



Metro

Metropolitan Transportation Authority

One Gateway Plaza
Los Angeles, CA 90012-2952

213.922.2000 Tel
metro.net

10

**PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING COMMITTEE
JULY 18, 2007**

**SUBJECT: TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT (TDA)
ARTICLE 8 FUND PROGRAM**

**ACTION: ADOPT FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND RESOLUTION FOR
FY 2007-08 TDA ARTICLE 8 UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS**

RECOMMENDATION

- A. Adopt findings and recommendations (Attachment A) for using fiscal year (FY) 2007-08 Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 8 fund estimates totaling \$20,364,747 as follows:
1. In the City of Avalon there are unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet. In the Los Angeles County unincorporated areas adjacent to the City of Avalon, existing transit needs can be met through other funding sources, however the City of Avalon chooses to use their Article 8 funds for their transit services. Therefore, TDA Article 8 funds will be used to meet the unmet transit needs as described in Attachment A. The allocation is \$126,039 for Avalon, as detailed in Attachment C.
 2. In the Antelope Valley, which includes the Cities of Lancaster and Palmdale, and in the Los Angeles County unincorporated areas of the Antelope Valley, transit needs are met using other funding sources, such as Proposition A and Proposition C Local Return. Therefore, there are no unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet, because other funding sources will be used to address these needs. Thus, TDA Article 8 funds may be used for street and road purposes. The allocations for the Antelope Valley are \$5,000,795 and \$5,095,469 (Lancaster and Palmdale, respectively). The allocation for Los Angeles County Unincorporated is \$4,093,011, as detailed in Attachment C.
 3. In the Santa Clarita Valley, which includes the City of Santa Clarita and the Los Angeles County unincorporated areas of the Santa Clarita Valley, transit needs are met with TDA Article 8 funds; however, other funding sources, such as Proposition A and Proposition C local Return, may be used to address their needs. Therefore, there are no unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet. TDA Article 8 funds may be used for transit and/or street and road purposes as long as their transit needs continue to be met. The allocation for Santa Clarita is \$6,049,433, as detailed in Attachment C.
- B. Adopt a resolution (Attachment D) making a determination of unmet public transportation needs in the areas of Los Angeles County outside the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) service area.

ISSUE

State law requires that Metro make findings regarding unmet transit needs in areas outside the Metro service area. If there are unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet, then the needs must be met before TDA Article 8 funds may be allocated for street and road purposes.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Metro has followed state law in conducting public hearings and obtaining input from the Social Service Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC) regarding unmet transit needs (Attachments B and E). The SSTAC is comprised of social service providers and other interested parties in the North County areas. On April 3rd, 10th, 12th and 16th of 2007, the TDA Article 8 Hearing Board was convened on behalf of the Metro Board of Directors to conduct the required public hearing process. The Hearing Board developed findings and made recommendations for using TDA Article 8 funds based on the input from the SSTAC and the public hearing process.

Attachment F summarizes the recommendations made and actions taken during FY 2006-07 (for the FY 2007-08 allocation estimates). Upon transmittal of Board-adopted findings and documentation of the hearings process to Caltrans Headquarters, and upon Caltrans approval, funds will be released for Metro to allocate to the eligible jurisdictions. Delay in adopting the findings, recommendations and the resolution contained in Attachments A and D would delay the allocation of \$20,364,747 in TDA Article 8 funds to the recipient local jurisdictions.

OPTIONS

The Board of Directors could adopt findings or conditions other than those developed in consultation with the Hearing Board, with input from the state-required SSTAC (Attachment G) and through the public hearing process. However, this is not recommended because adoption of the proposed findings and recommendations made by the SSTAC and adopted by the Hearing Board have been developed through a public hearing process, as described in Attachment B, and in accordance with the TDA statutory requirements.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

Metro's Subsidies Budget, which itself is included in the FY08 Metro Budget, includes the TDA Article 8 funds. Metro allocates TDA Article funds based on population and pays the funds out monthly, once each jurisdiction's claim form is received, reviewed and approved. The funding mark for FY 2007-08 is estimated at \$20,364,747 (Attachment C). Metro is not eligible for TDA Article 8 funds, as the funds are state sales tax revenues that are designated by state law for use by local jurisdictions outside the Metro service area.

