SANBAG County-Wide Transit Efficiency Study

Coordination and Optimization Alternatives Report

Prepared for: SANBAG Governments Working Together

September 18, 2015

Prepared by: PARSONS BRINCKERHOFF

SANBAG

County-wide Transit Efficiency Study

Task 2.6—Coordination and Optimization Alternatives Report, including:

Task 2.1—Comparative Reivew of Coordination/Optimization Alternatives
Task 2.2—Identify Coordination/Optimization Alternatives
Task 2.3—Development of Evaluation Criteria
Task 2.4—Evaluation
Task 2.5—SANBAG and Agency Direction on Evaluation Results

September 18, 2015

Prepared for:
SANBAG

Prepared by:
Parsons Brinckerhoff

Table of Contents

List of Tables

6.0 COMPARATIVE REVIEW OF ORGANIZATIONAL ALTERNATIVES/ MODELS

The purpose of this chapter is to present alternatives and models for transportation providers and agencies. Currently, transit agencies across the United States are responding to travel needs, service needs, and funding shortfalls through a variety of organizational structures, enhancing working relationships amongst transit agencies or creating new governance models to address public transportation planning and operations at the regional level. Additionally, state-legislated consolidated transportation services agencies (CTSAs) have developed various models, whereby a mix of functional social service transportation services are provided. This chapter describes and presents examples of each alternative and model.

6.1 Alternatives and Models Considered

This section provides a brief overview of the alternatives and models considered.

6.1.1 Public Transit Services

For public transit services, three alternatives are considered: cooperative agreements, functional consolidation, and complete consolidation.

Regarding these alternatives, it is important to note that, while the alternatives range from cooperative agreements to complete consolidation, a basic tenet of this study is that complete consolidation would only be an option for agencies who themselves see benefit in doing so and decide to proceed on that course of action (San Bernardino Associated Governments [SANBAG], 2014c). Thus, the review of the three alternatives is strictly for the purposes of identifying the range of options.

6.1.1.1 Cooperative Agreements

Cooperative agreements occur when two or more agencies use joint decision-making power to establish formal arrangements (e.g., interagency agreements) to provide for the management of the resources of a distinct system. Agencies retain their separate identities and authorities, including control over the vehicles they own, the services they provide, and their employees.

Within this alternative, interagency cooperation can include the establishment of joint powers authorities, intergovernmental service and/or transfer agreements, joint procurements, multi-agency cooperation agreements, and shared resources.

6.1.1.2 Functional Consolidation

Functional consolidation occurs when certain key functions or activities conducted by one agency are transferred to another agency, for the benefit of both agencies. Such transfers could result from a voluntary agreement among the agencies, or could result from a legislative initiative or change that requires the transfer. Under either approach,

each agency involved in the functional consolidation remains as a separate entity, with only the function or activity transferred.

An example of a voluntary functional consolidation is the recent agreement between the City of Barstow and Victor Valley Transit Authority (VVTA), which transferred the operation and administration of Barstow Area Transit (BAT), a city-run transit service, to VVTA. Both the City of Barstow and VVTA remain separate and distinct governmental agencies.

6.1.1.3 Complete Consolidation

Complete consolidation occurs when two or more agencies vest all operational authority into one agency, which then provides transit services according to purchase of service agreements or other contractual relationships. The consolidated agency owns the transit vehicles and could employ the employees.

Complete consolidation of multiple transit providers and/or agencies typically occurs by statute, with the desired coordination of transit services achieved by legislative mandate, often using funding authorities to encourage or require agreement on service changes (including service coordination), fares, and joint marketing.

6.1.2 Social Service Transportation Services

For social service transportation services, three organizational models (i.e., CTSA models) are considered. This section describes how CTSAs were developed, as well as available CTSA functions.

6.1.2.1 CTSA Development and Purposes

In 1980, Assembly Bill (AB) 120 (Ingalls) enacted the Social Service Transportation Improvement Act, promoting the coordination and consolidation of social service transportation services (California Association for Coordinated Transportation [CalACT], 2015b). The intent of the act, which added Part 13 to Division 3 of Title 2 of the Government Code, was to accrue the following potential benefits:

- Combined purchasing of necessary equipment so that some cost savings through larger number of unit purchases can be realized.
- Adequate training of vehicle drivers to ensure the safe operation of vehicles. Proper driver training should promote lower insurance costs and encourage use of the service.
- Centralized dispatching of vehicles so that efficient use of vehicles results.
- Centralized maintenance of vehicles so that adequate and routine vehicle maintenance scheduling is possible.
- Centralized administration of various social service transportation programs so that elimination of numerous duplicative and costly administrative organizations can occur. Centralized administration of social service transportation services can provide more efficient and cost effective transportation services permitting social service agencies to respond to specific social needs.

- Identification and consolidation of all existing sources of funding for social service transportation services can provide more effective and cost efficient use of scarce resource dollars. Consolidation of categorical program funds can foster eventual elimination of unnecessary and unwarranted program constraints.

The act required planning agencies throughout California to conduct regional inventory reports, prepare/implement action plans substantiating the feasibility of one or more of the benefits, and designate CTSAs. Also required was the identification of the social service recipients to be served, including but not limited to elderly individuals, individuals with disabilities, youth, and individuals with low income, and available funds.

Social service transportation costs have been defined as encompassing the following four major categories of activities:

- Transportation services provided by social service agencies (e.g., vehicles purchased, drivers hired, and maintenance and operating costs furnished).
- Cash payments (i.e., chits or tokens given to clients for securing transportation for an approved activity).
- Purchase of transportation services from public, private for-profit, or private non-profit providers for eligible clients.
- Payments made to social service agency personnel or volunteers for transporting clients in their personal vehicles to approved locations (mileage cost reimbursement).

As Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 4.5 claimants, CTSAs have the option to operate or contract out the operation of social service transportation services. (CalACT, 2015b).

6.1.2.2 CTSA Functions

Social service transportation services can be divided into three functional activities:

- **Administrative**—functions include supervision, billing, and receivables, record keeping, purchasing, marketing, information and referral, and risk management programs.
- **Vehicle operations**—functions are those which involve transporting passengers, including receiving trip requests, vehicle and driver scheduling, scheduling and routing trips, and dispatching and monitoring service.
- **Maintenance—**functions concern vehicle upkeep, repairs, storage, procurement, and purchasing of parts, fuel, and equipment.

The four major types of coordination for CTSAs, where some or all of the functions are combined, include cooperation, coordination, consolidation, and brokerage. Cooperation occurs where two agencies work together (e.g., client referral to services), typically in an informal manner, with each agency maintaining complete control over all functions.

Coordination occurs when two or more agencies work together for joint conduct of one or more functions (e.g., joint scheduling or dispatching, and sharing vehicle maintenance or storage facilities). Consolidation occurs when all functions are under the control of a single entity (e.g., one agency acquires all vehicles, performs all functions, and sells its services to agencies needing client transportation). Brokerages bring purchasers (clients or agencies) and sellers of transportation together.

The three different models (i.e., CTSA models) considered include: 1) CTSA providing all Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) paratransit services and agency coordination activities as a separate, stand-alone agency (Paratransit, Inc. in Sacramento County); 2) CTSA as a coordinating and technical support provider, but not a direct service provider (Access Services, Inc. [ASI] in Los Angeles County); and 3) CTSA housed within the transit agency serving the same geographic area (Riverside Transit Agency [RTA] in Riverside County).

6.2 Alternative and Model Examples

This section provides examples of each alternative and model.

6.2.1 Cooperative Agreements

For this alternative, examples are provided by agreement type.

6.2.1.1 Joint Procurements

Joint procurements focus on coordinating administrative and fiscal functions commonly undertaken by multiple agencies, in an effort to achieve greater cost economies and eliminate redundant activities. Examples of how transit agencies can consolidate purchasing include combined vehicle purchase or maintenance contracts, joint insurance pools or contracts, multi-agency driver training, and multi-agency substance abuse testing. Many of the cost-savings strategies evaluated in Chapter 5.0 involve joint procurements.

In California, the CalACT/MBTA Vehicle Purchasing Cooperative is used by agencies who are CalACT members to purchase a variety of vehicles through joint procurement. This allows better vehicle pricing and selection through larger volume purchases. All six transit agencies in San Bernardino County utilize this cooperative.
(CalACT, 2015a; SANBAG, 2014a).

6.2.1.2 Multi-Agency Cooperation Agreements

Multi-agency cooperation agreements involve efforts by multiple agencies, typically in a shared region, to cooperate on a particular program or service.

The Davenport (Iowa) region, which includes four cities in two states surrounding the Mississippi River, has implemented several multi-agency cooperation agreements. On the Illinois side, two cities are served by one transit agency, the Rock Island County Metropolitan Mass Transit District (MetroLINK), a general-purpose regional transit authority established in 1970 by state statute. On the Iowa side, there are three transit agencies: Davenport CitiBus (a municipal transit agency owned and operated by the

City of Davenport); Bettendorf Transit (a municipal transit agency owned and operated by the City of Bettendorf); and River Bend Transit (a paratransit agency that provides paratransit service to urbanized areas).

In 1982, MetroLINK and Davenport CitiBus agreed to jointly build and operate a single bus maintenance facility, the Quad City Transit Facility located on the Illinois side, which continues to serve both agencies today, with a separate policy and oversight board. In 2002, the metropolitan planning organization (MPO), the Bi-State Regional Commission, conducted a study of possible consolidation of the three transit agencies in Iowa, which did not occur but resulted in a stronger desire for closer coordination, leading to the creation of a single regional marketing entity branded Quad Cities (QC) Transit. QC Transit, the management of which is outsourced by the MPO, serves as a transit service coordinator and marketing entity for transit services in the Quad Cities area, specifically the fixed-route services of Davenport CitiBus, Bettendorf Transit, the LOOP, and MetroLINK, providing a website, telephone information line, and an advertising program. QC Transit also has developed a combined bus pass that is accepted by the QC Transit systems. Another multi-agency cooperation agreement is the LOOP, a weekend waterfront circulator that serves four communities in two states, which is the product of a partnership between Davenport CitiBus, Bettendorf Transit, and MetroLINK. (Transit Cooperative Research Program [TCRP], 2011; QC Loop, 2015).

6.2.1.3 Shared Resources

Shared resources could include the shared purchase and/or use of capital resources, such as vehicles and facilities, as well as operating and support services. Examples of shared operating and support services include the following: shared software; shared driver training and drug testing programs; and sharing/developing joint policies, procedures, and implementation plans.

In the San Diego (California) region, two transit agencies, the North San Diego County Transit District (NCTD) and the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS), worked together to design, procure, and deploy a regional transit management system that serves their respective transit system missions, while leveraging new technologies in an integrated fashion for region-wide implementation. Work included the development of a comprehensive intelligent transportation system (ITS) strategic plan, which identified the functional and communications requirements for introducing the new technologies in a thoughtful, cost effective, and time-phased manner across a common, countywide, 800 megahertz simulcast voice and mobile data radio communications network and computer-aided dispatch (CAD)/automatic vehicle location (AVL) platform serving both agencies independently. In addition to automatic passenger counters, farebox integration, and other “smart bus” technologies, a new bus service scheduling system for each transit agency was integrated. (Macro, 2015)

Also in the San Diego region, NCTD has several agreements with Amtrak and the Southern California Regional Rail Authority (SCRRA or Metrolink) regarding shared resources (e.g., commuter rail tracks and stations). This portion of the Los Angeles—San Diego—San Luis Obispo (LOSSAN) corridor is owned by NCTD from the San

Diego/Orange County Line to Del Mar and by MTS within the City of San Diego, with commuter rail (COASTER) service operated by NCTD. Agreements include:

- **Amtrak Shared-Use Agreement**. NCTD has a shared-use agreement with Amtrak for the use of the tracks and stations within San Diego County. The agreement includes a per-train-mile reimbursement rate to NCTD.

- **Rail Service Interruptions**. NCTD has a mutual assistance agreement with Amtrak for rail service interruptions.

- **Passenger Sharing**. In 2013, NCTD signed a 2-year passenger sharing agreement with Amtrak, expanding Amtrak service from two to eight COASTER stations. The agreement allows passengers with valid COASTER fare to board certain Amtrak trains, with additional Amtrak fare required for northbound travel beyond the COASTER service area (i.e., the Oceanside Transit Center). This agreement allows extra service for COASTER passengers and enhanced access for Amtrak passengers. (Whitlock, 2014)

- **SCRRA Shared-Use Agreement**. NCTD has a shared-use agreement with SCRRA for Metrolink's use of the LOSSAN tracks within San Diego County from the county line down to Oceanside, along with use of NCTD's Oceanside Transit Center tracks, platforms, and parking. The agreement also allows Metrolink to use NCTD's Stuart Mesa Maintenance Facility for trainset overnight storage and turn-around servicing for up to 34 passenger coaches and nine locomotives. The agreement called for a one-time capital cost participation by SCRRA when the Stuart Mesa facility was under construction.

- **Joint Fueling and Mutual Assistance**. NCTD has a fueling and mutual assistance agreement with SCRRA for the fueling of Metrolink trains at NCTD's Stuart Mesa Maintenance Facility. The same agreement includes a mutual assistance agreement for service interruptions.

6.2.2 Functional Consolidation

For this alternative, examples include San Diego, Kansas City, Syracuse, and Barstow.

6.2.2.1 San Diego, California

A successful example of legislative functional consolidation is demonstrated in the San Diego region. In 2002/2003, Senate Bill (SB) 1703 (Peace) merged the planning, financial programming, project development, and construction functions of two transit agencies (the Metropolitan Transit Development Board [MTDB] and NCTD) into the region's MPO (SANDAG), creating a consolidated transportation agency. Although MTDB, NCTD, and SANDAG remained separate agencies, the specified functions and certain associated personnel were transferred between the agencies.
(Legislative Council of California, 2002)

SB 1703, combined with AB 361 (Kehoe), which established the public process of SANDAG preparing and adopting a regional comprehensive plan, provides SANDAG the

ability to play a stronger role than other governmental entities in the design and delivery of the regional transportation infrastructure and transit systems. For example, the San Francisco Bay Area has ten transportation funding agencies, several regional transportation planning agencies (e.g., Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District, Bay Area Rapid Transit, Caltrain), and another housing and regional planning agency, whereas all of these duties are now assigned to SANDAG. As a result, SANDAG can consider a wider range of options, including transit, in the allocation of revenues, weighing service needs throughout the region. (Legislative Analyst's Office [LAO], 2006)

6.2.2.2 Kansas City, Missouri

A recent example of voluntary functional consolidation is demonstrated in Kansas City, Missouri. On December 17, 2014, the Kansas City Area Transportation Authority (KCATA) and Johnson County signed a 2-year agreement that allows KCATA to provide administrative and management services for Johnson County Transit (The JO). The partnership and consolidation of services is expected to save Johnson County an estimated $455,000 (mostly personnel cost savings, as existing KCATA staff will be utilized), while allowing KCATA a stronger role in coordinating regional services, including minimizing duplicated functions/services. The JO currently includes 15 routes throughout Johnson County and the metro area, and had a Fiscal Year 2013 ridership of 532,161 passengers. The service will still be known as The JO, and the existing contractor (First Transit), drivers, and buses will be used. Johnson County will continue to have control over all policy, budget, routes, and schedules related to The JO. (Johnson County, 2014; Mid-America Regional Council [MARC], 2014; KCATA, 2014)

6.2.2.3 Syracuse, New York

Another example of voluntary functional consolidation has been achieved in the Syracuse (New York) region, where the near bankruptcy of municipal transit operations in the outlying jurisdictions impelled them to reach agreement with the already existing regional transit authority to provide services. Each jurisdiction made a one-time payment of capital dollars, and agreed to a dedicated property tax to subsidize ongoing operations. The result has been the creation of a truly regional transit agency without any change in legislation.

