



STSP Advisory Committee Meeting 7.13.17
Meeting Notes

**Metropolitan Transportation Commission
 Yerba Buena Room, 375 Beale Street, San Francisco, CA 94105**

Phone attendees:	In-person attendees:
John Andoh- City of Escalon Doran Barnes - Foothill Transit Catherine Crayne - Caltrans Len Engel- AVTA Ina Gerhard- Caltrans Brian Lane - SANDAG Philip Law - SCAG Wingate Lew - Caltrans Josh Shaw - California Transit Association	Jennifer Pollom - SRTA Theresa Romell - MTC Juan Matute – UCLA ITS Teo Wickland – UCLA ITS Josh Pulverman – Caltrans DRMT

The presentation by the project manager (Juan Matute) included an overview and timeline of the project, project goals, and findings from the draft Stakeholder Engagement Activities Report and next steps for recommendations in the final Statewide Transit Strategic Plan. A copy of the final Baselines Report was made available to Advisory Committee members during the meeting. Throughout the presentation Advisory Committee members were given the opportunity to comment and ask clarification questions. The UCLA team has provided Caltrans with a digital copy of this presentation. The notes below reflect discussion in response to certain slides or sections of the presentation. The UCLA team’s responses follow in italics.

Summary of Spring 2017 Stakeholder Engagement Activities

A question was asked regarding how technology can be used to address the concern that ‘transit agencies do not value their riders’ time.’ This question was in response to feedback gathered during the public workshops. This question was then followed by the question on how the topic of technology and technology integration was discussed during the stakeholder engagement activity process.

- *The project team noticed that for the topics of technology and transit innovation, technology is a big concern for smaller agencies especially in terms of access and support for getting real time information to riders. The project team plans to look into this as recommendations are developed.*

Phase 3: Moving to Recommendations

There was some discussion regarding the idea of a state transit data collection repository for data from local transit providers and why it might have been less popular with transit agencies in comparison to the other CTP 2040 policies presented in the transit professional survey. Some of the concerns that were raised included duplication of efforts and minimizing impact from data sent to many different locations. It was noted that transit agencies already “onerously” contribute to the NTD and have to provide their data to other locations, so they would prefer not to duplicate efforts. Transit agencies would like to harmonize and simplify the data sharing process.

- *The project team acknowledges this and will keep this in mind when drafting the recommendations.*

Following this, there was some dialogue regarding Policy 7B (Create supportive policies and secure funding for the promotion of shared mobility, including car sharing, bike sharing, real-time ridesharing, Transportation Network Companies (TNCs), scooter share, shared neighborhood electric vehicles, and on-demand shuttle and jitney services). This particular policy was not as favored as the others in the professional survey results. The attendees were asked why that might be the case. It was pointed out that “whether or not transit agencies like it, TNCs are changing the mobility ecosystem” and that there are things that TNCs do well that transit does not. At the same time, it was noted that TNCs will not be able to provide everything transit agencies do (i.e. not all people have access to TNCs and limited infrastructure) and that there needs to be a balance and equilibrium between transit and TNCs. Therefore, it was stressed that transit needs to figure out how to embrace what TNCs do and create partnerships/linkages to TNCs. The concern regarding giving limited funding to TNCs was also raised. It was noted that transit agencies might feel uneasy about taking funding that could be used to meet their needs (i.e. operating budget) and instead giving it to TNCs. It was pointed out that the California Transit Association Strategic Plan is looking at evolving technologies like TNCs and hopes to identify complementary and competitive services to transit.

- *The project team acknowledges this and will keep this in mind when drafting the recommendations.*

Furthermore, there was feedback given on the recommendation for the restructuring of fares, in particular, the elimination of fares. It was suggested that this be further explored for the recommendations. The main concern raised was the balance between transit agencies having two roles as both mobility providers and social service providers. The concern transit agencies have with free fares is that they fear “turning into rolling homeless shelters or developmental disability workshops.” It was pointed out that fares create a barrier to these broader, more challenging issues. On the other hand, positive feedback was given to the recommendations

involving Transit First Priority, use of HOV lanes, and reallocations of how real estate is used in communities.

- *The project team acknowledges this and will keep this in mind when drafting the recommendations.*

Following this, there was conversation about the “transit excellence” proposals. Under the “pursue open data and systems for smarter transit” proposal, it was suggested that shuttle service data should also be made available in addition to TNC data. It was mentioned that transit agencies face a similar problem with access to shuttle service data as they do with TNC data (i.e. fear of competitive disadvantage and attempt by government to regulate in the future). It was further suggested that CPUCs should gather more information from shuttle service providers that could be helpful for both regional and local transportation agencies. As of right now, limited information is available from CPUC (registration and owner information, but not much on operators).

- *The project team will look into including shuttle service data as they further develop this recommendation.*

A comment was made that Air Resources Board’s Advanced Clean Transit Program has been expanded and renamed to the [Innovative Clean Transit \(ICT\) measure](#).

- *The project team has noted this.*

Lastly, a clarification question was asked in regards to sources of funding available to pursue final STSP recommendations.

- *The sources of funding that the recommendations will consider are from existing programs such as TIRCP and FTA under SB 1. The recommendations being considered will look to modify/change existing guidelines and proposals for available sources of funding.*