

Memorandum

To: Chair and Commissioners

Date: October 19, 2001

From: Diane C. Eidam

File: Book Item 4.5
Action

Ref.: AMENDMENT TO THE PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA FOR THE FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION PROGRAM FOR ELDERLY AND DISABLED INDIVIDUALS, CTC RESOLUTION #G-97-01

Issue: Should the California Transportation Commission amend the Procedures and Criteria for the Federal Transit Administration Program for the Elderly and Disabled Individuals (FTA Section 5310), CTC Resolution #G-97-01? The amendment request would change the "Quantitative Scoring Criteria and Project Rating Form: Section 1 - Project Need: Other Equipment", Page 4 of 11, to include the following:

"OR

4. Applicant needs to replace inadequate computer equipment to improve efficiency."

Five possible points could be obtained in this category.

Recommendation: Commission staff recommends that the Commission amend CTC Resolution #G-97-01. The Commission's 15-member Section 5310 Advisory Committee met on September 17, 2001, to discuss the current applicability of the "Quantitative Scoring Criteria and Project Rating Form". The Committee unanimously agreed that the Form should be changed to include the following on Page 4 of 11:

"OR

4. Applicant needs to replace inadequate computer equipment to improve efficiency."

Background: The Elderly and Disabled Persons Transit Program was established in 1975 and has been administered by Caltrans since its inception. The Program provides annual grants of federal funds to purchase transit capital equipment to meet the specialized needs of elderly and/or disabled persons for whom mass transportation services are unavailable, insufficient, or inappropriate. A 20% local match is required from all Program participants. The Program, since its inception, has provided approximately 2,543 vehicles to serve a variety of client groups and programs ranging from small agencies with specific clientele to paratransit providers serving entire communities. Most of these agencies are non-profit organizations, while some are public agencies where no non-profit organizations are readily available to provide the proposed service.

Although the Program is small in terms of dollars, it has relatively high visibility and was subject to debate for many years resulting in the introduction of two bills during two consecutive legislative sessions. Assembly Bill 772, which ultimately passed in FY 1995-96 and was subsequently signed by the Governor, placed three mandates on the Commission regarding the Program:

1. The Commission shall direct Caltrans on how to allocate funds for the Program.
2. The Commission shall establish an appeals process for the Program.
3. The Commission shall hold at least one public hearing prior to approving its Program of projects.

In January 1997, the Commission approved the Procedures and Criteria for the Federal Transit Administration Program for Elderly and Disabled Individuals, CTC Resolution #G-97-01, which includes the "Quantitative Scoring Criteria and Project Rating Form" ("Form"). The "Form" was originally developed by the Commission's 15-member Section 5310 Advisory Committee, which consists of members from Regional Transportation Planning Agencies, state and local social service agencies, the California Association for Coordinated Transportation, Caltrans and Commission staff.

The request to add a category to the "Form" falls under Mandate #1 above -- The Commission shall direct Caltrans on how to allocate funds for the Program. Over the last couple of years, Commission staff has received requests to reconvene the 15-member advisory committee to discuss the Section 5310 Program, especially, the "Quantitative Scoring Criteria and Project Rating Form". During the discussions on September 17, 2001, the Committee requested that the Department provide an analysis of the Program and provide certain information, such as; the number of successful rural vs. urban counties, distribution of funds by population, the number of replacement vehicles vs. service expansion, miles traveled vs. passengers per mile, etc. The Department has committed to having this information to the Committee by November 1, 2001. Once the Committee receives the information a more meaningful determination regarding the "Form" should be possible. However, the Committee agreed that one section of the "Form" should be immediately updated to allow the Department to start the process of notifying possible applicants for the FFY 2002-03 cycle by the end of this calendar year. It would also allow for the FFY 2002-03 cycle applicants whose current equipment is outdated and unable to accommodate the newer scheduling software to apply for replacement equipment. The change being requested can be found on Page 4 of 11, on the "Quantitative Scoring Criteria and Project Rating Form", which is part of the attached resolution. An agency applying for replacement equipment would need to prove through documentation that its current equipment is unable to use specific software that would make its operations, scheduling and routing more efficient.

