



**STSP Advisory Committee Meeting 1.26.17**

**Meeting Notes**

**Southern California Association of Governments  
Policy Room B, 818 West 7TH ST, 12 th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90017**

<b><u>Phone attendees:</u></b>	<b><u>In-person attendees:</u></b>
Kurt Brotcke – OCTA Elizabeth Scanlon – CalTrain Josh Shaw – California Transit Association Connie Garcia-Weinhardt – SacRT Brent Bernegger – SacRT Dave Goldman – SacRT Azadeh Doherty – SACOG Maureen El Harake – Caltrans D12 Luisa Easter – Caltrans D12 Brian Taylor – UCLA ITS Moses Stites – Fresno County RTA Tilly Chang – San Francisco County Transportation Authority Charlie Anderson – Western Contra Costa Transit Coleen Clementson – SANDAG Darton Ito – SFMTA Len Engel – Antelope Valley Transit Authority Jeff Dawson – SacRT Barro Emerson – Santa Cruz Metro Traci Canfield - SacRT Jennifer Pollom – Shasta Regional Transportation Agency Emily Abrahams – Caltrans DRMT Shannon Simmonds – Caltrans DRMT Jeffrey Damon- SACOG	Juan Matute – UCLA ITS Jasneet Bains – UCLA ITS Teo Wickland – UCLA ITS Philip Law – SCAG Kirk Schneider – Caltrans D7 Jad Andari– Caltrans D7 Rawan Al-Jamal – Caltrans D7 Joe Raquel – Foothill Transit Ed King – Big Blue Bus Alix Bockelman – MTC Roderick Diaz - Metrolink Jila Priebe – Caltrans DRMT Josh Pulverman – Caltrans DRMT

*\*\*UCLA’s notetaker Jasneet Bains totaled callers as they joined and a total 24 total callers called in. A chart on the last page shows join/leave records for callers who joined the webinar.*

## **STSP Baselines Report Presentation**

The presentation by the project manager (Juan Matute) included an overview and timeline of the project, project goals, and findings from the draft Baselines Report and next steps. Throughout the presentation advisory committee members were given the opportunity to comment and ask clarification questions. The presentation was made available to invited attendees 3 days prior to the meeting. Caltrans provided the draft Baselines Report to advisory committee members after the meeting. This email also contained a link to the recorded webinar version of the presentation.

- Comment regarding the total number of agencies in California that carry 89% of ridership was expressed. It was suggested that the total number of agencies in California be provided. (12% of agencies carry 89% of trips)
  - *This number (165 agencies) will be provided in the Baselines Report.*
- Question about Amtrak Thruway service allowing bus-only ticketing and what change in legislature made that possible (Greyhound Bill)
  - *The project team will look into this legislation change.*
- Question about SCAG's ridership and why this region was experiencing such a decline in ridership.
  - *UCLA ITS is working on another research project in collaboration with SCAG to look into this question including immigration trends. This research will be reflected in the STSP recommendations.*
  - *SCAG has examined socioeconomic data to help explain the current ridership trends (driver licenses, vehicle registration, etc.)*
  - *It was also mentioned that LA Metro's ridership survey showed that riders who stopped use listed safety or the perception of safety as the reason. OCTA has also conducted a similar ridership survey.*
- Suggestion to clarify possible discrepancy in commuter bus data reported by NTD since commuter bus was made into a new category and reported separate. (*Change in Transit Service Hours, 2010-2015 figure*)
  - *The project team recognizes this, however NTD data makes this difficult since there was a change in 2010-2011 reporting. Even in the case of least possible change in service hours, similar trends show service hours are moved from local bus to commuter bus.*
- Comment regarding demand-response and if policy or consolidation has led to longer trip lengths
  - *The project team has not examined trip length by provider, but has looked at cost by provider. It seems that the trend is not affecting all agencies equally.*
- Question if a figure similar to the *Inflation-adjusted Operating Costs per Passenger Trip* could be generated for inflation-adjusted operating costs per passenger mile.
  - *The project team has looked into this for the Baselines Report.*
- Comment that MTC still has active programs with Lyft, so a clarification question was raised about what TNC-transit program was cancelled.
  - *The project team will follow up on this in the revised draft of the Baselines Report.*
- Question regarding financial data that allows to display expenditures by mode.

- *The project team noted that to a certain extent SCO data does, however NTD data does allow to display overall expenditures by mode for operations.*
- Follow-up question regarding Southern California's decline in ridership was raised by an advisory committee member, in particular to the effect of issuing driver licenses to undocumented immigrants. It was asked if this decline was due to this and if so, would this decline level off over time.
  - *It was noted that decline began in 2014 and the issuing of driver licenses did not occur until 2016, so there are many other factors to consider like transitioning of immigrants.*
- Question about ridership conclusions and if trends were examined by demographics of riders, equity (who is being served and change over time), and changes in affordability of transit. It was also asked if this information could be provided for top 20 agencies.
  - *Baselines Report is based on NTD data and demographic information is not available.*
  - *However, the previously mentioned UCLA ITS- SCAG project is looking at household travel survey data and travel behavior (variations in income level, household structure, race/ethnicity, and geography)*
- Comment regarding the top 20 agencies and how the core of ridership (as much as 80-90% of all ridership) are carried on about 20% of the routes of these top 20 agencies. It was suggested to examine if the core of the ridership on these routes are experiencing the same trends.
  - *The project team does not have route-level boarding data from agencies and cannot conduct this analysis.*
- Comment concerning TNCs and their possible effect on least productive routes due to their low vehicle frequency. It was noted that this could have policy implications at the state-level.
  - *The project team does not have access to TNC data and cannot determine the impact of TNCs on individual transit routes. The project team will examine the competitive advantage of large public transit agencies in relation to TNCs and automated TNCs.*
- Comment regarding effects of loss of critical service in rural areas where service is already limited due to not meeting ridership levels or revenue projections, but it is the only choice for riders.
- Suggestion to identify demographic trends in California and trends in population in order to anticipate service needs in the future.
  - *The project team includes Department of Finance demographic projections by age group to year 2060 and MPO growth trends in Baselines Report. Findings show vast majority of growth will occur in five MPOs in CA.*

### **Open Discussion of Issues and Priorities**

Following the presentation of findings from draft Baselines Report, advisory committee members were given the opportunity to ask more questions or provide additional comments on Baselines Report and CTP 2040's transit-related goals and measures.

- Comment suggesting that bus-on-shoulder policies from Caltrans would be helpful.
  - *Bus-on-shoulder pilots was a recommendation measure in the last STSP. The project team will revisit recommendations that were included in the last STSP.*

- Concern regarding the strategies that will achieve goal of doubling transit ridership, in particular measures suggested as part of slide 60 were expressed as underwhelming with respect to achieving stability in revenues and streamlining process for federal grants to provide more transit. This comment was followed up on pricing the competitive system and how transit can be more cost and time competitive (pricing of non-transit options, commuter benefit programs, trip cap programs, etc.).
- Suggestion that travel time advantages offered to transit be included to close gap between transit and or private mobility. This suggestion was followed up by a comment on how sometimes express toll lanes are slower than general lanes at peak hours, so ways to incentive more to choose transit instead would be beneficial.
- Comment about institutional incentives was raised and ways to integrate transit with other departments to obtain their support for transit like public works, traffic engineering, and state highway agencies. This was followed up by questions on how to incentivize multiple transit providers for intermodal transit facilities, ways for seamless fare collection through state clearinghouses, and cross referencing with State Rail Plan for improved integration between passenger rail and mass transit. It was asked if there were models that the state could provide.
- Comment regarding the concern that transit agencies face pressures to meet multiple goals (state of good repair, safety, clean fuel, etc.) and how these other goals ranked compared to the goal of increasing ridership in the STSP update.
- Suggestion that pricing of the non-transit system be added as a category within the goals/objectives of the CTP 2040.
- Comment regarding the cost trends (Fuel, Insurance Costs Growing Fastest figure), where CA Transit Insurance Pool saw sharp decline in 2015 when membership experience in insurance pool worsened (losses up) and growing exposure for all public entities in the state. It was suggested the project team check against NTD data since beginning in 2014 membership experience has gone in a different direction than shown in figure (upward direction). This could be important for insurance pool membership because it could lead to withdrawal.