BACKGROUND

Under the California TDA Article 8 statute, state transportation funds are allocated to the portions of Los Angeles County outside the Metro service area. These funds are for unmet transit needs that may be reasonable to meet. However, if no such needs exist, the funds can be spent for street and road purposes.

Before allocating TDA Article 8 funds, the Act requires that Metro conduct a public hearing process. If there are determinations that there are unmet transit needs, which are reasonable to meet and Metro adopts such a finding, then these needs must be met before TDA Article 8 funds can be used for street and road purposes. By law, Metro must adopt a resolution annually that states its findings regarding unmet transit needs. Attachment A is the FY 2007-08 resolution. The proposed findings and recommendations are based on public testimony (Attachment E) and the recommendations of the SSTAC and the Hearing Board.

NEXT STEPS

Once Caltrans reviews and approves the adopted resolution and documentation of the hearing process, which we will submit, Metro will receive TDA Article 8 funds to allocate to the recipient local jurisdictions.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A - Findings and Recommended Actions

Attachment B - Hearing Process

Attachment C - TDA Article 8 Apportionments for FY 2007-08

Attachment D - FY 2006-07 TDA Article 8 Resolution

Attachment E - Summary of Public Testimony

Attachment F - FY 2006-07 Recommendations and Actions Taken


Attachment G - Social Service Transportation Advisory Council recommendations

Prepared by: Susan Richan, Program Manager, Local Programming

Nalini Ahuja, Director of Local Programming
Programming and Policy Analysis



Carol Inge
Chief Planning Officer
Countywide Planning and Development



Roger Snoble
Chief Executive Officer

FY 2007-08 TDA ARTICLE 8
PROPOSED FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDED ACTIONS

ANTELOPE VALLEY AREA

- **Proposed Findings** - That in the Cities of Lancaster and Palmdale and the unincorporated portions of North Los Angeles County, existing transit needs can be met* through the recommended actions using other funding sources. Therefore, TDA Article 8 funds may be used for street and road projects, or transit projects.
- **Recommended Actions** - That Antelope Valley Transit Authority (AVTA) address the following and implement if reasonable to meet: 1) continue to explore opportunities to improve dial-a-ride service and usability for seniors and people with disabilities; 2) explore effective service and greater outreach to rural areas of the Antelope Valley; 3) continue to evaluate more effective fixed route service, especially for seniors and people with disabilities; and 4) gather information throughout the year from AVTA on public comments. Comments made throughout the year will be included with all TDA Article 8 oral testimony and written comments.

SANTA CLARITA VALLEY AREA

Proposed Findings - That in the City of Santa Clarita and the unincorporated portions of the Santa Clarita Valley, existing transit needs can be met* through the recommended actions using other funding sources. Therefore, TDA Article 8 funds may be used for street and road projects, or transit projects.

- **Recommended Actions** - That Santa Clarita Transit address the following and implement if reasonable to meet: 1) continue to evaluate funding opportunities for additional Park and Ride facilities in Santa Clarita; and 2) continue to assess service improvements.

CATALINA ISLAND AREA

- **Proposed Findings** - That in the City of Avalon there are unmet transit needs that can be met using TDA Article 8 funds; therefore, TDA Article 8 funds are to be used for the recommended action.

In the unincorporated areas of Santa Catalina Island, existing transit needs can be met* through the recommended actions using other funding sources. Therefore, for the unincorporated areas, TDA Article 8 funds may be used for street and road projects.

- **Recommended Actions** - That the City of Avalon address the following and implement if reasonable to meet: 1) maintain funding sources for transit services.

*i.e., there are no unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet

TDA ARTICLE 8 PUBLIC HEARING PROCESS

Article 8 of the California Transportation Development Act (TDA) requires annual public hearings in those portions of the County that are not within the Metro transit service area. The purpose of the hearings is to determine whether there are unmet transit needs which are reasonable to meet. Metro established a Hearing Board to conduct the hearings on its behalf in locations convenient to the residents of the affected local jurisdictions. The Hearing Board, in consultation with Metro staff, also makes recommendations to the Metro Board of Directors for adoption: 1) a finding regarding whether there are unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet; and 2) recommended actions to meet the unmet transit needs, if any.

In addition to public hearing testimony, the Hearing Board received input from the Social Service Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC), created by state law and appointed by Metro, to review public hearing testimony and written comments and, from this information, identify unmet transit needs in the jurisdictions.