6.2.2.4 Barstow, California

Another example of voluntary functional consolidation is found in Barstow, California. In July 2013, a feasibility study was conducted to evaluate the creation of a consolidated system in the High Desert, with the analysis demonstrating benefits from consolidating the transit services of two agencies (BAT and VVTA). The feasibility study recommended BAT and VVTA be consolidated into a single transit authority serving the areas of Victor Valley, Barstow, and unincorporated areas, resulting in administrative cost savings that could be used to support existing services (i.e., "Barstow-Victorville Link [B-V Link]" and "National Training Center [NTC] Commuter" services, which are currently operated by VVTA but serve both areas) and/or improve service on routes within Barstow and adjoining areas. It also was recommended that a new operations and maintenance facility be constructed in Barstow, and that service to all areas be covered by a single operations and maintenance contract. On May 19, 2014, the City of

Barstow City Council approved an intergovernmental agreement with VVTA to operate the BAT system on a contract basis through July 1, 2015 or until a final decision is made regarding the merger. In September 2014, VVTA's operating contractor took over operation of BAT, and the full merger took effect July 1, 2015. This example is considered a functional consolidation in that both the City of Barstow and VVTA will continue existing as separate agencies. Furthermore, the City of Barstow has a seat on the VVTA Board of Directors as a result of the consolidation (SANBAG, 2013b; City of Barstow, 2014).

6.2.3 Complete Consolidation

For this alternative, the primary examples include San Diego and Los Angeles.

6.2.3.1 San Diego, California

An example of complete consolidation is found in the San Diego region. Starting in 1976, SB 101 (Mills) established the Metropolitan Transit Development Board (MTDB) as a transit development entity to plan, construct, and operate transit guideways in the urbanized area of south San Diego County. For the first few years, MTDB focused on the development of the light rail system, the San Diego Trolley, which opened in 1981. In coordination with these efforts, other actions were undertaken:

- **Formation of the San Diego Trolley, Inc. (SDTI).** SB 101 gave the MTDB Board of Directors the option to operate transit guideways or contract services. For the San Diego Trolley, the MTDB Board of Directors elected to create a separate corporate entity, SDTI, to operate the light rail transit (LRT) service.
- **Unified Transit Services Implemented with Initiation of the LRT Service.** With initiation of the LRT service, the following also occurred: the reorganization of San Diego Transit Corporation (SDTC) bus services, to feed and support the San Diego Trolley, and the reduction of SDTC bus-miles in the South Bay area, where the San Diego Trolley would operate; coordinated fares and transfers amongst the metropolitan area transit operators, as well as a single monthly pass (replacing separate operator-issued passes); and, coordinated timed-transfers at key transfer locations, a single regional telephone public information number, coordinated bus route numbering (across the multiple operators), and publication of the first regional transit map and guide.

In 1984, legislation was passed, resulting in the following changes to MTDB:

- **Acquisition of SDTC.** In 1985, MTDB took ownership of SDTC, acquiring assets from the City of San Diego. This was a complete consolidation of SDTC into MTDB/MTS, as SDTC ceased to exist as a separate entity.
- **Formalization of the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS).** Coincident with MTDB acquiring SDTC, MTS was introduced as the "umbrella" organization of the metropolitan area transit operators, which at the time included SDTC, the San Diego Trolley, and three contract bus operators (i.e., the County Transit System, Chula Vista Transit, and National City Transit). MTS was a brand name/logo, with no

employees and no budget. All staff and administrative expenses were assumed by MTDB and the individual operators.

- **Expansion of the MTDB jurisdiction and the MTDB Board of Directors.** The MTDB Board of Directors was changed from an 8-member to a 15-member board, better representing the actual metropolitan jurisdiction, allowing each of the nine suburban cities to have one of their council members on the board.

From the late 1980s to 2003, additional legislation was passed and other steps were taken, resulting in the following: a standard farebox recovery ratio for all metropolitan area transit operators; state transportation funds received by MTDB and distributed to the metropolitan area transit operators; the reorganization of marketing activities for all metropolitan area transit operators under MTDB; and the transfer of County Transit System (CTS) operations from the County of San Diego to MTDB.

By 2003, MTDB had acquired the assets of all but one municipal area transit operator, and had assumed management of all bus and light rail operations. By 2003, the roster of bus services that comprised MTS included SDTC, Chula Vista Transit, National City Transit (NCT), CTS, and other contract services (i.e., Strand Express JPA and Amarillo y Rosa). In 2005, MTDB reorganized and changed its name to MTS. In 2007, MTS assumed control over NCT from the City of National City (Larwin, 2012; MTS, 2014; MTS, 2013; TCRP, 2011; TCRP, 2012).

6.2.3.2 Los Angeles, California

Another example of complete consolidation with legislative roots is found in the Los Angeles (California) region. Starting in 1951, the Metropolitan Transit Authority (MTA) was formed as a transit planning agency, empowered to formulate plans and policy for a publicly-owned and operated mass rapid transit system that would replace the crumbling infrastructure of privately-owned and operated systems.

In 1964, the Southern California Rapid Transit District (SCRTD) was created by California state legislature to improve bus systems and design/ build a transit system for Los Angeles. The SCRTD took over all bus services operated by the near bankrupt MTA and, like MTA, acquired local suburban bus companies. The SCRTD also was successful in securing federal funding for the Metro Rail subway project.

In 1976, California state legislature enacted AB 1246, which created the Los Angeles County Transportation Commission (LACTC) to oversee public transit and highway policy/funding in the nation's largest county. The creation of the LACTC required the SCRTD to share some of its power. Ultimately, SCRTD and LACTC merged on April 1, 1993, creating the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LACMTA or Metro). Through this merger, "transit" was expanded to "transportation," as the agency combined both county-wide roles of the two predecessor agencies.

Today, Metro has very broad powers. According to the Metro website: "Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) is unique among the nation's transportation agencies. It serves as transportation planner and coordinator, designer, builder, and operator for one of the country's largest, most populous counties." As the

regional transportation planning agency and public transportation operating agency for Los Angeles County, Metro develops and oversees transportation plans, policies, funding programs, and both short-term and long-range solutions that address the county's increasing mobility, accessibility, and environmental needs (Wikipedia, 2015a; Wikipedia, 2015b; Metro, 2015a; Metro, 2015b). It should be noted that even with the creation of LA Metro there are still several municipal systens which operate cooperatively but independently, such as Santa Monica's "Big Blue Bus" system and Culver City Bus (http://bigbluebus.com/; http://www.culvercity.org/government/transportation/bus.aspx).

6.2.4 CTSA Models

For each of the three models, examples are provided. Examples include Sacramento County, Los Angeles County, and Riverside County.

6.2.4.1 Sacramento County, California

Paratransit, Inc. is the CTSA for the urbanized area of Sacramento County and provides comprehensive ADA Paratransit services, as well as the more typical CTSA functions of social service transportation coordination. When Paratransit, Inc. became a direct claimant of TDA Article 4.5, city, and county funds in the 1980s, it consolidated duplicate services operated by the local transit district. Paratransit, Inc. also is a direct claimant of local sales tax funds (i.e., a local 20-year transportation measure that was renewed for an additional 30 years in 2009). Since the 1990s, Paratransit, Inc. and local transit district funds have blended, to consolidate ADA complementary paratransit services with other paratransit mobility management activities, benefitting over 80 neighborhood and social service organizations.

Paratransit, Inc. provides demand-response and social service agency transportation services to elderly, low-income, and/or ADA-qualified persons, through direct operation or brokerages. For example, Paratransit, Inc. is the ADA paratransit service provider for the local transit district (Sacramento Regional Transit District) and has partnership programs with social service agencies (e.g., using two retired vehicles provided by Paratransit, Inc., the Asian Community Center organized 55 volunteer drivers to provide trips). The goal of the partnership program is to empower social service agencies to provide transportation services to their clients, thus moving individuals who would qualify for ADA paratransit service to lower cost alternatives.

Social service agency transportation services are either consolidated with Paratransit, Inc. or coordinated with Paratransit, Inc., on a cost-sharing basis, with operational and financial data collection, forecasting, and reporting tools developed and managed by Paratransit, Inc. For directly operated services, the fleet is owned by Paratransit, Inc. and/or Sacramento Regional Transit District and is equipped with mobile data computer, automatic vehicle location, and global positioning system technologies owned by Paratransit, Inc. for paperless real-time monitoring and data collection. Trip booking, scheduling, and dispatching are accomplished in advance and/or in real-time using scheduling software owned and operated by Paratransit, Inc.

Paratransit, Inc. also offers travel training, to encourage the use of fixed-route public transit rather than the more expensive ADA paratransit door-to-door service. Additionally, Paratransit, Inc. operates a maintenance shop for its vehicles and those of social service agencies in the area. Paratransit, Inc. maintains its own fleet (over 170 vehicles) and about 200 vehicles belonging to over 40 CTSA partner agencies, shuttle systems, and outside agencies. In a recent new coordination effort with the City of Sacramento, Paratransit, Inc. is engaged in a pilot project to implement annual taxicab safety inspections to ensure compliance with the city's newly-adopted taxi ordinance, which mandates an accessible taxi fleet. (CalACT, 2015b; Paratransit, Inc., 2015).

Agency Performance

To gauge how this model for operation of a CTSA compares financially with Omnitrans Access service, the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) National Transit Database (NTD) was consulted. Paratransit, Inc. is a "Full Reporter" under NTD rules. The most recent year for which NTD data is available is 2012.

Paratransit, Inc. performance is detailed in Table 6-1. For comparison, Omnitrans Access service performance is shown in Table 6-2.

Table 6-1. NTD Operating and Performance Statistics, Paratransit, Inc. 2012

Total Operating Expenses	$	15,231,456
Unlinked (total) Passenger Trips		370,848
Vehicle Revenue Hours		202,039
Passenger Trips per Vehicle Revenue Hour		1.84
Operating Cost per Vehicle Revenue Hour	$	75.39
Operating Cost per Unlinked Passenger Trip	$	41.07

Source: FTA, 2012b

Table 6-2. NTD Operating and Performance Statistics, Omnitrans Access 2012

Total Operating Expenses	$	12,740,647
Unlinked (total) Passenger Trips		478,342
Vehicle Revenue Hours		183,631
Passenger Trips per Vehicle Revenue Hour		2.60
Operating Cost per Vehicle Revenue Hour	$	69.38
Operating Cost per Unlinked Passenger Trip	$	26.64

Source: FTA, 2012b

As shown in Table 6-1 and Table 6-2, Omnitrans' operating cost per revenue hour and operating cost per passenger trip were significantly lower than those for Paratransit, Inc. Also, the passengers-per-revenue-hour statistic for Omnitrans Access was 41 percent higher than Paratransit, Inc., indicating higher passenger productivity in the Omnitrans

system. Of course, many factors can affect such performance indicators, including the number and types of programs being provided by the CTSA, differences in service area size and density, and other factors. A more detailed evaluation would be needed to determine what factors account for the differing performance indicators. However, at this high-level initial review, the Paratransit, Inc. CTSA model (separate CTSA agency providing all services) does not appear to offer a model for reduced ADA paratransit costs or improved productivity compared to current Omnitrans Access service.

6.2.4.2 Los Angeles County, California

ASI (Access Services, Inc.) is the CTSA for Los Angeles County. The County of Los Angeles did not conduct an inventory or develop an action plan pursuant to the Social Services Transportation Improvement Act until 1989 when the act was amended. In 1990, coinciding with passage of the ADA, the planning agency designated itself as the first CTSA. Four years later, a group of 44 public fixed-route transit operators in the county designated ASI to administer and manage delivery of a regional ADA complementary paratransit program, called "Access Paratransit," also referred to as Access Services[1]. In this capacity, ASI is not a direct service provider, but contracts with independent private transit providers, who in turn supply the reservation taking and transportation services in accordance with ADA requirements. Access Services also leases vehicles to the regional providers at $1 a month to help facilitate provision of service. In total, the Access Services system provides more than 3.1 million trips per year in a service area of over 1,950 square miles (ASI, 2015).

ASI has sought to fulfill its CTSA mandate in a manner that is commensurate with the size of Los Angeles County and complexity of services offered. As such, ASI provides the best possible information and technical assistance to the county's specialized transportation providers through ASI's Professional Development Training Program—low-to-no cost workshops and seminars that offer technical assistance and training opportunities, including the University of the Pacific Transit and Paratransit Management Certificate Program and financial aid in the form of scholarships.

ASI also maintains a local transit service directory, known as RIDEINFO—a free telephone referral service providing callers with quick, accurate referrals to over 200 public, human service, and private specialized transportation providers in Los Angeles County. ASI also lists volunteer driver programs in Los Angeles County and adjacent counties.

Agency Performance

As with Paratransit, Inc., NTD data was consulted to obtain operating performance information for Access Services' contract-operated paratransit service. "Access Services" is listed in the NTD as a "Full Reporter" under NTD rules. All transit services listed in the NTD report for Access Services are in the "Purchased Transportation"

[1] http://accessla.org/about_us/overview.html

category, reflecting the fact that ASI contracts for all services rather than operating them directly. The most recent year for which NTD data is available is 2012.

Access Services demand response service performance is detailed in Table 6-3.

Table 6-3. NTD Operating and Performance Statistics, Access Services (Los Angeles County) 2012

Total Operating Expenses	$	109,750,765
Unlinked (total) Passenger Trips		3,275,021
Vehicle Revenue Hours		1,780,381
Passenger Trips per Vehicle Revenue Hour		1.84
Operating Cost per Vehicle Revenue Hour	$	61.64
Operating Cost per Unlinked Passenger Trip	$	33.51

Source: FTA, 2012b

Comparing Access Services' performance in Table 6-3 with Omnitrans in Table 6-2, Access Services' operating cost per revenue hour, at $61.64, was significantly lower than Omnitrans' rate, at $69.38, possibly reflecting more favorable contracts with private vendors than Omnitrans has. It should also be noted that Access Services is nearly nine times larger in operating budget than Omnitrans Access, possibly leading to some economies of scale.

However, Access Services' operating cost per passenger, at $33.51, is significantly higher than Omnitrans' cost per passenger rate of $26.64, indicating that Omnitrans may be scheduling trips more efficiently. Omnitrans' passenger per revenue hour figure is also significantly better than Access Services, again reflecting higher efficiency in Omnitrans' scheduling of trips. This high-level review does not consider other programs that ASI is providing, such as their trip referral services and volunteer driver programs, so a more detailed evaluation would be needed to pinpoint the reasons for the variations in performance measures. On the surface, however, the ASI model does not appear to offer a more cost-effective paratransit service approach on a "cost-per-passenger" or "passengers-per-hour" basis than Omnitrans' service.

6.2.4.3 Riverside County, California

RTA is the fixed-route transit operator and CTSA for the urbanized western area of Riverside County. RTA was established as a JPA on August 15, 1975 and began operating bus service on March 16, 1977. RTA's role as a CTSA is to assist the Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC) in coordinating social service transportation throughout the approximate 2,500-square-mile service area, provide driver training and technical workshops, and assist with preparing grant applications.

In the cities of Corona, Beaumont, and Banning, RTA coordinates regional services with the Corona Cruiser and Pass Transit. In the City of Riverside, RTA coordinates with Riverside Special Services, which provides complementary ADA compliant service to RTA's fixed routes. Outside of the City of Riverside, RTA provides the ADA paratransit service. Additionally, RTA staff periodically meets with social service providers, bus

riders, and other advocates through forums such as RCTC's Citizens Advisory Committee, RTA's quarterly ADA meetings, Transportation Now (T-NOW) committees, and surrounding regional transit operators.

As the CTSA and a federal grantee, RTA receives FTA funds directly and is responsible for the provision and compliance of sub-recipients adhering to federal regulations and policies. RTA is assisting sub-recipients throughout western Riverside County with federal funds through the FTA Section 5316 Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) and 5317 New Freedom (NF) Programs. FTA funds will be administered by RTA, with RCTC providing the local match funds. These programs include specialized public transportation initiatives that are targeted to assist low-income individuals, seniors, and persons with disabilities who require support beyond conventional public transit services to maintain their independence and mobility.

RTA also offers travel training for seniors and persons with disabilities. (RTA, 2013).

Agency Performance

As with Paratransit, Inc., NTD data was consulted to obtain operating performance information for RTA's directly-operated paratransit service. RTA is a "Full Reporter" under NTD rules. The most recent year for which NTD data is available is 2012.

RTA demand response service performance is detailed in Table 6-4.

Table 6-4. NTD Operating and Performance Statistics, RTA Demand Response 2012

Total Operating Expenses	$	9,180,493
Unlinked (total) Passenger Trips		372,322
Vehicle Revenue Hours		164,905
Passenger Trips per Vehicle Revenue Hour		2.26
Operating Cost per Vehicle Revenue Hour	$	55.67
Operating Cost per Unlinked Passenger Trip	$	24.66

Source: FTA, 2012b

As shown in Table 6-4 and Table 6-2, RTA's operating cost per revenue hour, at $55.67, was significantly lower than Omnitrans' rate, at $69.38. However, RTA's operating cost per passenger, at $24.66, was only slightly lower than Omnitrans' rate at $26.64. Also, RTA's passenger productivity (passengers per revenue hour) was lower than Omnitrans' passenger productivity (by 0.34 passengers per hour). A more in-depth evaluation of the two systems would need to be conducted to determine why RTA's cost per revenue hour is nearly 20 percent lower than Omnitrans' rate, but their cost per passenger is only 7.4 percent lower than Omnitrans' rate. However, this initial review indicates it may be worthwhile to study the RTA model (transit agency also serving as CTSA) more closely.

6.3 Summary and Conclusions

This section provides a summary of each alternative and model example.

Cooperative agreements are beneficial in that they take advantage of the synergies available through the participation of multiple agencies, rather than each agency conducting its own program on a stand-alone basis. In California, the CalACT/MBTA Vehicle Purchasing Cooperative provides agencies better vehicle pricing and selection through joint procurement. In Davenport, the interconnectedness of the region, as demonstrated by the creation of several intergovernmental forums to support the QC area, allowed three agencies to come together to support the creation of a singular regional marketing entity and a weekend circulator service. In San Diego, example, the sharing of operating/support services and equipment (i.e., ITS) allowed two agencies to support region-wide advancement, while continuing to maintain separate transit system identities, missions, and operations. Also in San Diego, the sharing of capital resources (i.e., commuter rail tracks and stations) expanded transit service within the county without adding additional vehicles or staff, as well as supporting transit service beyond the county. These agreements allow agencies to acquire resources and/or offer services that would otherwise be more costly or out of reach.

Functional consolidation improves the coordination of transit services and may create new opportunities for comprehensive regional planning. Certain governmental entities could benefit from increases in the size or scale of operations, as well as an expansion in the scope of their responsibilities (e.g., a broader geographic area), provided the agency receiving the new functional activity has the capacity (e.g., staff and financial) to conduct it. In San Diego, the legislative functional consolidation of planning, financial programming, project development, and construction services from two transit agencies into a consolidated transportation agency allowed for better coordination of transit services, specifically the development/implementation of regionally-significant projects (e.g., projects extending across jurisdictions, projects consistent with regional transportation plans, projects that meet regional needs). A transfer of staff and financial resources was a part of this transfer of functions. In Kansas City, the voluntary functional consolidation of administrative and management services from one agency to another resulted in cost savings for existing transit services, with potential improved regional transit services in the future (the same results are anticipated in Barstow). Functional consolidation allows for coordination of transit services, especially in advancing regional projects and potential cost savings.

Complete consolidation places all operational authority in one agency. As demonstrated in metropolitan (southern) San Diego County and Los Angeles, the evolution from separate agencies to one unified and fully coordinated system typically occurs as a step-by-step process and is achieved or influenced by legislative mandate. The metropolitan San Diego County example demonstrated the benefits of mixing modes (i.e., bus and LRT) and jurisdictions, to achieve coordinated and cost effective transit services in specific corridors, though the consolidation was not always favorably received initially[2].

[2] In 2007, MTS assumed control over National City Transit from the City of National City, amid the City's reluctance to implement findings of the COA. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/San_Diego_Metropolitan_Transit_System

The Los Angeles example demonstrated the benefits of consolidating planning and funding authority, and operating and construction authority, in a single entity.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

7.0 ALTERNATIVES AND MODELS FOR SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY

This chapter expands upon the alternatives and models presented in Chapter 6.0, identifying those that could be implemented in San Bernardino County. The alternatives and models, also referred to as "coordination/optimization alternatives" and "consolidated transportation services agency (CTSA) models," offer different organizational approaches for improving cost and operational efficiencies for public transit services and social service transportation services in the county.

7.1 Existing Conditions

In San Bernardino County, transportation providers and agencies consist of the following: six transit agencies, one regional transportation planning agency (San Bernardino Associated Governments [SANBAG]), and a non-profit CTSA for the San Bernardino Valley subarea. In addition, at the June 3, 2015 SANBAG Board meeting (after the start of this study), Victor Valley Transit Authority (VVTA) was designated as the CTSA for the Victor Valley and North Desert subareas for a period of 4 years[3].

The transportation providers and agencies have various operational and administrative functions, systems, and assets, as described in Chapter 2.0. Currently, the provision of transit services within San Bernardino County is limited to the six transit agencies, with the organizational structure and operator of the future Redlands Passenger Rail Project still to be determined. In addition, the Southern California Regional Rail Authority (SCRRA) operates the multi-county Metrolink commuter rail service. As discussed in Section 3.1 of Chapter 3.0, coordination amongst the San Bernardino County transportation providers and agencies exists, but is limited mostly to the six transit agencies (i.e., the procurement of buses and inter-agency passenger transfer agreements).

The transportation providers and agencies vary in their founding legislation; however, most are joint powers authorities (JPAs). JPAs include the following four transit agencies: Morongo Basin Transit Authority (MBTA), Mountain Area Regional Transit Authority (MARTA), Omnitrans, and VVTA. The remaining two transit agencies (Barstow Area Transit [BAT][4] and the City of Needles are each administered by a local city. SANBAG was created as a Council of Governments, although it also functions as a County Transportation Commission, County Transportation Authority, Congestion Management Agency, and Subregional Planning Agency. Valley Transportation Services (VTrans) was created by SANBAG, with VTrans Board members consisting of SANBAG, Omnitrans, and County of San Bernardino representatives.[5]

[3] SANBAG, June 3, 2015 Board Agenda, Item 16.

[4] At the beginning of this study, BAT was a separate transit agency administered by the City of Barstow; however, BAT operations were merged with VVTA in September 2014.

[5] In October 2012, the SANBAG Board of Directors created and designated VTrans as the CTSA for the San Bernardino Valley subarea. SANBAG has apportioned 8 percent of Measure I revenue to the San Bernardino Valley Senior and Disabled Transit Program, of which a minimum of 25 percent shall be made available for the creation and operation of a CTSA.

7.2 Purpose of Alternatives and Models

The coordination/optimization alternatives are based on national strategies, or national best practices, of coordinating/optimizing public transit services. The CTSA models are based on CTSAs from across the state that provide social service transportation services. Although several regions were included in the alternative and CTSA model examples (see Chapter 6.0), the examples differ from San Bernardino County in a number of ways (e.g., distance between service areas and system connectivity). This chapter looks at the alternatives and CTSA models in terms of practical application in San Bernardino County.

Regarding the alternatives, it is important to note that, while the alternatives evaluated range from cooperative agreements to complete agency consolidation, a basic tenet of this study is that complete consolidation would only be an option for transit agencies who themselves see benefit in doing so and decide to proceed on that course of action (SANBAG, 2014c). Thus, the review of the three alternatives' effects on operational and administrative functions and cost saving and coordination strategies is for evaluation purposes only.

7.3 Comparison of Alternatives and Models

This section provides a comparison of the alternatives and CTSA models.

7.3.1 Alternatives

Three alternatives for public transit services are provided. The impacts of each alternative on key functional activities, including many of the functions evaluated in the financial review (see Chapter 5.0), are detailed in a matrix format in Table 7-1 and summarized in the discussion below.

7.3.1.1 Cooperative Agreements

Cooperative agreements generally are used by transit agencies as a means to achieve cost savings, while continuing to maintain the separate operations, policies, goals, and objectives of their respective transit systems. Coordination is relatively easy, as participation is voluntary, and to the benefit of all transit agencies involved.

Current Applications of this Alternative

Currently, transit agencies participate in a number of cooperative agreements.

For fixed-route transit services, some transit agencies coordinate their routes and schedules, accepting transfers from or offering discounts to riders at specific points of connection (e.g., MARTA "Off-the-Mountain" and Omnitrans Fixed Route services). Additionally, some transit agencies offer commuter services beyond their service area and into adjacent service areas; however, these transit services typically are not the result of cooperative agreements amongst the transit agencies.

For bus procurements, all San Bernardino County transit agencies have used joint procurements. Typically, the California Association for Coordinated Transportation

(CalACT)/MBTA Vehicle Purchasing Cooperative has been used to procure smaller vehicles. Omnitrans has procured full-size buses through joint procurements with transit agencies outside of San Bernardino County.

For short-range transit plans (SRTPs) and comprehensive operational analyses (COAs), SANBAG, as the county transportation commission, has established cooperative agreements for shared resources, where SANBAG consultants conduct studies on behalf of the transit agencies.

Potential Applications of this Alternative

Transit agencies can explore additional cooperative agreements to achieve cost savings and/or to improve services. Many of these functional areas were previously discussed in Chapter 5.0 (Financial Review).

For transit agencies that are relatively close in geography, some vehicle maintenance activities could be coordinated, such as heavy overhauls or body work, if travel time costs do not significantly reduce cost savings. Likewise, any cooperative agreements for training would have to consider travel time costs to the training center.

In some instances, coordination due to geography may not be feasible, making joint contracting the best option to promote cost savings. Functions like vehicle maintenance, facility maintenance, compressed natural gas (CNG) fueling system maintenance, bus parts procurement, and security could benefit from joint contracting agreements. Jointly-contracted vehicle maintenance training may also be feasible for agencies with similar fleets.

Some functions can be coordinated to provide shared resources. For some functions (e.g., grant application assistance, service scheduling/runcutting, service planning/data analysis, and project development/construction management), transit agency or consultant staff could possibly be shared, providing access to technical expertise; however, staff availability and transit agency priorities must be managed. In some instances, staff familiarity with the transit agency or service area is needed. In other cases, the function is one of many functions managed by one or few staff at the agency, which is typical of the smaller transit agencies, minimizing cost savings. For Information Systems/Technology, resources could be designed, procured, and then deployed for the benefit of multiple transit agencies.

Certain administrative functions, such as Americans with Disabilities Act [ADA] paratransit passenger certifications, payroll processing (centralized processing or via a vendor), and drug and alcohol program compliance (testing services) may have opportunities for joint contracting, but the varying processes amongst the transit agencies would have to be reconciled, which may reduce cost savings.

Under all alternatives (i.e., cooperative agreements, functional consolidation, and complete consolidation), the development of a joint regional marketing program or on-line customer information system could provide long-term improvements for transit services, simplifying customer access to transit information for cross-jurisdictional trips, with limited cost savings but improved service to the public in the short-term. Likewise,

development of a regional fare structure with certain fare media recognized by all participating operators would simplify fare media for passengers. Omnitrans, SCRRA, and VVTA have all expressed interest in regional fare solutions such as Smart Cards or mobile phone fare applications.

Limitations of this Alternative

Some functions do not work well for cooperative agreements, as they are unique to each transit agency (i.e., reconciling transit agency differences/processes is not worth the cost savings). For example, labor relations typically involve different unions and labor contracts at each transit agency; the sharing of labor relations staff would likely be problematic.

7.3.1.2 Functional Consolidation

Functional consolidation is used to transfer certain key functions from one transit agency to another transit agency, for the benefit of both agencies. Transfers may be voluntary or the result of legislative initiative.

Current Applications of this Alternative

An example of functional consolidation is the recent agreement between the City of Barstow and VVTA, which transferred BAT, a city-run transit service, to VVTA. Both the City of Barstow and VVTA remain separate and distinct governmental agencies.

Potential Applications of this Alternative

Functional consolidation could be used to achieve cost savings and/or to improve services in San Bernardino County.

Like the example of VVTA and BAT, certain fixed-route transit services that operate in relatively close in geography could be functionally consolidated, providing cost savings and/or improved services, such as regional services promoted over a larger combined service area. An example is the current VVTA National Training Center service, which has been consolidated under VVTA operation for some time (preceding the current merger), even though some of the service originates or terminates in Barstow[6].

For transit agencies that are relatively close in geography, vehicle maintenance (heavy overhauls or body work, for example) could be functionally consolidated, with possible cost savings (if travel time costs do not significantly reduce cost savings). Likewise, any training that is functionally consolidated would have to consider travel time costs to the training center.

For transit agencies with similar existing fleet vehicle types, maintenance training or bus parts procurement could be functionally consolidated through a single purchasing

[6] Though geographic proximity of services enhances functional consolidation opportunities for transit routes, VVTA notes that it now has responsibility for volunteer programs in Trona and Big River, which are long distances away from VVTA's operating base, as a result of the merger with Barstow.

agency for possible cost savings, with the suppliers still delivering the services or parts to each separate agency's yard.

Bus procurements could be functionally consolidated, but would require some consistency in the acquired vehicles, which may or may not meet the needs of each transit agency. This has largely been accomplished for the cutaway vehicle purchases of the agencies through joint use of the CalACT/MBTA bus procurement program.

Some functions could be functionally consolidated to provide shared resources. For some functions (e.g., grant application assistance, service scheduling/runcutting, service planning/data analysis, and project development/construction management), transit agency or consultant staff could be shared through functionally consolidated resources, providing access to technical expertise; however, staff availability and transit agency priorities must be managed. In some instances, staff familiarity with the transit agency or service area is needed. In other cases, the function is one of many functions managed by one or few staff, which is typical of the smaller transit agencies, minimizing cost savings.

Certain administrative functions, such as ADA paratransit passenger certifications, payroll processing (centralized processing or via a vendor), and drug and alcohol program compliance (testing services) could be functionally consolidated, but the varying processes amongst the transit agencies would have to be reconciled, which may reduce cost savings.

Under all alternatives (i.e., cooperative agreements, functional consolidation, and complete consolidation), the development of a joint regional marketing program or on-line customer information system could provide long-term improvements for transit services, simplifying customer access to transit information for cross-jurisdictional trips, with limited cost savings but improved service to the public short-term. Likewise, development of a regional fare structure with certain fare media recognized by all participating operators would simplify fare media for passengers.

Limitations of this Alternative

Some functions (e.g., labor relations) do not work well for functional consolidation, as they are unique to each transit agency (i.e., reconciling transit agency differences/processes is not worth the cost savings). Other functions, like information systems/technology and finance/accounting, cannot be functionally consolidated.

7.3.1.3 Complete Consolidation

Complete consolidation typically occurs by statute, transferring all functions from one or more transit agencies to a single consolidated agency, which then provides transit services. The consolidated agency typically owns the transit vehicles and oversees the employees. One or more of the previous agencies ceases to exist as a separate entity.

Current Applications of this Alternative

Currently, there is no example of this alternative in San Bernardino County.

Potential Applications of this Alternative

Potential cost savings or improved services under this alternative would result from the complete consolidation of all functions, as there is no option to select which functions are consolidated or transferred. As detailed in Table 7-1, there are key trade-offs with this approach. While there may be some administrative staff cost savings, separate operations and maintenance facilities and transit centers are typically still needed in each of the consolidated agencies' service areas due to geographic distances, including supervisory staff to manage them. This would limit the extent of administrative cost savings beyond that which can already be obtained through cooperative agreements or functional consolidation of specific transit activities.

Additionally, the complexity of some functions may be increased (e.g., preparation of SRTPs and COAs), and at some point size of operations can become counter-productive to cost savings. On the positive side, inter-transit agency conflicts would be eliminated (e.g., no competition for grants, though internal departmental competiveness may still occur) and uniformity could be established through singular processes (e.g., drug and alcohol compliance, employee benefits, and ADA paratransit certification process) and shared resources (e.g., buses, training, fuel), depending on how differences in collective bargaining unit agreements between the consolidated agencies are reconciled.

Additionally, under a single consolidated agency, a marketing program or telephone and on-line customer information system could improve regional transit services in the short- and long-term, improving access to transit information and uniformity of fare policies and fare collection systems for the customer.

Limitations of this Alternative

For some functions, like fuel purchasing, tire contracts, or other services, existing contracts may have to be terminated or modified. For other functions, such as labor relations, the different unions, labor contracts, and seniority lists already in place at each transit agency would make complete agency consolidation more complex.

7.3.2 CTSA Models

CTSAs can have a wide variety of functions, leading to the establishment of different CTSA models. The legislative intent of the Social Services Transportation Improvement Act, which created CTSAs, is to improve the quality of transportation services to low-mobility groups, while achieving cost savings, lowered insurance premiums, and more efficient use of vehicles and funding sources. Key functions by CTSA model are detailed in **Error! Reference source not found.** and summarized below (CalACT, 2015b).

7.3.2.1 CTSA as Stand-alone ADA Paratransit Service Provider

Under this CTSA model, the CTSA is an independent agency which has administrative as well as operations and maintenance functions, and supports other social service transportation agencies and programs.

Under this model, the CTSA would provide or directly contract for ADA paratransit services on behalf of the transit operator ultimately responsible for the provision of ADA paratransit service complementary to the fixed-route service (i.e., Omnitrans in the San Bernardino Valley area). As a result, funds are mostly retained within the agency and performance reporting is specific to the agency. For example, "Paratransit, Inc.," the Sacramento CTSA example discussed in Chapter 6.0, is a direct reporter to the National Transit Database.

As a transportation provider, operations and maintenance functions are tied to the provision of ADA paratransit service and related functions (e.g., ADA paratransit service dispatching). The CTSA owns its vehicles and coordinates its services with other social service agencies.

Under this CTSA model, the CTSA also supports other social service agencies providing transportation. Support is provided via trip brokerages, vehicle maintenance, driver training, and other training. The purpose of this support is to empower these agencies to provide services to their clients, moving individuals who quality for ADA paratransit service to lower cost alternatives. Designated CTSA's under this model are eligible to file claims for Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 4.5 funding.

7.3.2.2 CTSA as Coordinating/Technical Support Provider

Under this CTSA model, the CTSA has administrative functions and supports other social service transportation agencies and programs. This model is most like that followed by VTrans at this time.

The CTSA does not provides ADA paratransit services (does not contract services), but receives funds to support itself, as well as help support other social service transportation agencies and programs.

The CTSA may support other social service agencies through a variety of functions, including trip brokerages, vehicle maintenance, driver training, and travel training programs for riders. The purpose of this support is to empower social service agencies to provide services to their clients, moving individuals who quality for ADA paratransit service to lower cost alternatives. Designated CTSA's under this model are eligible to file claims for Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 4.5 funding.

7.3.2.3 CTSA within Transit Agency

Under this CTSA model, the CTSA is incorporated within a transit agency's organizational structure, has administrative and operations and maintenance functions, and supports other social service transportation programs. The Riverside Transit Agency (RTA) example discussed in Chapter 6.0 is most like this model. The recent designation of VVTA as a CTSA for its service area is also in this category.

The CTSA provides ADA paratransit services within a transit agency, so funds are retained within the agency (CTSA/transit agency) and performance reporting is specific

to the agency. Under this CTSA model, the CTSA can use Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 4.5 funds to operate and contract transportation services[7].

As a transportation provider, operations and maintenance functions are tied to the provision of ADA paratransit service and related functions (e.g., ADA paratransit service dispatching). The CTSA owns its vehicles and coordinates its services with other social service agencies.

Under this CTSA model, the CTSA typically does not support other social service agencies providing transportation (e.g., supporting social service agency vehicle maintenance at the transit agency is usually not feasible).

[7] TDA regulations specify that claimants may not file claims in excess of their operating and eligible capital costs. If contract services are used, the CTSA may claim contract costs, as well as internal administrative costs. If the CTSA operates services, it may claim both operating costs and capital costs for the purchase of vehicles (including equipment, parts, and accessories), and communication and data processing equipment.

Table 7-1. Key Features by Alternative

Key Function	Alternative		
	Cooperative Agreements	**Functional Consolidation**	**Complete Consolidation**
Operations and Maintenance			
Fixed-Route Transit Services	**Opportunity**: Possible cost savings or improved services through cooperative agreement on fixed-route transit services, such as one agency operating service for another. Shared resources (e.g., commuter rail tracks/stations) could increase ridership and/or generate revenue. Potential to coordinate with other systems (e.g., schedules, transfers, fare media) and develop supporting services (e.g., circulator service to support more than one system). **Challenge:** Each agency has separate policies and goals for their service area, requiring coordination.	**Opportunity**: Possible cost savings or improved services through functional consolidation of fixed-route transit service operations under one agency. Regional transit services (across service areas) could be coordinated and possibly duplicative services eliminated. **Challenge**: Each agency could have separate policies and goals for their service area, requiring coordination. Excluding Omnitrans, agencies have few administrative and management staff, so administrative cost savings could be minimal. Additionally, one agency providing fixed-route transit services for more than one service area could be problematic, as long distances may increase deadhead costs and coach operators may be unfamiliar with the service area.	**Opportunity**: Possible cost savings or improved services through complete agency consolidation. One agency would oversee all services (one system, one set of policies/goals, one set of fares). **Challenge**: A single consolidated agency providing fixed-route transit services for a large service area could be problematic, as long distances may increase deadhead costs and coach operators may be unfamiliar with the service area. Additional resources, like local bases, would still be required. Any potential cost savings may be reduced by continuing need for separate operating bases. Also, labor costs of the largest transit union with the highest rate structures could be imposed on lower cost consolidated agencies, again negating savings.
Fixed-Route Transit Dispatching/Coordination	**Opportunity**: Possible cost savings through cooperative agreement on fixed-route transit dispatching/coordination, such as one agency providing dispatching service on certain routes for another. **Challenge**: At most San Bernardino County agencies, dispatchers handle other functions besides service dispatching, such as customer service, information calls, and administrative tasks, so cost savings could be minimal. Each agency's dispatchers know their own system best.	**Opportunity**: Possible cost savings through functional consolidation of fixed-route transit dispatching/coordination under one agency. **Challenge**: At most agencies, dispatchers handle other functions besides service dispatching, such as customer service, information calls, and administrative tasks, so cost savings could be minimal. Each agency's dispatchers know their own system best.	**Opportunity**: Possible cost savings through complete agency consolidation, including all dispatching under one entity. **Challenge**: A single consolidated agency providing fixed-route transit dispatching/coordination for a large service area could be problematic. Additional resources, like local bases, could be required. Any cost savings may be reduced accordingly.
ADA Paratransit **– Service** **– Dispatching/Coordination**	**Opportunity**: Possible cost savings through cooperative agreement to provide some ADA paratransit services and/or dispatch/coordination for another. **Challenge**: The varying service policies and systems among the operators would need to be reconciled. At smaller agencies, ADA paratransit service allows administrative costs to be spread among more service, improving efficiency. Also, some of the San Bernardino County agencies use route deviation service in lieu of providing any ADA paratransit service.	**Opportunity**: Possible cost savings through functional consolidation of ADA paratransit service and dispatch/coordination under one agency. **Challenge**: The varying service policies and systems among the operators would need to be reconciled. At smaller agencies, ADA paratransit service allows administrative costs to be spread among more service, improving efficiency. Also, some of the San Bernardino County agencies use route deviation service in lieu of providing any ADA paratransit service.	**Opportunity**: Possible cost savings through complete agency consolidation including ADA service provision and dispatching. **Challenge**: A single consolidated agency providing ADA paratransit services for a large service area could be problematic, as long distances may increase deadhead costs and paratransit operators may be unfamiliar with the service area and customers. Additional resources, like local bases, could be required. Any cost savings may be reduced accordingly.
ADA Paratransit **–Certification Process**	**Opportunity**: Possible cost savings through cooperative agreement on the ADA paratransit certification process with one agency providing the certification service for another (a uniform process is created). Improvement in the certification process was a high-potential cost savings item in Chapter 5.0 (for agencies with a high number of ADA applications). **Challenge**: The varying processes among the agencies would need to be reconciled. There is a low number of ADA applications at some agencies, so need for uniform process is unlikely (cost savings unlikely).	**Opportunity**: Possible cost savings through functional consolidation of the ADA paratransit certification process under one agency (a uniform process is created). Improvement in the certification process was a high-potential cost savings item in Chapter 5.0 (for agencies with a high number of ADA applications). **Challenge**: The varying processes among the agencies would need to be reconciled. There is a low number of ADA applications at some agencies, so need for uniform process is unlikely (cost savings unlikely).	**Opportunity**: Possible cost savings through complete agency consolidation including ADA service provision and certification. This was a high-potential cost savings item in Chapter 5.0 (for agencies with a high number of ADA applications). **Challenge**: Under a single consolidated agency, there would be one process, but separate local certification sites would still be required due to the large service area.

Table 7-1. Key Features by Alternative (Continued)

Key Function	Alternative		
	Cooperative Agreements	Functional Consolidation	Complete Consolidation
Vehicle Maintenance	**Opportunity**: Possible cost savings through cooperative agreement for one agency to provide some vehicle maintenance services to another. **Challenge**: Long distances between service areas would cause large deadhead costs to share maintenance facilities, so local bases would still be needed, reducing cost savings potential. Savings more likely if contracted parts or overhaul procurements are pursued.	**Opportunity**: Possible cost savings through functional consolidation of all vehicle maintenance under one agency. **Challenge**: Long distances between service areas would cause large deadhead costs to share maintenance facilities, so local bases would still be needed, reducing cost savings potential. Savings more likely if contracted parts or overhaul procurements are pursued.	**Opportunity**: Possible cost savings through complete agency consolidation including all vehicle maintenance activities. **Challenge:** Under a single consolidated agency, the large service area (distance) would cause large deadhead costs to share maintenance facilities, so local bases would still be needed, reducing cost savings potential.
Facility Maintenance (includes maintenance facility, bus stops, shelters, transit centers)	**Opportunity**: Possible cost savings through cooperative agreement on some facility maintenance services between agencies. **Challenge**: Long distances between service areas would cause large travel time costs to combine facility maintenance work, reducing cost savings potential. Savings more likely via joint contracting for maintenance.	**Opportunity**: Possible cost savings through functional consolidation of all facility maintenance under one agency. **Challenge**: Long distances between service areas would cause large travel time costs to combine facility maintenance work, reducing cost savings potential. Savings more likely via joint contracting for maintenance.	**Opportunity**: Possible cost savings through complete agency consolidation including all facility maintenance. **Challenge**: Under a single consolidated agency, the large service area (distance) would cause large travel time costs to combine facility maintenance work under one contract, reducing cost savings potential.
Coach Operator Training	**Opportunity**: Possible cost savings or improved services through cooperative agreement on providing some coach operator training for another agency. **Challenge**: Only classroom portion likely to be feasible, as coach operators need training on the specifics of their agency's vehicles, routes, service area. Distances between agencies also an issue for trainees reporting to training center.	**Opportunity**: Possible cost savings or improved services through functional consolidation of all coach operator training under one agency. **Challenge**: Only classroom portion likely to be feasible, as coach operators need training on the specifics of their agency's vehicles, routes, service area. Distances between agencies also an issue for trainees reporting to training center.	**Opportunity**: Possible cost savings through complete agency consolidation including coach operator training. **Challenge**: Under a single consolidated agency, the large service area (distance) would still require separate training locations for trainees, reducing cost-savings potential. In addition, the schedules required for training classes may vary between agency areas based on driver turnover rates.
Maintenance Training	**Opportunity**: Possible cost savings or improved services through cooperative agreement on maintenance training among agencies. Training suppliers/vendors may be able to tailor training to a few days or 1-week training courses to make more viable. Takes advantage of industry trainers, expertise. **Challenge**: Travel time and cost for trainees attending training at the combined location. Varying training needs due to varying fleet types.	**Opportunity**: Possible cost savings or improved services through functional consolidation of all maintenance training under one agency. Training suppliers/vendors may be able to tailor training to a few days or 1-week training courses to make more viable. Takes advantage of industry trainers, expertise. **Challenge**: Travel time and cost for trainees attending training at the combined location. Varying training needs due to varying fleet types.	**Opportunity**: Potential cost savings and/or efficiency through complete agency consolidation including maintenance training. Training suppliers/vendors may be able to tailor training to a few days or 1-week training courses to make more viable. Takes advantage of industry trainers, expertise. **Challenge**: Under a single consolidated agency, the large service area (distance) would still require multiple training locations, reducing cost-savings potential. Varying training needs due to varying fleet types, at least in early years following consolidation.
Bus Heavy Overhaul/Repair	**Opportunity**: Possible cost savings through cooperative agreement on bus heavy overhaul/repair services via either a joint procurement or one agency providing for another. This was a high-potential cost savings item in Chapter 5.0. **Challenge**: Variations in engine and transmission models between agencies reduce potential cost savings. Cost savings most practical via contracting for this service.	**Opportunity**: Possible cost savings through functional consolidation of bus heavy overhaul/repair services under one agency via either a joint procurement or one agency providing for another. This was a high-potential cost savings item in Chapter 5.0. **Challenge**: Variations in engine and transmission models between agencies reduce potential cost savings. Cost savings most practical via contracting for this service.	**Opportunity**: Possible cost savings through complete agency consolidation, where one agency would be issuing all overhaul contracts. This was a high-potential cost savings item in Chapter 5.0. **Challenge**: Variations in engine and transmission models in existing fleets reduce potential cost savings. Over time, as fleets become consistent under one consolidated agency, this issue would resolve itself.
Bus Procurement	**Opportunity**: Possible cost savings through cooperative agreement on bus procurement. The agencies already use Cooperative Agreements through the CalACT/MBTA program. This was a high-potential cost savings item in Chapter 5.0. **Challenge**: Various service operations (i.e., direct or contract operations) amongst the agencies. Differing fleet types/needs.	**Opportunity**: Possible cost savings through functional consolidation of bus procurement under one agency. This was a high-potential cost savings item in Chapter 5.0. **Challenge**: Various service operations (i.e., direct or contract operations) amongst the agencies. Would force more conformity among fleet procurements, which may or may not always meet local needs.	**Opportunity**: Possible cost savings through complete agency consolidation including bus procurement. This was a high-potential cost savings item in Chapter 5.0. **Challenge**: Under a single consolidated agency, the varying local service operations (i.e., direct or contract operations) and fleet types/needs would need to be reconciled.

Table 7-1. Key Features by Alternative (Continued)

Key Function	Alternative		
	Cooperative Agreements	Functional Consolidation	Complete Consolidation
Bus Part Procurement	**Opportunity**: Possible cost savings through cooperative agreement on bus parts procurement via joint procurement. This was a high-potential cost savings item in Chapter 5.0. **Challenge**: Various service operations (i.e., direct vs. contract operations) amongst the agencies. For non-contracted operations, there are variations in bus engines, transmissions, and other equipment, reducing potential cost savings. Efforts toward consistency in initial bus procurements would improve effectiveness of this strategy.	**Opportunity**: Possible cost savings through functional consolidation of bus parts procurement under one agency. This was a high-potential cost savings item in Chapter 5.0. **Challenge**: Various service operations (i.e., direct vs. contract operations) amongst the agencies. For non-contracted operations, there are variations in bus engines, transmissions, and other equipment, reducing potential cost savings. Efforts toward consistency in initial bus procurements would improve effectiveness of this strategy.	**Opportunity**: Possible cost savings on bus parts procurement through complete agency consolidation. This was a high-potential cost savings item in Chapter 5.0. **Challenge**: Under a single consolidated agency, the various service operations (i.e., direct vs. contract operations) would need to be reconciled. Variations in engines, transmissions, and other equipment would reduce potential cost savings. Over time, new bus procurements by the single agency would lead toward consistency, improving cost savings potential.
Fuel Procurement (non-CNG)	**Opportunity**: Possible cost savings through cooperative agreement on joint fuel procurement. **Challenge**: Agencies may have long-term fuel procurement contracts with local suppliers.	**Opportunity**: Possible cost savings through functional consolidation of fuel procurement under one agency. **Challenge**: Agencies may have long-term fuel procurement contracts with local suppliers.	**Opportunity**: Possible cost savings through complete agency consolidation including fuel procurement. **Challenge**: Existing contracts would need to be terminated or modified. Cost savings hard to determine without procurement.
CNG Fuel Procurement	**Opportunity**: Possible cost savings through cooperative agreement on CNG fuel joint procurement. This was a high-potential cost savings item in Chapter 5.0. **Challenge**: Agencies may have long-term fuel procurement contracts with local suppliers. Differing CNG fuel type (Omnitrans currently uses LNG converted to CNG, and MBTA and VVTA use CNG compressed from pipeline supply).	**Opportunity**: Possible cost savings through functional consolidation of CNG fuel procurement under one agency. This was a high-potential cost savings item in Chapter 5.0. **Challenge**: Agencies may have long-term fuel procurement contracts with local suppliers. Differing CNG fuel type (Omnitrans currently uses LNG converted to CNG, and MBTA and VVTA use CNG compressed from pipeline supply).	**Opportunity**: Possible cost savings through complete agency consolidation including CNG fuel procurement. This was a high-potential cost savings item in Chapter 5.0. **Challenge**: Existing contracts would need to be terminated or modified. Differing CNG fuel type (Omnitrans currently uses LNG converted to CNG, and MBTA and VVTA use CNG).
CNG Station Maintenance	**Opportunity**: Possible cost savings through cooperative agreement on joint procurement of CNG station maintenance services. **Challenge**: Differing current arrangements on CNG station maintenance between the agencies. New joint procurement for maintenance services would be required; possible termination or revision of current agreements in place could be needed.	**Opportunity**: Possible cost savings through functional consolidation of CNG station maintenance services under one agency. **Challenge**: Differing current arrangements on CNG station maintenance between the agencies. New joint procurement for maintenance services would be required; possible termination or revision of current agreements in place could be needed.	**Opportunity**: Possible cost savings through complete agency consolidation including CNG station maintenance. Trained staff at one central location could provide preventive maintenance and emergency repairs to all three CNG bases. **Challenge**: Existing contracts would need to be terminated or modified. Cost savings hard to determine without procurement.
Labor Relations Staffing	**Opportunity**: Possible cost savings through cooperative agreement to share labor relations staff. **Challenge**: Differing unions/labor situations at each agency, with unique labor agreements, grievance processes, and timelines, mitigate against this being a viable coordination area. Also, at smaller agencies, this is one of many hats the General Manager or Assistant General Manager wears. Possible exception would be joint procurement of specialized labor attorneys.	**Opportunity**: Possible cost savings through functional consolidation of labor relations staffing under one agency. **Challenge**: Differing unions/labor situations at each agency, with unique labor agreements, grievance processes, and timelines, mitigate against this being a viable coordination area. Also, at smaller agencies, this is one of many hats the General Manager or Assistant General Manager wears. Possible exception would be joint procurement of specialized labor attorneys.	**Opportunity**: Possible cost savings through complete agency consolidation including labor relations staffing. **Challenge**: Differing unions/labor situations at the consolidated agencies may have to be reconciled/combined. Separate operating bases are likely to remain due to distances, requiring local labor relations presence.
Drug & Alcohol Program Compliance	**Opportunity**: Possible cost savings through cooperative agreement on procurement of drug and alcohol program compliance (testing vendors). **Challenge**: The varying processes among the agencies/worksites would need to be reconciled.	**Opportunity**: Possible cost savings through functional consolidation of procurement of drug and alcohol program compliance (testing vendors) under one agency. **Challenge**: The varying processes among the agencies/worksites would need to be reconciled.	**Opportunity**: Possible cost savings through complete agency consolidation including drug and alcohol compliance program. **Challenge**: Under a single consolidated agency, there would be one process. However, separate compliance programs would still be needed at each operating base due to distances.

Table 7-1. Key Features by Alternative (Continued)

Key Function	Alternative		
	Cooperative Agreements	Functional Consolidation	Complete Consolidation
Administrative			
Service Planning/Data Analysis	**Opportunity**: Possible improved services through cooperative agreement on shared service planning/data analysis resources/consulting contracts. Access to expertise/resource sharing. As discussed in Chapter 5.0, this was an item not likely to reduce costs but which could improve services or revenues. **Challenge**: Service planning may occur at the same time for more than one agency, causing resource availability issues. One agency must have, or hire, surplus expertise that could be shared with others. Shared staff must become familiar with each agency's service area/needs.	**Opportunity**: Possible improved services through functional consolidation of service planning/data analysis under one agency. Access to expertise/resource sharing. As discussed in Chapter 5.0, this was an item not likely to reduce costs but which could improve services or revenues. **Challenge**: Service planning may occur at the same time for more than one agency, causing resource availability issues. One agency must have, or hire, surplus expertise that could be shared with others. Shared staff must become familiar with each agency's service area/needs.	**Opportunity**: Possible improved services through complete agency consolidation including service planning/data analysis. As discussed in Chapter 5.0, this was an item not likely to reduce costs but which could improve services or revenues. **Challenge**: The larger consolidated agency would have very diverse service planning needs spread out over a large service area, which could require more resources, possibly minimizing any net cost savings. However, service coordination under a single consolidated agency should improve.
Service Scheduling/Runcutting	**Opportunity**: Possible cost savings or improved services through cooperative agreement on scheduling/runcutting staff. Access to expertise/resource sharing. **Challenge**: Scheduling may occur at the same time for more than one agency, causing resource availability issues. One agency must have, or hire, surplus expertise that can be shared with other agencies. Shared staff must become familiar with each agency's service area/needs and labor agreement rules.	**Opportunity**: Possible cost savings or improved services through functional consolidation of scheduling/runcutting staff under one agency. Access to expertise/resource sharing. **Challenge**: Scheduling may occur at the same time for more than one agency, causing resource availability issues. One agency must have, or hire, surplus expertise that can be shared with other agencies. Shared staff must become familiar with each agency's service area/needs.	**Opportunity**: Possible cost savings or improved services through complete agency consolidation. **Challenge**: The larger consolidated agency would have greater scheduling and runcutting needs potentially spread out over multiple operating bases, which will require more scheduling resources, possibly minimizing any net cost savings. Also, as a single agency, service changes are likely to occur at the same time system-wide, increasing concurrent demand for this resource.
SRTPs and COAs	**Opportunity**: Possible cost savings or improved services through cooperative agreement on SRTP/COA staff and/or consultant procurement. Access to expertise, either through resource sharing or through consultants. This already occurs via SANBAG consulting agreements used to task consultants with this work. **Challenge**: Resource availability if agency staff performs function; not an issue if consultants are used.	**Opportunity**: Possible cost savings or improved services through functional consolidation of SRTP/COA staff and/or procurement under one agency. Access to expertise, either through resource sharing or through consultants. This already occurs via SANBAG consulting agreements used to task consultants with this work. **Challenge**: Resource availability if agency staff performs function; not an issue if consultants are used.	**Opportunity**: Possible cost savings or improved services through complete agency consolidation including SRTP/COA development. Access to expertise, either through resource sharing or through consultants. This already occurs via SANBAG consulting agreements used to task consultants with this work. **Challenge**: A single consolidated agency may save costs through smaller number of SRTPs/COAs to prepare, but the complexity of the task for the consolidated agency will be greater, possibly mitigating cost savings.
Grant Application Assistance	**Opportunity**: Possible improved services through cooperative agreements on grant application assistance between agencies. Access to expertise, either through resource sharing or through consultants. As discussed in Chapter 5.0, this was an item not likely to reduce costs but which could improve services or revenues. **Challenge**: These are generally infrequent/quick turnaround opportunities where staff availability would be an issue. Use of consultant support maybe preferable. Possible conflicts of interest on competitive grants.	**Opportunity**: Possible improved services through functional consolidation of grant application efforts under one agency. Access to expertise, either through resource sharing or through consultants. As discussed in Chapter 5.0, this was an item not likely to reduce costs but which could improve services or revenues. **Challenge**: These are generally infrequent/quick turnaround opportunities where staff availability would be an issue. Use of consultant support maybe preferable. Possible conflicts of interest on competitive grants.	**Opportunity**: Possible improved services through complete agency consolidation. Access to expertise, either through staff or through consultants. As discussed in Chapter 5.0, this was an item not likely to reduce costs but which could improve services or revenues. **Challenge**: Under a single consolidated agency, agency conflicts of interest should be eliminated; however, member agencies of the consolidated agency may still challenge the use/distribution of grant funds.

Table 7-1. Key Features by Alternative (Continued)

Key Function	Alternative		
	Cooperative Agreements	Functional Consolidation	Complete Consolidation
Fare Structures and Fare Media	**Opportunity**: Possible revenue increase or improved services through cooperative agreement on fare structures and fare media between agencies. While regional fares would be accepted, each agency can also retain its own fare structure/policies. Such agreements currently exist regarding acceptance of transfers. **Challenge**: If there are fare differentials, agreement must be reached on how to handle any cash transfers/reimbursements.	**Opportunity**: Possible revenue increase or improved services through functional consolidation of fare structures and fare media, with one program/structure covering all involved agencies. Such agreements currently exist regarding acceptance of transfers. **Challenge**: Setting fares is a critical budgeting function for each agency. If each agency continues to operate service, they would likely need their own fare structure as well as the consolidated fare structure. If there are fare differentials, agreement must be reached on how to handle any cash transfers/reimbursements.	**Opportunity**: Under a single consolidated agency, there would be one fare structure. **Challenge**: How to deal with differing fare revenue levels and farebox recovery for services of differing performance levels. Applying the higher fares of a more urbanized area to routes in rural areas could raise Title VI or equity issues.
Marketing	**Opportunity:** Possible cost savings and improved services through the creation of a regional marketing program. Could improve ridership and long-term productivity. This program was a low- to mid-potential cost savings item in Chapter 5.0. **Challenge**: Ensure the regional marketing message is consistent with that of each agency. Few agencies have dedicated marketing staff (no cost savings).	**Opportunity**: Possible cost savings and improved services through the creation of a regional marketing program under functional consolidation of marketing under one agency. Could improve ridership and long-term productivity. This program was a low- to mid-potential cost savings item in Chapter 5.0. **Challenge**: Ensure the regional marketing message is consistent with that of each agency. Few agencies have dedicated marketing staff (no cost savings).	**Opportunity**: Under a single consolidated agency, there would be one marketing program. **Challenge**: Ensure the regional marketing program explores advertising mechanisms and media buys that benefit both urban and rural areas and the varying service needs in each area.
Customer Service	**Opportunity:** Possible cost savings through cooperative agreement to create a regional telephone customer information center. This center was a low- to mid-potential cost savings item in Chapter 5.0. **Challenge**: At most agencies, staff handle this and other functions, so cost savings would be minimal.	**Opportunity**: Possible cost savings through the creation of a regional telephone customer information center under functional consolidation of Customer Service. This center was a low- to mid-potential cost savings item in Chapter 5.0. **Challenge:** At most agencies, staff handle this and other functions, so cost savings would be minimal.	**Opportunity**: Under a single consolidated agency, there would be one telephone customer information system, though there may be multiple customer service locations. **Challenge:** Should customer or call demand outweigh resources, additional staffing or a call taking function would be needed, requiring additional costs and potentially training or upgraded software.
Telephone Information	**Opportunity:** Possible cost savings through cooperative agreement on the creation of a regional telephone customer information center. This strategy was a low- to mid-potential cost savings item in Chapter 5.0. **Challenge**: At most agencies, staff handle this and other functions, so cost savings would be minimal.	**Opportunity**: Possible cost savings through functional consolidation of regional telephone customer information services. This strategy was a low- to mid-potential cost savings item in Chapter 5.0. **Challenge:** At most agencies, staff handle this and other functions, so cost savings would be minimal.	**Opportunity**: Under a single consolidated agency, there would be one telephone customer information system, though possibly multiple locations. **Challenge:** Should call demand outweigh resources, additional staffing or a call taking function would be needed, requiring additional costs and potentially training or upgraded software.
Training/Staff Development	**Opportunity**: Possible improved services through cooperative agreement on training/staff development. As discussed in Chapter 5.0, this was an item not likely to reduce costs but which could improve services or revenues. **Challenge**: Distances between agencies an issue for trainees reporting to training center.	**Opportunity**: Possible improved services through functional consolidation of training/staff development under one agency. As discussed in Chapter 5.0, this was an item not likely to reduce costs but which could improve services or revenues. **Challenge**: Distances between agencies an issue for trainees reporting to training center.	**Opportunity**: Possible improved services through complete agency consolidation. As discussed in Chapter 5.0, this was an item not likely to reduce costs but which could improve services or revenues. **Challenge**: Under a single consolidated agency, the large service area (distance) would be an issue for trainees reporting to training center, likely resulting in continuation of multiple training locations.
Finance/Accounting	**Opportunity**: Limited cost savings through joint procurement of auditor services. **Challenge**: Similar timing of audit needs may exceed vendor resources/responsiveness. Possible conflicts of interest.	**Challenge**: This item cannot be functionally consolidated if separate agencies continue to exist.	**Opportunity**: Under complete consolidation, all finance/accounting would be under a single agency. **Challenge**: The larger size and complexity of the consolidated agency likely mitigates any significant cost savings.

Table 7-1. Key Features by Alternative (Continued)

Key Function	Alternative		
	Cooperative Agreements	Functional Consolidation	Complete Consolidation
Payroll	**Opportunity**: Possible cost savings through cooperative agreement on payroll (combined vendor services). **Challenge**: The varying processes/payroll rules among the agencies would need to be reconciled or accommodated in the payroll services.	**Opportunity**: Possible cost savings through functional consolidation of payroll (combined vendor services) under one agency. **Challenge**: The varying processes/payroll rules among the agencies would need to be reconciled or accommodated in the payroll services.	**Opportunity**: Under complete consolidation, all payroll would be under a single agency. **Challenge**: The larger size and complexity of the consolidated agency likely mitigates any significant cost savings.
Information Systems/Technology	**Opportunity**: Possible cost savings through cooperative agreement on combined IT systems/services procurement. **Challenge**: Differing systems and software in place at each agency reduce or eliminate cost savings potential. See Chapter 2.	**Challenge**: It is unlikely that this item can be functionally consolidated. If separate agencies continue to exist, each will have information systems/technology needs.	**Opportunity**: Under complete consolidation, all information systems/technology would be under the single agency. **Challenge**: The larger size and complexity of the consolidated agency would lead to more systems and larger implementations, likely mitigating any significant cost savings.
Security	**Opportunity**: Possible cost savings through cooperative agreements on security (security firm services or contracts with the County Sheriff) joint procurement. **Challenge**: Distances between agencies may mitigate the potential savings unless the security firms have coverage in each service area.	**Opportunity**: Possible cost savings through functional consolidation of security (security firm services) under one agency. **Challenge**: Distances between agencies may mitigate the potential savings unless the security firms have coverage in each service area. Possible issues of who gets priority on emergencies.	**Opportunity**: Possible cost savings through complete agency consolidation. **Challenge**: The larger size and complexity of the consolidated agency likely mitigates any significant cost savings. Coverage for the larger service area would likely lead to need/desire for more personnel to cover all areas.
Project Development/Construction Management	**Opportunity**: Possible cost savings or improved services through cooperative agreement on project development/ construction management. Access to expertise, either through resource sharing or through consultants. This was a low- to mid-potential cost savings item in Chapter 5.0. **Challenge**: Access to agency or consultant expertise should be workable if resources are available. Providing agency would need to have surplus resources or hire or contract for them.	**Opportunity**: Possible cost savings or improved services through functional consolidation of project development/ construction management under one agency. Access to expertise, either through resource sharing or through consultants. This was a low- to mid-potential cost savings item in Chapter 5.0. **Challenge**: Access to agency or consultant expertise should be workable if resources are available. Providing agency would need to have surplus resources or hire or contract for them.	**Opportunity**: Possible cost savings or improved services through complete agency consolidation. Access to expertise, either through staff or through consultants. This was a low- to mid-potential cost savings item in Chapter 5.0. **Challenge**: The consolidated agency would have more projects to manage; could have resource limitations. Expanded use of consultants is likely to cover the peaks and valleys in demand for this type of support.
Risk Management (Handling Claims, Insurance, Accidents)	**Opportunity**: Possible cost savings through cooperative agreement on risk management services (insurance services, claims adjusters services, legal services). **Challenge**: The varying processes and levels of risk among the agencies would need to be reconciled. At the smaller agencies, this may be a minimal cost area.	**Opportunity**: Possible cost savings through functional consolidation of risk management. (insurance services, claims adjusters services, legal services). **Challenge**: The varying processes and levels of risk among the agencies would need to be reconciled. At the smaller agencies, this may be a minimal cost area.	**Opportunity**: Possible cost savings through complete agency consolidation. **Challenge**: Under a single consolidated agency, there would be one risk management program. Costs are likely to be higher in a larger agency with more risk exposure, mitigating potential savings.
Personnel Administration and Labor Relations	**Opportunity**: Possible cost savings through cooperative agreement on personnel administration and labor relations staff resources. **Challenge**: The varying personnel procedures and labor arrangements among the agencies would need to be reconciled. Simultaneous demand on resources (during contract negotiations, for example), could be a problem.	**Opportunity**: Possible cost savings through functional consolidation of personnel administration and labor relations staff resources under one agency. **Challenge**: The varying personnel procedures and labor arrangements among the agencies would need to be reconciled. Simultaneous demand on resources (during contract negotiations, for example), could be a problem.	**Opportunity**: Possible cost savings through complete agency consolidation in personnel administration and labor relations staff resources. **Challenge**: Under a single consolidated agency, the differing personnel rules and labor arrangements/contracts would have to be reconciled, or separate systems for the consolidated agencies would continue to need to be staffed. More complex and costly labor contract provisions of the larger agencies may ultimately be imposed in the less-complex labor environment of the smaller agencies, increasing costs.

Source: Parsons Brinckerhoff, 2015
Notes: ADA = Americans with Disabilities Act; CalACT = California Association for Coordinated Transportation; CNG = compressed natural gas; COA = comprehensive operational analysis; LNG = liquefied natural gas; MBTA = Morongo Basin Transit Authority; SANBAG = San Bernardino Associated Governments.

Table 7-2. Typical Key Features by CTSA Model

Key Feature	CTSA Model		
	CTSA as Stand-alone ADA Paratransit Service Provider	CTSA as Coordinating/ Technical Support Provider	CTSA within Transit Agency
CTSA Function			
Administrative			
Performance reporting	√	Varies	√
TDA Article 4.5 funds: CTSA	√	-	√
TDA Article 4.5 funds: Contract services	√	-	√
FTA JARC and New Freedom funding	√	√	√
Other CTSA funding	√	√	√
O&M: CTSA			
ADA paratransit service	√	-	√
ADA paratransit booking, scheduling, and dispatching	√	-	√
Vehicle ownership	√	-	√
Coordinate ADA paratransit service with social service agencies	√	Varies	√
O&M: Supporting Social Service Transportation Agencies			
Trip brokerages	√	√	√
Vehicle maintenance	√	√	-
Driver training	√	√	-
Other training	√	√	√
Other Programs			
ADA paratransit certification process	√	√	√
Travel training	√	√	√
Trip telephone referrals	√	√	√
Taxi vouchers	√	√	√
Accessible taxis	√	√	√
Grant application assistance	√	√	√
TREP	√	√	√

Notes: √ = Provided or could be provided; - = Not provided or would not be provided
ADA = Americans with Disabilities Act; CTSA = Consolidated Transportation Services Agency; FTA = Federal Transit Administration; JARC = Job Access and Reverse Commute; TREP = Transportation Reimbursement Escort Program

7.4 Development of Evaluation Criteria

In order to evaluate which organizational coordination/optimization alternative might best meet the needs of the San Bernardino County transit operators, a set of evaluation criteria needs to be developed and agreed upon. This section develops and proposes those criteria.

7.4.1 Transit Agency Goals and Objectives

As a starting point, any alternative needs to support the overall goals of each participating transit agency. Accordingly, the current goals and objectives from each agency's most recent SRTP or COA were reviewed and general categories were created that cover most of the agencies' goal statements.

Table 7-3 displays the transit agency goals information in a tabular format. In some cases, agency goals were expressed as objectives, in which case those objectives were provided in the table (items preceded by a bullet point).

There was a fair degree of commonality among transit agency goals and objectives. Generally, they fell into seven categories as listed and discussed below:

- Service/Network Implementation
- Ridership and Productivity
- Efficiency, Cost Effectiveness, Financial Sustainability
- Safety, Reliability, High Quality Transportation
- Marketing, Outreach, Public Participation
- Infrastructure and Equipment
- Accessibility/Meeting Service Needs

Service/Network Implementation – Four of the six transit agencies had goals/objectives related to implementation of a new route network with improved ridership and cost efficiencies. This reflects the fact that these goals were contained in an updated SRTP or COA.

Ridership and Productivity – Five of the six transit agencies had goals/objectives related to increasing ridership and/or service productivity. In some cases these were fairly broad goals to increase ridership generally, while others had very specific objectives, such as addressing excess capacity, modifying service frequencies and service spans, or modifying route alignments to improve productivity.

Efficiency, Cost Effectiveness, Financial Sustainability – Five of the six transit agencies had goals/objectives related to efficiency, cost effectiveness, and/or financial

sustainability. One of Omnitrans' goals covered both this area and enhancing the network design to increase ridership and minimize cost by reducing redundancy.

Safety, Reliability, High Quality Transportation – Five of the six transit agencies had goals/objectives related to providing safe, reliable, high-quality transit services.

Marketing, Outreach, Public Participation – Two of the six agencies had goals/objectives related to using public input or public outreach processes to gain insight into unmet needs or improve public participation.

Infrastructure and Equipment – Three of the six agencies had goals/objectives relating to developing or enhancing vehicles, facilities, and/or passenger amenities such as bus stop improvements.

Accessibility/Meeting Service Needs – Three of the six agencies had goals/objectives related to providing transit services that are accessible to everyone and/or meet the mobility needs of area residents.

It is proposed that these goal categories serve as part of the criteria for the evaluation of the different alternatives. Essentially, the evaluation would focus on the degree to which each alternative supports furtherance of these agency goal areas.

7.4.2 Additional Considerations

In addition to the degree to which an alternative supports agency goals, there are other considerations which are important to consider. The following three additional criteria are proposed:

Ease of Implementation – Any decision to change agency organizational arrangements should be relatively easy to implement, through inter-agency agreements and/or other governing board actions. Changes which would require legislative changes at the state level would be much more difficult to implement.

Ease of Administration – A change in agency organizational arrangements should be relatively easy to administer for on-going operations, once implemented. For example, a change which requires administration of complex formulae for the allocation of costs, revenues, or funding could make administration of on-going operations more difficult.

Organizational Viability and Function – A change in agency organizational arrangements or structures should leave each participating agency still viable and capable of continuing its on-going operations for elements not functionally combined (with the exception of voluntary complete agency consolidation in which case one or more agencies would cease to exist). As was discussed at length in Chapter 2.0 (Transportation Providers and Agencies), all of the transit agencies except Omnitrans are extremely leanly-staffed, and all management personnel at those agencies wear multiple hats and support multiple agency functions. An alternative which transfers a

particular function conducted by two agencies to one agency, but leaves the other agency without critical staff support for their remaining functions, does not serve the best interests of both agencies in the long-run.

One criterion which was considered but ultimately not included for this evaluation was "Potential Cost Savings". As was seen in the previous section, potential cost savings depend more on the strategy being examined (joint procurement of bus parts, for example), than the organizational coordination/optimization alternative used to pursue the strategy. Cost savings for most of the various strategies (reviewed in detail in Chapter 5.0) are potentially achievable under either cooperative agreements or functional consolidation, and possibly even under complete agency consolidation, though other challenges related to organizational size or service area distances start to interfere with potential savings under that alternative. The potential for cost savings from the strategies appears to be more a matter of agency commitment than the organizational coordination/optimization model under which they are sought. Thus, "Potential Cost Savings" was not chosen as an evaluation criterion here.

7.4.3 Evaluation Scoring

To conduct the evaluation of the alternatives, the following five-point subjective scale is proposed:

Evaluation Criteria Scoring:
5 = Very Strongly Meets/Supports Criterion
4 = Strongly Meets/Supports Criterion
3 = Meets Criterion
2 = Fails to meet Criterion on some aspects
1 = Does not meet Criterion

Alternatives which very strongly meet or support the evaluation criterion would receive the full five points. Those that do not support it as strongly, or interfere with its achievement, would receive lower point scores as defined above.

Table 7-3. Goal Categorization of the Transit Agencies*

General Goal Category	BAT	MARTA	MBTA	Needles	Omnitrans	VVTA
Service/Network Implementation	Implement a new route network to reduce costs and increase revenues system-wide and improve route farebox recovery ratios	Implement identified operational improvements to increase ridership, improve productivity, and meet demonstrated service needs, dependent on financial capacity			Enhance Omnitrans' network design to increase ridership and minimize costs by reducing redundancy	Implement a new route network • Link services to areas outside VVTA
Ridership and Productivity	• Minimize service duplication • Address excess capacity • Clarify service eligibility and encourage use of fixed routes rather than demand response services • Provide bi-directional (versus loop-based) service • Provide direct routes rather than circuitous routes	• Modify service frequencies, where appropriate • Modify span of service • Modify route alignments, where appropriate • Link services to areas outside MARTA		Provide an effective public transportation program that is responsive to community market needs at or above minimum productivity standards.	Minimize the impact to existing riders while seeking opportunities to expand ridership	• Address excess capacity • Modify service frequencies where appropriate • Modify span of service • Modify route alignments where appropriate
Efficiency, Cost Effectiveness, Financial Sustainability		Establish a sufficient operating reserve to absorb normal funding fluctuations	Sustainably operate an efficient and effective transit system through maximizing service and minimizing cost impacts	Provide public transportation services that are financially sustainable within existing local, state, and federal funding program availability	Enhance Omnitrans' network design to increase ridership and minimize costs by reducing redundancy	• Maximize cost recovery while charging a fair fare • Support initiatives that are financially and environmentally sustainable in the short and long term
Safety, Reliability, High Quality Transportation	• Eliminate delays due to fueling operations		Provide safe, reliable, and high quality transportation	Sustain and promote the City of Needles transportation program as safe, convenient and reliable, growing ridership while ensuring that service is provided in a cost-effective manner.	Deliver safe, reliable, clean, frequent, convenient, comfortable and equitable service	• Improve on-time performance
Marketing, Outreach, Public Participation	Use public input to determine and address currently unmet needs		Undertake effective marketing, outreach, and public participation			
Infrastructure and Equipment				Develop the infrastructure to support transportation services and enhance awareness and grow ridership of Needles' public transportation services.	Expand, maintain, and improve existing vehicles, facilities, and passenger amenities	Provide bus stop amenities

Table 7-3. Goal Categorization of the Transit Agencies* (Continued)

General Goal Category	BAT	MARTA	MBTA	Needles	Omnitrans	VVTA
Accessibility/Meeting Service Needs			Provide transit service that is accessible to all persons while maintaining system productivity	Develop sustainable out-of-area transportation projects, through coordinated partnerships, to extend the mobility choices of residents		• Support the local economy by providing connections to where people want to go

* In some cases, agency goals were expressed as objectives, in which case those objectives were provided in the table as items preceded by a bullet point.

Sources: *MARTA 2012-2016 SRTP* (MARTA, 2012); *MBTA 2012 COA* (MBTA, 2012); *Operational Analysis of BAT* (SANBAG, 2009a); *COA and SRTP of VVTA* (VVTA, 2013); OmniConnects: Connecting People, Business, and Community, FY2015 – 2020 SRTP (Omnitrans, 2014b); Needles Transit Services Short Range Transit Plan, 2015-2020*

Notes: BAT = Barstow Area Transit; MARTA = Mountain Area Regional Transit Authority; MBTA = Morongo Basin Transit Authority; SRTP = short-range transit plan; VVTA = Victor Valley Transit Authority

*City of Needles proposed goals are preliminary based on the *Draft Needles Transit Services Short Range Transit Plan, 2015-2020* .

7.5 Evaluation of Alternatives and Models

7.5.1 Alternatives

Using the evaluation criteria and scoring system developed in section 7.3, an assessment was conducted of the three organizational coordination/optimization alternatives for the San Bernardino County transit operators. Table 7-4 provides a detailed matrix of the evaluation results, including scores and explanatory comments for each criterion. A summary of the evaluation results and rationale is provided in this section, by criterion.

Transit Agency Goals/Objectives:

Service/Network Implementation – In general, the organizational alternative was not seen as having a major impact on the ability of the agencies to implement their SRTP's. All three alternatives were given three points.

Ridership and Productivity – Both Cooperative Agreements and Functional Consolidation of certain limited operations were seen as potentially supporting improved cross-jurisdictional services, leading to increased regional ridership, and received four points. Complete Agency Consolidation could implement similar services; however, competition for funding vs. other service needs in the consolidated service area was seen as a disadvantage, so this option was scored three points.

