



Contra Costa Accessible Transportation Strategic Plan

Task Force Meeting #6

August 18, 2022



Update on Coordinated Entity

- ATSP recommended creating a Countywide Coordinating Entity (CE) responsible for countywide strategy implementation.
- The memo documents findings from research, individual observations, ATS Task Force and Working Group comments.
- Structural option selected should find best fit for the unique needs of Contra Costa County - try and avoid or anticipate potential problems.

Structural Considerations

Selected structure will need to:

- Partner with Contra Costa's existing transit agencies, transportation providers, transportation authority, and the nonprofit community
- Be implemented in a way that mitigates challenges and barriers documented in the ATSP

DRAFT Governance Structure

- The recommended governance structure for a CE is a Board of Directors and an accompanying advisory committee
- The Board of Directors could be comprised of representatives of public agencies, transit agencies, social service agencies, and other stakeholders

Funding

- Potential funding sources:
 - Measure J, Measure X, Community Development Block Grants, FTA 5310, funding and grants from philanthropic foundations, private donations, TDA, state transit funds, and planned CPUC/SB1376 funding
- Discretionary funding sources could be used to fill gaps in service
- Need to identify new funding sources

Reporting

- The CE will need to administer and fulfill reporting requirements from various agencies and funders
- Reporting will ensure that the CE is positioned to offer a range of programs and services
- Tracking and reporting should be designed to meet the extensive requirements for Caltrans grants, FTA 5310 grants, and ADA paratransit

DRAFT Approach to Programs and Services

- An initial inventory of the CE scope and priorities
 - May change depending on structure selected
- Three steps:
 - **Administer:** If the services or programs are already offered throughout the County, the CE should document the services, determine how to assist via technical support and/or funding, and coordinate the services with other transportation services in the County.
 - **Facilitate:** If the desired services or programs are not already offered throughout the County, the CE should determine if there are existing providers or organizations that could provide the service, if provided with support. The CE should then support the development of those programs and coordinate them with other transportation services in the County.
 - **Create:** If there are no existing providers or organizations to provide the desired services or programs, the CE will need to design, implement, and operate the program.

DRAFT Approach to Programs and Services

Programs that the CE should prioritize include the following (from ATSP):

- One-Call/One-Click
- Secure New Funding
- Mobility as a Service
- Travel Training
- Means-Based Fare Subsidy Program
- ADA Paratransit Support
- Intercity Trip Program
- Volunteer Driver and Door-through-Door Programs
- On-Demand Transit Operations
- Ongoing Community Outreach and Engagement
- CTSA
- Integration of existing related activities into the new CE-led ATS Framework
- Governmental Liaison Activities

Structural Options

Transit Agency		
Strengths	Weaknesses	Examples
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Principal Need: Easy to incorporate ADA paratransit trips into a broader accessible transportation system ▪ Can access transit funding where appropriate ▪ Direct oversight from elected officials 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Key Obstacle: Do not currently have capacity ▪ Key Obstacle: Transit agency directors may not have experience with human service transportation ▪ Key Obstacle: The Board of Directors for each transit agency has specific obligations relative to their agency-specific activities, these may not align with CE obligations. ▪ Multiple transit agencies within Contra Costa County that have discrete regulatory and geographic obligations in addition to unique priorities, expertise and Boards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Access Services (LA) ▪ Omnitrans

Structural Options

Transportation Authority		
Strengths	Weaknesses	Examples
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Principal Need: CCTA is the primary countywide forum for transportation issues and planning. Housing the CE would be a reasonable expansion of that role ▪ Principal Need: Existing stable, respected countywide authority and presence ▪ Access to public funding sources ▪ May make a better case to apply to be CTSA as a “neutral” party in County ▪ Direct oversight if issues arise 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Key Obstacle: Transportation Authority directors may not have experience with accessible transportation ▪ CCTA has limited operations experience and authority 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Solano Transportation Authority

Structural Options

Nonprofit		
Strengths	Weaknesses	Examples
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Principal Need: More options for funding are needed. A nonprofit could access new funds not available to public providers, philanthropic orgs, donations, etc. ▪ Principal Need: A nonprofit is likely to be better positioned to attract new funding ▪ Could consolidate different sources of funding ▪ Can potentially sponsor a new simple majority sales tax initiative ▪ More options for partnerships outside of the transportation system (partnerships with healthcare providers, for example) ▪ More flexible and agile than a transit agency or transportation authority – can respond to gaps or opportunities quicker ▪ A new non-profit could have a Board structure and governance deliberately established for accessible transportation ▪ Addresses the “no sole authority” identified in the ATSP process, using an existing agency (with other existing, primary responsibilities) would be diluted 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Key obstacle: Experience shows that significant tension can arise between nonprofit and public providers of accessible transportation, especially on ADA paratransit trips ▪ May require significant training, expertise, and resources to report on operations. ▪ Could have limited access to some public funding sources ▪ Potential need to substantially recreate the board membership/functions of an existing non-profit 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Access Services (LA) ▪ FACT (San Diego) ▪ MOVE (Stanislaus Council of Governments) ▪ Ride-On Transportation ▪ Easy Lift Transportation ▪ Outreach and Escort, Inc. ▪ Paratransit, Inc.

Structural Options

Hybrid – Nonprofit Within a Public Agency

Strengths	Weaknesses	Examples
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Principal Need: Funding: A non-profit is likely to be better positioned to attract new funding ▪ Principal Need: Stability: Aligning with an existing public agency should provide more stability than an independent nonprofit ▪ Oversight from a public agency like CCTA ▪ Mitigated tensions between the nonprofit and public agency ▪ Could partner with private providers (similar to CCTA’s partnership with GoMentum station) ▪ Allows for the structure and oversight of an agency, but is able to focus more on achieving its mission through outside-of-the-box partnerships like a nonprofit ▪ Combines non-profit workers with experience with accessible transportation beyond ADA paratransit and transit agency operators ▪ Can potentially sponsor simple majority sales tax initiative ▪ Potentially more flexible and agile than a transit agency or transportation authority – can respond to gaps or opportunities quicker ▪ A new non-profit could have a Board structure and governance deliberately established for accessible transportation ▪ Addresses the “no sole authority” issue identified in the ATSP process, using an existing agency (with other existing, primary responsibilities) would be diluted 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Key Obstacle: Challenging to create new organization ▪ If the Nonprofit has a separate Board, governance may be convoluted between the agency and the nonprofit. ▪ May give an impression of creating “another” government agency 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Access Services (LA) ▪ GoMentum Station (CCTA and AAA)

Thank you!

Sophia Constantine

Nelson\Nygaard