report

Appendix G Stakeholder Comments on Draft Report

Chapter Title	Comment
General	I am wondering how “disabled” is defined. That might be important for the lay person. It’s not explained anywhere. We need something that better defines the constituency that we are talking about
	A lot of comments center around coordination. It would be of benefit to clearly define what this could look like as well as potential options to implement or look further into.
Chapter 1 - Introduction	The intro could benefit from a small lead paragraph that explains that WCCTAC has initiated this study and that Nelson Nygaard is the consultant that it selected.
	The first line of the second paragraph is a little weird – I don’t like calling ourselves “wise”. The point about the booming economy also seems odd and out of place.
	2010 Census Data shows El Cerrito over 65 to be 17.9% not 7.5%
	<u>Unincorporated Areas represented by Municipal Advisory Council’s:</u> East Richmond Heights Municipal Advisory Council (recently formed): El Sobrante Municipal Advisory Council Kensington Municipal Advisory Council North Richmond Municipal Advisory Council
	<u>Other:</u> Bayview Crockett Montalvin Manor Port Costa Rodeo Rollingwood Tara Hills Tormey
	Why weren’t Rollingwood, Tara Hills, Rodeo or Crockett considered? If they are not part of the study area it should be explained why.
	Apply for a grant to Implement a Partnership with local agencies which is a service for routes outside of our service area – (One Stop Ambassador Service) Route will have certain days and times during the week and possibly nights and weekends.

Chapter Title	Comment
Chapter 1 - Introduction	The first line of paragraph 4 duplicates “city-operated”. Sounds weird
	EBP receives about 6% from Measure BB. East Bay Paratransit receives about \$255K from Measure J, which is less than 1%.
	The amount EBP receives from Measure J funding as a % of total funds is less than 1%
	Is this based on EBPC entire service area or Contra Costa Service Area. Measure J funding can only be used in Contra Costa. This should be clarified one way or the other. (re: “East Bay Paratransit receives around six percent of its total revenue from the Measure”)
	Revisit Grant application previously submitted for a Tri-Partnership with City of San Pablo, Richmond and El Cerrito- One Stop Ambassador Program (re: “Coordinated information and referrals at the regional level”)
	Can you provide a link to these docs either in a footnote or appendix?
	is HSA a recognized or generic agency acronym? Not my area but I thought HHS was the more broadly applied generic
	The section about the needs and solutions could use work. It’s a bit too “cut-and pasty. Verb tenses are all over the place. This may work better and will be taken more seriously as a narrative
	Is the thought process to include TNCs? And how would we then get passed the lack of w/c accessible vehicles?
	Is there a recommendation of who would handle this? Could it be incorporated in the County’s 211 system?
	I don’t know what this is! Is this the paper for the County BOS? In that case it’s the county and not CCTA. Also CCTA is Transportation Authority not Transit Authority (re: “White Paper on Accessible Transportation”)
	Regional as in Bay Area or West County? (Re: “Coordinated information and referrals at the regional level”)
	The Background section of Existing Conditions ends up being duplicative with the “Local Context” section of the Intro.
	Would this be a good place to mention services that are client or resident based such as senior housing complexes that have a bus for residents or non-profits like ARC that provide transportation for its clients?