Under the current "Quantitative Scoring Criteria and Project Rating Form", an agency would not be eligible to apply for replacement equipment. Currently, when an agency applies for "Other Equipment" it must make a determination that the ancillary equipment will provide critical support to the applicant's transportation program by coordinating a fleet of at least 3 vehicles AND the applicant is currently using a manual system for scheduling, vehicle tracking, etc. OR the applicant has no communication equipment. In other words, if an applicant currently has a computer system that provides for some scheduling and/or vehicle tracking the applicant could not make a request for "Other Equipment". However, it was determined that many agencies have very outdated equipment and need the funding assistance to purchase new equipment. Adding the fourth criteria -- "Applicant needs to replace inadequate computer equipment to improve efficiency", would allow an agency that currently has equipment but that equipment is outdated (to the extent that it's unable to accommodate modern scheduling software) to apply for replacement equipment by demonstrating that the equipment must be replaced in order to accommodate the newer software. The applicant must be able to demonstrate that the new equipment and/or software would allow for efficiencies. The Advisory Committee voted unanimously to add the fourth criterion.

The impact to the Program, by adding the fourth criterion, will most likely be an increase in "Other Equipment" being requested by applicants. The amount available for "Other Equipment" will continue to be limited to \$40,000 for the entire request.

CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA FOR THE FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION
PROGRAM FOR ELDERLY AND DISABLED INDIVIDUALS

Resolution G-01-XX

Amending Resolution G-97-01

- 1.1 WHEREAS, Federal law (Title 49 U.S.C. Section 5310) provides for capital grants for the purpose of assisting private non-profit corporations and under certain circumstances, public agencies in providing transportation services to meet the needs of elderly persons and persons with disabilities for whom public mass transportation services are otherwise *unavailable, insufficient, or inappropriate*; and
- 1.2 WHEREAS, State law, AB 772 (Chapter 669, Statutes of 1996), placed three mandates on the Commission regarding that Program as follows:
 - The Commission shall direct Caltrans on how to allocate funds for the Program.
 - The Commission shall establish an appeals process for the Program.
 - The Commission shall hold at least one public hearing prior to approving its Program of projects; and
- 1.3 WHEREAS, the Commission worked with a 15-member advisory committee made up of individuals from the Regional Transportation Agencies, state and local social service agencies, the California Association for Coordinated Transportation, Caltrans and Commission staff, to develop a Program process that will provide for a statewide ranked list of projects to be adopted by the Commission and funded by Caltrans; and
- 2.1 NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Commission has determined that the process will utilize objective project scoring criteria and a statewide review committee consisting of representatives from the State Departments of Rehabilitation, Developmental Services, Aging, and Transportation, with Commission staff acting in the role of facilitator/coordinator for the statewide committee.
- 2.2 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Commission adopts scoring criteria as described in Attachment 1 of this resolution; and
- 2.3 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Commission adopts the project selection process, as follows:

Regional Transportation Planning Agencies will score projects from their region utilizing the Commission's adopted project scoring criteria and send a scored list of their projects to

Caltrans. Caltrans will forward the regional lists to the statewide review committee. The statewide review committee will compile a draft statewide prioritized list based on the project scores calculated by the regions and determine a "cut-off point" (score) on the draft list, at which 110% of the estimated available program funding will be expended. The statewide committee will review the projects above the "cut-off point" on the draft list based on the Commission's adopted criteria. The committee will rescore any projects that are incorrectly scored by the regions and create a statewide-prioritized list of projects with a cost equal to 110% of the estimated available funds.

Ties in scoring that occur at the funding cut-off that will result in a project not being funded when another project with the same score will be funded, will be broken as follows:

- First priority will be given to vehicle replacement projects with the vehicle having the greatest mileage, in excess of the minimum requirement for program participation, being ranked higher.
- Second priority will be given to service expansion projects with the project serving the most persons being ranked higher.
- Third priority will be given to other equipment projects with the highest ranking being given to the equipment that will coordinate the greatest number of vehicles.

The statewide evaluation committee will hold a staff level conference for all stakeholders to discuss the statewide-prioritized list and hear any appeals on technical issues. Only appeals based on actions that occurred at the statewide level will be considered and the appealing agency will have to demonstrate, using documentation from their original application, that the statewide committee incorrectly followed the adopted criteria. Appeals regarding regional scoring will be heard by the responsible regional agencies prior to submitting their scored lists to Caltrans.

The statewide evaluation committee will submit a final statewide-prioritized list to the Commission. The Commission will hold a public hearing to discuss the prioritized list and overall program policy, after which the Commission will adopt the prioritized list as the annual Elderly and Disabled Transit Program. Caltrans will fund projects in priority order until all available funds have been utilized.

Attachment

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION PROGRAM
FOR ELDERLY AND DISABLED INDIVIDUALS
(49 U.S.C. SECTION 5310)
2002-03 FUNDING CYCLE

ISSUE DATE: NOVEMBER 30, 2001

QUANTITATIVE SCORING CRITERIA
AND PROJECT RATING FORM

CONTENTS

		Page
SECTION 1	Project Need: Replacement	1 - 2
	Project Need: Service Expansion	3
	Project Need: Other Equipment	4
SECTION 2	Project Need: Unavailable, Insufficient or Inappropriate	5 - 6
SECTION 3	Service Effectiveness	7 - 8
SECTION 4	Ability of Applicant	9 - 10
SECTION 5	Coordination	11

11/30/01

SECTION 1 - Project Need: Replacement

Maximum 20 Points

DEFINITION	QUANTITATIVE CRITERIA	QUANTITATIVE SCORE	PROJECT SCORE
<p>Excessive Maintenance: Vehicle <u>does not meet minimum useful life requirements</u> (4 years or 100,000 miles for minivan, modified van and single wheel cut-a-way or 7 years or 200,000 miles for bus), but needs to be replaced due to excessive maintenance.</p>	<p>3. Vehicle to be replaced due to problems related to excessive maintenance:</p> <p>Documented major component problems (e.g., repeated engine replacement, excessive brake and transmission replacement, excessive repairs during warrantee period due to design flaw, repair cost more than replacement cost). Documentation to include copies of letters to vendor and/or original equipment manufacturer, repair bills, repair estimates, etc.</p>	<p>0 - 20</p>	<p>_____</p>
		<p>TOTAL POINTS Maximum 20 points</p>	<input type="text"/>

GO TO PAGE 5 OF 11

SECTION 1 - Project Need: Other Equipment

Maximum 20 Points

Other Equipment - computer system and software, maintenance equipment, communication system and other

	DEFINITION	QUANTITATIVE CRITERIA	QUANTITATIVE SCORE	PROJECT SCORE
___ computer system ___ software ___ maintenance equipment ___ communication system ___ other: _____	Determination that ancillary equipment will provide critical support to the applicant's transportation program.	1. Equipment will coordinate fleet of:		
		more than 15 vehicles	15	_____
		14 vehicles	14	_____
		13 vehicles	13	_____
		12 vehicles	12	_____
		11 vehicles	11	_____
		10 vehicles	10	_____
		9 vehicles	9	_____
		8 vehicles	8	_____
		7 vehicles	7	_____
		6 vehicles	6	_____
		5 vehicles	5	_____
		4 vehicles	4	_____
		3 vehicles	3	_____
		less than 3 vehicles	0	_____
	AND			
	2. Applicant is currently using manual system for scheduling, vehicle tracking, etc.	5	_____	
	OR			
	3. Applicant has no communication equipment.	5	_____	
	OR			
	4. <u>Applicant needs to replace inadequate computer equipment to improve efficiency.</u>	5	_____	
			TOTAL POINTS Maximum 20 points	<input type="text"/>

GO TO PAGE 5 OF 11

SECTION 2 - Project Need: Unavailable, Insufficient or Inappropriate

Maximum 10 Points

	DEFINITION	QUANTITATIVE CRITERIA AND SCORING	PROJECT SCORE
<p>Target Population: Proposal fully describes the needs of the target population of persons who are elderly or of any age with disabilities, as well as why mass transportation and paratransit services are unavailable, insufficient or inappropriate.</p> <p><i>Check one:</i> <input type="checkbox"/> 1 Unavailable <input type="checkbox"/> 2 Insufficient <input type="checkbox"/> 3 Inappropriate</p>	<p>Unavailable: There is no existing mass transportation or public paratransit (e.g., ADA paratransit, fixed route, dial-a-ride services) in proposed project service area available to serve the described target population.</p> <p>Insufficient: Available mass transportation and paratransit services are insufficient to meet the needs of the target population, or equipment needs replacement to ensure continuance of service. (Examples: service at capacity, service parameters, routes, hours, need not met due to eligibility and/or trip criteria, projected future need, vehicles inaccessible, etc.)</p>	<p>SCORING: 0 points = Does not address question. 1 points = Addresses question without attaching relevant documentation. 2 points = Addresses question completely attaching relevant documentation and discussion of the issue. Examples of documentation include: testimony at or findings from an Article 8 hearing, citizen/on-board passenger surveys, current waiting lists, records of trips denied, ADA Plan, recognized studies or plans that document transit needs (e.g. Area Agency on Aging Needs Assessment, short range transit plan, Senate Bill 826 Action Plan/Progress Report), letter from public transit agency, newspaper articles, agency brochures, agency statistics or demographics, letter of inquiry to and /or response from other funding sources.</p> <p>UNAVAILABLE</p> <p>1. Applicant accurately describes how population is unserved by public transit or public paratransit, including fixed route, dial-a-ride, ADA complementary paratransit services, and private paratransit.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">AND</p> <p>2. Applicant describes target population (ages, types of disabilities, demographics).</p> <p style="text-align: center;">AND</p> <p>3. Applicant describes transportation needs of target population.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">AND</p> <p>4. Applicant describes how proposed project will address described needs.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">AND</p> <p>5. Applicant describes other funding sources considered (e.g., other grants, donations, contracts, cash reserves of the agency, etc.) and why these are not available to fund the proposed project.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p>INSUFFICIENT</p> <p>1. Applicant accurately describes available public transit and public paratransit, including fixed route, dial-a-ride, ADA complementary paratransit services, and private paratransit.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">AND</p> <p>2. Applicant describes target population (ages, types of disabilities, demographics).</p> <p style="text-align: center;">AND</p> <p>3. Applicant describes transportation needs of target population and why available transit is insufficient to meet the identified needs.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">AND</p> <p>4. Applicant describes how proposed project will supplement or expand available transit and address described unmet needs or in case of vehicle replacement, will ensure continuance of existing service.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">AND</p>	<p>_____</p>
		SUBTOTAL	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 40px; height: 20px; margin: 0 auto;"></div>

SECTION 2 - Project Need: Unavailable, Insufficient or Inappropriate

Maximum 10 Points

<i>DEFINITION</i>	<i>QUANTITATIVE CRITERIA</i>	<i>PROJECT SCORE</i>
<p><i>Inappropriate:</i> Target population has unique or special needs which are difficult or impossible to serve on available mass transportation and/or paratransit. Example: lack of wheelchair accessibility.</p>	<p>5. Applicant describes other funding sources considered (e.g., other grants, donations, contracts, cash reserves of the agency, etc.) and why these are not available to fund the proposed project.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p><u>INAPPROPRIATE</u></p> <p>1. Applicant accurately describes available public transit and public paratransit, including fixed route, dial-a-ride, ADA complementary paratransit services, and private paratransit.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">AND</p> <p>2. Applicant describes target population (ages, types of disabilities, demographics).</p> <p style="text-align: center;">AND</p> <p>3. Applicant describes special transportation needs of target population and why available transit is inappropriate to meet the identified needs.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">AND</p> <p>4. Applicant describes how proposed project will address special needs of target population.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">AND</p> <p>5. Applicant describes other funding sources considered (e.g., other grants, donations, contracts, cash reserves of the agency, etc.) and why these are not available to fund the proposed project.</p>	<p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p>
	<p>TOTAL POINTS <i>Maximum 10</i></p>	<p><input type="text"/></p>

points

GO TO PAGE 7 OF 11

SECTION 3 - Service Effectiveness

Maximum 30 Points

QUANTITATIVE CRITERIA	QUANTITATIVE SCORE	PROJECT SCORE
<p>3. Existing transportation provider: Total miles per day divided by number of vehicles: First-time transportation provider : Projected number of miles for requested vehicle per day:</p> <p>Over 102 miles per vehicle</p> <p>over 94 miles per vehicle, but not more than 102 miles per vehicle</p> <p>over 86 miles per vehicle, but not more than 94 miles per vehicle</p> <p>over 78 miles per vehicle, but not more than 86 miles per vehicle</p> <p>over 70 miles per vehicle, but not more than 78 miles per vehicle</p> <p>over 62 miles per vehicle, but not more than 70 miles per vehicle</p> <p>over 54 miles per vehicle, but not more than 62 miles per vehicle</p> <p>over 46 miles per vehicle, but not more than 54 miles per vehicle</p> <p>over 38 miles per vehicle, but not more than 46 miles per vehicle</p> <p>30 to 38 miles per vehicle</p> <p>less than 30 miles per vehicle</p>	<p>10</p> <p>9</p> <p>8</p> <p>7</p> <p>6</p> <p>5</p> <p>4</p> <p>3</p> <p>2</p> <p>1</p> <p>0</p>	<p>_____</p>
<p>ADDITIONAL POINTS CAN BE OBTAINED UNDER THE FOLLOWING PROVIDED TOTAL POINTS FOR SERVICE EFFECTIVENESS CATEGORY DO NOT EXCEED 30 POINTS</p>		
<p>4. Existing transportation provider: Current wheelchair users as a percentage of current total users: First-time transportation provider: Projected wheelchair users as a percentage of projected total users:</p> <p>more than 65%</p> <p>more than 60 to 65%</p> <p>more than 55% to 60%</p> <p>more than 50% to 55%</p> <p>more than 45% to 50%</p> <p>more than 40% to 45%</p> <p>more than 35% to 40%</p> <p>more than 30% to 35%</p> <p>more than 25% to 30%</p> <p>20% to 25%</p> <p>less than 20%</p>	<p>10</p> <p>9</p> <p>8</p> <p>7</p> <p>6</p> <p>5</p> <p>4</p> <p>3</p> <p>2</p> <p>1</p> <p>0</p>	<p>_____</p>
	<p>TOTAL POINTS <i>Maximum 30 points</i></p>	<p><input type="text"/></p>

SECTION 4 - Ability of Applicant

Maximum 30 Points

DEFINITION	QUANTITATIVE CRITERIA	QUANTITATIVE SCORE	PROJECT SCORE
Evidence of an applicant's experience and history of providing efficient and effective transit services.	1. Applicant has experience providing existing specialized transportation services for elderly or individuals with disabilities for:		
	a) more than 5 years	4	_____
	b) more than 3 up to 5 years	3	_____
	c) more than 1 up to 3 years	2	_____
	d) less than 1 year	0	_____
	2. Inclusion of satisfactory CHP or Caltrans inspection, or documentation that such an inspection is not required.	2	_____
	3. Operating plan describes the following:		
	a) Driver training program includes:		
	New and continuing in-service driver training, including testing and certification	2	_____
	Sensitivity Training	2	_____
	First Aid/CPR	2	_____
	b) Description of dispatching plan	2	_____
	4. Maintenance plan includes the following:		
	a) Pre- and post- trip inspection description	2	_____
b) Preventative and routine maintenance description	2	_____	
5. Inclusion of maintenance and inspection forms.	2	_____	
6. Contingency plans for when equipment is out of service.	2	_____	
7. Operating funds:			
a) Qualified audit for agency included with no instances of non-compliance.	2	_____	
b) Appropriate funding source for local match is identified.	2	_____	
c) All sources of estimated operating income are identified for proposed project.	2	_____	
d) Operating budget for applicant agency includes previous year, current year and upcoming year.	2	_____	
		SUBTOTAL	□

SECTION 4 - Ability of Applicant

Maximum 30 Points

QUANTITATIVE CRITERIA	QUANTITATIVE SCORE	PROJECT SCORE
<p>ADDITIONAL POINTS CAN BE OBTAINED FOR APPLICANTS THAT HAVE NOT PREVIOUSLY BEEN TRANSPORTATION PROVIDERS PROVIDED TOTAL POINTS FOR ABILITY OF APPLICANT CATEGORY DO NOT EXCEED 30 POINTS</p> <p>1. Applicant has experience in providing other (non-transit) services for elderly or individuals with disabilities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) More than 3 years b) 1 to 3 years c) less than 1 year <p>2. Applicant demonstrates support from the local regional transportation planning agency or CTSA (letter must be attached).</p>	<p>2</p> <p>1</p> <p>0</p> <p>2</p>	<p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p>
	<p>TOTAL POINTS <i>Maximum 30 points</i></p>	<input type="text"/>

SECTION 5 - Coordination

Maximum 10 Points

	<i>DEFINITION</i>	<i>QUANTITATIVE CRITERIA</i>	<i>QUANTITATIVE SCORE</i>	<i>PROJECT SCORE</i>
<p><i>Coordination of transit services and other transportation related activities where opportunities exist to coordinate.</i></p>	<p>Determination of an applicant's documented attempts and success in coordinating with other agencies needing and/or providing transportation services.</p> <p>Coordination of services includes:</p> <p>1. Allowing another agency or organization to use the requested vehicle while it is not being used by the applicant or providing transportation services for the clientele of another agency along with the applicant's service.</p> <p>2. Sharing transportation-related services, such as dispatching, driver/maintenance training programs, maps and schedules, etc., with another agency.</p>	<p>1. A letter from the CTSA* or coordinating agency confirming that applicant currently coordinates or proposes to coordinate one or more of the following activities (total not to exceed 10 points):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Shared use of vehicles b) Dispatching or scheduling c) Maintenance d) Staff training programs e) Joint procurement of services and supplies from funding sources other than Section 5310 f) Active participation in local social service transportation planning process g) Back-up transportation h) Coordination of client trip(s) with other transportation agencies <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p>2. CTSA* has provided applicant with letter confirming that no opportunities for coordination currently exist for requested equipment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If applicant is a CTSA or if there is no CTSA, a letter from the RTPA must be submitted. 	<p>2</p> <p>2</p> <p>2</p> <p>2</p> <p>2</p> <p>2</p> <p>2</p> <p>2</p> <p>10</p>	<p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p>
			<p>TOTAL POINTS <i>Maximum 10 points</i></p>	<p><input type="text"/></p>

SECTION 1: PROJECT NEED (*Replacement, Service Expansion, Other Equipment*)

Total Score

SECTION 2: PROJECT NEED (*Unavailable, Insufficient, Inappropriate*)

Total Score

SECTION 3: SERVICE EFFECTIVENESS

Total Score

SECTION 4: ABILITY OF APPLICANT

Total Score

SECTION 5: COORDINATION

Total Score

TOTAL PROJECT SCORE: