

CASTA 5311/5310 Membership/Stakeholder Meeting
January 18,2017
Conference Call

- Attendees: 21-25
- Amber Blake, CASTA President reviewed the slides from the TRAC subcommittee meeting that took place on January 11, 2017
- Membership Discussion
 - More discussion around regional and multi-jurisdictional (See below for comments from David Peckler)
 - Frank Bruno
 - Difficult to decide methodology without knowing the actual dollar amount that each individual agency will receive
 - Amber Response: We asked but CDOT wanted to refine right policy and methodology first. We need to avoid individual conflicts of interest.
 - Amber Response: Fairness is hard when money is unclear.
 - Dan Blankenship
 - We'll ask CDOT, but real numbers are coming soon from CDOT; we think at the next meeting
 - Not enough funding to go around.
 - It's not clear what is fair and equitable. Does that mean near to what you received last year?
 - Figure out what is a fair share
 - Incentives for developing local support
 - Base threshold decrease?
 - Ann Rajewski
 - We are looking for suggestions for other options from our membership. Please email Ann or other TRAC members with suggestions.
 - Will Jones
 - Transit funding will match CDOT's larger goals.
 - David Peckler
 - Hard to score in both categories.
 - Carolyn
 - Are individual agencies or CDOT's goals more important?
 - Amber Response: Only one methodology will be chosen by CDOT
- Next TRAC Meeting
 - February 1 (VIA phone)
 - February 17 (In person)

Chat Log

Ariane Bergen (to Everyone): 9:54 AM: Hey, can anyone hear us?

Biz Collins (to Everyone): 9:57 AM: I can hear you.

Ariane Bergen (to Everyone): 9:57 AM: Thanks!

David Peckler (to Everyone): 10:18 AM: What is your definition of regional vs jurisdictions? It feels as if they are somewhat the same.

Angel (to Everyone): 10:31 AM: Does it have anything to do with how many TPRs/MPOs the service is in?

Tanya Allen (to Everyone): 10:34 AM: Cooperation between individual agencies is one way to ensure regional connectivity without creating redundancy. Would evidence of this kind of cooperation be credited at all when dealing with small/medium agencies that only serve one jurisdiction?

Brian Wells (to Everyone): 10:43 AM: The Base Funding Plus Points seems to uphold the FTA desire for avoiding repetitive service. It also supports the CDOT statewide plan to have interconnectivity. Since these are the goals then funding should match those goals.

David Peckler (to Everyone): 10:51 AM: I will send email later

Brian Wells (to Everyone): 10:55 AM: Just guessing that regional connectivity is going to be more expensive to fund/operate than multi jurisdictional. Weighting more funding to regional points seems reasonable.

Amy Ostrander (to Everyone): 10:56 AM: Please specify who to send comments too.

Brian Wells (to Everyone): 11:00 AM: Thank you for the regular meetings.

Emailed Comments from David Peckler:

Ann,

My comment on the question of “Jurisdictions” and “Regional Service” was prompted by slide #27 and the list under the category “Add Points For:”

- Jurisdictions served
- If regional service is provided
- Amount of human service funding
- Level of employment transportation

It could be perceived that an end result is being supported by these Plus Points. The State Wide Plan focuses on the regional movement and human services. Generally, this is appropriate for CDOT. CDOT focuses on highway maintenance and improvements and does not do work on local streets. That is their charge. So to their focus is on the

regional movement as opposed to local movement in transit. In the roadway case there is a balancing for the local jurisdictions because they receive a share of the gas tax dollars for the maintenance of the local streets. There is no requirement to distribute between regional or local agencies in the case of transit funding. The State Wide Transit Plan is not focused on local services by its nature. So these Plus Points seem to me to be a bit biased. There would be a number of ways for certain agencies to benefit under these categories:

1. Take ECO for example. They run a regional service and by default serve a number of jurisdictions. So, do they score points in both categories? This seems unfair to local agencies who do not appear to benefit from either category. I would support having one category for Jurisdictions served/regional service to recognize the benefits of service between jurisdictions but not a doubling of Plus Points.
2. The category for human service funding (or service?) is usually a county program by nature in the rural areas. So they score in both the Jurisdictions served (regional being multiple counties I assume) and the human service category by the nature of this service. This is again to the detriment of the local, general public services. They operate within their jurisdiction and are not specifically identifying special need users on the public system. There is no easy way to discern if regional commuters are using local services as part of the "first and last mile" for their trip. This means there is no recognition of "feeder" services or disadvantaged using local services in the Plus Points.
3. Local public services are not focusing on human service riders specifically, but they do have seniors and disabled passengers in their passenger mix. Without surveying their passengers they have no way to demonstrate that they are providing services to a special needs group. By the requirements of ADA the local systems have to provide "human services" within their service areas. How do you factor that into this special consideration measure? Also, what are you looking for in equity under Title VI? This is a component of our compliance with the Certifications and Assurances.
4. Employment transportation is what we all do as a basic element of our service. Yes, the resorts also carry skiers to and from lodging and public lands. Generally this has been done to protect the environment and the carrying capacity of the road network. Are general public services that do not differentiate being penalized for carrying more than just workers to address goals other than supporting labor?

I believe that finding reasonable balance in these Plus Points is important. Does it level the playing field to be allowed Plus Points in only one category? Is there a potential category that addresses local general public services in some way, or are performance measures and budget portion being used for that purpose? I think there has been a lot of hard work done on the Conceptual Methodology – Base Funding. The Draft Funding Options for the Small and Large systems (34 & 36) seems to show a fairly consistent application with some exceptions. A special thanks to the committee for putting that much thought into the issue.

To the point about a strategy to wean agencies off of support. The stagnant level of funding has by default been a declining funding source. Operational costs are escalating by the increases in health benefits, labor and energy costs while grant funding has been frozen for some. Is it possible to have a minimum for each of the categories, or is the goal to get all agencies out of the grant funding eventually? Like capitalism in reverse, you may end up with only one agency eligible for funding in the end. The only alternative appears to be additional local funding for service. This is pretty challenging for all agencies. Those jurisdictions that are funding regional as well as local services face a larger problem. Could this possibly be another Plus Point?

Sorry to ramble on.

David