Chapter Title	Comment
Chapter 2 - Existing Conditions	WestCAT provides both ADA-mandated Paratransit Service for qualified residents within its service area AND Paratransit Service for all seniors within its service area. This is not clear in Paragraph 3 – It would perhaps be beneficial to mention both the Cities of Hercules and Pinole in this description so the elected officials understand that service above and beyond ADA is provided within their jurisdictions.
	This is one of the graphs I do not think is helpful to elected officials in this format. While there is value in comparing the three city program's numbers, East Bay and WestCAT offer very different services and should be separated out in the graph.
	WestCAT's paratransit does not go to Del Norte BART. We meet East Bay at Target in Pinole only. (re: "Most paratransit transfers take place at the Del Norte BART Station, where passengers typically transfer to East Bay Paratransit.")
	an acknowledgment of the above ADA service that WestCAT provides should be included in this section.
	The description of the early morning, late night and Sunday service should be enhanced and expanded to understand that service is provided within the timeframe that WestCAT fixed route operates, that is to say that ADA paratransit service is provided past midnight M-F
	A discussion of WestCAT providing regional trips into Martinez and Richmond should be included to acknowledge that these trips are currently available for residents of West County
	Add Travel Training Program, and Standing Orders (Re: San Pablo description of services in Figure 7)
	Easy Ride Paratransit Description of Service Limited Service Beyond El Cerrito
	Use "EBP" rather than "EBPT" throughout the document
	Somewhere in this report a full description of the above ADA service that is provided to the Cities of Hercules, Pinole and the unincorporated areas of Rodeo, Crockett and Port Costa by WestCAT needs to be included
	is % approximation of fleet accessibility available? (re: "Buses and trains equipped with wheelchair lifts...")
	is this one time training? Annual? In my experience if this training is not regularly updated/conducted or spot checked in the field it is not of much use (re: "bus drivers are trained...")
	Can you provide downtime information if it available in a footnote? (re: "BART stations with elevators...")

Chapter Title	Comment
Chapter 2 - Existing Conditions	I believe its spelled Capitol. If you include Capitol Corridor you also need to include the San Joaquins intercity Amtrak service. There are also multiple express bus operators in West County including Napa Vine, SolTrans and FAST. Also in 2018 WETA will start ferry service between Richmond and SF. (re: "Five fixed-route transit agencies that operate in West Contra Costa County include...")
	Please include additional coverage information, at least for both AC Transit and WestCAT to inform readers that service from both agencies into (for instance) SF and Martinez is available. Also update the ADA-Mandated Paratransit section for WestCAT to include the ADA Paratransit services that East Bay provide during certain hours.
	Some cities or communities offer free shuttle (not El Cerrito) Three such shuttles currently exist in West Contra Costa..... El Cerrito's shuttle operates twice a week??? I don't know what that means. El Cerrito does not offer any free rides other than lunch time. We have excursions twice a week and shopping to Costco, Target, Sprouts and Grocery Outlet once a month.
	At the end of the first section that addresses volunteer driver programs, after reporting the number of rides given by Mobility Matters Rides for Seniors program in West County ONLY, an unfounded conclusion is stated, "This number reflects a COUNTYWIDE (emphasis added) need for increased access to volunteer driver programs." What is the basis for this conclusion?
	WestCAT has 12 (12 passenger) vans/ with 11 full time drivers . The demand for drivers is very high
	Travel Training is available to seniors as well. Not just ADA-eligible customers.
	Mica from WestCAT was also trained in this program (re: "CIL's Community Connections in partnership with the three city programs, did train-the-trainer training to empower staff to train seniors and people with disabilities to ride transit")
	I would suggested defining what this is in a footnote (re: "5310 funding")
	The large paragraph about "Other examples of private transportation" is a bit confusing. Are these other examples that are routinely used by seniors? School bus services?
	What about private van providers that provide Medical/medicare trips an ambulance and gurney transport? (re: "This service would allow participants to remotely request Lyft rides without the need for a smartphone or app")

