MEETING OF THE

REGIONAL TRANSIT
TECHNICAL ADVISORY
COMMITTEE

Wednesday, January 27, 2021
10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

***ZOOM MEETING AND TELECONFERENCE ONLY***

If members of the public wish to review the attachments or have any questions on any of the agenda items, please contact Priscilla Freduah-Agyemang at (213) 236-1973 or email agyemang@scag.ca.gov

SCAG, in accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), will accommodate persons who require a modification of accommodation in order to participate in this meeting. SCAG is also committed to helping people with limited proficiency in the English language access the agency’s essential public information and services. You can request such assistance by calling (213) 236-1908. We request at least 72 hours (three days) notice to provide reasonable accommodations and will make every effort to arrange for assistance as soon as possible.
The Regional Transit Technical Advisory Committee may consider and act upon any of the items listed on the agenda regardless of whether they are listed as information or action items.

1.0 CALL TO ORDER
(Joyce Rooney, City of Redondo Beach, Regional Transit TAC Chair)

2.0 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD – Members of the public desiring to speak on items on the agenda, or items not on the agenda, but within the purview of the Regional Transit Technical Advisory Committee, must fill out and present a speaker’s card to the assistant prior to speaking. Comments will be limited to three minutes. The chair may limit the total time for all comments to twenty (20) minutes.

3.0 RECOGNITION OF PAST CHAIR AND INTRODUCTION OF NEW VICE CHAIR
(Joyce Rooney, Regional Transit TAC Chair)

4.0 RECEIVE AND FILE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Minutes of the September 30, 2020 RTTAC Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2021 Regional Transit Technical Advisory Committee Agenda Look Ahead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>TransAM Webinar (Priscilla Freduah-Agyemang, SCAG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Transit Ridership (Philip Law, Manager, SCAG)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.0 INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>The Effect of Crime on Commuting Patterns in Southern California (Professor John Hipp, UCI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>Coronavirus Response and Relief Supplemental Appropriations Act (CRRSSA) Funding Update (Mariana Pulido, Senior Regional Planner, SCAG)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.3 **MAP 21 Regional Transit Safety Target Setting (PTASP) update**  
(Priscilla Freduah-Agyemang, SCAG)  

5.4 **SCAG Regional Transit Operators Forum**  
(Priscilla Freduah-Agyemang, SCAG)  

6.0 **STAFF REPORT**

6.1 **Alternative and Advanced Fuel Tours**  
(Steve Fox, Senior Regional Planner, SCAG)  

7.0 **ADJOURNMENT**

*The next Regional Transit Technical Advisory Committee meeting is tentatively scheduled for Wednesday, March 31, 2021.*
Regional Transit Technical Advisory Committee (RTTAC)  
of the  
Southern California Association of Governments  

September 30, 2020  

Minutes  

THE FOLLOWING MINUTES ARE A SUMMARY OF ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE REGIONAL TRANSIT TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (RTTAC). AN AUDIO RECORDING OF THE MEETING IS AVAILABLE FOR LISTENING IN SCAG’S OFFICE.  

The Regional Transit Technical Advisory Committee held its meeting telephonically and electronically given public health directives limiting public gatherings due to the threat of COVID-19 and in compliance with the Governor’s recent Executive Order N-29-20. The meeting was called to order by Chair, Gary Hewitt, OCTA.  

Members Participating:  

Gary Hewitt (Chair)  
Joyce Rooney (Vice Chair)  
Zeron Jefferson  
Gillian Gillet  
Lilly Shoup  
Elizabeth Sall  
Rory Vaughn  
Lori Huddleston  
Kevin Kane  
Tracy Beidleman  
Shirley Hsiao  
Christopher MacKechnie  
Manuel Alcala  
Jeni Eddington  
Aaron Bonfilio  
Joe Raquel  
Josh Landis  
Nancy Strickert  
Lori Huddleston  
James Lee  
Alex Porlier  
Adrian Aguilar  
Jennifer Nguyen  
Diana Chang  
Rolando Cruz  
Bill Tsuei  
Beatris Megerdichian  
Geraldina Romo  
Martin Tompkins

Orange County Transportation Authority  
City of Redondo Beach/Beach Cities Transit  
Caltrans District 7  
Caltrans, California Integrated Mobility Program  
Caltrans, California Integrated Mobility Program  
UrbanLabs LLC (Consultant for Cal-ITP)  
Metrolink  
LA Metro  
Victor Valley Transit  
Long Beach Transit  
Long Beach Transit  
Long Beach Transit  
SunLine Transit  
VCTC  
VCTC  
Foothill Transit  
Foothill Transit  
SBCTA  
LACMTA  
Torrance Transit  
Santa Clarita Transit  
Santa Clarita Transit  
Riverside Transit Agency  
Culver City Transit  
Culver City Transit  
Access Services  
Gold Coast Transit District  
Antelope Valley Transportation Authority  
Antelope Valley Transportation Authority
1.0 CALL TO ORDER

Gary Hewitt, OCTA, called the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m. Attending agencies were introduced.

2.0 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

No members of the public requested to comment.

3.0 RECEIVE AND FILE

3.1 Minutes of the July 29, 2020 RTTAC Meeting
3.2 American Public Transportation Association’s (APTA) “Health and Safety Commitments” Programs

4.0 INFORMATION ITEMS

4.1 California Integrated Travel Project (Cal-ITP)

Gillian Gillett, Caltrans Program Manager, reported on Cal-ITP. Ms. Gillett stated their research reflects that transit riders experience challenges including a lack of real time data and reliable travel information; unnecessary barriers for payment and a cumbersome process to access discounts. She noted this effort focusses on some of those customer concerns. She noted that real time data and trip planning involve firstly developing a General Transit Speed Specification (GTSF) standard statewide. Improvements in the rider payment process includes introducing contactless EMV payment which will in turn reduce the cost of digital payments. Equity efforts include supporting an easy-to-use statewide benefit verification program which ought to simplify contactless payment for all users while accommodating fare capping policies. Ms. Gillett noted further efforts include involving transit operators in working groups. She reviewed the working groups’ upcoming schedules and invited member agencies to become involved.
Tracy Beidleman, Long Beach Transit, asked about the eligibility verification demonstration. Ms. Gillett responded that Caltrans would be the sponsoring agency, which would link transit operators and the Department of Motor Vehicles. The DMV has information such as age which would be attributed to the unique rider and applied at fare purchase.

Joyce Rooney, Beach Cities Transit, asked if the age discount could be modified for individual transit agencies and ages. Ms. Gillett responded that current efforts would link only one age for the purposes of a discount.

Kevin Kane, Victor Valley Transit, asked about the response received from private local and regional fare systems. Ms. Gillett responded that most requests from them ask for a standardized fare system across the state as well as a need for the industry to move away from cash payments.

4.2 SCAG-UCLA Ridership Study Phase 2 Update

Mike Manville, UCLA Department of Urban Planning provided an update on the SCAG-UCLA Ridership Study. Professor Manville reported that the study examines the relationship between transit ridership, the housing crisis and neighborhood demographic change. He noted that transit riders represent a small and lower income share of the population. They tend to be concentrated in specific areas. If a crisis in housing pushes those residents away from areas with high quality transit, this may instigate a loss in transit ridership. It was noted indicators of neighborhood change include housing values, housing rents, racial composition, and income with the level of housing burden being a prominent driver. He reviewed the data collection procedure and noted the trend of ridership decline continues. More places lost rides than gained and the losers lost more than the gainers gained. He noted while 25 percent of tracts gained rides, 54 percent lost rides. Losses are concentrated in dense areas and gains near new rail lines.

Regional maps were provided showing areas of transit ridership loss and increase further noting the concentration of riders in specific areas while rider increases occurred most significantly in the 19 tracts that added a rail station. Next, he provided data showing that those tracts with ridership loss also experienced housing costs increases. It was noted that the harder it becomes to live in high transit neighborhoods there is a greater likelihood it will also drive a loss in transit ridership. He reviewed the next steps of the study.

Gary Hewitt, OCTA, asked if information is known about those who leave an area and if they also leave transit patronage. Professor Manville responded that data is being obtained presently which would help determine transit use after a rider has moved.
Joyce Rooney, Beach Cities Transit asked if car ownership data was collected. Professor Manville responded that car ownership data was collected and showed an increase perhaps reflecting that new residents in an area are more likely to favor private automobile use over transit ridership.

4.3 SCAG ADA Paratransit Forecasting Tool Development Update

Bruno Penet, HDR Engineering, provided an update on the ADA Paratransit Forecasting Tool. Mr. Penet reported that the study is concluding and reviewed the demand forecast tool, methodology, data and inputs. Also, how the tool can be used to test the impacts of specific technology innovations. He noted the tool enables operators to forecast ADA paratransit demand through 2045 in the SCAG region. Its capabilities include market analysis, policy scenario analysis, planning and budgeting. The tool can forecast not only ridership but also capacity needs and budget requirements. He noted a flow chart has been developed to show the user how the projections are developed in the tool. He reviewed the functionality of the methodology. Mr. Penet reviewed the data sources obtained to develop the tool and noted that only basic Microsoft Excel knowledge is needed by the user.

Heather Menniger, HDR Engineering, continued the presentation noting the tool can look at the impact of different technology affecting service or future challenges. She reviewed the “Where’s My Ride” function and examined how to test specific scenarios.

Finally, Mr. Penet noted the tool is scalable and can forecast demand for different geographies, either small or the largest ADA providers.

Adrian Aguilar, Santa Clarita, asked if the service can be used for on-demand micro transit service by changing the data set. Mr. Penet responded the tool can be customized to accommodate specific systems by working the input data.

Priscilla Freduah-Agyemang, SCAG staff, stated the tool, the user guide and the recording from the workshop presentation will be available on SCAG’s website.

4.4 FY 2021 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) Update

Priscilla Freduah-Agyemang, SCAG staff, provided and update on FTIP. Ms. Freduah-Agyemang stated the FTIP is a federally mandated list of multimodal transportation investment priorities in the SCAG region over a six-year period. Federal regulations require it to be updated at least every four years, but SCAG updates every two years. She noted the FTIP is prepared in coordination with the County Transportation Commissions and reflects the region’s overall strategy for providing mobility and improving safety. Further, SCAG is required to develop a Transit Asset Management (TAM) plan. She reviewed TAM development. Ms. Freduah-Agyemang noted the FTIP contains approximately 2,000 regional projects.
representing an investment of $35.2 billion. She next reviewed the funding sources noting 56 percent originates locally, 28 percent from the state and 16 percent federal.

5.0 STAFF REPORTS

5.1 Alternative and Advanced Fuel Tours

Steve Fox, SCAG staff, reported SCAG has received a Department of Energy grant through the Clean Cities Program. As part of the work program for the grant, SCAG will be showcasing clean fleet in the region. SCAG has been working with three (3) operators in the region, Foothill Transit, OCTA and SunLine Transit, and will be organizing a story bus and virtual tours due to the pandemic. He noted further information will be available at the SCAG website and updates will be provided at the next meeting.

5.2 SCAG Transit Operators Discussion Forum

Priscilla Freduah-Agyemang, SCAG staff, provided an update on developing a transit operators discussion forum. SCAG wants to continue discussions and dialogue among operators in the region, not only because of COVID but beyond to encourage best practices and peer learning experiences. SCAG is looking forward to including different topics to help facilitate the dialogue. She reported SCAG is exploring issues related to privacy and any other ideas or concerns to make the site user friendly and useful for the group.

5.3 Connect SoCal Update

Priscilla Freduah-Agyemang, SCAG staff, stated at the September 3, 2020 meeting, the Regional Council approved Connect SoCal’s Sustainable Communities portion, which will be forwarded to California Air Resources Board. She reviewed the notations for the plan and discussed next steps including the availability of the plan on the SCAG website.

6.0 ADJOURNMENT

Gary Hewitt, OCTA, adjourned the meeting at 11:40 a.m.
Regional Transit Technical Advisory Committee
2021 Agenda Look Ahead

The RTTAC meets quarterly on the fifth Wednesday of the month. The following is a tentative look-ahead to the proposed RTTAC agendas for 2021. It includes three standing items requested by the Chair and Vice Chair for:

1) Regulatory Compliance – items addressing compliance with MAP - 21 and FAST Act rulemakings, as well as state regulations including SB 375 or ARB fleet rules
2) Performance – items related to understanding why ridership has declined, and highlighting steps local agencies are taking to address these losses
3) Technology and Mobility Innovations – items related to transportation network companies, ITS, advanced technologies, and other mobility innovations

The discussion items below are proposed and speakers have not yet been contacted. Suggestions from RTTAC members are welcome.

Spring 2021 (March 31)
- Regulatory Compliance Standing Item
  o MAP 21 Regional Transit Safety Target Setting
- Performance Standing Item
- Technology and Mobility Innovations Standing Item
  o Connect2Transit (Marin Transit) Riverside Transit contactless payment
  o Regional Dedicated Transit Lanes Study introduction
  o MaaS Feasibility Study White Paper introduction
  o Innovative Clean Transit update
  o Sustainable Communities Program (SCP) Call 3 – Smart Cities and Mobility Innovations
- SCAG’s Equity Work Group (EWG)
- Metro Transit to Parks

Summer 2021 (June 30)
- Regulatory Compliance Standing Item
  o MAP 21 Regional Transit Safety Target Setting
- Performance Standing Item
  o SCAG-UCLA Ridership Study Phase 2 – Neighborhood Change
- Technology and Mobility Innovations Standing Item
  o Regional Microtransit Update –
    ▪ LADOT LA Now
    ▪ Metro Microtransit pilots
    ▪ OC Flex
  o VCTC Cal-ITP mobile ticketing and contactless payment initiative
• Metro NextGen Study Update and Recovery Plan
• High Quality Transit Corridors and 2024 RTP/SCS
• Update on Metro 28 by 28

Fall 2021 (September 29)
• Regulatory Compliance Standing Item
  o MAP 21 Regional Transit Safety Target Setting Update
• Performance Standing Item
  o TBD
• Technology and Mobility Innovations Standing Item
  o Regional Dedicated bus lanes study update
  o MaaS Feasibility study update
To: Regional Transit Technical Advisory Committee (RTTAC)

From: Priscilla Freduah-Agyemang, Senior Regional Planner, 213-236-1973, agyemang@scag.ca.gov

Subject: TransAM Database Workshop (Webinar)

DISCUSSION:

SCAG currently contracts with Cambridge Systematics (CS) to host, support and maintain TransAM, an open source asset management and planning database, as part of the Transit Asset Management (TAM) target setting process. TransAM manages data on regional transit assets with familiar interfaces and features for both SCAG and transit operators to utilize for future regional transit target setting and NTD asset reporting updates.

TAM Database Workshop

SCAG and CS have provided several workshop sessions to introduce transit operators to the TransAM database and to collect asset data for the TAM target setting. As part of the ongoing support and maintenance, CS will continue to educate operators on all the features of TransAM, while identifying opportunities to improve the database to better align with SCAG and the operators’ needs.

A survey was sent to operators seeking inputs on topics to be covered in the next workshop(s). Most responders expressed interest in Asset Replacement/Rehabilitation Policy and how it is used for the State of Good Repair Capital Project Analyzer.

Laura O’Neill, the Project Manager, Cambridge Systematics, will share the details of the webinar with the RTTAC members.
To: Regional Transit Technical Advisory Committee (RTTAC)

From: Philip Law, Manager, Mobility Planning and Management, 213-236-1841, law@scag.ca.gov

Subject: Transit Ridership Update

DISCUSSION:
As part of the RTTAC’s ongoing monitoring of transit ridership trends, SCAG staff has prepared this update depicting the ongoing impact of the COVID-19 pandemic and stay-at-home orders on transit ridership in the months of 2020, compared to 2019. This staff report builds upon SCAG’s “Snapshot of COVID-19 Transportation Impacts in the SCAG Region” released last fall and available at https://scag.ca.gov/post/snapshot-covid-19-transportation-impacts-scag-region. Figure 1 and Table 1 below reflect National Transit Database (NTD) information reported by urban Full Reporters.

Figure 1. Monthly Bus Ridership Change by County, 2019 versus 2020

While bus ridership in Los Angeles and Ventura Counties are down 45% to 47% in November 2020 compared to November 2019, it is down by 60% or more in the other four counties over the same period. Regional bus ridership overall was down by 47% in November 2020 compared

to November 2019. Still, this represents a dramatic improvement from the 71% decline seen in April 2020 versus April 2019.

For November 2020, the latest month of data available from NTD, bus operators across the region were experiencing ridership declines ranging from 32.5% (Long Beach Transit) to 99.9% (Anaheim Transportation Network), as shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Bus Ridership Change by Operator, 2019 versus 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bus Operator</th>
<th>QTR 1</th>
<th>QTR 2</th>
<th>QTR 3</th>
<th>OCT</th>
<th>NOV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anaheim Transportation Network</td>
<td>-28.8%</td>
<td>-100.0%</td>
<td>-99.9%</td>
<td>-99.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antelope Valley Transit Authority</td>
<td>-9.8%</td>
<td>-68.3%</td>
<td>-66.5%</td>
<td>-68.2%</td>
<td>-62.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach Cities Transit (City of Redondo Beach)</td>
<td>-8.7%</td>
<td>-78.7%</td>
<td>-62.6%</td>
<td>-64.9%</td>
<td>-59.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Commerce Municipal Buslines</td>
<td>-24.2%</td>
<td>-84.2%</td>
<td>-77.9%</td>
<td>-75.8%</td>
<td>-78.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Glendale</td>
<td>-14.6%</td>
<td>-81.6%</td>
<td>-73.7%</td>
<td>-77.8%</td>
<td>-62.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation</td>
<td>-21.5%</td>
<td>-69.1%</td>
<td>-67.5%</td>
<td>-58.8%</td>
<td>-60.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Pasadena</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>-58.1%</td>
<td>-45.8%</td>
<td>-46.3%</td>
<td>-46.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culver City Municipal Bus Lines</td>
<td>-21.0%</td>
<td>-70.5%</td>
<td>-60.0%</td>
<td>-64.7%</td>
<td>-63.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foothill Transit</td>
<td>-11.2%</td>
<td>-52.4%</td>
<td>-41.5%</td>
<td>-46.1%</td>
<td>-50.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold Coast Transit</td>
<td>-3.4%</td>
<td>-57.6%</td>
<td>-50.9%</td>
<td>-48.9%</td>
<td>-43.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Gardena Transportation Department</td>
<td>-11.2%</td>
<td>-65.6%</td>
<td>-61.8%</td>
<td>-68.0%</td>
<td>-59.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial County Transportation Commission</td>
<td>-15.2%</td>
<td>-74.5%</td>
<td>-71.2%</td>
<td>-68.4%</td>
<td>-63.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Beach Transit</td>
<td>-5.3%</td>
<td>-72.9%</td>
<td>-49.8%</td>
<td>-48.5%</td>
<td>-32.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles County Metro</td>
<td>-10.1%</td>
<td>-61.3%</td>
<td>-48.6%</td>
<td>-48.8%</td>
<td>-42.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montebello Bus Lines</td>
<td>-13.0%</td>
<td>-84.3%</td>
<td>-66.9%</td>
<td>-70.1%</td>
<td>-70.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwalk Transit System</td>
<td>-3.9%</td>
<td>-70.7%</td>
<td>-53.0%</td>
<td>-54.5%</td>
<td>-52.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omnitrans</td>
<td>-6.6%</td>
<td>-60.1%</td>
<td>-63.0%</td>
<td>-65.9%</td>
<td>-62.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange County Transportation Authority</td>
<td>-8.0%</td>
<td>-59.3%</td>
<td>-45.6%</td>
<td>-48.8%</td>
<td>-49.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside Transit Agency</td>
<td>-7.3%</td>
<td>-65.9%</td>
<td>-59.4%</td>
<td>-65.4%</td>
<td>-66.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clarita Transit</td>
<td>-12.1%</td>
<td>-59.8%</td>
<td>-47.9%</td>
<td>-42.2%</td>
<td>-39.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Monica's Big Blue Bus</td>
<td>-5.1%</td>
<td>-69.9%</td>
<td>-60.7%</td>
<td>-62.2%</td>
<td>-56.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SunLine Transit Agency</td>
<td>-9.3%</td>
<td>-55.8%</td>
<td>-46.1%</td>
<td>-51.9%</td>
<td>-50.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torrance Transit System</td>
<td>-1.3%</td>
<td>-61.6%</td>
<td>-55.3%</td>
<td>-58.8%</td>
<td>-49.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura Intercity Service Transit Authority</td>
<td>-11.9%</td>
<td>-74.8%</td>
<td>-66.9%</td>
<td>-70.5%</td>
<td>-66.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victor Valley Transit Authority</td>
<td>-1.7%</td>
<td>-63.9%</td>
<td>-61.8%</td>
<td>-82.0%</td>
<td>-81.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>-10.2%</td>
<td>-63.5%</td>
<td>-51.7%</td>
<td>-52.4%</td>
<td>-47.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data reported by Metro for its bus and rail systems through December 2020 are reflected in Figure 2 below. Metro bus ridership overall is down by 40% in December 2020 compared to December 2019. As of October 2020, ridership on Metro Rail appears to have diverged from that of Metro Bus. While bus ridership is trending in the right direction, Metro rail ridership has worsened and is down by 60% in December 2020 compared to December 2019.

**Figure 2. Metro Bus and Rail Ridership Change, 2019 versus 2020**

![Metro Bus and Rail Ridership Change, 2019 versus 2020](image)

Source: Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority, [https://isotp.metro.net/MetroRidership/Index.aspx](https://isotp.metro.net/MetroRidership/Index.aspx), as of January 15, 2021.

Metrolink commuter rail ridership has been holding steady, with total system ridership down by 85% in December 2020 compared to December 2019. This is an improvement over the early months of the pandemic, when Metrolink ridership had been down by 90% in April and May 2020 compared to the same period in 2019.

**American Public Transportation Association (APTA) Ridership Trends Dashboard**

APTA and the Transit app developed a dashboard to track demand for transit and estimate real-time changes in ridership. The dashboard compares the differences between pre-pandemic ridership, using ridership figures reported by agencies for the period February 2019 to February 2020, and estimated ridership during the pandemic, statistically modeled using Transit app usage statistics and not actual ridership counts from agencies. The dashboard supports comparisons by
size, region, and agency and includes estimates for 17 of the largest transit agencies in the SCAG region. The dashboard is available at https://transitapp.com/apta.

**NEXT STEPS:**
Staff will continue to provide updates for ridership trends using the NTD’s monthly adjusted data release as the data becomes available.
Metropolitan Futures Initiative (MFI)

The effect of crime on commuting patterns in Southern California

John R. Hipp, UC Irvine
General goals of the MFI

• Study various dimensions of a region (e.g., housing, commuting, economy, crime) and how they combine to produce neighborhood outcomes
• Interdisciplinary research team
• Combines large longitudinal and spatial data sources, and employs cutting edge statistical analyses
• Want to understand how various regions operate, and how they differ.
• Focus particularly on the larger Southern California area.
• John Hipp, Director. Jae Hong Kim, Associate Director.
Public transportation usage over time

• 18 month project collecting data on crime and transit use, and statistical analyses
Figure 1. Percent commuting by public transportation, by county 2006-2015

Los Angeles County
Orange County
Riverside County
San Bernardino County
San Diego County
Ventura County
Imperial County

PUMS household-level data
Who uses public transportation?

• Used PUMS household-level data
• Black residents (compared to white residents):
  – 200% more likely to use public transportation
  – 250% more likely to ride the bus
  – 100% more likely to ride rails
• Latino residents (compared to white residents):
  – 130% more likely to ride the bus
  – 35% more likely to ride rails
• Asian residents (compared to white residents):
  – 50% more likely to ride the bus or rails
Who uses public transportation?

• Immigrants
  – 64% more likely to ride the bus
  – 15% less likely to ride rails
• Someone with a Bachelor’s degree (compared to someone with a high school degree):
  – 23% less likely to ride the bus
  – 50% more likely to ride rails
• Those who are 21 or younger (compared to older residents)
  – much more likely to ride the bus
  – less likely to ride rails
• Those with children
  – 20-30% less likely to ride the bus or rails
Figure 2. Public transportation usage, by age of housing
Transportation usage by county
Percent using Public Transportation in Los Angeles County in 2014-18 ACS
Percent using Public Transportation in Orange County in 2014-18 ACS
Percent using Public Transportation in Riverside County in 2014-18 ACS
Percent using Public Transportation in San Bernardino County in 2014-18 ACS
Percent using Public Transportation in Ventura County in 2014-18 ACS
Percent using Public Transportation in Imperial County in 2014-18 ACS
Which neighborhoods use more public transportation?

- Used data on census tracts in Southern California from 1970 to 2010
Figure 9. Relationship between age of housing and using public transportation
Figure 10. Relationship between population density and using public transportation
Figure 11. Relationship between average income and using public transportation
Which neighborhoods have more ridership?

• More Black residents:
  – more public transportation ridership over all decades
  – although has cut in half in recent years

• More Asian residents
  – Less public transportation ridership in recent decades

• More immigrants
  – more public transportation ridership over all decades
  – although this has cut in half in recent years
The impact of crime on use of public transportation: Los Angeles and Orange County

• Analytic strategy
  – Crime data from the Irvine Lab for the Study of Space and Crime (ILSSC) collecting directly from agencies
  – Bus data for Los Angeles County from 2019 (LA Metro)
  – Bus data for Orange County for 2014-15 (Orange County Transit Agency (OCTA))
  – We computed the number of riders at that particular stop
  – We computed the # of crimes within a ¼ mile buffer and a ½ mile buffer. The results were similar, so we show the ¼ mile results
  – We account for same features as prior models
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rail ridership in LA County</th>
<th>Bus ridership in LA County</th>
<th>Bus ridership in Orange County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily boardings, logged</td>
<td>13.66</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>4.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property crime rate in 1/4 mile buffer, logged</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>5.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent crime rate in 1/4 mile buffer, logged</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated assault rate in 1/4 mile buffer, logged</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery rate in 1/4 mile buffer, logged</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. Models predicting bus and train ridership in Los Angeles County, and bus ridership in Orange County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LA buses</th>
<th>OC buses</th>
<th>LA trains</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property crime rate in 1/4 mile buffer, logged</td>
<td>0.086**</td>
<td>0.030*</td>
<td>-0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4.66)</td>
<td>(2.45)</td>
<td>-(0.99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent crime rate in 1/4 mile buffer, logged</td>
<td>0.173**</td>
<td>0.011*</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(11.0)</td>
<td>(2.12)</td>
<td>-(0.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated assault rate in 1/4 mile buffer, logged</td>
<td>0.149**</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(9.52)</td>
<td>(1.56)</td>
<td>(0.53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery rate in 1/4 mile buffer, logged</td>
<td>0.189**</td>
<td>0.012*</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(13.3)</td>
<td>(2.32)</td>
<td>-(0.38)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Crime and ridership

• LA County bus ridership:
  – More nearby property crimes (1 std. dev) 9.5% more bus ridership
  – More nearby violent crime 26% more
  – More nearby aggravated assaults 22% more
  – More nearby robberies 30% more

• OC bus ridership:
  – More nearby property crime 4% more
  – More nearby violent crime (or robberies) 2% more
High violent crime does not reduce ridership in Latino neighborhoods
Figure 14. Effect of violent crime and percent Black on rail ridership in Los Angeles County

High violent crime reduces ridership in Black neighborhoods
Figure 15. Effect of property crime and percent Black on rail ridership in Los Angeles County

High property crime reduces ridership in Black neighborhoods
Study Conclusions

• No evidence that crime reduces ridership in this study
• We accounted for other neighborhood characteristics that might impact ridership
• Possible explanations?
  – Crime occurs less often in the morning: so less impact on commuting decisions?
  – Nearby crime may be circumvented by nearby parking for riders?
Future Directions

• Would prefer to have longitudinal ridership data (to better assess the impact of crime)
• Would like to have data from other counties as well. Do the same results hold?
• Would be useful to have even more recent data
• Compare crime levels with rider perceptions?
Thank you!

http://mfi.soceco.uci.edu/
Coronavirus Response and Relief Supplemental Appropriations Act of 2021
SCAG Section 5307 Apportionments

Mariana Pulido
Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP)
January 27, 2021

www.scag.ca.gov
The Coronavirus Response and Relief Supplemental Appropriations Act of 2021 (CRRSAA) includes $14 billion in supplemental appropriations allocated to support the transit industry during the COVID-19.

- $13.26 billion to urbanized areas (UZAs) apportioned by the formulas for FTA’s Section 5307 Formula Grant Program and Section 5337 State of Good Repair Program

- No urbanized area may receive more than 75% of the UZA’s 2018 operating cost.
### Section 5307 in the SCAG Region

#### FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

**TABLE 2**

**FY 2021 CRRSAE SECTION 5307 URBANIZED AREA APPORTIONMENTS**  
(including funds apportioned under 5337 - State of Good Repair)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>URBANIZED AREA/STATE</th>
<th>APPORTIONMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,000,000 or more in Population</td>
<td>$12,307,702,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200,000 - 999,999 in Population</td>
<td>$745,539,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 - 199,999 in Population</td>
<td>$208,588,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Total</td>
<td>$13,261,831,064</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Amounts Apportioned to Urbanized Areas 1,000,000 or more in Population:*

| Los Angeles-Long Beach-Anaheim, CA       | $954,900,781    |
| Total                                    | $12,307,702,880 |

*Amounts Apportioned to Urbanized Areas 200,000 to 1 million in Population:*

| Indio-Cathedral City, CA                 | $5,011,454      |
| Santa Clarita, CA                        | $224,351        |
| Total                                    | $745,539,641    |
Questions?

Mariana Pulido
Pulido@scag.ca.gov

www.scag.ca.gov
To: Regional Transit Technical Advisory Committee (RTTAC)

From: Priscilla Freduah-Agyemang, Senior Regional Planner, 213-236-1973, agyemang@scag.ca.gov

Subject: Regional Transit Safety Performance Targets

SUMMARY:

This is an update to previous reports by SCAG staff to the RTTAC on the Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan (PTASP) Final Rule by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). The Final Rule published on July 19, 2018, requires Transit operators who are recipients and subrecipients of the Federal financial assistance under the 49 U.S.C. Chapter 53, and rail transit agencies that are subject to Federal Transit Administration (FTA) State Safety Oversight (SSO) Program, to develop an Agency Safety Plan (ASP). Agencies must certify they have a plan in place, initially by July 20, 2020, now extended to no later than July 20, 2021, due to the current COVID-19 public health emergency. The ASP must also be updated and certified annually by the operator. Exceptions are made for commuter rail agencies regulated by the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA), ferries and recipients that only receive Section 5310 and/or 5311 funds.

The PTASP Final Rule also requires transit agency coordination with the metropolitan and statewide planning process, including sharing safety performance targets with the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) and coordination with the MPO in the selection of MPO safety performance targets. The following guidance is taken from the FTA’s PTASP Technical Assistance Center at https://www.transit.dot.gov/PTASP-TAC. Note that “Metropolitan Transportation Plan” is the same as “Regional Transportation Plan” in the SCAG region.

The PTASP rule requires transit providers to have their certified agency safety plans in place, which includes the first set of required safety performance targets and share these targets with the MPO no later than July 20, 2020. Following the recent Notice of Enforcement Discretion, the compliance deadline has been extended to July 20, 2021. MPOs still have 180 days from receipt of the agency performance targets to prepare their initial public transportation safety performance targets. (23 C.F.R. § 450.306d (3)) MPOs with multiple transit providers should work with the transit providers to identify appropriate targets for that metropolitan area.

The MPO is not required to set new transit safety targets each year but can choose to revisit the MPO’s safety targets based on the schedule for preparation of its system performance report that is part of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP). The first MPO MTP update or amendment to be approved on or after July 20, 2021, must include...
the adopted transit safety targets for the region. The next MTP update, but not each MTP amendment, also includes an updated system performance report that contains the adopted transit safety targets.

DISCUSSION:

As discussed previously SCAG’s approach to developing initial regional safety targets follows the approach used for the initial regional Transit Asset Management (TAM) targets, including coordination with the County Transportation Commissions (CTCs) and the transit agencies on the RTTAC. SCAG staff requested Transit operators in the region share certified safety targets before or by the new compliance deadline, July 2021 to ensure the development of the initial regional safety targets.

SCAG continued to coordinate with the CTCs and the RTTAC to establish the methodology for determining the county averages to further develop the initial regional safety targets, including meetings, and providing updates on the progress.

Notice of Enforcement Discretion

On December 11, 2020, FTA published a second Notice of Enforcement Discretion (Attachment A) for the PTASP due to the COVID-19 public health emergency, which supersedes the initial notice further extending the compliance deadline from December 31, 2020 to July 20, 2021. Recipients or sub-recipients that are unable to certify their ASP will now have until July 20, 2021 to do so.

Submission of Targets

SCAG staff developed a template for transit agencies to better coordinate the submission of the safety targets. Agencies are encouraged to submit their certified targets to SCAG using this template. Operators who decide not to use the template should be willing to provide SCAG any additional information requested and in a timely manner to help the target setting process.

In reviewing some the safety targets submitted SCAG found the following inconsistencies that may further complicate the outcome of the county weighted averages:

- Rate: VRM rate used to calculate targets varies by operator. While some operators use 100,000 others use, for eg. 1,000,000
- Targets by mode: Some operators calculate targets by mode others combined modes and determined one (1) set of targets for all modes
- Calculation errors: Some operators use VRH instead of VRM, others also calculate system reliability dividing major mechanical failures by VRM instead of VRM by Major mechanical failures.
• Target year: different operators tend to use different yearly data as the baseline for determining the targets. The variations include One (1) calendar year, multi-calendar year, (2-5 years), One (1) Fiscal year, Multi-fiscal year averages (3-5 FY averages)
• Operators tend to use “agency definitions” such as accidents per year, or accident insurance claims data, rather than considering NTD thresholds and definitions for fatalities, injuries and safety events.

A summary of safety targets received by SCAG as of January 15, 2021, is shown in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Summary of Agency Safety Plan Certification responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agencies expected to submit Safety targets to SCAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agencies already certified and submitted to SCAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agencies not yet certified and/or submitted to SCAG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Methodology**

SCAG previously reported, as with the TAM targets, safety targets will be determined by county as that represents a reasonable approach, particularly as local funding decisions for transit are made at the county level. Two proposed methodologies for establishing the initial regional safety targets were presented to the RTTAC for feedback at the July 2020 RTTAC meeting:

1. **Weighted average** – This will be determined by the sum of the products of operators’ rates by annual total VRM (the weight) divided by total county annual VRM.

2. **Simple average** – This will be determined by the sum of operators’ reported safety measure (eg. Injuries) divided by total county annual VRM by 100k to get the injury rate per County.

SCAG staff also sought input from the CTCs in November 2020 and based on the feedback received from the CTCs and operators, SCAG will proceed with the county weighted averages to determine the initial regional safety targets. The weighted average methodology will be used to calculate the county averages for the four (4) Safety Performance Measures discussed in the National Safety Plan (NSP), Fatalities, Injuries, Safety events, and System reliability, using 100,000 VRM rate. Weighting of the county averages will be based on the agency’s vehicle revenue miles (VRM). If an operator does not provide VRM, SCAG would default to using the latest available NTD reported VRM. The thresholds for "reportable" fatalities, injuries, and safety events are defined in the National Transit Database (NTD) Safety and Security Reporting Manual. The County averages will also be determined by mode as required, in the Final Rule.
Next Steps

Though the FTA extended the compliance deadline to July 20, 2021, SCAG plans to still certify the initial safety targets by June 2021. This is necessary for SCAG to comply with the July 20, 2021 deadline to incorporate performance-based planning into its RTP and FTIP, as required by the USDOT Metropolitan Planning Final Rule. Attached is the Coordination Timeline (Attachment B) previously shared with the RTTAC.

The initial regional safety targets will be based on the targets received so far and will be updated once all the targets are received.

SCAG will continue to coordinate with the CTCs and RTTAC throughout the coordination process to develop the initial regional safety targets.
NOTICE OF ENFORCEMENT DISCRETION
PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AGENCY SAFETY PLAN REGULATION
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

On July 19, 2018, the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) published the Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan (PTASP) regulation, 49 CFR Part 673, as required by 49 U.S.C. § 5329(d). The effective date of the regulation was July 19, 2019. The PTASP regulation implements a risk-based Safety Management System approach and requires recipients or subrecipients of financial assistance under FTA’s Urbanized Area Formula Program (49 U.S.C. § 5307)\(^1\) and rail transit agencies to establish and certify that they have an Agency Safety Plan in place that meets statutory requirements no later than July 20, 2020, as required by 49 U.S.C. § 5329(d)(1).

On January 31, 2020, the Secretary of Health and Human Services declared a public health emergency under section 319 of the Public Health Service Act\(^2\), and on March 13, 2020, the President issued a Proclamation on Declaring a National Emergency Concerning the Novel Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19). During the COVID-19 public health emergency, transit agencies are providing essential transportation services. While ridership has fallen drastically during this emergency, transit agencies across the country are continuing to provide millions of trips a day to lifeline services and carry healthcare and other essential workers to critical jobs. Accordingly, Federal guidance\(^3\) includes transit workers on an advisory list of essential critical infrastructure workers.

In recognition of the extraordinary operational challenges that the COVID-19 public health emergency presents for transit agencies, FTA published a Notice of Enforcement Discretion on April 22, 2020. The Notice conveys that until after December 31, 2020, FTA will refrain from taking enforcement action if FTA recipients and subrecipients are unable to certify that they have established a compliant Agency Safety Plan.

FTA acknowledges that transit agencies continue to experience substantial operational challenges due to the COVID-19 public health emergency, including reduced or suspended service, and reduced ridership and financial resources. COVID-19 case numbers are high or rising across the Nation, resulting in a foreseeable continuing need for transit providers to focus resources to address the COVID-19 public health emergency. FTA recognizes that these challenges seriously impact the ability of many transit agencies to meet the compliance and

---

\(^1\) FTA has deferred applicability of the PTASP regulation to recipients and subrecipients that only receive funding under the Formula Grants for the Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Formula program (5310) and the Rural Area Formula program (5311). In addition, the PTASP regulation does not apply to recipients and subrecipients that are subject to the safety jurisdiction of another Federal agency, including commuter rail operators and ferry operators. Accordingly, the aforementioned recipients and subrecipients were not required to comply with the PTASP regulation by July 20, 2020.

\(^2\) The Secretary of Health and Human Services renewed the public health emergency determination on April 21, 2020; July 23, 2020; and October 2, 2020.

certification requirements of 49 U.S.C. § 5329(d)(1) and 49 CFR Part 673 by December 31, 2020. This Notice is to advise FTA recipients and subrecipients subject to the PTASP regulation that FTA will refrain from taking enforcement action pursuant to 49 U.S.C. § 5329(g) and the FTA Master Agreement (26) (October 1, 2019) until July 21, 2021, if those FTA recipients and subrecipients are unable to certify that they have established a compliant Agency Safety Plan.

This Notice supersedes FTA’s Notice of Enforcement Discretion dated April 22, 2020, and will remain in effect through July 20, 2021. Notwithstanding this Notice’s exercise of enforcement discretion, FTA expects affected recipients and subrecipients to continue to work toward meeting the PTASP compliance and certification requirements as soon as reasonably practicable under the current circumstances caused by the COVID-19 public health emergency. FTA expects recipients and subrecipients to certify promptly and without delay after establishing a compliant Agency Safety Plan.

This document is a temporary notice of enforcement discretion. Regulated entities may rely on this notice as a safeguard from departmental enforcement as described herein. To the extent this notice includes guidance on how regulated entities may comply with existing regulations, it does not have the force and effect of law and is not meant to bind the regulated entities in any way. Issued

December 11, 2020, in Washington D.C.

K. Jane Williams
Deputy Administrator
Federal Transit Administration
### Attachment B – Initial Regional Safety Target Setting Coordination Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Responsible Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 2020</td>
<td>Kick-off meeting</td>
<td>SCAG &amp; CTCs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 30, 2020</td>
<td>Develop Draft Methodology</td>
<td>SCAG &amp; CTCs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 20, 2020</td>
<td>Receive Safety Targets from transit operators</td>
<td>CTCs &amp; Transit Operators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 29, 2020</td>
<td>Initial Regional Safety Targets Methodology Discussion with RTTAC</td>
<td>SCAG, CTCs &amp; Transit Operators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August, 2020</td>
<td>Refine Methodology, review submitted targets</td>
<td>SCAG, CTCs &amp; Transit Operators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2020</td>
<td>Develop County Averages (IC, OC &amp; SB)</td>
<td>SCAG, CTCs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September, 2020</td>
<td>Review County Averages</td>
<td>SCAG, CTCs &amp; Transit Operators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 3, 2020</td>
<td>PTASP updates and Initial Regional Safety Targets methodology to TC</td>
<td>SCAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2021</td>
<td>Receive remaining Safety Targets from transit operators</td>
<td>CTCs &amp; Transit Operators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2021</td>
<td>Initial Regional Safety Targets update to RTTAC</td>
<td>SCAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2021</td>
<td>*Develop Initial Regional Safety Targets</td>
<td>SCAG, CTCs &amp; Transit Operators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2021</td>
<td>*Review Initial Regional Safety Targets</td>
<td>SCAG, CTCs &amp; Transit Operators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 31, 2021</td>
<td>Initial Regional Safety Targets update to RTTAC</td>
<td>SCAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1, 2021</td>
<td>Initial Regional Safety Targets update to TC</td>
<td>SCAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2021</td>
<td>Initial Regional Safety Targets to RC for final adoption</td>
<td>SCAG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Will include one-on-one meetings with CTCs and transit operator committee meetings*
Regional Transit Technical Advisory Committee (RTTAC)
Regional Transit Safety Performance Targets

Priscilla Freduah–Agyemang
Mobility Planning & Management
Wednesday, January 27, 2021

www.scag.ca.gov
Notice of Enforcement Discretion

- New notice of enforcement deadline published December 11, 2020
  - Extended from December 31, 2021 to July 20, 2021
Target Submission – Update

- Template provided for operators to use
  - Other agency discretion but to include additional information needed to develop safety targets

Issues with Targets submitted:

- Rate
- Targets by mode
- Calculation errors
- Target year
- Definitions for injuries, fatalities and safety events
### Target Submission Update – Cont’d

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agencies expected to submit safety targets to SCAG</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agencies already certified and submitted to SCAG</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agencies not yet certified and/or submitted to SCAG</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Based on responses received as of 1/15/2021
## Targets submitted by Operator & County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Submitted</th>
<th>Submitted (Cont’d)</th>
<th>Expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imperial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ICTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Foothill Transit</td>
<td>Redondo Beach</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Commerce</td>
<td>Santa Clarita</td>
<td>La Mirada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>Gardena – GTrans</td>
<td>LADOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AVTA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Norwalk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Culver City</td>
<td>Montebello</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Torrance Transit</td>
<td>Pomona Valley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Monica BBB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Long Beach Transit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>OCTA</td>
<td></td>
<td>ATN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>Riverside Transit A.</td>
<td></td>
<td>City of Riverside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sunline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Corona</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>Omnitrans</td>
<td></td>
<td>VVTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura</td>
<td>VCTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moorpark Transit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GCTD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Camarillo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Simi Valley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thousand Oaks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Methodology – Update

Option 1: (Preferred)

- Weighted average – This will be determined by the sum of the products of operators’ rates by annual total VRM (the weight) divided by total county annual VRM.

Option 2:

- Simple average – This will be determined by the sum of operators’ reported safety measure (e.g., Injuries) divided by total county annual VRM by 100k to get the injury rate per County.
# Coordination Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Responsible Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 2020</td>
<td>Kick-off meeting</td>
<td>SCAG &amp; CTCs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 30, 2020</td>
<td>Develop Draft Methodology</td>
<td>SCAG &amp; CTCs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 20, 2020</td>
<td>Receive Safety Targets from transit operators</td>
<td>CTCs &amp; Transit Operators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 29, 2020</td>
<td>Initial Regional Safety Targets Methodology Discussion with RTTAC</td>
<td>SCAG, CTCs &amp; Transit Operators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2020</td>
<td>Refine Methodology, review submitted targets</td>
<td>SCAG, CTCs &amp; Transit Operators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2020</td>
<td>Develop County Averages (IC, OC &amp; SB)</td>
<td>SCAG, CTCs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2020</td>
<td>Review County Averages</td>
<td>SCAG, CTCs &amp; Transit Operators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 3, 2020</td>
<td>PTASP updates and Initial Regional Safety Targets methodology to TC</td>
<td>SCAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2021</td>
<td>Receive remaining Safety Targets from transit operators</td>
<td>CTCs &amp; Transit Operators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2021</td>
<td>Initial Regional Safety Targets update to RTTAC</td>
<td>SCAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2021</td>
<td>*Develop Initial Regional Safety Targets</td>
<td>SCAG, CTCs &amp; Transit Operators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2021</td>
<td>*Review Initial Regional Safety Targets</td>
<td>SCAG, CTCs &amp; Transit Operators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 31, 2021</td>
<td>Initial Regional Safety Targets update to RTTAC</td>
<td>SCAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1, 2021</td>
<td>Initial Regional Safety Targets update to TC</td>
<td>SCAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2021</td>
<td>Initial Regional Safety Targets to RC for final adoption</td>
<td>SCAG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next Steps

- Receive and review the additional/remaining targets from agencies
- Apply the methodology to the targets to derive the county weighted averages (will be presented to RTTAC in March)
- Develop the initial regional safety targets
- Review and discuss with CTCs, RTTAC, Transit operator committees
- SCAG Transportation Committee for review and approval
- Regional Council for adoption (June 2021)
Thank you!

Questions?

www.scag.ca.gov
To: Regional Transit Technical Advisory Committee (RTTAC)

From: Priscilla Freduah-Agyemang, Senior Regional Planner, 213-236-1973, agyemang@scag.ca.gov

Subject: Regional Transit Operators Forum

SUMMARY:

This staff report is to introduce the SCAG regional transit operators’ forum to the Regional Transit TAC. The community forum will be a platform for operators to discuss relevant topics related to transit in the region.

DISCUSSION

Following the stay-at-home orders, transit operators across the world, and the region sought for answers related to safety protocols, rear door boarding and fare collection, and overall service changes or modifications, from peer and partner agencies, which resulted in long chain of emails.

At the March 30, 2020 meeting, SCAG introduced the “Service Planning Changes in Response to COVID-19” crowd-sourced google document, which was shared with all operators in the region. The document helped to collect information, facilitate the dialogue among agencies nearby and to coordinate with each other. Though well received by the operators, others were unable to access the google document on work computers due to organization restrictions.

SCAG Regional Transit Operators Forum

The forum will be a discussion space for transit operators in the SCAG region to continue to dialogue and exchange information, share best practices and receive feedback on transit service planning, operations, emerging trends and issues, share ideas on future projects, as well as give operators the opportunity to continue to engage in meaningful discussions and peer-learning experiences on variety of transit topics.

As transit operators move towards recovery from the pandemic, the forum will offer the opportunity to share ideas on how to safely return riders to transit and explore programs, projects, and innovative ideas for reimagining transit.
Membership

The RTTAC members will form the membership of the forum. Membership will be limited to agency staff from public transportation providers in the SCAG region and designees. Other membership to the site will be by request only, pending approval by SCAG staff.

Site Rules and Discussion Guidelines

SCAG wants to ensure the best experience for all members and has included some guidelines for members of the site. The guidelines include community rules, individual and group discussion etiquette, and information on privacy.

Next Steps

RTTAC members will be added to the site after the launch. SCAG staff will be available for comments to improve the site and any other questions members may have. SCAG staff also created frequency asked questions (FAQs) document (Attachment A) to help members navigate the site. The FAQs also specify who and how to contact SCAG staff for assistance.
Frequently Asked Questions

1. *How do I join the community?*

Members of the SCAG Regional Transit Technical Advisory Committee (RTTAC) will automatically be added to the initial member list and will receive an email with the link to join the community.

   a. Click on “Regional Transit Operators Forum” to access the site

   Here’s the site that Priscilla Freduah-Agyemang shared with you.

   **Go to Regional Transit Operators Forum**

   *Follow this site to get updates in your newsfeed.*

   ![Get the SharePoint mobile app!](image)

   b. Existing Microsoft users will get a prompt to enter the Microsoft account credentials.
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After the login screen, members will be directed to the site where a prompt on the right corner will ask to “join the community”. You are now a member and can begin exploring the site.

2. What if I don’t have a Microsoft account?

All users/members of the site must have a Microsoft account. If you don’t have a Microsoft account or your current work email account is not linked to Microsoft, you will get a prompt when the link to the site is accessed to create a Microsoft account. Members who need assistance to complete this process should contact SCAG staff (agyemang@scag.ca.gov).

3. If I am not on the initial member list and did not receive an email invitation from SCAG, how can I join the community?

You should email SCAG staff (agyemang@scag.ca.gov) and request to be added to the community.

4. If I receive a link to the community from someone other than SCAG staff, can I still join the community?

If a link to the site is shared with you, by clicking on the link you will receive a prompt to “request access” to the site. This will also be the case for anyone who may not have been added to the initial member list.

You need permission to access this site.

Awaiting approval. We'll let you know about any updates.

I would like to request to the SCAG Regional Transit Forum - (add name)

Priscilla Fredua-Agyemang
I’d like access, please.

A notification will be sent to SCAG staff to grant you access to the community.
5. **Can I share the site with others after I become a member?**

Yes, the site can be shared however, always remember to share the weblink and not the “Share” button located at the top right corner of the page.

6. **Are there any rules for the community?**

Yes, SCAG has identified rules and etiquette for the community to guide member participation and discussions. It’s important that all members become familiar with and adhere to these guidelines. By clicking on the “About” link located in the left-hand column of the page you will have access to:

a. The purpose of the community,
b. Who makes up the membership of the community,
c. Who to contact for assistance, and
d. Community rules and etiquette, and privacy guidelines.
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7. **What topics can be discussed on the site?**

SCAG created seven (7) categories of topics relevant to transit operations to guide discussions on the site; 1) General, 2) COVID-19, 3) Innovative Clean Transit, 4) Long- and Short-range planning, 5) Operations and Maintenance, 6) Performance Measures, and 7) Service Planning. Members are encouraged to recommend to SCAG staff (See FAQ #12 on how to contact us) any additional topics that may be relevant to the transit operators’ community in the SCAG region.

8. **How do I begin a discussion?**

Once you are ready to begin a discussion, follow these steps:

a. Navigate to “Discussion” in the left-hand column
b. Click on “new discussion” to open a dialogue box

c. In the dialogue box, start drafting your discussion post [steps shown below]:
   1) Enter the subject for the discussion
   2) Enter Discussion
   3) Check box if the discussion is intended to ask a question for response from other members
   4) Select category
   5) By clicking “save” the discussion gets posted and is accessible to all members
d. Formatting text: Clicking in the “Body” of the discussion box, opens the formatting tools similar to Microsoft Word.
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e. The "insert" formatting tool offers members the ability to share files (documents, photos, videos, etc.) and URL links as part of their discussion.

9. **How can I reply to a previous discussion?**

In addition to posting discussions, members can also reply to discussions from other members, which is highly encouraged, to facilitate the dialogue. To reply to a post, you should do the following.

a. Click on "Discussions". Here you will have access to all discussions on the site
b. Go to the discussion item you’d like to reply to. This opens another page
c. Click in the "Add a reply" to activate the text editing tools
d. Type in reply
e. A "reply" will be posted by clicking “Reply”, located at the bottom right of the page
10. **How can I receive notifications about new posts and discussions?**

Alerts are not automatically created once you become a member of the community. Members can create new alerts under the Discussions page to receive notifications using these steps:

a. In the “create alerts” subpage members can specify alerts, delivery method, specify the type of changes to be alerted to, specify criteria for filter alerts and frequency of the alerts.

b. By clicking “ok” after all entries are made, your alert is saved.
11. Can I modify my alerts if I change my mind or no longer want to receive them?

Yes, the “manage alerts” subpage allows members to add new alerts, delete and manage previously created alerts. On this page members can also select alerts created and change previous settings, for eg., frequency for the alerts.

12. If I encounter issues while using the site how do I get assistance?

There are two ways to get assistance

a. The “Contact Us” page on the left corner allows members to email SCAG staff directly. A click will open an email address to contact for all issues related to the site.
13. How do I leave the community?

There are two ways members can leave the community:

1. [Highly Recommended]. Send email to SCAG staff (see FAQ #12) to remove you from the community.
2. Steps to leave the site are described below. Please note, members who use the “Leave this Community” function will no longer be able to post discussions, however, their credentials will still be on the page until removed by SCAG staff.
   a. Navigate to “Members” on the left-hand column
   b. Then click on “Leave this community” in the lower right-hand column
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Purpose
The forum will be a discussion space for transit providers in the SCAG region to continue to dialogue and exchange information, share best practices and receive feedback on transit service planning, operations, emerging trends and issues, share ideas on future projects as well as give operators the opportunity to continue to engage in meaningful discussions and peer-learning experiences on variety of transit topics.
Membership
The RTTAC members will form the membership of the forum. Membership will be limited to agency staff from public transportation providers in the SCAG region and designees. Other membership to the site will be by request only pending approval by SCAG staff.
Site Rules and Discussion Guidelines

SCAG wants to ensure the best experience for all members and has included some guidelines for members of the site. The guidelines include community rules, individual and group discussion etiquette, and information on privacy.
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Next Steps

• Site Tour
• Members will be added to site
• SCAG welcomes any feedback
Thank you!

Questions?