Hearing Board

Metro staff secured the following representation on the FY 2007-08 Hearing Board:

- A representative from Supervisor Michael Antonovich's office for the North Los Angeles County, appointed by Supervisor Antonovich;
- A representative from Supervisor Donald Knabe's office, representing Santa Catalina Island, appointed by Supervisor Knabe; and
- Two representatives from two of the three cities in the North County

For the FY 2007-08 Hearing Board, City of Lancaster, Mayor Henry Hearn and the City of Palmdale, Mayor Pro Tem Mike Dispenza, represented the North County; Michael Cano represented Supervisor Antonovich; and Ray Harris appointed representative for Supervisor Knabe, with Metro staff representing Mr. Harris as needed.

Also, Metro staff formed membership on the FY 2008 Social Service Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC) per requisite of the *Transportation Development Act Statutes and California Code of Regulations*. Membership of the SSTAC was not fully represented by the social services. Metro staff did have adequate representation of the local service providers and represented jurisdictions, therefore the SSTAC meeting convened with proposed recommendations as included in Attachment G.

Hearing and Meeting Dates

The Hearing Board held public hearings in Avalon on April 3, Lancaster on April 10, Santa Clarita on April 12, and in Palmdale on April 16, 2007. A summary of the public testimony received at the hearings and the written comments received or postmarked within two weeks after each hearing is included in Attachment E.

The SSTAC met on May 31, 2007. Attachment E contains the SSTAC's recommendations, which were considered by the Hearing Board at its June 14, 2007, meeting.

Permanent Adoption of Unmet Transit Needs Definitions

Definitions of Unmet Transit Need and Reasonable to Meet Transit Need were originally developed by the SSTAC and Hearing Board and adopted by Metro Board Resolution in May 1997 as follows:

- Unmet Transit Need- any transportation need, identified through the public hearing process, which could be met through the implementation or improvement of transit or paratransit services.
- Reasonable to Meet Transit Need - any unmet transit need that can be met, in whole or in part, through the allocation of additional transit revenue and be operated in a cost-efficient and service-effective manner, without negatively impacting existing public and private transit options.

Based on discussions with and recommendations from Caltrans Headquarters' staff, these definitions have been adopted on an ongoing basis by the resolution. The Metro Board did re-approve the definitions of unmet transit need and reasonable to meet transit need at its June 25, 1998 and June 24, 1999 meetings.

These definitions will continue to be used each year unless amended by the Metro Board.

ATTACHMENT C

TDA ARTICLE 8 APPORTIONMENTS
ESTIMATES FOR FY 2007-08

Jurisdiction	Population (1)	Article 8 Percentage	TDA Article 8 Revenue for FY 2007-08
Avalon	3,488	0.62%	126,039
Lancaster	138,392	24.56%	5,000,795
Palmdale	141,012	25.02%	5,095,469
Santa Clarita	167,412	29.71%	6,049,433
LA County Unincorporated	113,270	20.10%	4,093,011
Total	563,574	100.00%	\$20,364,747

(1) Population estimates are based on State of California Department of Finance Census 2006 Data-Report. The Unincorporated population figure is not revised.

**RESOLUTION OF THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY METROPOLITAN
TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY MAKING A DETERMINATION AS TO
UNMET PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION NEEDS IN LOS ANGELES COUNTY
FOR FISCAL YEAR 2007-08**

WHEREAS, the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) is the designated Transportation Planning agency for the County of Los Angeles and is, therefore, responsible for the administration of the Transportation Development Act, Public Utilities Code Section 99200 et seq.; and

WHEREAS, under Sections 99238, 99238.5, 99401.5 and 99401.6, of the Public Utilities Code, before any allocations are made for local street and road use, a public hearing must be held and from a review of the testimony and written comments received and the adopted Regional Transportation Plan, make a finding that 1) there are no unmet transit needs; 2) there are no unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet; or 3) there are unmet transit needs, including needs that are reasonable to meet; and

WHEREAS, at its meetings of June 25, 1998 and June 24, 1999, the Metro Board of Directors approved definitions of unmet transit need and reasonable to meet transit need; and

WHEREAS, public hearings were held by Metro in Los Angeles County in Avalon on April 3, Lancaster on April 10, Santa Clarita on April 12, and Palmdale on April 16, 2007, after sufficient public notice of intent was given, at which time public testimony was received; and