Chapter Title	Comment
Chapter 2 - Existing Conditions	Some explanation might be warranted/useful here (re: "Cities and paratransit agencies are not able to track trip purpose for all funded programs")
	Format "shopping/pharmacy" label
	Senior Center is listed twice – Senior Center (1) Social/recreational, Senior Center (2) Social/recreational should be Alzheimer / Respite Program
	We actually have not had an increase in trips to Martinez, so I would remove the "likely" part (re: "Many of these trips are likely to the medical facilities in Martinez")
	Can we get more data on this? I'm not sure this is the case. (re: "it can be inferred that the percentage of paratransit trips outside of their jurisdictions is at least as high.")
	Can we qualify this paragraph. It looks like when one medical office closed another opened, and so why would there be an impact? If you keep this paragraph, it should mention why individuals have to travel outside of the area. I don't think the paragraph above really captures that. (re: "Lifelong Medical Care..." paragraph)
	WestCAT did not notice any change. Nor did it increase ridership on our 30z route that goes from the Del Norte Hercules Transit Center to Martinez (re: "Doctors Medical Center's closure resulted in significant medical care demand outside of West Contra Costa County, which has affected all providers")
	As both WestCAT and East Bay have not seen any effect on trips by this closure I would really encourage this to be acknowledged more in this report, if all of the information about additional trips and burden on agencies is anecdotal this should be noted. If actual figures and data are available, please use it.
	These numbers are incorrect. (re: Active Users and Annual Trips per Active User numbers)
	The description regarding WestCAT's active users and the statement about our system being open to General Public is misleading. This needs to be revisited and addressed.
	El Cerrito's program reported an OTP rate of 100% within it 20 minute window of scheduled time.
	If we (City of San Pablo) did not provide data why does it reflect that on the footer on the bottom of the page (#18) our program cost the most per trip of all the programs? I feel that something is not correct with that statement.

Chapter Title	Comment
Chapter 2 - Existing Conditions	Contributing factors to El Cerrito's low cost per trip likely include the service's shorter distances which enables them to make more trips per day (due to a smaller coverage area) and the fact that trips often carry multiple passengers. All El Cerrito drivers are part-time employees which has kept overhead cost lower.
	Our service area is larger than the city ran programs and our cost per trip is closer to the \$22 per trip range.
	If this is cost per rider then I believe it to be inaccurate based on the other information in the report. I refer back to my comments on Figure 5 in how to show this data, I also do not feel that the conclusion that shorter distances and the fact that trips carry multiple passengers would have any effect on cost per rider. If this is indeed cost per trip I am not clear on how that data was determined.
	I would strongly advise that some notation be made that Richmond's Measure J revenues have been suspended given the operational issues
	This is not true for WestCAT (re: "The closure of San Pablo's Doctors Medical Center hospital in 2015 resulted in an increase in trip requests across all transportation providers serving seniors and people with disabilities in West Contra Costa County")
	Re: Closure of Doctors Hospital – see previous comments
	Add a new map that includes service areas of paratransit service providers
Chapter 3 - Outcomes from Public Participation and Outreach Efforts	We should keep it consistent and use "Senior" throughout the document.
	Key Finding section: for Richmond, the sub-bullets under the disabled persons program are confusing. Are the staff involved in music therapy? As part of the ride?
	Confusion re: "Largest complaint about system is that transfers between WestCAT and fixed route could be better")
	I have concern with the text in the stakeholder interviews.
	Last bullet point, could also include transfers between EastBAY and WestCAT could be improved
	Note that we solicited comments from Richmond, but they never responded.
	Do we really want to say so bluntly that San Pablo thinks Richmond is hard to work with? Is San Pablo staff OK with having that comment in there?

Chapter Title	Comment
Chapter 3 - Outcomes from Public Participation and Outreach Efforts	Stakeholder Interview summary should be an actual summary, with analysis and discussion based on the comments received. Listing the key findings should be an appendix to the document, not as part of the actual report.
	Bad sentence structure (re: "While 87 percent of respondents use a cell phone, only 65 percent of those that do, have phones with internet capabilities")
	Conflicts with statement on "and a majority of those have internet capability on their mobile phones" (re: "While 87 percent of respondents use a cell phone, only 65 percent of those that do, have phones with internet capabilities")
	when we say "many West County residents" drive, do we mean West County seniors and the disabled? This needs to be clarified.
	Same as above, IMO this is worthy of a mention in the Exec Summary (re: "Almost fifty percent of respondents would like to get to parts of Contra Costa County that they are unable to due to a lack of convenient transportation options")
	This is significant and worthy of a mention in the Exec Summ IMO (re: "Around one-third of respondents (31 percent) have had challenges obtaining medical care since the closure of Doctors Medical Center")
	Is this really the reason? I didn't read that in the above detail. (re: "Many West County residents drive or are driven by family and friends due to lack of other convenient transportation options")
	Was there any research done on residents who are also seniors, who could get a Senior Clipper card rather than an RTC card and get the same discounts?
Chapter 4 - Transportation Needs and Gaps	There is substantial content related to transfers in the draft Needs Assessment. Given this, I believe a more complete discussion of transfer trip/issues is warranted. As I'm sure you are aware, the new MTC Draft Coordinated has a discussion of transfers. The County supports that language but has requested that additional important language be included as seen in the attached draft letter to MTC. The discussion regarding transfers, in the absence of a description of exactly why transfers on demand response and specifically ADA paratransit are problematic, is incomplete. I believe the MTC language, with the addition of the County comments, provides a complete description of transfers.
	Implement a Marketing Campaign to promote all transportation services in West County (re: "Awareness of programs among eligible population is lacking.")

Chapter Title	Comment
Chapter 4 - Transportation Needs and Gaps	is it worth noting here, or elsewhere, that if awareness were increased that resources could not accommodate? (re: "Awareness of programs among eligible population is lacking.")
	On the second bullet, is East Bay Paratransit Consortium interested in expanding its service area? This bullet suggests that the answer is "yes" and that the only barrier to expansion is funding. This may need to be clarified.
	again, I think we should note that Measure J funds have been suspended when referencing Richmond performance issues (re: "Current City of Richmond service is unreliable")
	Conflicts with statement earlier "only 65 percent of those that do, have phones with internet capabilities" (re: "a majority of those have internet capability on their mobile phones")
	This sentence has a positive tone while the same statement earlier had a negative tone. I find that odd. (re: "Close to 90 percent of survey respondents have mobile phones, and a majority of those have internet capability on their mobile phones.")
	Measure J recipients report performance annually to CCTA as part of the Claim process. Previous quarterly reporting was burdensome and unnecessary for the smaller operators. The last part of this statement is untrue. WCCTAC has significant capacity in choosing where most of the Measure J funds are allocated. Of the 35% of Measure J Program 15 funds that go to west county 23% of the annual allocation is "protected" by the expenditure plan. WCCTAC has capacity to direct the remaining 12% of the west county allocation. In Program 20b, WCCTAC has the capacity to direct 100% of those funds. (re: "Under current conditions, recipients have limited requirements for reporting performance, and WCCTAC has limited capacity to reduce funding based on performance.")
Chapter 5 - Strategies	I like how the strategies are presented. I think you should include a section in each strategy that is "Possible Roadblocks/issues to implementation" that would need to be addressed for each strategy.
	Want to Echo comment about each strategy having some discussion on the roadblocks and issues that would need to be overcome to achieve and implement them
	San Pablo currently works with East Bay Paratransit closely with their representative who conducts interviews weekly at the Senior Center. It somewhat contradicts the statement noted in Transportation Needs and Assessment. Maybe this can be rearranged to note other cities should support with the exception of San Pablo.