Efficiency, Cost Effectiveness, Financial Sustainability – All of the cost savings strategies discussed in the Transit Efficiency Study's Financial Review were seen as feasible under any of the organizational alternatives. However, the geographic distances between the central service areas of the agencies were seen as a potential drawback to service efficiency and cost effectiveness, especially in operations and maintenance. Thus, Cooperative Agreements were scored four points, Functional and Complete Agency Consolidation alternatives were scored three points.

Safety, Reliability, High Quality Transportation – Safe, reliable, high quality transportation can be provided under any organizational alternative, so all three alternatives were scored four points. It was noted, however, that under Complete Agency Consolidation, at some point the size and geographic spread of the transit system could become counter-productive to service quality.

Marketing, Outreach, Public Participation – In this area, a Functional Consolidation or Complete Agency Consolidation, including consolidated marketing and public outreach, was seen as potentially enhancing regional marketing for transit. Unlike several of the other criteria, this one is less impacted by distances between the agencies, so these two alternatives were scored five points. It was noted that, in a consolidated marketing effort under one agency, that agency would need to be knowledgeable and supportive of all the other agencies' services and markets.

THIS PAGE INTENTIOANLLY LEFT BLANK

Table 7-4. Evaluation of Alternatives*

Evaluation Criteria	Alternative		
	Cooperative Agreements	Functional Consolidation	Complete Agency Consolidation
Transit Agency Goals/Objectives			
Service/Network Implementation	3 – Does not affect outcome regarding implementation of each area's SRTP changes.	3 – Does not affect outcome regarding implementation of each area's SRTP changes.	3 – Does not affect outcome regarding implementation of each area's SRTP changes. Eventually, through complete consolidation, there would only be one SRTP.
Ridership and Productivity	4 – Could help support cross-jurisdictional services leading to increased regional ridership (e.g., improved VVTA – Omnitrans area express services)	4 – Functional consolidation of some operations could help support cross-jurisdictional services and increase regional ridership; however, due to distances involved, consolidation of operations would need to be limited to certain cross-jurisdictional services. Example: VVTA's operation of Ft. Irwin Commuter Service for both VVTA's and Barstow's service areas when they were separate operations.	3 – Could help support cross-jurisdictional services leading to increased ridership (e.g., improved VVTA – Omnitrans area express services). But would also involve competition for funding for such service with other needs in the consolidated service area.
Efficiency, Cost Effectiveness, Financial Sustainability	4 – Virtually all of the cost savings strategies discussed in the Transit Efficiency Study Financial Review can be achieved through cooperative agreements among the agencies if the agencies are willing to make the commitment	3 - Virtually all of the cost savings strategies discussed in the Transit Efficiency Study Financial Review could be implemented through consolidation of certain functions among the agencies if the agencies are willing to make the commitment. But, distances between the agencies could lead to other cost inefficiencies, reducing overall savings for the agencies.	3 - Virtually all of the cost savings strategies discussed in the Transit Efficiency Study Financial Review could be implemented under a complete consolidation of the agencies. But, distances between the agencies' service areas could lead to other cost inefficiencies, reducing overall savings.
Safety, Reliability, High Quality Transportation	4 – Safe, reliable, high quality transportation can be provided under any organizational scenario. Through enhanced inter-agency agreements, cross-system transfers can be enhanced.	4 – Safe, reliable, high quality transportation can be provided under any organizational scenario. Through enhanced inter-agency agreements, cross-system transfers can be enhanced, even if certain functions are consolidated.	4 – Safe, reliable, high quality transportation can be provided under any organizational scenario. Under complete consolidation, cross-system transfers can be enhanced since a single entity is establishing policies. However, at some point, size and geography covered can become counter-productive to service quality.
Marketing, Outreach, Public Participation	4 – Virtually all of the cost savings strategies discussed in the Transit Efficiency Study Financial Review, including regional marketing and outreach, can be achieved through cooperative agreements among the agencies if the agencies are willing to make the commitment.	5 – A consolidated marketing and public outreach function could enhance regional marketing for transit. It would require the agency holding this consolidated function to be knowledgeable and supportive of all the other agencies' services and markets.	5 – A complete agency consolidation, including a consolidated marketing and public outreach function, could enhance regional marketing for transit. It would require the agency holding this consolidated function to be knowledgeable and supportive of all the other agencies' services and markets.
Infrastructure and Equipment	4 – Cooperative agreements can support parts procurement, heavy overhaul, and joint fueling efforts. Not likely feasible for day-to-day fleet or facility maintenance. The agencies are already coordinating on vehicle procurement via the CalACT vehicle program.	4 – Functional consolidation can support parts procurement, heavy overhaul, and joint fueling efforts. Not likely feasible for day-to-day fleet or facility maintenance. The agencies are already coordinating on vehicle procurement via the CalACT vehicle program.	4 – Complete consolidation can support parts procurement, heavy overhaul, and joint fueling efforts since a single entity would be contracting for these items. Not likely feasible for day-to-day fleet or facility maintenance. Given the distances involved, there will remain a need for separate operating bases and management in each service area. In the long run, the potential for more uniform fleets and facilities is enhanced under this option. The agencies are already coordinating on vehicle procurement via the CalACT vehicle program.

Table 7-4. Evaluation of Alternatives*(Continued)

Evaluation Criteria	Alternative		
	Cooperative Agreements	Functional Consolidation	Complete Agency Consolidation
Transit Agency Goals/Objectives (Cont.)			
Accessibility/Meeting Service Needs	5 – The more localized a service provider is, the more responsive to local service needs it can potentially be.	4 – The more localized a service provider is, the more responsive to local service needs it can potentially be. Under functional consolidation, particularly of planning or operations, there could potentially be less responsiveness to local service issues and concerns.	3 –As agency size and jurisdictional area increases, the ability to respond to localized constituent needs becomes more and more challenging. Local service issues and concerns must compete with issues in other areas of the larger service area for attention.
Additional Considerations			
Ease of Implementation	5 – Very easy to implement, either between two agencies or multiple agencies, with agency commitment	3 – Requires significant inter-agency agreements on transferred functions. Often involves voluntary or legislative actions to implement.	2 – Would likely require action at the State level to implement.
Ease of Administration	5 – Very easy to administer once cooperative agreement is in place.	3 – It may be easy to administer but reimbursement arrangements for transferred functions can be complex and difficult to administer.	4 – In theory, once agency consolidation is complete, administration within one agency should be easier than under functional consolidation.
Organizational Viability and Function	5 – Should have no impact on the ability of the organization to continue to fulfill its operational mission.	3 – Functional consolidation must be implemented in a manner so as not to deprive the consolidated agencies of their ability to manage on-going operations.	2 - Only agency remains, so only the consolidated agency must remain viable. However, local jurisdictions' service improvements and needs can become more competitive and result in less local control of services.
Grand Total Points	**43**	**36**	**33**

***Point score on the five-point scale, and explanation/rationale provided for each criterion under each alternative**

Evaluation Criteria Scoring:
5 = Very Strongly Meets/Supports Criterion
4 = Strongly Meets/Supports Criterion
3 = Meets Criterion
2 = Fails to meet Criterion on some aspects
1 = Does not meet Criterion

Cooperative agreements for marketing and public outreach are also entirely feasible; this alternative was given four points.

Infrastructure and Equipment – It was felt that any of the three organizational alternatives could support joint parts procurement, joint heavy overhaul contracting, and/or joint fuel purchasing arrangements, with potential for resulting cost savings. However, given the sheer distances between the transit agencies' facilities, day-to-day fleet or facility maintenance was seen as less feasible. Even under a Complete Agency Consolidation, there will remain a need for separate operations and maintenance facilities in each general service area to keep deadhead mileage and bus operator wage costs to a minimum. All three alternatives were scored four points.

Accessibility/Meeting Service Needs – This area was evaluated under the concept that, the more localized a public service provision is, the more responsive it is likely to be to constituent concerns and needs. Accordingly, Cooperative Agreements were scored five points, Functional Consolidation was scored four points, and Complete Agency Consolidation was scored three points.

Additional Considerations

Ease of Implementation – Cooperative Agreements were seen as very easy to implement, compared to the other alternatives, and were scored five points. Functional Consolidations can require significant inter-agency negotiations and agreements on transferred functions, and possibly even State legislative action, as occurred in the San Diego region example under Senate Bill 1703, and was scored three points. Complete Agency Consolidation is even more difficult to achieve and would very likely require legislation at the state level, and was thus scored two points.

Ease of Administration – Cooperative Agreements were seen as easy to administer once they are in place, and were scored five points. Functional Consolidation arrangements can be easy to administer once they are set up, but reimbursement agreements for the value of transferred functions can be complex and politically difficult to achieve and maintain over time, especially as funding levels change, so this alternative was scored three points. Complete Agency Consolidation, in theory, should be easier to administer since all activities are under one agency; however, reaching a mutually-agreeable arrangement among multiple jurisdictions can be extremely difficult. This alternative was scored four points.

Organizational Viability and Function – As discussed in Section 7.3, any organizational alternative must leave the resulting agencies capable of continuing to manage their daily operations. Cooperative Agreements were seen as having no impact on the ability of the organization to fulfill its operational mission, and was scored five points. Functional Consolidation was scored three points, as there is a potential in a Functional Consolidation, depending on the functions consolidated, to leave one agency short of critical staff. (This in fact happened in the San Diego functional consolidation in

the service planning area – so many planners were transferred from Metropolitan Transit Development Board [MTDB] to the San Diego Association of Governments [SANDAG] that when a new MTDB chief executive officer arrived on the scene in 2004, he transferred back some of the planning staff that had transferred to SANDAG, so that MTDB could conduct basic service planning). Under Complete Agency Consolidation, only one agency remains, presumably consisting of resources from the consolidated agencies, so the new consolidated agency should be viable. However, local jurisdictions' service needs can become a lower priority in the new, larger agency, resulting in less local control of services. This alternative was thus scored two points.

Grand Total Evaluation Score

When the above scoring levels were summed, the Cooperative Agreements alternative had 43 points, Functional Consolidation had 36 points, and Complete Agency Consolidation had 33 points. Key factors in this outcome included consideration of the impact of distances between the transit agencies, the transit service market differences (urban vs. rural), and the ability of larger, consolidated organizations to still be responsive to local service needs and concerns. As mentioned earlier, virtually all the cost savings strategies discussed in the Financial Review are achievable under a Cooperative Agreements approach. For Cooperative Agreements to succeed, however, there has to be a willing commitment on the part of the transit agencies to work toward the agreements and their objectives.

This evaluation outcome does not necessarily rule out some limited Functional Consolidation, where it makes sense and is desired between two or more agencies. A good example of this is when VVTA began operating the National Training Center Commuter service, serving both the VVTA and City of Barstow service areas. In that case, the two agencies had effectively functionally consolidated the commuter route's operation for increased efficiency.

7.5.2 CTSA Models

As discussed previously in Chapter 6.0 of this study, in 1980, the California State Legislature passed Assembly Bill (AB) 120, enacting the Social Service Transportation Improvement Act, which led to the creation of CTSAs. The legislature's intent in passing this bill was to promote improved coordination and consolidation of social service agency transportation services for seniors and persons with disabilities, to accrue the following potential benefits (CalACT, 2015b):

- Combined purchasing of necessary equipment so that some cost savings through larger number of unit purchases can be realized.

- Adequate training of vehicle drivers to ensure the safe operation of vehicles. Proper driver training should promote lower insurance costs and encourage use of the service.

- Centralized dispatching of vehicles so that efficient use of vehicles results.
- Centralized maintenance of vehicles so that adequate and routine vehicle maintenance scheduling is possible.
- Centralized administration of various social service transportation programs so that elimination of numerous duplicative and costly administrative organizations can occur.
- Identification and consolidation of all existing sources of funding for social service transportation services can provide more effective and cost efficient use of scarce resource dollars.

These overall CTSA program benefit goals can potentially be achieved under any of the three CTSA models reviewed in this study, namely, 1) CTSA as Stand-Alone ADA Paratransit Service Provider; 2) CTSA as Coordinating/Technical Support Provider; or 3) CTSA within Transit Agency. Successful examples of all three CTSA organizational models exist in California, based on the unique local conditions and resources present in each jurisdiction.

On September 10, 2010, the SANBAG Board designated VTrans to act as the CTSA for the San Bernardino Valley, as required in the AB 120's implementing regulations and as permitted in the Measure I half-cent sales tax ordinance[8]. This decision was made based on a SANBAG study which reviewed CTSA implementation options, similar to the options discussed in this study. To date, VTrans has operated in a manner similar to the model "CTSA as Coordinating/Technical Support Provider," including coordination and support for social service agency transportation services, travel training provider, and, recently, vehicle maintenance services provider. VTrans does not directly provide paratransit services and is a separate entity from any public transit agency.

SANBAG has continued to have interest in increased efficiencies in the provision of Omnitrans' complementary ADA paratransit service through potential consolidation with VTrans' CTSA services. In October 2014 and January 2015, the SANBAG Commuter Rail & Transit Committee reviewed information on alternative CTSA organizational models, including the model where the CTSA operates within a transit agency, as is the case with RTA and the recent designation of VVTA as a CTSA within its service area. On June 3, 2015, the SANBAG Board voted to request Omnitrans to analyze the VTrans Five-Year Business Plan and provide a financial estimate of the cost of providing certain appropriate CTSA services that are currently being provided by or are proposed to be provided by VTrans. In this action, the SANBAG Board also asked Omnitrans to prepare a transition plan for potentially shifting responsibility for those certain services from

[8] SANBAG Commuter Rail & Transit Committee Meeting Agenda Item 6, October 9, 2014.

VTrans to Omnitrans by June 30, 2018, when the current funding agreement with VTrans expires[9].

Given the recent SANBAG Board discussion and actions on a possible change in CTSA model for the San Bernardino Valley subarea, and the review underway by Omnitrans, it would not be appropriate for this study to further evaluate CTSA models at this time. As mentioned earlier, any of the organizational models can be successful, depending on local conditions and resources available, and how they are coordinated and managed.

[9] San Bernardino Associated Governements Board of Directors Agenda Item 28, June 3, 2015.

7.6 SANBAG and Agency Direction on Evaluation

7.6.1 Agency Review and Input on Organizational Evaluation

Following completion of the preliminary evaluation process, the entire organizational alternatives review and evaluation report was circulated to the agencies for review and comment. Comments and corrections were received from two agencies, with an additional two agencies stating that they had no comments. The comments received were incorporated into the the report, as appropriate. All of the agencies agreed with the study's overall evaluation finding that a cooperative-agreements approach to organizational coordination was the preferred way to proceed, versus functional or complete agency consolidation.

7.6.2 Agency Review Direction on Next Steps

On September 8, 2015, an agency workshop was convened to discuss the results of the organizational evaluation and obtain SANBAG and agency direction on next steps to complete the study. All of the agencies except the City of Needles were represented. A powerpoint presentation summarizing the study to date and the findings of the organizational analysis was reviewed with the group. Using the cooperative-agreements approach, an outline was created listing the following: all of the cost-saving and coordination strategies meriting further advancement, the agencies that indicated interest in each strategy, and draft approaches on ways to proceed.

The group began with a general discussion of agency coordination issues, including the following items:

- VVTA now has City of Barstow representatives on the VVTA Board of Directors. The consultant team pointed out that this was perceived as a functional consolidation of the transit service function, since the city is still in existence and did not dissolve as a result of consolidation.