WHEREAS, a Social Service Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC) was formed by Metro and has recommended actions to meet the transit needs in the areas outside the Metro service area; and

WHEREAS, a Hearing Board was appointed by Metro, and has considered the public hearing comments and the recommendations of the SSTAC; and

WHEREAS, the SSTAC and Hearing Board reaffirmed the definitions of unmet transit need and reasonable to meet transit need; and

WHEREAS, Metro staff in consultation with the Hearing Board recommends the finding that in the City of Avalon there are ongoing transit needs that are being met using TDA Article 8 funds. Should the TDA Article 8 funds become unavailable, there would be unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet in the City of Avalon. In the unincorporated areas of Santa Catalina Island, the ongoing needs can be met through the allocation of Proposition A and/or Proposition C Local Return funds; therefore, there are no unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet, because these needs will be addressed through other funding sources; and

WHEREAS, Metro staff in consultation with the Hearing Board recommends the finding that in the City of Santa Clarita, and the unincorporated portions of the Santa Clarita Valley, there are unmet transit needs that can be met through the recommended actions. These actions can be accomplished through the allocation of Proposition A and/or Proposition C Local Return funds. Therefore, there are no unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet in these jurisdictions, because these needs will be addressed through other funding sources; and

WHEREAS, Metro staff in consultation with the Hearing Board recommends the finding that in the Cities of Lancaster and Palmdale and the unincorporated portions of North Los Angeles County, there are transit needs that can be met through the recommended actions. These actions can be accomplished through the allocation of Proposition A and/or Proposition C Local Return funds; therefore, there are no unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet in these jurisdictions, because these needs will be addressed through other funding sources.

NOW THEREFORE,

- 1.0 The Metro Board of Directors approves on an on-going basis the definition of Unmet Transit Needs as any transportation need, identified through the public hearing process, which could be met through the implementation or improvement of transit or paratransit services; and the definition of Reasonable to Meet Transit Need as any unmet transit needs that can be met, in whole or in part, through the allocation of available transit revenue and be operated in a cost efficient and service effective manner, without negatively impacting existing public and private transit options.
- 2.0 The Metro Board hereby finds that, in the City of Avalon, there are ongoing transit needs that are being met using TDA Article 8 funds. Should the TDA Article 8 funds become unavailable, there would be unmet transit needs in the City of Avalon. In the unincorporated areas of Santa Catalina Island, the ongoing needs can be met through the allocation of Proposition A and/or Proposition C Local Return funds; therefore, there are no unmet transit needs, that are reasonable to meet.
- 3.0 The Metro Board hereby finds that in the City of Santa Clarita, and the unincorporated portions of the Santa Clarita Valley, there are transit needs that can be met through the recommended actions. These actions can be accomplished through the allocation of Proposition A and/or Proposition C Local Return funds; therefore, there are no unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet in these jurisdictions.

- 4.0 The Metro Board hereby finds that in the Cities of Lancaster and Palmdale and the unincorporated portions of North Los Angeles County, there are transit needs that can be met through the recommended actions. These actions can be accomplished through the allocation of Proposition A and/or Proposition C Local Return funds; therefore, there are no unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet in these jurisdictions.

CERTIFICATION

The undersigned, duly qualified and acting as the Board Secretary of the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority, certifies that the foregoing is a true and correct representation of the Resolution adopted as a legally convened meeting of the Board of Directors of the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority held on Thursday, July 26, 2007.

MICHELE JACKSON
Metro Board Secretary

DATED:

(SEAL)

COMMENTS
FY 2008 ARTICLE 8 UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS
PUBLIC HEARINGS

The following pages contain summaries of the public testimony and written comments received through the unmet transit needs hearings process. The numbers in the right hand column indicate the number of comments received on each topic.

For Avalon, two comments were made and one written response received.

For the Antelope Valley, there were a total of 11 coded comments by 6 individuals.

For the Santa Clarita Valley, there were a total of 44 comments from 17 individuals.

There were 58 comments in total extracted from testimony and 26 separate written responses by individuals.

Many of the letters and speakers touched on multiple topics. To facilitate the counting of comments on specific topics, each line contains a specific comment.

TDA ARTICLE 8 UNMET NEEDS PUBLIC TESTIMONY
AND WRITTEN COMMENTS
FY 08 - SUMMARY TABULATION SHEET - ALL HEARINGS

	Santa Clarita and Avalon	Antelope Valley
Overall increase in service, including longer hours, higher frequency, and/or more days of operation	3	3
1.1 More service in evening/morning, longer span of service	1	
1.15 Service to and from schools		1
1.2 Weekend/Sunday/Holiday service		
1.25 Express Service	8	
1.3 Route design/special destinations/new bus stops	4	3
1.35 Service for seniors/disabled		1
1.4 Frequency/relief of overcrowding	4	1
1.5 Expansion of commuter service hours, days, frequency, etc. Increase service to Castaic & San Fernando Valley		
1.6 Mid-day commuter service		
1.7 Expansion of local routes	3	1
1.8 Special event	2	
1.9 Limit Service to rural areas		
2 Scheduling, reliability, transfer coordination	1	
2.1 Publish comprehensive bus routes and time tables		
3 Demand responsive service, dial-a-ride availability		
3.1 Service to Seniors	1	
3.2 Access to medical care facilities		
4 Inoperable wheelchair lifts and tie-downs, wheelchair pass-ups, more wheelchair positions		1
4.1 Bus maintenance issues		
5 Security issues (park-n-ride lots, bus stops & buses). Include safety measures of surveillance.	7	
5.1 Improved pedestrian access/Safer corridor for pedestrians & bicycles		
6 Fare issues/Bus scripts		
6.1 Fare subsidy- Avalon comment	1	
7 Park-n-ride, bus shelter issues, signage and amenities	1	
8 Metrolink issues	3	
8.1 Other train issues: Super train/Mag Lev		
9 Other issues: better public information needed, cleaner buses, bus improvements, upgrades, increase fleet, seat belts on buses, bus tokens, transit center	1	
9.1 Better customer service from operators	2	
10 Other, statement (2 Santa Clarita,1 Avalon and 1 Lancaster)	3	
11 Avalon – support	2	
Sub-total:	47	11

TOTAL: 58 =(11+47)

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS AND ACTIONS
TAKEN DURING FY 2005-06 FOR FY 2006-07 ALLOCATIONS
AS PROVIDED BY THE TRANSIT AGENCIES

SANTA CLARITA VALLEY AREA

Santa Clarita Transit Statement

Since completing its first full year of providing transit services in the Santa Clarita Valley 15 years ago, the City of Santa Clarita Transit ridership has grown from 600,000 to 3.7 million riders annually. As a result of last year's public hearings, two needs were identified for the Santa Clarita Valley. First, the recommendation was to update the Transportation Development Plan, TDP, to include comments from the TDA Article 8 public hearing.

In 2005, the City of Santa Clarita hired a consultant to develop a 10-year Transportation Development Plan covering the Santa Clarita Valley through 2015. The TDP acts as a blueprint guiding future development of public transit in the Santa Clarita Valley. The TDP was completed and adopted by the City Council in November of 2006. The TDP incorporated comments received by the previous Unmet Needs Hearings as well as a variety of other sources and developed short-term and long-term recommendations. Transit staff started implementing short-term recommendations immediately starting with the adjustment of schedules in January 2007 to improve on-time performance. Staff is currently working on the remaining short-term recommendations which include a route restructuring and expansion of all of our routes. It's to be noted that the TDP Plan calls for about a 58 percent expansion of services over the course of the next ten years. The second recommendation from the previous TDA meeting was to evaluate funding opportunities for additional Park and Ride facilities in Santa Clarita.

In January 2007, the City of Santa Clarita submitted a \$4 million Call-for-Project to Metro to cover the land and construction costs of a new Park and Ride facility adjacent to the existing McBean Regional Transit Center. This site is expected to provide between 200 and 300 parking spots. The City has also recently hired a consultant to update the City's Transit Impact Fee, which will set proposed conditions upon development projects to provide for future capital funding. Transit staff continues to pursue and monitor Federal, State, and discretionary funding programs for an opportunity to fund Park and Ride facilities. These efforts will continue. It should be noted that the City of Santa Clarita currently dedicates 100 percent of its TDA revenues to transit service.

All TDA, Proposition A, and Proposition C funds are programmed for ongoing operating and capital needs. However, these funds will cover only a portion of the expected growth in demand for transit service. Additional funding sources, particularly for operations, will need to be identified to keep up with this growth. Although the TDP Plan highlights several unmet transit needs, I'm going to talk about just a few quick ones that are really highlighted. On a regional perspective, there needs to be some midday connections -- some additional

midday connections from the Valley to Downtown Los Angeles and the Santa Clarita for those commuters who have morning meetings in Downtown or work half-days. We're constantly getting requests for this midday service.

Additional service or some service – new service to the North Hollywood Metro Station. The North Hollywood Metro Station is a major transportation hub and is the terminus for the Metro Red Line Subway and Metro Orange Line Busway as well as eight Local Metro routes and two Burbank Bus routes. By creating a regional service to connect with us we'll be able to afford our community and our residents the opportunity to connect with the regional system. Additional service between the Santa Clarita and Antelope Valley areas are needed. Of the twelve northbound, it would be particularly ideal if we could get some additional train service. Of the twelve northbound and twelve southbound Metrolink trains that operate on the Antelope Valley line, three northbound and two southbound trains end in the Santa Clarita Valley thus increasing demand for service between the Santa Clarita and Antelope Valleys. There has also been an increase in demand to provide service between the two areas outside of peak-hour travel. And fourth, you will hear from some other folks in the audience including our own City Council Member that there is a need for some conductivity between the Santa Clarita Valley and some of the other schools that lie outside of our Valley. We have over 200 families that go to one of the schools and probably another 100 that go to another school and they need some services and you'll hear about that.

From a local perspective we need to look at also some ways to create some direct transit services for the areas west of the Interstate 5 that lie outside of our community to the Newhall Metrolink Station. That concludes my remarks. Thank you.

ANTELOPE VALLEY AREA

Antelope Valley Transit Authority Statement

Good morning. This memo is provided as an update to recommended actions developed at last year's Article 8 Hearings.

Recommended Action 1, evaluate linkages with Metrolink, including reverse commutes. Our Response is that AVTA continues to work towards improved coordination with Metrolink. We are now using the same contractor as Metrolink and anticipate that this will further ease communication.

Recommended Action 2, improve Dial-A-Ride service and access for seniors and people with disabilities. Our Response is that as of October 30th, 2005, AVTA no longer provides ADA-required paratransit service. This service is now being provided to Access Services Inc., ASI, through a new contractor. This allows AVTA to focus on Dial-A-Ride service through our paratransit operations. We have installed new paratransit dispatching software.

Through these two measures we have seen an immediate positive impact on productivity and on-time performance.

Recommended Action 3, evaluate customer outreach regarding signage and scheduling. Our Response is that AVTA has brought development of signage and scheduling in-house resulting in better products which can be produced quickly and efficiently.

Recommended Action 4, explore methods to improve connectivity for medical needs to the Los Angeles Basin. Our Response is that AVTA is working with Access Services Inc., the regional paratransit planner, to develop a coordinated plan to address inter-regional non-emergency medical trips.

Recommended Action 5, continue to evaluate more effective fixed route service, especially for seniors, people with disabilities, and rural communities. Our Response is that AVTA has performed several focus group studies to determine the needs of our community members with special needs. In addition, AVTA has undertaken several surveys, with several more upcoming, to help determine the needs of the rural communities. Once completed, this information will be used to update the long range transit plan and scheduled for implementation, where appropriate.

Thank you.

PROPOSED RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE FY 2007-08
SOCIAL SERVICE TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COUNCIL
(SSTAC)

ANTELOPE VALLEY AREA

- Recommendation that Antelope Valley Transit Authority (AVTA) address the following and implement if reasonable to meet: 1) continue to explore opportunities to improve dial-a-ride service and usability for seniors and people with disabilities; 2) explore effective service and greater outreach to rural areas of the Antelope Valley; 3) continue to evaluate more effective fixed route service, especially for seniors and people with disabilities; and 4) gather information throughout the year from AVTA on public comments. Comments made throughout the year will be included with all TDA Article 8 oral testimony and written comments.

SANTA CLARITA VALLEY AREA

- Recommendation that Santa Clarita Transit address the following and implement if reasonable to meet: 1) continue to evaluate funding opportunities for additional Park and Ride facilities in Santa Clarita; and 2) continue to assess service improvements.

CATALINA ISLAND AREA

- Recommendation that the City of Avalon address the following and implement if reasonable to meet: 1) maintain funding sources for transit services.