Chapter Title	Comment
Chapter 5 - Strategies	Will rely on the Marketing Campaign to be the resources and voice for awareness of other programs to connect them in West County (re: "providers can easily inform riders about other programs they can use and connect them immediately".)
	The critique of R-Transit is generally fine, but I think that it may go too far to suggested where within the City of Richmond's structure R-Transit should be managed. What if R-Transit changes drastically and becomes merely a contract? I think that the last sentence may go too far or may be based on too many assumptions.
	Under "what need does it solve", there is some language about communication and info sharing, but nothing about "re-configuration". There needs to be more narrative and explanation about the problem reconfiguration would solve. Is there a cost savings that could be re-allocated? A better case is needed here.
	Under "who would be appropriate" section, when referring to organizations, we should just refer to the organizations without the use of the word staff. For example, changes to the City of Richmond's program will require the cooperation of the City of Richmond (not just program staff)
	Is this supposed to be a cost-neutral move? Why not say that. What is it necessary that there be more meetings? Staff time is a negligible enough impact here that I'm not sure it's even worth mentioning
	This should not be the way to go. We should promote travel training and other programs that continue to keep people from going to an ADA Mandated service unless they are prevented from using fixed route. The outreach effort should push for more fixed route use through travel training and clipper programs or volunteer driver programs.
	Is there data to support this? (re: "city paratransit programs do well when under the same department as senior services")
	The establishment of the sub-committee would need to be formalized and agreed to by each member. Historically these groups have met as a sub-committee but nothing ever gets accomplished. Parties are either making power plays or undercutting the good of the whole. There needs to be by-laws or and MOU that formally established the rules of how to move coordination forward.

Chapter Title	Comment
Chapter 5 - Strategies	Again I think it important to more fully describe what services WestCAT offers in this section, especially in relation to the service for residents of Pinole and Hercules – In the section on discussing potential changes to the service boundaries I would prefer you not name actual agencies who could take on the service, merely acknowledge that this could occur. I state this as El Sobrante is in the East Bay Paratransit service area and adding it to our non ADA service would potentially create confusion and would require the WestCAT board to formally changes our service boundaries.
	I'm a little confused about the distinction between the WCMM group and the Provider Advisory Committee. Why do we need both? Is this intended to be a Brown Act Advisory Committee like the TAC?
	WestCAT currently has a Senior/ADA passenger orientation that is held monthly for our passengers.
	I think this is worthy of inclusion in the Exec summary (re: "West Contra Costa County currently has no reliable public source of same-day transportation for seniors and people with disabilities who cannot access public transit.")
	I'm still a little hazy on the cost of proving subsidized TNC services. If these services are made available and are widely known, might the demand (and subsequent cost) be a lot higher?
	GoGoGrandparent charges ours vendors fares + \$0.19/minute. The rates of Uber and Lyft vary by zip code. The rates that I gave you are for Contra Costa County. GoGo's average fee is an extra \$3, making us one of the most affordable virtual concierge services on the market.
	The data, at least for EBP, does not support this statement (re: "Due to the closure of the Doctors Medical Center, ride requests among all West County providers increased")
	The Lyft and Uber programs rely on one of the partners to cover the administrative costs of the person scheduling the trips. If you assume that cost those models would also have an administrative cost similar to GoGo and Arrive. While I really like this strategy I think two potential issues need to be called out for consideration. Are the ADA operators at risk with ADA compliance with this model and is their possibility of significant liability. If this can be operated and paid outside of the funding jurisdiction of the feds would that make a difference? Uber and Lyft operators have limited insurance and it is likely that, if a major injury occurs, the city or operators would be the deep pockets the passenger goes after. I have heard this argument from some operators as a concern in California.