- VVTA and Omnitrans have discussed options for a regional fare system. This has been more of a technological discussion, as opposed to streamlining fare mechanisms or instituting a single fare structure for both operators. The group discussed considering smart phone/apps, as opposed to an interim TAP card mechanism (like Los Angeles County has transitioned to), due to the extensive time and cost of smart card system implementations and the fact that once implemented, the agencies are frozen in that technology for a period of time. VVTA/Omnitrans will keep other agencies in the loop on discussions. The group also highlighted the importance of keeping the rider in mind, in that agencies should continue to accept cash, as many riders do not have smart phones. It was also dicussed that Metrolink is looking into new ticket vending machines (TVMs), as an interim solution to update aging equipment until the eventual transition to mobile applications.

- A concern was expressed that, if agencies participate in a joint procurement, and if the results are not beneficial and/or cost effective, that the agency does not have to implement the procurement/outcome. It was suggested that any joint procurements initiated by the agencies should include language stating that the agencies are under no obligation to issue a contract from the bid results if not cost effective for the agencies.

- VVTA brought up a service need from the City of Needles (transporting riders to courts/hearings). This issue was also addressed in the SANBAG SRTP public outreach process, and will be addressed further in that effort via a SANBAG agency goal to explore solutions to this issue.

The consultant team discussed various options on how to proceed, including: 1) groups formed/meeting by strategies of interest; 2) the consultant team meeting with each agency individually to discuss key issues/points of concern related to each strategy; 3) the consultant team proposing initial cooperative agreement terms and points, then circulating for review. After some discussion, the group consensus was for the consultant team to meet with or conduct conference calls with each agency individually, identify each agency's areas of interest, concerns, and agreement points, and incorporate these deal points into "term sheets" for review by the participating agencies on each strategy for confirmation. These term sheets could then be used to draft the cooperative agreements or MOUs, where needed.

The group then went through the outline of strategies and, for each strategy, identified a lead agency and confirmed the agencies interested in purchasing/participating in the strategy. The strategy outline, with additional edits provided during the group discussion, is shown in Table 7-5. A summary of key points discussed includes the following:

ADA Taxi Voucher Program – It was clarified that there are actually two strategies within this item. One strategy is to simply substitute the use of taxis for regular partransit vehicles during hours of low demand, when it was cost-effective to do so. Omnitrans has included such language in their new paratransit operator contract and plans to proceed with this strategy in the next year. The second strategy is to establish a taxi voucher program as VTrans had recently started up. It was further clarified that the intent of the taxi voucher strategy is for VTrans to provide technical assistance on the model they have developed, to serve as a template for other interested agencies, but only if eligible/reliable taxi providers exist in each operator's service area. On that basis, VVTA stated that, due to the lack of reliable taxi operators in their service area, they would not be able to participate in this strategy. MARTA indicated continuing interest and VTrans agreed to provide technical assistance to MARTA.

Table 7-5. Cost Savings and Coordination Strategies, Lead Agency(s), Purchasing/Participating Agency(s) and Comments/Approaches

Strategy	Lead Agency	Purchasing/Participating Agency	Comments/Approach
ADA Taxi Voucher Program	VTrans	MARTA	VVTA is not interested (no viable taxi provider). Omni is pursuing taxi service through their subcontractor; MARTA will continue to talk to VTrans for more info.
Heavy Overhaul	Omnitrans	VVTA, MBTA, MARTA	MOU for service provision and possible joint procurement
Bus Parts	Omnitrans	VVTA, MBTA	Possible joint procurement
CNG Fuel Procurement	Omnitrans	VVTA	VVTA has fuel commitment until 2018, but is interested in learning/participating. MBTA has CNG from pipeline, extremely low fuel costs. Will not result in joint procurement or MOU at this point.
CNG Station Maintenance	Omnitrans	VVTA, MBTA	Possible joint procurement
Project Development & Construction Management	SANBAG	All agencies	Individual cooperative agreements between SANBAG and each agency requiring service - also includes real estate/facility development
Regional Marketing	SANBAG	All agencies	Develop marketing toolkit and regional marketing plan via consultant; all agencies to participate/express needs.

Table 7-5. Cost Savings and Coordination Strategies, Lead Agency(s), Purchasing/Participating Agency(s) and Comments/Approaches (Continued)

Strategy	Lead Agency	Purchasing/Participating Agency	Comments/Approach
Mutual Aid Agreements	Omnitrans	VVTA, MARTA, possibly Metrolink	MOUs for service breakdowns/emergency response
Inter-Agency Transfer Agreements	N/A	Omnitrans, VVTA, MBTA, MARTA	Standard agreements between Omnitrans/VVTA, Omnitrans/MARTA, & MBTA/SunLine. Future agreements between Metrolink/VVTA.
Service Planning Assistance	SANBAG	VVTA, MBTA, MARTA, City of Needles	SANBAG to conduct initial assessment to determine in-house/contract staff, and annual needs. Envision MOU between SANBAG and each agency. VVTA has plans to hire in-house service planner with FY 16-17 Budget.
Grant Application Assistance	SANBAG	All Agencies	SANBAG can assist on case-by-case basis; may require MOU or consultant assistance.
Civil Rights Planning Assistance	SANBAG	VVTA, MBTA, MARTA, VTrans	SANBAG (via consultant) will continue to assist agencies with these services. Should assistance be above and beyond scope, possible MOU between SANBAG and interested agency
Training/Staff Development	SANBAG or Omnitrans	VVTA, MBTA, MARTA, VTrans, City of Needles	Currently CalACT, CTA, APTA, and NTI training is available; suggested to do an inventory on training needs and proceed from there.

Notes: ADA = Americans with Disabilities Act; APTA = American Public Transportation Association; CalACT = California Association for Coordinated Transportation; CNG = compressed natural gas; MARTA = Mountain Area Regional Transit Authority; MBTA = Morongo Basin Transit Authority; MOU = memorandum of understanding; NTI = National Transit Institute; SANBAG = San Bernardino Associated Governments; VVTA = Victor Valley Transit Authority; VTrans = Valley Transportation Services

Heavy Overhaul – Omnitrans volunteered to serve as the lead agency. A cooperative agreement to conduct a joint procurement is envisioned, with VVTA, MBTA, and MARTA as other participants. Alternatively, Omnitrans might be in a position to directly sell overhaul services to the other agencies under an MOU.

Bus Parts – Omnitrans volunteered to serve as the lead agency, with VVTA and MBTA participating in a possible joint procurement under a cooperative agreement. This would be subject to VVTA's caveat that the procurement results were cost effective compared to their contract operator's parts costs.

CNG Fuel Procurement – Omnitrans volunteered to serve as the lead agency. Some timing issues were identified with this strategy. Omnitrans is pursuing conversion of their LNG system to CNG, which may affect the time at which it makes sense to conduct a joint procurement. Omnitrans recently re-entered the fuel price hedging market and was able to achieve the middle scenario for cost savings/price caps discussed in Chapter 5.0. VVTA has a fuel commitment until 2018, but is interested in learning and possibly participating in Omnitrans' fuel price hedging program. MBTA has an exceptionally low cost for its pipeline CNG and would likely not participate due to its current cost structure.

CNG Station Maintenance – Omnitrans volunteered to serve as the lead agency, with possible participation by VVTA and MBTA. A cooperative agreement for a joint procurement for these services is envisioned.

Project Development and Construction Management – SANBAG volunteered to serve as the lead agency, with individual cooperative agreements with each agency desiring such services. SANBAG may utilize its on-call consultants to provide such services. Real estate and facility development projects also could be covered by the cooperative agreements in this area.

Regional Marketing – SANBAG volunteered to serve as the lead agency on this initiative. SANBAG will go to the Commuter Rail and Transit Committee and the SANBAG Board to seek funding for a SANBAG-led effort. SANBAG would seek transit agency participation and input. This is envisioned as a two-fold effort: 1) develop a tool kit for agencies to deploy/utilize; and 2) create and implement regional marketing advertisement/strategies to promote transit in general. SANBAG transit staff indicated possible participation by the Air Quality/Mobility Department as they are also involved in regional marketing for the rideshare program.

Mutual Aid Agreements – Omnitrans volunteered to serve as the lead agency, with participation by VVTA and MARTA. There are discussions already occurring amongst the agencies on this initiative. Omnitrans needs to ensure that they can commit to assistance effectively and efficiently – for example, only Omnitrans' contractors operate the smaller-size buses appropriate for response to MARTA emergencies. Also highlighted was the need to bring Metrolink into the discussion. Should there be

Metrolink service disruptions, it would be good to have agreed-upon locations to alight riders and coordinate service transfers. Such mutual aid services will also be needed for the new Redlands Passenger Rail Service, and VVTA anticipates a new commuter service in the near future (current B-V Link service is primarily a hospital/medical service connection).

Inter-agency Transfer Agreements – Omnitrans and MARTA currently have existing fare agreements with Metrolink. VVTA's inter-agency agreement with Metrolink was cancelled when their previous express bus service was discontinued, but they will need the agreement again in the future. This strategy would likely result in updated inter-agency transfer agreements between Omnitrans and VVTA, Omnitrans and MARTA, and MBTA and Sunline (Palm Springs).

Service Planning Assistance – SANBAG volunteered to lead this strategy. SANBAG staff will seek input from interested agencies on their specific service planning needs and, if sufficient demand exists, SANBAG could hire or contract with a consultant for a service planner.

Grant Application Assistance – SANBAG volunteered to lead this strategy. Currently, SANBAG provides final grant review, as well as some grant writing assistance. SANBAG has on-call consultants to assist - each agency should make a formal request and SANBAG will assess if in-house staff or a consultant can support the request, and determine the charge for this service or other arrangements. SANBAG staff will need to discuss this further internally and explore options.

Civil Rights Planning Assistance - SANBAG will continue to have agencies work with SANBAG's consultants (as they have in the past). Should the request for assistance be beyond the scope of SANBAG's consultant, then those discussions will be brought to SANBAG for further consideration.

Training/Staff Development – SANBAG and/or Omnitrans volunteered to lead this item, depending on the type of training involved. It was suggested that SANBAG inventory the training needs, and either SANBAG or Omnitrans bring in resources for training, in a group environment. Currently, CalACT, California Transit Association, American Public Transit Association, and National Training Institute training programs are available. Omnitrans has a trainer in both the maintenance and operations areas. Even vendors can assist (e.g., VVTA worked with their contractor to provide training at MBTA).

The meeting and discussion provided clear direction for proceeding into the final phase of the Transit Efficiency Study, Implementation Planning.

REFERENCES

Access Services, Inc. (ASI). 2015. Access. Website accessed January 20, 2015 at: http://accessla.org/home/

Barstow, City of. 2014. Agenda Item 1630: Approval of Intergovernmental Agreement with VVTA for Operation of the BAT System. May 19, 2014.

California Association for Coordinated Transportation (CalACT). 2015a. CalACT/MBTA Purchasing Cooperative. Website accessed January 14, 2015 at: http://calact.org/purchasingco-op

California Association for Coordinated Transportation (CalACT). 2015b. CTSA e-Book. Website accessed January 20, 2015 at: http://www.calact.org/ctsaebook

Federal Transit Administration (FTA). 2012b. *National Transit Database. Transit Profiles: 2012 Full Reporters*. For Paratransit, Inc., Omnitrans, Access Services, and Riverside Transit Agency. U.S. DOT, Office of Budget and Policy, October 2013.

Johnson County. 2014. *The Jo Newsletter*. Winter 2014 Issue. Seventh Edition. Accessed at: http://www.jocogov.org/dept/transit/about/newsletter-media

Kansas City Area Transit Authority (KCATA). 2014. Johnson County Board of Commissioners Agrees to Partner with KCATA. September 26, 2014.

Larwin, Thomas F. 2012. *San Diego MTDB: Lessons for Competitive Transit Governance*. May 17, 2012.

Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO). 2006. *SANDAG: An Assessment of its Role in the San Diego Region*. Accessed December 29, 2014 at: http://www.lao.ca.gov/2006/sandag/sandag_033006.htm

Legislative Council of California. 2002. *SB 1703, Peace. San Diego: Consolidated Transportation Agency*. Accessed December 21, 2014 at: http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/01-02/bill/sen/sb_1701-1750/sb_1703_bill_20020920_chaptered.html.

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Commission (Metro). 2015a. Metro website, "Who We Are" webpage: http://www.metro.net/about/agency/mission/. Accessed February 3, 2015.

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Commission (Metro). 2015b. Metro website, "Los Angeles Transit History" webpage:

http://www.metro.net/about/library/about/home/los-angeles-transit-history/. Accessed February 17, 2015.

Macro. 2015. San Diego MTS/North County Transit District—Real-Time Management System (RTMS). Accessed January 13, 2015 at: http://www.macro.com/transit-its/transit-it-projects/san-diego-metropolitan-transit-system-north-county-transit-district/

Metropolitan Transit System (MTS). 2013. MTS Bus Operations. November 2013.

Metropolitan Transit System (MTS). 2014. MTS Historical Timeline. Accessed December 2014 at: http://www.sdmts.com/MTS/timeline.asp

Mid-America Regional Council (MARC). 2014. KCATA and Johnson County Transit Make Partnership Offiical. December 19, 2014. Accessed January 2015 at: http://transportation.marcblogs.org/2014/12/19/kcataandjohnsoncountytransitmakepartnershipofficial/.

Morongo Basin Transit Authority (MBTA). 2012. *MBTA 2012 Comprehensive Operational Analysis*. Prepared by Moore & Associates for MBTA.

Mountain Area Regional Transit Authority (MARTA). 2012. *MARTA 2012-2016 Short Range Transit Plan.* Prepared by Transit Marketing and Mobility Planners for MARTA. May 2012.

Needles, City of. 2015. *Draft Needles Transit Services 2015 – 2020 Short-Range Transit Plan*. April 2015. Prepared for Needles Transit Services by AMMA Transit Planning.

Omnitrans. 2014b. *OmniConnects: Connecting People, Business, and Community, FY2015-2020 Short-Range Transit Plan*. May, 2014.

Paratransit, Inc. 2015. CTSA. Website accessed January 20, 2015 at: http://www.paratransit.org/php/ctsa.php.

Quad Cities (QC) Loop. 2015. About QC Loop. Accessed January 13, 2015 at: http://www.qcloop.com/about.php

Riverside Transit Agency (RTA). 2013. *Riverside Transit Administration Short Range Transit Plan 2014-2016*.

San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG). 2013b. *Desert Consolidation Study*. July 25, 2013. Submitted by AECOM Technical Services, Inc.

San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG). 2014a. *Transit Agency Functional Assessment Questionnaire*. (Prepared for, submitted to and completed by all San Bernardino County Transit agencies for this study.)

San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG). 2014c. *Contract Task Order (CTO) for County-Wide Transit Efficiency Study for Contract C14086*. Task Order approved by SANBAG February 19, 2014.

Transit Cooperative Research Program (TCRP). 2011. *Regional Organization Models for Public Transportation*. TCRP Project J-11/Task 10. January 2011.

Victor Valley Transit Authority (VVTA). 2013. *Comprehensive Operational Analysis and Short Range Transit Plan of Victor Valley Transit Authority*. Prepared by AECOM Transportation for VVTA.

Whitlock, Jared. 2014. *With New Agreement, More Hopping on Amtrak's Surfliner*. The Coast News. Published March 5, 2014. Accessed January 14, 2015 at: https:///thecoastnews.com/blog/2014/03/with-new-agreement-more-hopping-on-amtraks-surfliner/

Wikipedia. 2015a. *Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority*. Accessed February 3, 2015.

Wikipedia. 2015b. *Southern California Rapid Transit District*. Accessed February 3, 2015.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK