MEETING OF THE

REGIONAL TRANSIT TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Wednesday, June 30, 2021
10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

***ZOOM MEETING AND TELECONFERENCE ONLY***

VIDEOCONFERENCE AVAILABLE
***Zoom Meeting and Teleconference Only***

TELECONFERENCE IS AVAILABLE
TO JOIN THE MEETING: https://scag.zoom.us/j/220315897
CONFERENCE NUMBER: +1 669 900 6833 US Toll (West Coast)
Meeting ID: 220 315 897

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) 630-1402. 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.
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 **RECEIVE AND FILE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Minutes of the March 31, 2021, RTTAC Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>MAP 21 Regional Transit Safety Target Setting (PTASP) update (Priscilla Frewah-Agyemang, Senior Regional Planner, SCAG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Regional Transit Operators Forum (Priscilla Frewah-Agyemang, SCAG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>FTA Sustainable Transit for a Healthy Planet Challenge (Priscilla Frewah-Agyemang, SCAG)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.0 **INFORMATIONAL ITEM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td><strong>California Integrated Travel Project (Cal-ITP) Update</strong> (Gillian Gillet, Caltrans)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td><strong>Bakersfield/Via Partnership (Integrated Microtransit, Paratransit, NEMT)</strong> (Robert Williams, Golden Empire Transit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td><strong>Automated Buses Deployment</strong> (Dennis Solensky, Connecticut DOT)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The next Regional Transit Technical Advisory Committee meeting is tentatively scheduled for Wednesday, September 29, 2021.
Regional Transit Technical Advisory Committee (RTTAC)  
of the  
Southern California Association of Governments  
March 31, 2021  

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, Joyce Rooney, Beach Cities Transit.

Members Participating:

Joyce Rooney (Chair) City of Redondo Beach/Beach Cities Transit
Kristin Warsinski (Vice Chair) Riverside Transit Agency
Geraldina Romo Antelope Valley Transportation Authority
Martin Tompkins Antelope Valley Transportation Authority
Gerardo Sanabria Corona Transit Service
Kaitlyn Zhang Culver City Bus
Robin Martin Culver City Bus
Joseph Raquel Foothill Transit
Gustavo Gomez Imperial County Transportation Commission
Teresa Wong LACMTA
Tracy Beidleman Long Beach Transit
Sara Baumann Long Beach Transit
Rory Vaughn Metrolink
Abigail Marin Montebello Bus Lines
Anthony Rodriguez Montebello Bus Lines
Derek Donnell Norwalk Transit System
Charlie Larwood OCTA
Warren Whiteaker OCTA
Kurt Brotcke OCTA
Connie Raya Omnitrans
Jeremiah Bryant Omnitrans
Anna Jaiswal Omnitrans
Martha Masters Riverside County Transportation Commission
Lorelle Moe-Luna Riverside County Transportation Commission
Jennifer Nguyen Riverside Transit Agency
Nancy Strickert SBCTA
Adrian Aguilar Santa Clarita Transit
Susan Lipman Santa Clarita Transit
Christopher Latham City of Simi Valley
1.0 CALL TO ORDER

Joyce Rooney, City of Redondo Beach, order at 10:05 a.m.

2.0 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

No members of the public requested to comment.

3.0 RECEIVE AND FILE

3.1 Minutes of the January 27, 2021 RTTAC Meeting
3.2 TCRP Research Report 226 – An update on Public Transportation’s Impacts on Greenhouse Gas Emissions
3.3 Regional Transit Operators Forum

4.0 INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

4.1 Connect2Transit

Cody Lowe, Marin Transit reported on their Connect2Transit program. He noted Marin County is north of San Francisco and reviewed the bus, rail and ferry transit providers and services. He reviewed the first iteration of the program and its goal to increase access to transit using a first/last mile program using a TNC. The results of the initial pilot did not meet targets and he described the response including modifying technology options. He noted Connect2Transit provides on-demand links to microtransit and real-time public transit services within the Uber app. Users view not only Uber options but local transit options and fares. It provides a comparison of the different services offered as well as a door-to-door mobility service. In addition to the Uber app, a call center option is available.
He reviewed the fare structure and options as well as passenger use of the system since inception.

4.2 Advanced and Clean Fuel Initiatives

Lauren Skiver, CEO/General Manager, SunLine Transit Agency, reported on their alternative fuel buses and infrastructure. She noted the agency is undergoing a redesign post COVID-19 to make their service network faster with fewer transfers and adding a line to Cal State San Bernardino in addition to providing rideshare service using taxis. She reviewed the service components including consolidated fixed route network, Sunride, commuter link and Route 1x. She noted a goal is to have each service at 15 minutes or less. Goals include capturing new riders, supporting the economy and supporting mixed-use neighborhoods.

Ms. Skiver introduced their zero emissions efforts and reviewed the benefits of the program. She reviewed the proposed solar to hydrogen effort which will include a solar farm on the facility to power hydrogen production. She reported on their West Coast Center for Zero Emission Technology, which serves as an on-site trade school to train workers in zero emission infrastructure.

4.3 Zero Emission Bus (ZEB) Rollout Plan

Connie Raya, Omnitrans reported on their ZEB rollout plan. She noted the two types of zero emission buses include battery electric (BEB) and Fuel Cell Electric (FCEB). She noted Omnitrans is purchasing BEBs with additional future purchases planned. Ms. Raya reviewed the California Air Resources Board (CARB) Innovative Clean Transit Regulation and noted 25 percent of new bus purchases must be Zero Emission after 2023 and 50 percent by 2026, 100 percent by 2040. She reviewed the infrastructure modifications need for charging stations commensurate with the BEBs acquired for the fleet. Next, she reviewed operator training goals as well as mechanics training as additional activities toward implementing the electric busses. She noted the cost of conversion is estimated at $223 million and reviewed supplemental funding sources available to agencies.

4.4 Coronavirus Response and Relief Supplemental Appropriations Act (CRRSSA) Funding Update

Naresh Amatya, SCAG staff, reported on the upcoming CRRSSA and ARPA funding acts and associated apportionments. He noted since the onset of COVID the federal government has passed three rounds of funding appropriations including funding to support the country’s transit agencies. Further, in urban areas, funds are being distributed using existing formulas. Mr. Amatya noted the first round of funding or the CARES Act included $1.4 billion to designated Urbanized Zone Area (UZA) with SCAG being the designated recipient. Those funds were distributed in May 2020. He stated the second funding round or CRRSSA states that no UZA shall receive no more than 75 percent of operating cost. He noted the eligible UZAs received approximately $960 million in funding. He stated the
Regional Transit Technical Advisory Committee (RTTAC) – March 31, 2021

third funding cycle, ARPA stipulates that no UZA shall receive no more than 132% of its operating cost. SCAG staff recommends that the 132 percent guide is utilized when distributing funds to eligible counties. He noted there is consensus among the county transportation commissions about the recommended funding formulas. Further, the recommendation will be brought to the Transportation Committee for approval.

4.5 Sustainable Communities Program (SCP) Call 3 – Smart Cities and Mobility Innovations

Marisa Laderach, SCAG staff, reported on the 2020/2021 Sustainable Communities Program – Smart Cities & Mobility Innovations Call for Applications. Ms. Laderach noted the SCP allows SCAG to partner with member agencies to provide direct technical assistance with a focus on active transportation, multimodal planning efforts, sustainability, land use and planning for affordable housing. In addition, it seeks to promote efforts in smart cities and job centers, Go Zones, shared mobility and mobility as a service. Further, funding will be directed toward local jurisdictions that seek to use technology and innovation by implementing curb space management measures.

Ms. Laderach noted that cities have been struggling with curb space issues so an effort is being made to assess curb space to inform future solutions. The effort seeks to support mobility and the local economy as well as enhance public spaces. She noted analysis of curb space will include understanding the needs of local businesses who use them. Additionally, equity is examined including use of transit and transportation network companies. She noted the focus areas include curb space data collection and inventory, technology assessment and plan, parking management plan and permitting process evaluation. She reviewed the eligible agencies and Call for Applications schedule.

4.6 SCAG Racial Equity Action Plan

Dorothy Le Suchkova, SCAG staff, reported that the Racial Equity Early Action Plan. She noted the objectives include defining equity, equity inventory, equity framework, creation of a workplace and public participation. The equity framework seeks to identify short and long-term actions which extends the life of the effort beyond the one year special committee. She noted the goals include shifting organizational culture, center racial equity in regional planning, encourage racial equity in local planning practices and to activate and amplify the effort going forward. Activities include integrating new practices as well as integrate and institutionalize processes. She reviewed the next steps and asked for the committee’s feedback by participating in a survey.

4.4 MAP 21 Regional Transit Safety Target Setting (PTASP) Update

Priscilla Freduah-Agyemang, SCAG staff, provided an update on MAP 21 Regional Transit Safety Target Setting. She noted the final rule compliance deadline has been extended to July 20 2021, and briefed the committee on the target setting effort. She discussed the initial regional transit safety targets was scheduled to the SCAG Transportation Committee (TC) to recommend approval by the Regional Council in June and that any
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issues raised at this meeting will be reported verbally to TC. She mentioned staff will continue to work with the CTCs and the transit operators to update the targets for the 2024 RTP.

**STAFF REPORTS**

6.1 **SCAG General Assembly Update**
Priscilla Freduah-Agyemang, SCAG staff, provided an update on SCAGs 2021 General Assembly May 5th which will be conducted virtually.

5.0 **ADJOURNMENT**
Joyce Rooney, Beach Cities Transit, adjourned the meeting at 11:51 a.m.
RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Approve the proposed initial regional transit safety targets.

STRATEGIC PLAN:
This item supports the following Strategic Plan Goal 1: Produce innovative solutions that improve the quality of life for Southern Californians.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
On April 1, 2021, the Transportation Committee (TC) unanimously approved recommending to the Regional Council to approve the proposed initial regional transit safety targets. SCAG staff coordinated with the County Transportation Commissions (CTCs) and transit operators through the Regional Transit Technical Advisory Committee (RTTAC) to develop the initial regional transit safety targets in accordance with federal metropolitan planning regulations. The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) published a Final Rule for Public Transportation Agency Safety Plans (PTASP) as authorized by the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP–21). The Final Rule requires states and certain providers of public transportation systems that receive Federal financial assistance under 49 U.S.C. Chapter 53 to develop Public Transportation Agency Safety Plans, and requires Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs), states and transit providers to collaborate, to the maximum extent practicable, in the development of safety performance targets. The development and implementation of safety plans will help ensure that public transportation systems are safe nationwide. The Final Rule is available at: https://www.transit.dot.gov/PTASP.

In accordance with the April 1, 2021 TC action, staff recommends adopting the initial regional transit safety targets described in this report.

BACKGROUND:
Staff reported to the TC on September 3, 2020 regarding the development of the initial regional transit safety targets, including the FTA rulemaking processes to improve safety on the public
transportation systems and to ensure better oversight of recipients of the Federal transit funds. The PTASP Final Rule, published on July 19, 2018, requires Transit operators who are recipients and subrecipients of the Federal financial assistance under 49 U.S.C. Chapter 53, and rail transit agencies that are subject to FTA’s State Safety Oversight (SSO) Program, to develop an Agency Safety Plan (ASP). Exempt from this requirement are commuter rail agencies regulated by the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA), ferries and recipients that only receive Section 5310 and/or 5311 funds. Agencies must certify they have a plan in place, initially by July 20, 2020. Due to the COVID-19 public health emergency, FTA published a Notice of Enforcement Discretion which extended the initial compliance deadline to December 31, 2020 (Attachment 1), and then to July 20, 2021 (Attachment 2).

The PTASP Final Rule also requires transit agency coordination with the metropolitan and statewide planning process, including sharing safety performance targets with the MPO and coordination with the MPO in the selection of MPO safety performance targets. In summary, MPOs have 180 days from receipt of the agency targets to prepare their initial regional safety performance targets. The first MPO Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) update or amendment to be approved on or after July 20, 2021, must include the adopted transit safety targets for the region. Each subsequent full RTP update (not an amendment) must include adopted transit safety targets in its system performance report.

States must draft and certify Safety Plans on behalf of small public transportation providers, defined as a recipient or subrecipient of Federal financial assistance under 49 U.S.C. 5307, that has one hundred (100) or fewer vehicles in peak revenue service and does not operate a rail fixed guideway public transportation system. Operators can choose to opt out of the state plan to develop and certify their own. As of March 2021, Caltrans notified SCAG that eleven (11) agencies in the region have opted out of the Caltrans plan. Caltrans has certified and/or is yet to certify five (5).

**DISCUSSION:**
SCAG staff’s approach to developing the initial regional transit safety targets follows the approach previously approved by the Regional Council and used for the initial regional Transit Asset Management (TAM) targets, including coordination with the County Transportation Commissions (CTCs) and the transit agencies on the Regional Transit Technical Advisory Committee (RTTAC).

**Methodology**
As with the TAM targets, the initial regional safety targets were determined using county weighted averages of the operators’ targets. The CTCs and transit operators on the RTTAC concurred that this represents a reasonable approach, particularly as local funding decisions for transit are made at the county level.
The weighted average methodology was used to calculate the county averages for the four (4) required safety performance measures discussed in the National Safety Plan: fatalities, injuries, safety events, and system reliability. Weighting of the county averages is based on the operator’s vehicle revenue miles (VRM). Where an operator did not provide VRM, SCAG defaulted to the latest available reported VRM in the National Transit Database (NTD). The thresholds for "reportable" fatalities, injuries, and safety events are defined in the NTD Safety and Security Reporting Manual. The county averages were calculated by mode, as required in the Final Rule.

**Submission of Operator Targets**

SCAG staff developed a template for transit providers to better coordinate the submission of the safety targets and to ensure SCAG receives all the information needed to develop the initial regional safety targets. As of March 2021, out of the thirty-two (32) operators requested to submit their targets, SCAG has received thirty (30). SCAG staff will continue to coordinate with the remaining operators to collect their data in preparation for the 2024 RTP.

In reviewing the safety targets submitted, SCAG staff provided assistance to the operators to ensure consistency regarding following:

- **Rate**: Operators used different VRM rates to calculate targets.
- **Targets by mode**: The Final Rule specifies targets must be determined by mode however, some operators combined modes and determined one (1) set of targets.
- **General calculation errors**: For some of the targets operators were using Vehicle Revenue Hours (VRH) instead of VRM, others also calculated system reliability dividing major mechanical failures by VRM instead of VRM by Major mechanical failures.
- **Target baseline year**: Baseline year for determining targets varied by operator. These included, one (1) calendar year, multi-calendar years, one (1) Fiscal year, and multi-fiscal year averages (eg. 3-5 FY averages)
- **Agency definitions versus NTD thresholds**: The FTA specified operators to use NTD thresholds and definitions for fatalities, injuries, and safety events.
- **Data Tracking**: Many bus operators lacked the mechanism for tracking road calls and safety events.

SCAG staff will continue to monitor and support the transit agencies when developing the regional safety targets to be included in the 2024 RTP.

**Initial Regional Transit Safety Targets**

The county targets and initial regional safety targets presented here are based on the operators’ targets received so far. Since the TC meeting on April 1, the targets (values) submitted were
updated based on the most current data received from the operators. The required safety performance measures are as follows.

- **Fatalities**: Total number of fatalities reported to NTD and rate per total vehicle revenue miles (VRM) by mode.
- **Injuries**: Total number of injuries reported to NTD and rate per total VRM by mode.
- **Safety Events**: Total number of safety events reported to NTD and rate per total VRM by mode.
- **System Reliability**: Mean distance between major mechanical failures by mode.

Attachment 3 includes all the transit safety targets submitted to SCAG by operator and county, organized by the safety performance measures. Bus mode includes fixed route and commuter bus services. Demand Response mode includes all demand response modes: American with Disabilities Act (ADA) services, demand response taxi and general purpose demand response services.

- **Imperial County Targets**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measures</th>
<th>Bus</th>
<th>Demand Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fatalities (Total)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatalities (rate per 100k VRM)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injuries (Total)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injuries (rate per 100k VRM)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Events</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Events (rate per 100k VRM)</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Reliability (Mean Distance between failures)</td>
<td>42,264</td>
<td>34,998</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Los Angeles County Targets**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measures</th>
<th>Bus</th>
<th>Demand Response</th>
<th>Rail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fatalities (Total)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatalities (rate per 100k VRM)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injuries (Total)</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injuries (rate per 100k VRM)</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Events</td>
<td>773</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Events (rate per 100k VRM)</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Reliability (Mean Distance between failures)</td>
<td>9,246</td>
<td>55,594</td>
<td>41,980</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Orange County Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measures</th>
<th>Bus</th>
<th>Demand Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fatalities (Total)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatalities (rate per 100k VRM)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injuries (Total)</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injuries (rate per 100k VRM)</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Events</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Events (rate per 100k VRM)</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Reliability (Mean Distance between failures)</td>
<td>14,848</td>
<td>14,823</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Riverside County Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measures</th>
<th>Bus</th>
<th>Demand Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fatalities (Total)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatalities (rate per 100k VRM)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injuries (Total)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injuries (rate per 100k VRM)</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Events</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Events (rate per 100k VRM)</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Reliability (Mean Distance between failures)</td>
<td>9,261</td>
<td>13,219</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### San Bernardino County Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measures</th>
<th>Bus</th>
<th>Demand Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fatalities (Total)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatalities (rate per 100k VRM)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injuries (Total)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injuries (rate per 100k VRM)</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Events</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Events (rate per 100k VRM)</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Reliability (Mean Distance between failures)</td>
<td>23,933</td>
<td>34,592</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ventura County Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measures</th>
<th>Bus</th>
<th>Demand Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance Measures</td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>Demand Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatalities (Total)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatalities (rate per 100k VRM)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injuries (Total)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injuries (rate per 100k VRM)</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Events</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Events (rate per 100k VRM)</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Reliability (Mean Distance between failures)</td>
<td>23,312</td>
<td>31,593</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- SCAG Region Targets

The safety targets indicate the commitment of the transit operators to support safety management and provide resources and training, integrate safety as a primary principle and responsibility for all staff, and to ensure data-driven compliance measures and realistic targets inform operations and safety performance standards. They also reflect the aspirational goals towards zero (0) injuries, zero (0) fatalities, zero (0) safety events and fewer mechanical breakdowns between miles travelled to provide safe and reliable public transportation in Southern California region.

**Relationship between the Safety Performance and Transit Asset Management (TAM)**

The safety and overall performance of a public transit systems depend, to an extent, on the condition of its assets. When transit assets are not in a state of good repair, the consequences include increased safety risks (injuries, fatalities, safety events), decreased system reliability, leading to higher maintenance costs, and lower system performance.

**Next Steps**
Though the FTA extended the transit operators’ compliance deadline to July 20, 2021, SCAG staff is requesting the Regional Council adopt the initial safety targets by June 2021. This is necessary to comply with the separate July 20, 2021 deadline to incorporate performance-based planning into the RTP and Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP), as required by the Metropolitan Transportation Planning Final Rule. SCAG staff will continue to coordinate with the CTCs and RTTAC to update the regional transit safety targets that will be included in the 2024 RTP.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**
Funding for staff work on this issue is included in FY20/21 OWP 140.0121.01 Transit Planning.

**ATTACHMENT(S):**
1. PTASP Regulation - Notice of Enforcement Discretion (April 22, 2020)
2. PTASP Regulation - Notice of Enforcement Discretion (December 11, 2020)
3. Transit Operator Targets Submitted to SCAG by County
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. § Section 5307) 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, 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 includes transit workers on an advisory list of essential critical infrastructure workers. Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency, Memorandum on Identification of Essential Critical Infrastructure Workers During COVID-19 Response. https://www.cisa.gov/publication/guidance-essential-critical-infrastructure-workforce.

The FTA acknowledges that current and anticipated disruptions to transit agencies due to the extraordinary operational challenges presented by the COVID-19 public health emergency are seriously impacting their ability to meet the compliance and certification requirements of 49 U.S.C. § 5329(d)(1) and 49 CFR Part 673 by July 20, 2020. This Notice is to advise FTA recipients and subrecipients subject to the PTASP regulation that until December 31, 2020, FTA will refrain from taking enforcement action pursuant to 49 U.S.C. § 5329(g) and the FTA Master Agreement (26) (October 1, 2019) if those FTA recipients and subrecipients are unable to certify that they have established a compliant Agency Safety Plan.

This Notice will remain in effect until December 31, 2020. Notwithstanding this Notice’s exercise of enforcement discretion, FTA expects affected recipients and subrecipients to continue to work

---

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.
toward meeting the July 20, 2020, effective date to the extent practical under the current circumstances caused by the COVID-19 public health emergency.

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

April 4/22/20 2020, in Washington D.C.

KIMBERLY
JANE WILLIAMS

K. Jane Williams, Acting Administrator
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
Initial Regional Transit Safety Targets

Bus mode includes fixed route and commuter services. Demand Response mode includes all demand response modes: American with Disabilities Act (ADA) services, demand response Taxi and general purpose demand response services.

### Imperial County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County/Mode</th>
<th>Operator</th>
<th>Fatalities</th>
<th>Fatalities (per 100k VRM)</th>
<th>Injuries</th>
<th>Injuries (per 100k VRM)</th>
<th>Safety Events</th>
<th>Safety Events (per 100k VRM)</th>
<th>System Reliability (VRM/ Failures)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>ICTC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>42,264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand Response</td>
<td>ICTC (ADA)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>35,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ICTC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>14,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ICTC - Med to SD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70,515</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Los Angeles County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County/Mode</th>
<th>Operator</th>
<th>Fatalities</th>
<th>Fatalities (per 100k VRM)</th>
<th>Injuries</th>
<th>Injuries (per 100k VRM)</th>
<th>Safety Events</th>
<th>Safety Events (per 100k VRM)</th>
<th>System Reliability (VRM/ Failures)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>Antelope Valley Transit Authority</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>9,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Arcadia Transit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>163,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beach Cities Transit (City of Redondo Beach)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>7.87</td>
<td>2,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Commerce Municipal Bus Lines</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>324,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Culver CityBus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foothill Transit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>11,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gardena Municipal Bus Lines</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Long Beach Transit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>3,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2,749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Montebello BL(Local)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>41,980</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Initial Regional Transit Safety Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Demand</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Montebello BusLines (Express)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwalk Transit System</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santa Clarita Transit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santa Monica Big Blue Bus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torrance Transit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antelope Valley Transit Authority</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Arcadia Transit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach Cities Transit (City of Redondo Beach)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Commerce Municipal Bus Lines</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culver CityBus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardena Municipal Bus Lines</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of LaMirada Transit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montebello Bus Lines DR-Taxi</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santa Clarita Transit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santa Monica BBB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torrance Transit (Taxi - Bell cab)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torrance Transit (Taxi - Contractor - All Yellow)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torrance Transit (Taxi - Contractor - South Bay Yellow)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Demand Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Demand</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Montebello BusLines (Express)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwalk Transit System</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santa Clarita Transit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santa Monica Big Blue Bus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torrance Transit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antelope Valley Transit Authority</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Arcadia Transit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach Cities Transit (City of Redondo Beach)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Commerce Municipal Bus Lines</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culver CityBus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardena Municipal Bus Lines</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of LaMirada Transit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montebello Bus Lines DR-Taxi</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santa Clarita Transit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santa Monica BBB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torrance Transit (Taxi - Bell cab)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torrance Transit (Taxi - Contractor - All Yellow)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torrance Transit (Taxi - Contractor - South Bay Yellow)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Demand</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Montebello BusLines (Express)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwalk Transit System</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santa Clarita Transit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santa Monica Big Blue Bus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torrance Transit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antelope Valley Transit Authority</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Arcadia Transit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach Cities Transit (City of Redondo Beach)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Commerce Municipal Bus Lines</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culver CityBus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardena Municipal Bus Lines</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of LaMirada Transit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montebello Bus Lines DR-Taxi</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santa Clarita Transit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santa Monica BBB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torrance Transit (Taxi - Bell cab)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torrance Transit (Taxi - Contractor - All Yellow)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torrance Transit (Taxi - Contractor - South Bay Yellow)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Initial Regional Transit Safety Targets

### Orange County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County/Mode</th>
<th>Operator</th>
<th>Fatalities</th>
<th>Fatalities (per 100k VRM)</th>
<th>Injuries</th>
<th>Injuries (per 100k VRM)</th>
<th>Safety Events</th>
<th>Safety Events (per 100k VRM)</th>
<th>System Reliability (VRM/ Failures)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>Anaheim Transit Network</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>15,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>14,832</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Demand Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operator</th>
<th>Fatalities</th>
<th>Fatalities (per 100k VRM)</th>
<th>Injuries</th>
<th>Injuries (per 100k VRM)</th>
<th>Safety Events</th>
<th>Safety Events (per 100k VRM)</th>
<th>System Reliability (VRM/ Failures)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OCTA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14,823</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Riverside County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County/Mode</th>
<th>Operator</th>
<th>Fatalities</th>
<th>Fatalities (per 100k VRM)</th>
<th>Injuries</th>
<th>Injuries (per 100k VRM)</th>
<th>Safety Events</th>
<th>Safety Events (per 100k VRM)</th>
<th>System Reliability (VRM/ Failures)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>City of Corona Transit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>16,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Riverside Transit Agency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Riverside Transit Agency (Contracted)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SunLine Transit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>7,032</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Demand Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operator</th>
<th>Fatalities</th>
<th>Fatalities (per 100k VRM)</th>
<th>Injuries</th>
<th>Injuries (per 100k VRM)</th>
<th>Safety Events</th>
<th>Safety Events (per 100k VRM)</th>
<th>System Reliability (VRM/ Failures)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Corona Transit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>27,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Riverside Transit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>24,929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside Transit Agency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SunLine Transit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>11,756</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Initial Regional Transit Safety Targets

### San Bernardino County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County/Mode</th>
<th>Operator</th>
<th>Fatalities</th>
<th>Fatalities (per 100k VRM)</th>
<th>Injuries</th>
<th>Injuries (per 100k VRM)</th>
<th>Safety Events</th>
<th>Safety Events (per 100k VRM)</th>
<th>System Reliability (VRM/Failures)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bus</strong></td>
<td>Omnitrans</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>22,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victor Valley Transit Authority</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>27,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demand Response</strong></td>
<td>Omnitrans</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>25,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victor Valley Transit Authority</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ventura County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County/Mode</th>
<th>Operator</th>
<th>Fatalities</th>
<th>Fatalities (per 100k VRM)</th>
<th>Injuries</th>
<th>Injuries (per 100k VRM)</th>
<th>Safety Events</th>
<th>Safety Events (per 100k VRM)</th>
<th>System Reliability (VRM/Failures)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bus</strong></td>
<td>Camarillo Area Transit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gold Coast Transit District</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>27,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moorpark</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Simi Valley</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thousand Oaks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Camarillo</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ventura County Transportation Commission (VCTC)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ventura County Transportation Commission (Commuter)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demand Response</strong></td>
<td>Camarillo Area Transit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GCTD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>51,439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Moorpark Transit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Simi Valley Transit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>2,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Thousand Oaks Transit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Initial Regional Transit Safety Targets

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VCTC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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

DISCUSSION:

This is to remind the RTTAC members of the SCAG regional transit operators’ forum, which was introduced and launched at the January 27 meeting. The community forum is a platform for operators to discuss relevant topics related to transit in the region.

The forum is 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.

The membership is made up of the RTTAC members and is 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. Every RTTAC member should have received an email with the link to the community.

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.

Please contact Priscilla Freduah-Agyemang, agyemang@scag.ca.gov or 213-236-1973 with any questions related to the forum. We also welcome any comments/thoughts on how to improve the site.
Regional Transit Operators Forum

Welcome to the SCAG Regional Transit Operators Forum. This is a space for the transit providers in the SCAG region to exchange information, best practices and receive feedback on transit service planning, operators, emerging trends and issues, share ideas on future projects and offer the opportunity to continue to engage in meaningful discussions and peer-learning experiences on variety of transit topics.

We want to hear from you. Ask a question, Share your thoughts. Get smarter and help others. Learn More

new discussion

Seeking Applicants for the FY21 round of the INFRA Grant Program

The USDOT recently announced that it is seeking applicants for the FY21 r...

by Priscilla Piodjun-Agyeman In Grants/Funding February 25

What's happening

14 members
To: Regional Transit Technical Advisory Committee (RTTAC)

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

Subject: Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Sustainable Transit for a Healthy Planet Challenge

SUMMARY

From https://www.transit.dot.gov/climate-challenge

On April 22, 2021, President Biden announced an ambitious goal: for the United States to achieve a 50-52 percent reduction from 2005 levels in economy-wide net greenhouse gas (GHG) pollution in 2030.

On June 15, 2021, FTA launched the Sustainable Transit for a Healthy Planet Challenge to encourage transit agencies to build on progress already made and to further reduce GHG emissions from public transportation to support President Biden’s GHG reduction goal.

The Challenge

FTA’s Sustainable Transit for a Healthy Planet Challenge encourages transit agencies to take bold actions and investments to cut GHG emissions. The challenge calls on transit agencies to develop climate action strategies with measurable goals to achieve GHG emission targets. All transit agencies nationwide, regardless of size or service area, are encouraged to develop climate action or sustainability plans that detail GHG reduction strategies, such as converting fleets to electric buses and making facilities more energy efficient.

Throughout 2021 and early 2022, FTA staff will provide technical assistance to agencies that commit to developing climate action plans or other strategies. On Earth Day 2022, FTA will showcase the impact of the challenge and transit agency success stories toward reducing their GHG emissions.

More information on how to sign up for the challenge and resources are available at the program website provided.
RTTAC Update

June, 2021
What is Cal-ITP?

Managed by Caltrans, the California Integrated Travel Project (Cal-ITP) is a statewide initiative designed to unify transit in California with a common fare payment system, real-time data standard, and seamless verification of eligibility for transit discounts.
The California Integrated Travel Project

Making travel simpler and more cost-effective for everyone by:

1. Enabling contactless payments
2. Automating customer discounts
3. Standardizing information for easy trip planning
Transit data for trip planning

The General Transit Feed Specification (GTFS) is a data standard. GTFS "feeds" let public transit agencies publish their transit data and developers write applications that consume that data in an interoperable way.

Transit service providers produce schedules and prices; Third-party applications consume this data; Riders use this data to plan and pay for their transit trip.
What Transit Providers should expect in 2021

1. **California Minimum GTFS Guidelines** prescribe completeness, accuracy, access standards

2. Request or wait for your **Transit Data Assessment** to find gaps against the Guidelines (Caltrans District 7 in July, District 8 in October, etc.)

3. Work with Cal-ITP to develop a **Transit Data Improvement Plan**, committing to resolve gaps before participating in new statewide procurements (including contactless payments)
Focus on Real Time Passenger Information

What do the Minimum GTFS Guidelines say?

- Real time information in the standard GTFS-Realtime format
  - Vehicle positions
  - Trip Updates
  - Service Alerts
- Updates at least once every 20 seconds
- Available for anyone to consume (allowing for reasonable API key registration and rate limits)

How to get it?

[Already working with a vendor]

- Talk to your vendor about the Guidelines (invite Cal-ITP to join if you wish).
- Ask Cal-ITP to evaluate the quality of the feed for common errors (a “data assessment”).
- If your current vendor doesn’t meet your needs, Cal-ITP is issuing statewide procurements for hardware and software this summer/fall at camobilitymarketplace.org

[No existing CAD/AVL vendor]

- Cal-ITP’s in-house open source solution: GTFS-Realtime as a Service (GRaaS)
Introducing GTFS-RT as a Service

Transit providers—no matter their size or budget—need more low-cost mobility data solutions than are offered on the market today.

That’s why Cal-ITP developed GRaaS.

GRaaS is an easy-to-use, low-cost smartphone application that allows California transit providers to publish real-time schedules and arrival predictions for use on Google Maps, Transit App, and other websites. Compared to a typical GTFS-RT system, GRaaS requires minimal upfront costs or technical expertise.
How it works

Mobile app is used by bus operators in the vehicle

Cal-ITP servers generate valid GTFS and GTFS-RT

Apps like Google Maps show vehicles in real-time
Once you’ve implemented GTFS-RT, you will be eligible for Cal-ITP support with contactless fare collection.

Next steps...

So, which option is best for you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>GTFS-RT through GRaaS</th>
<th>GTFS-RT through hardware procurement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>User-friendliness</td>
<td>High 🟢🟢🟢</td>
<td>High 🟢🟢🟢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordability</td>
<td>Cost-effective 🟢🟢🟢</td>
<td>Expensive 🔴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical support</td>
<td>Available, but limited 🔴🟠</td>
<td>Available 🟢🟢🟢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Fast and easy 🟢🟢🟢</td>
<td>Takes time 🔴🟠</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Contactless Payments

Updates on the MST Trial
Monterey-Salinas Transit Demonstration

Paying for a bus ride just got easier: Today MST becomes the first public transit agency in CA to add open contactless fare payment technology to its buses. Now riders can tap to pay their fare on an MST bus—just like they tap to pay for a coffee, lunch, or anything else.

MST riders can use a Visa or Mastercard contactless credit/debit/prepaid card or mobile wallet to pay a fare + only pay for the distance traveled when tapping on when boarding / off when exiting—max $10/day + pay-as-you-go 7- & 31-day caps: mst.org/contactless-pa...
Demonstration project

- Partners: Monterey-Salinas Transit (MST), Littlepay, and the California Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV)
- Allows older adults (65+) to enroll and link their contactless bank cards to receive transit discounts when they pay
- Objectives:
  - Elimination of paper applications and in-person processes
  - Increased data privacy for riders
  - Standardized eligibility definitions
Thank you!

Next steps

Whichever option you choose, CAL-ITP is here to offer you technical assistance in rolling out GTFS-RT and contactless payments.

Links:

California Mobility Marketplace
California Minimum GTFS Guidelines
GOLDEN EMPIRE TRANSIT DISTRICT

ON-DEMAND

CO-MINGLING DEMAND RESPONSE

We make life better by connecting people to places one ride at a time.
ABOUT US

Robert Williams - IT Supervisor/ Project Leader
With GET almost 3 years - in Transit almost 3 years
First major project was to help start Microtransit at GET

DR Implementation Team
9 people from Administration, Operations, Marketing, Customer Service and IT
GOLDEN EMPIRE TRANSIT

District is 160 square miles
- Bakersfield population about 500,000 people
- About 6.2 million rides per year pre-COVID
- Fixed route ridership down about 54% with COVID
- 14 Fixed Routes, One Express, One Limited

Demand Response area is 111 sq miles
- Paratransit was 200 / 100 / 50 / day
- Microtransit was approaching 200 rides / day average
- Non-Emergency Medical Transportation was approaching 200 rides / day
- Demand Response has not fallen off at the levels of fixed route, even with Social Distancing limiting seating

Vehicles
- 15 Paratransit
- 9 Microtransit
- 12 NEMT
June of 2020 GET issues RFP For Full-Suite Demand Response – 3 services

**Wants:**

Set out for best of each service  
Provider with one platform would be preferred

Interviewed 10 vendors, all with different takes  
Included competing vendors partnering  
Scored on many factors, flexibility and needs

Awarded Contract to VIA September 2020
SAAS PROVIDER - VIA

Via’s Integrated Mobility Solution

Via’s technology integrates multiple service modes into a single, unified platform to utilize resources more efficiently, reduce costs, and create a better experience for all users — operators, riders, and drivers.
THREE INTEGRATED TOOLS

Rider App, Operations Console, and Driver App

**Rider App / Booking Portal**
- Custom-branded, intuitive and functional Rider App
- Ability to add additional functionalities (multimodal, payment, fixed routes)

**Operations Console**
- Sends real-time notifications to riders
- Functionality to support phone bookings
- Flexibility to implement service changes
- Standard and custom data and analytic reports

**Driver App**
- Transmits notes about rider needs and preferences
- Allows for rider-driver communication
IMPLEMENTATION & THE PLAN

Implementation
Launched as separate services – December 2020

Change of Thought
Could we run as one service?
Co-mingling, Marketing, Departments, Consolidation of Resources

Leading the way
GET is the first to this approach, but other agencies are looking at the idea
Our method was watch and wait, but technology is allowing us to lead

Upcoming Plans
Expanded to second Microtransit area in April
 Possibly replace an underperforming route in January 2022
 Replace Fixed Route evening service a target for 2022
 Plan to be comingled in all aspects Q3 2021
 Rider App/Web App for Micro and Para in June

Key Points
Still have all rules and goals - ADA vs Micro
Will still schedule as now except for one large block of service
 pick up times vs. scheduled appointments
Will roll out service slowly (van at a time)
**Changes and Gains**

What do we need to do? What do we expect?

### Changes

- Functionally we can to break down some silos and change procedures
  - **Customer Service** - take all incoming calls/reservations
  - **Marketing** - All vehicles as one brand, outreach becomes easier and less service specific, allows us to reach more new, choice riders
  - **Finance** - streamline allocations to one service.
  - **Operations** - will manage all 3 services, watch to improve specific efficiencies

### Gains

- Expect to see efficiencies in a number of areas
  - **Maintenance** - instead of 3 vehicles down on one service, 3 vehicles down across the service, PMs
  - **Operations** - Drivers who no-show/call-out - less effect on service
  - **Efficiency on the road** - instead of having a possible 4 vehicles for the ride to be assigned to we'll have 3 times that - while they may be busier overall that should still leave more opportunities
  - **System** - Para/transit sign in vs first ride
  - **Metrics** - Passengers per Vehicle Hour - aggregate more rides
  - **IT/Training** - One software, one solution. Less Training, cross-departmental help.
  - **Flexibility** - On-the-fly changes in vehicles and drivers to respond to demand. Ability to make changes within a very short timeframe.
ON-DEMAND FARES

Microtransit Tiered Program

- 0 - 3mi : $3
- 3.1 - 7mi : $5
- 7.1 - 10 mi : $7
- 10.1 + mi : $10

Analysis of Fares

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>January 2020</th>
<th>July 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$2,962 Additional Revenue</td>
<td>$1,650 Additional Revenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+3.5% Farebox Recovery</td>
<td>+2.26% Farebox Recovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~50.5% of Uber/Lyft Fare</td>
<td>~51% of Uber/Lyft Fare</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Non Emergency Medical Transport

Negotiated at ~$17 leg

Paratransit - $3 / leg
LESSONS

Over-define your needs. Set concrete goals and timelines for everything you think you want and what you are replacing.

Smaller areas are more efficient. Large zones provide the rider more service, but at a cost of efficiency / resources. For larger agencies, first-mile/last-mile may be the best answer.

Whole-agency buy-in is one of the keys. GETused one project-leader with access to all departments.

And still learning...every....day.
THANK YOU

Robert Williams  +1 661 869 6358
  rwilliams@getbus.org
  getbus.org/on-demand
CT DOT Facility Electrification Bus Project & CTfastrak Automated Bus Initiative

Dennis Solensky
Transit Administrator
CTDOT Public Transportation

Public Transportation in CT:

- 75% transit operated directly by CTDOT through private contractor
- 25% transit operated by transit districts
- CTDOT subsidizes about 95% of transit district operating costs
- CTDOT has direct oversight over pretty much all of transit statewide
- Engaged in all transit capital projects as well
Old Transit Model

- Cost of Driver
  - 80% cost of service

- Booking/Service Experience
  - Arrangements made long in advance
  - Long wait times
  - Long unnecessary commutes
  - Drivers waiting idle

- Fixed Route Experience
  - Routes traveling long paths
  - Go to bus stop
  - Wait for buses
    - No way to know when the bus will come
New Transit Model

• Ability to Book on Demand
  • Computer and cellphone scheduling/payment
  • ADA has ability to book easier/faster
• Smaller Vehicles
  • Wheelchair accessible
• Ability to Integrate other Service Providers
  • Taxi, Uber, and Lyft
• Coordination of Human Service Agencies
• Paradigm Shift
  • Change initiative
  • Hiring project managers
• Connected & Automated Technologies (emerging)
CTfastrak
CTfastrak Fixed Guideway

Bus-Only Road for Bus Rapid Transit

- Owned & Maintained by CTDOT
- Opened March 2015
- $567 Million (80% Federal, 20% State)
- 9.4 Miles Long
- 11 Stations
- 5 Intersections
- Includes Multi-Use Trail (5 miles)
Station Features

- Raised Platforms
- Real-Time Bus Arrival Signs
- Crosswalks with Flashers
- Ticket Vending Machines
- ADA Access
CTfastrak Vehicle Types

The region's first rapid transit system

- CTfastrak Vehicle Types
  - Length: 30 feet
  - Rider Capacity: 28 seats, 10 standees
  - System Use: New CTfastrak Connector & Circulator Routes
  - Manufacturer: Gillig LLC, California

- Length: 40 feet
  - Rider Capacity: 39 seats, 10 standees
  - System Use: CTfastrak Local Routes
  - Manufacturer: New Flyer, Minnesota

- Length: 45 feet
  - Rider Capacity: 55 seats, no standees
  - System Use: CTfastrak Express Routes
  - Manufacturer: MCI, Illinois

- Length: 60 feet
  - Rider Capacity: 55 seats, 19 standees
  - System Use: CTfastrak guideway/Downtown Htfd
  - Manufacturer: Nova, NY

New Buses in Production

www.CTfastrak.com
Our Vision

Bus Automation On Fixed Guideway
Automation

• Deploy three 40-foot autonomous buses (SAE Level 4) in revenue service on fixed guideway

• Automated driving capabilities demonstrated include steering, braking, lane keeping, pedestrian and object detection

• Buses will operate autonomously on the fixed guideway during all times of day, night, weather conditions and can travel up to 40 mph

• Buses will have safety driver seated in driver seat able to take over

• Buses will be manually driven in Downtown Hartford
Precision Docking

• Front door must align correctly to allow wheelchair to roll on

• Scraping platform damages bus

• Leaving wide gap is unsafe, driver must deploy bridge plate

• ADS will dock the bus correctly every time
  • Improves Safety
  • Enhances Mobility
  • Saves Time and Money
Bus Platooning

- Peak period ridership demands larger buses (60ft articulated)
- Off peak ridership makes large buses look wasteful to taxpayers
- Platoon smaller (40ft) buses during peak, return to garage off-peak
- Allows increased capacity for special events
Bus Electrification

• Building charging infrastructure

• Testing battery electric buses
Project Understanding: To create a long range plan to reach our goal of having statewide 100% electrification. Each facility with an individual plan 100%. The plan will rank facilities by priority and line out a phasing strategy and deliver 100% electrification. In cases where an existing facility cannot support 100% conversion, the study will provide maximum capacity of the existing facility as well as recommendations to get to 100%.

2021 Objective: The Connecticut Department of Transportation is seeking to retain one firm to provide planning and engineering services for a statewide assessment of all facility upgrades necessary to operate Battery Electric Buses.
CTDOT is Evaluating Infrastructure Upgrades Needed to Enable & Enhance Bus Automation:

- New traffic signal controllers to broadcast SPaT and MAP messages
- New traffic detection equipment (camera/radar)
- Additional equipment to alert bus of potential red-light violations
- Fiber or cellular backhaul for remote monitoring
- Incorporate new transit signal priority (if needed)
## Current Project Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Design, Build &amp; Testing</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connected Infrastructure Design &amp; Build</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Testing at CTfastrak</td>
<td>Late 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Demonstration at CTfastrak</td>
<td>2023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Current Project Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$2.4 Million</td>
<td>FTA Low-No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3 Million</td>
<td>FTA IMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4.1 Million</td>
<td>FTA 5339 Formula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1.2 Million</td>
<td>Other State and Federal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0.3 Million</td>
<td>FHWA Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$11 Million</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thank you!

Let's Connect on LinkedIn
Dennis Solensky
Bus Stops Tiers Methodology toward Sustainability

Presented by Gabriella Marquez and Christopher MacKechnie

June 30, 2021
Purpose

To develop a bus stop measuring system within Service Planning to:

• Update bus stop location changes
• Improve amenities upon ridership and land use interface
• Prioritize capital improvements based upon tiers ratings
• Blueprint for coordination with cities on street improvements and negotiation in development review with property owners
Project Timeline

• Bus stop measuring system first introduced at Long Beach Transit (LBT) in 2015 to prioritize bus stop improvements and capital funding allocation.

• Due to ridership decline, the tier system was updated in 2019 and helped verify lessons learned related to sustainable transit-land use interface in the urban environment.
Methodology – Step 1

• Bus stops were evaluated based on four major transit performance variables:

1. Ridership
   • FY16 – FY18 Average
2. Transfer Location
   • Transfers to other LBT Routes and Metro Rail
3. Major Destinations
   • Schools, Commercial centers, senior centers, airports, and hospitals
4. Demographics
   • SB535 Disadvantaged Community or Title VI Minority/Low-Income
Methodology – Step 2

- Stops were categorized into one of six tiers. Each stop may get 0 – 6 weighting points in this measuring process.

- Stops higher on the points scale are deemed more important and assigned to a higher tier.
Applications

- Land-use interface and development review
  - Bus stops are evaluated based on tier to determine amenities
  - Recommend bus stop improvements for high tier bus stops
  - Lower tier stops could be removed if within the established spacing parameters.
Applications

- **Bus Stops Spacing Effects**
  - Removed low-tier bus stops to increase bus stop spacing from an average of 1/8 mile to an average of 1/5 mile
  - Routes with removed bus stops have had an increase in On-Time Performance (OTP)
Applications

• Opportunities for bikeway and pedestrian integration

• To improve safety, bus stop islands with bike lanes have been constructed in downtown Long Beach and at major stops along arterial corridors such as Long Beach Blvd

• Bus stops were identified for this improvement primarily based upon the bus stop tiers
Lessons Learned for Continued Improvement

1. Inclusion in City Urban Design Guidelines
   • Bus stops often covered as an afterthought in the development review process
   • Need proactive city rules and incentives to improve the transit/land use interface.

2. Developer and property owner’s “NIMBY” attitude
   • Tiers provide a rational empirically-based evaluation of the importance of bus stops to counter the “Not In My Back Yard” (NIMBY) attitudes
Lessons Learned for Continued Improvement

3. Stronger connectivity with pedestrian and ADA accessibility

- The tiers system allows for a methodical approach when updating older stops “grandfathered” in during the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).

4. Linkage with TNC within context of First/Last Mile

- Any special infrastructure that needs to be constructed to facilitate the transfer between transit and TNCs should be built at tier I bus stops.
Thank you!

Shirley Hsiao – Service Planning Manager (shsiao@lbtransit.com)
Christopher MacKechnie – Service Development Planner (cmackechnie@lbtransit.com)
Gabriella Marquez – GIS/ITS Transit Planner (gmarquez@lbtransit.com)
High Quality Transit Corridors and Areas: Interactive Web Map

Marisa Laderach, Senior Regional Planner
Mobility Planning and Management
6/30/2021

www.scag.ca.gov
• SB 375 provides CEQA streamlining incentives for “transit priority projects” that are:
  • at least 50 percent residential use, and
  • are within ½ mile of an HQTC or major transit stop in the RTP.
• SB 743 results in changes to the criteria for determining significance of transportation impacts of projects within “transit priority areas” that are:
  • within ½ mile of a major transit stop that is existing or planned within the FTIP horizon
• Definitions provided in CA Pub. Res. Code Sections 21155(b) and 21064.3, in summary:
  • HQTC – bus corridor w/peak period frequency of 15 minutes or less
  • Major transit stop – rail station, BRT station, ferry terminal, or intersection of two or more HQTCs

HQTC = high quality transit corridor
Connect SoCal HQTCs and Major Transit Stops

- Methodology developed in coordination with Regional Transit TAC
- Asked transit operators to review and provide input
Limitations and Considerations

• These datasets only represent a snapshot in time
  • Transit operators adjust bus schedules regularly
  • Planned transit projects are subject to local decisions on alternatives

• Some aspects required significant consideration, especially for the mapping process
  • peak period
  • bi-directional frequency
  • overlapping routes
  • Intersection definition

• Communications, input, and methodology
  • Staff consulted with OPR, MPOs prior to vetting with RTTAC
  • Final methodology included in Transit Technical Report Appendix
High Quality Transit Areas (HQTAs)

- Created by SCAG to help link transportation and land use planning
- **Areas** within ½ mile of existing and planned HQTCs and major transit stops
- One of the SCS Priority Growth Areas
- Used in RHNA methodology
Interactive Map Purpose and Development

• SCAG periodically receives external inquiries on the identification and location of HQTCs and major transit stops.

• Currently the SCAG GIS portal provides some spatial data on HQTAs and TPAs (transit priority areas, or half-mile buffers around major transit stops).

• An interactive map is envisioned to provide more functionality as well as underlying attribute data on the HQTCs that provide the basis for HQTAs.

• The interactive map is also envisioned as a tool for use by SCAG and the transit operators to support the development and vetting of HQTCs for the 2024 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS).
The Interactive Map

• Begins with an important disclaimer
  • Aligns with the disclaimers from Connect SoCal maps
• Utilizes Connect SoCal layers for HQTCs and HQTAs
  • 2016 Base Year
  • 2045 Plan Year
• Provides underlying route and stop information to help viewers understand context behind HQTCs
Interactive Guide to the Interactive Map

• Supplemental story map walkthrough provides:
  • Background into state law
  • Important definitions
  • Interactive layer preview windows
  • Side-by-side comparison of 2016 vs. 2045 datasets
Thank you!
Questions?

Marisa Laderach
Laderach@scag.ca.gov
Mobility Planning and Management
www.scag.ca.gov
Mobility As A Service (MaaS) Feasibility Whitepaper & Regional Dedicated Transit Lanes Study

Introduction

Regional Transit Technical Advisory Committee

Priscilla Freduah-Agyemang, Senior Regional Planner
Mobility Planning & Management
Wednesday, June 30, 2021
Study Background – Connect SoCal

- Mobility Choices
- Robust Economy
- Safe & Healthy Environment
- Improved Air Quality
- Disaster Resiliency
- Community
- Climate Change Adaptation
- Diverse Types of Houses
- Land Conservation
- Maximize Infrastructure
1. Regional Dedicated Transit Lanes Study - Background

- Decline in transit ridership (SCAG–UCLA 2018 study) and national trends
- Rethinking mobility and improving efficiencies
  - E.g. tactical transit lanes
- COVID–19 pandemic and need for recovery mobility and improving efficiencies

5th & 6th bus only lanes

Red stripped bus lane on Figueroa street
Regional Dedicated Transit Lanes Study

Objective

- To support the development of a regional network of dedicated bus lanes to enable enhanced transit services, improve mobility, accessibility and sustainability, and advance implementation of Connect SoCal.

- Identify key benefits of dedicated bus lanes
- Identify the primary factors for successful implementation
- Provide a preliminary assessment of possible dedicated bus lanes in the SCAG region,
- Provide recommendations and guidance for local jurisdictions
## Regional Dedicated Lanes Transit Study – Project Summary

- **Duration:** June 2021 – June 30, 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Key Deliverables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Project Initiation &amp; Workplan</td>
<td>- Kick-off meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Project Workplan &amp; Schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Stakeholder Engagement</td>
<td>- Stakeholder Engagement Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Stakeholder Engagement Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Review of existing conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Corridor Identification</td>
<td>- Corridor Identification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Corridor Evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regional Dedicated Lanes Transit Study – Next Steps

• SCAG staff will continue to work with Cambridge Systematics to advance the study
• Staff will share project updates at future RTTAC meetings
• Consultant will share study findings to be incorporated into the Final Report
2. Mobility as a Service (MaaS) Feasibility Whitepaper

Background:
Connect SoCal identified **Key Connections** that lie at the intersection of land use, transportation and innovation meant to advance policy discussions and strategies to leverage new technologies and create better partnerships to increase progress on the regional goals.
MaaS Feasibility Whitepaper Background: What MaaS Is Not...

- MaaS is not just an app
  - Trip planning app
  - Payment app
MaaS Feasibility Whitepaper Background: Defining MaaS

MaaS is the consolidation or integration of various travel modes into a single mobility service or platform — giving people a variety of mobility and payment options. At the core of MaaS is the ability to equitably offer customized mobility options for all persons.
Objective

- To assess the feasibility of implementing MaaS within the SCAG region, including identification of challenges and opportunities, key institutional and infrastructure needs, and to develop an implementation guide.
MaaS Feasibility Whitepaper – Project Summary

- Duration: June 2021 – March 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Key Deliverables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Project Initiation & Management | - Kick-off meeting  
                                 | - Project Schedule  
                                 | - Advisory Group/Roundtable  |
| 2. Study Research             | - Literature review & case studies  
                                 | - Existing Conditions  
                                 | - Feasibility, Challenges & Opportunities  |
| 3. Implementation Guide      | - Goals & Objectives Setting  
                                 | - Identification of key strategies  
                                 | - Implementation Guide  |
MaaS Feasibility Whitepaper – Next Steps

• Work with AECOM to advance the study
• Continue to solicit feedback from the RTTAC at the various stages of the study
  • Advisory group/roundtable
  • Task 2 findings (case studies, literature review)
  • Task 3 findings (key strategies and implementation guide)
Thank you!

Questions & Comments?

Contact Info:
Priscilla Freduah-Agyemang
Senior Regional Planner, Mobility Planning & Management
agyemang@scag.ca.gov/213-236-1973