Chapter Title	Comment
Chapter 5 - Strategies	Please add discussion on potential Insurance liability for agencies who work with TNC's.
	It is clear from the recommendations that Mobility Matters is being ruled out as a partner/provider of volunteer rides for West County. As I have expressed a number of times, all we need to meet the needs for this service on a broad scale in West County is more West County volunteers and would like to work with West County cities and organizations to achieve this goal. Due to demand exceeding human resources, we bring in volunteer drivers from both Central and East County, as well as our staff to cover West County rides when possible. Why is Mobility Matters being excluded?
	worth noting that all transit agencies are currently experiencing a driver shortage.
	It appears that the plan is to have the countywide toll free Mobility Matters Transportation I&R Helpline stop serving West County callers looking for a match to meet their transportation needs. Why? Are we to not help callers when we know the answer to their question/request and tell them to call another number? Why? How does that benefit callers? (Re: "call in transportation helpline")
	this section should accommodate and describe the range of mobility management functionality all the way up to one call/one click type of operations with centralized dispatch, eligibility, etc. I understand that it may not be supported or recommended but excluding this end of the continuum lacks transparency and is a disservice. Decision makers should not be shielded from the full range of options available.
	I make some comments towards the end of the doc re: comprehensively describing the universe of possibilities, even if they aren't expected to be supported or recommended. This is along the lines of the discussion in the draft MTC letter which is, summarized, "basic coordination is good but that is a really low bar, other areas of the transportation system don't suffer from similar low expectations". The potential for having a centralized, one call/one click operation countywide (and other fundamental changes/improvements) should be clearly described to the decision makers. It might not be popular and even rejected but that doesn't free staff (and consultants) from the obligation of providing complete information to decision makers.
	Mobility Management functions listed under Long Term Strategy #5 (and elsewhere) should cover accounting functions as discussed in attached the draft comment letter on MTC's coordinated plan.
	Are the costs the are cited (\$130K and \$200K) annual costs? If so, that needs to be clarified.

Chapter Title	Comment
Chapter 5 - Strategies	Could the Contra Costa County 211 system handle this? (re: "A West County Mobility Manager could take steps towards implementing a centralized call center")
	Maybe CoCo County can mirror the Alameda county 211 system to be more of a mobility management partner.
	The Board of Directors approved the continuation of the Flex service at the December 23, 2017 meeting. Line 275 will be eliminated.
	I guess my thought on the use of microtransit applications in this context are different. I wonder if a microtransit application in west county (even if it is in the three-city area) could virtually consolidate the three services to provide better coordination and efficiency while providing riders in the three cities better options. Could these efficiencies off-set the cost of the application itself? Was this considered?
	This is a strategy that is worth exploring, but in terms of road blocks it is a fairly new concept and does not work in all circumstances. We have met with one provider to look at potential replacement of some of our fixed route with this model. The back of the envelope costs and requirement of vehicles and drivers would not have made sense from a financial standpoint. In "How much will it cost" I believe your statement that a cost reduction based on a reduction in vehicle size is inaccurate, you previously state that the primary costs are drivers salaries and maintenance, neither are changed by a smaller vehicle.
	I think we should be blunt here, coordination and efficiency improvements in the absence of increased revenues will absolutely not allow accommodation of the projected growth in demand. This should be stated explicitly at the outset (in the executive summary), increased revenues are a necessity. (re: "What need does it solve for West Contra Costa County?")
	The Monterey example might be instructive here. (re: "Are there any local examples?")
	the language above focuses on locally generated revenue. This section should accommodate state level initiatives. The County will have formal positions out shortly re: GGRF recommendations for this transportation sector. (re: "What are the next steps?")

Chapter Title	Comment
Chapter 6 - Next Steps	Well put...should go in the Exec Summary (re: first paragraph)
	It may seem unnecessary at first blush but I think we need to define “coordination” and “cooperation”. It has become the default solution/recommendation in this field and what exactly it means is often ambiguous. In the glossary or elsewhere can we have a list of coordination outcome ranging from low effort (e.g. regional coordination meetings) to high effort (e.g. Share vehicles) (re: second paragraph)
	Thank you for including this the reference. The link in the Study points to the entire BOS meeting for that day. The link below might be more useful to readers, it goes directly to the pdf of the white paper: http://www.contracosta.ca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/47102 Alternatively, the link below goes to a page w/a link to the BOS report and the pdf: http://www.contracosta.ca.gov/6131/Accessible-Transit-Services-Resources (re: "The white paper also notes this WCCTAC Study")
	It seems that the Next Steps section could use work. The first paragraph is OK, but there is an excessive focus on the CCTA Study, and too little about all of the next steps generated by each idea in Strategies.



For more information, contact:

Joanna Pallock
WCCTAC Project Manager
(510) 210-5934
jpallock@wcctac.org

Prepared by