



# 40

# 40

PLANNING & PROGRAMMING COMMITTEE  
JUNE 21, 2001

Metropolitan  
Transportation  
Authority

One Gateway Plaza  
Los Angeles, CA  
90012-2952

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

**ACTION: ADOPT FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND  
RESOLUTION FOR FY 2001-02 TDA ARTICLE 8 FUNDS**

**RECOMMENDATION**

Adopt:

A. The resolution (Attachment A) making a determination of unmet public transportation needs in the areas of Los Angeles County outside the MTA service area; and

B. Findings and recommended actions (Attachment B) for the allocation and use of FY 2001-02 TDA Article 8 funds of \$14,514,334 as follows,

- In the Cities of Avalon and Santa Clarita, there are unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet; therefore, TDA Article 8 funds shall be used to meet these unmet transit needs as described on Attachment C. The allocation for Avalon is \$99,139 and for Santa Clarita it is \$4,155,034 as described in Attachment G.
- In the Antelope Valley which includes the Cities of Lancaster and Palmdale, and in the Los Angeles County unincorporated areas of Santa Clarita Valley and Catalina Island, transit needs are met using other funding sources, such as, Propositions A and C Local Return; therefore, the finding is that there are no unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet, and the TDA Article 8 funds may be used for street and road projects. The allocation for the Antelope Valley (Lancaster and Palmdale) is \$3,635,998 and \$3,361,376. The allocation for Los Angeles County Unincorporated is \$3,262,787 as described in Attachment G.

**ISSUE**

State law requires the MTA to make a finding regarding unmet transit needs in areas outside the MTA service area. If there are unmet transit needs, which are reasonable to meet, then the needs must be met before any allocation of TDA Article 8 funds is made for street and road projects. MTA is not eligible to receive TDA Article 8 funds, as these funds are provided for use exclusively by the local jurisdictions outside MTA's transit operations service area.

## **POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

MTA followed State law in conducting public hearings and obtaining input from the Social Service Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC) regarding unmet transit needs (Attachment E). The TDA Article 8 Hearing Board is convened on behalf of the MTA Board to conduct the public hearing process and develop findings and make recommendations for the use of TDA Article 8 funds based on the input from the SSTAC and the public hearing process. Attachment F is the summary of recommendations and actions taken during FY 2001. Upon transmittal of the MTA Board-adopted findings and documentation of the hearings process to Caltrans Headquarters, and upon Caltrans approval, funds are released to the MTA for allocation to the eligible jurisdictions. Delay in adopting the findings and conditions contained in Attachments A and B would result in a delay of the allocation of TDA Article 8 funds to the recipient local jurisdictions.

## **OPTIONS**

The Board could adopt findings or conditions other than those developed in consultation with the Hearing Board with input by the state-required SSTAC and through the public hearing process. This is not recommended as 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 C, in accordance with the requirements of TDA law.

## **FINANCIAL IMPACT**

This action has no impact on the FY 02 MTA budget. The MTA's subsidies budget includes the TDA Article 8 funds, which are allocated, based on population and paid out on a monthly basis upon receipt and approval of each jurisdiction's claim form. The funding mark for FY 2001-02 is \$14,514,334 (Attachment G). MTA is not eligible for TDA Article 8 funds, as they are state sales tax revenues, which are designated by State law for use by local jurisdictions outside the MTA service area

## **BACKGROUND**

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

Prior to allocating TDA Article 8 funds, the Act requires the MTA to conduct a public hearing process. If there are determinations that there are unmet transit needs which are reasonable to meet and the MTA 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, MTA must annually adopt a resolution, which states its findings regarding unmet transit needs. Attachment A is the FY 2001-02 resolution. The proposed findings and recommendations are based on public testimony (Attachment D) and the recommendations of the SSTAC and the Hearing Board.

### **NEXT STEPS**

Upon Caltrans' review and approval of the resolution and documentation of the hearing process, MTA will receive TDA Article 8 funds for allocation to the affected jurisdictions.

### **ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment A FY02 TDA Article 8 resolution  
Attachment B Findings and Recommended actions  
Attachment C Hearing Process  
Attachment D Summary of Public Testimony  
Attachment E Social Service Transportation Advisory Council recommendations  
Attachment F Matrix FY 01 (last year's) Recommendations and Actions Taken  
Attachment G TDA Article 8 Apportionments

Prepared by: Dolores Roybal, Transportation Planner  
Diego Cardoso, Director, Pedestrian/Urban Environment,  
Transportation Linkages



---

CAROL INGE

Interim Deputy Executive Officer, Transportation Development  
and Implementation



---

JAMES L. de la LOZA

Executive Officer, Countywide Planning  
and Development



---

ALLAN G. LIPSKY

Office of the Chief Executive Officer

## ATTACHMENT A

### A 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 2001-02

WHEREAS, the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA) 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.;

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 meeting of June 25, 1998, the MTA Board approved definitions of unmet transit need and reasonable to meet transit need;

WHEREAS, public hearings were held by MTA in Los Angeles County in Palmdale on February 21, in Lancaster on February 24, in Santa Clarita on March 1, and Avalon on March 6, 2001, 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 the MTA and has recommended actions to meet the transit needs in the areas outside the MTA service area; and

WHEREAS, a Hearing Board was appointed by the MTA, 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, MTA staff in consultation with the Hearing Board recommends the finding that in the City of Avalon there are ongoing transit needs which 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 C Local Return funds and therefore, there are no unmet transit needs which are reasonable to meet.

WHEREAS, MTA staff in consultation with the Hearing Board recommends the finding that in the City of Santa Clarita, there are unmet transit needs which can be met through the recommended actions. In the unincorporated portions of Santa Clarita Valley, there are also unmet transit needs which can be met through the recommended actions, however, these actions can be accomplished through the allocation of Proposition A and/or C Local Return funds; therefore there are no unmet transit needs which are reasonable to meet in the unincorporated Santa Clarita area.

WHEREAS, MTA 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 which can be met through the recommended actions. These actions can be accomplished through the allocation of Proposition A and/or C Local Return funds; therefore, there are no unmet transit needs, which are reasonable to meet in these jurisdictions.

NOW THEREFORE,

- 1.0 The MTA Board approves on an on-going basis the definition of Unmet Transit Needs as any transportation needs, identified through the public hearing process, that could be met through the implementation or improvement of transit or paratransit services; and the definition of Reasonable to Meet 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 MTA Board hereby finds that in the City of Avalon there are ongoing transit needs, which 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 C Local Return funds and therefore, there are no unmet transit needs, which are reasonable to meet.
- 3.0 The MTA Board hereby finds that in the City of Santa Clarita, there are unmet transit needs, which can be met through the recommended actions, which require Article 8 funds. In the unincorporated portions of Santa Clarita Valley, there are also unmet transit needs which can be met through the recommended actions, however, these actions can be accomplished through the allocation of Proposition A and/or C Local Return funds; therefore there are no unmet transit needs which are reasonable to meet in the unincorporated Santa Clarita area.
- 4.0 The MTA Board hereby finds that in the Cities of Lancaster and Palmdale and the unincorporated portions of North Los Angeles County, there are transit needs which can be met through the recommended actions. These actions can be accomplished through the allocation of Proposition A and/or C Local Return funds; therefore, there are no unmet transit needs, which are reasonable to meet in these jurisdictions.

FY 2001-02 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. These actions can be accomplished through the allocation of Proposition A and/or C Local Return funds; therefore, TDA Article 8 funds may be used for street and road projects.
- **Recommended Actions** that Antelope Valley Transit Authority address the following and implement if reasonable to meet: 1) longer hours on fixed routes.

SANTA CLARITA VALLEY AREA

- **Proposed Findings** that in the City of Santa Clarita, there are unmet transit needs which can be met using TDA Article 8 funds; therefore TDA Article 8 funds are to be used for transit actions.

In the unincorporated areas of Santa Clarita Valley, existing transit needs can be met\* through the recommended actions using other funding sources. These actions can be accomplished through the allocation of Proposition A and/or C Local Return funds; therefore for the unincorporated areas, TDA Article 8 funds may be used for street and road projects.

- **Recommended Actions** that Santa Clarita Transit address the following and implement if reasonable to meet: 1) provide all day /seven day service fixed route service between the San Fernando Valley and Los Angeles basin area, and 2) implement all day / seven day service on McBean and Decoro.

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

## CATALINA ISLAND AREA

- **Proposed Findings** that in the City of Avalon there are unmet transit needs which 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. These actions can be accomplished through the allocation of Proposition A and/or C Local Return funds; 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) upgrading transit equipment, and 2) implementing connecting services for commuters using the jitney service.

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

## ATTACHMENT C

### TDA ARTICLE 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 MTA transit service area. The purpose of the hearings is to determine whether there are unmet transit needs which are reasonable to meet. MTA 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 staff and, also recommends to the MTA Board for adoption: 1) a finding regarding whether there are unmet transit needs which 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 the MTA, to review public hearing testimony and written comments and, from this information, identify unmet transit needs in the jurisdictions.

#### Hearing Board

MTA staff appointed the following representation on the FY 2002 Hearing Board:

A representative of the MTA, appointed by the chair of the MTA Board of Directors

A representative from Supervisor Antonovich's office for the North Los Angeles County, appointed by Supervisor Antonovich

A representative from Supervisor Knabe's office, representing Santa Catalina Island, appointed by Supervisor Knabe

A representative from one of the three cities in the North County, appointed by the cities

For the FY 2002 Hearing Board, Santa Clarita Councilmember Laurene Weste represented the MTA; Rosa Fuquay represented Supervisor Antonovich, Ray Harris represented Supervisor Knabe and Lancaster City Councilmember Henry Hearn represented the three cities in the North County.

Also, MTA staff formed membership on the FY 2002 Social Service Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC) per requisite of the *Transportation Development Act Statutes and California Code of Regulations*.

The following is a list of the legally required membership and the individuals who were appointed to fill these positions:

One member who is over 60 years old	Juanita Heinly
One member who is disabled	George Sosa
Two local social service providers	Linda Jacoby Brad Berens
Two local social service providers	Marge Darling David Cohen
One local social service provider	Lupe Lopez
One representative from Avalon	Betty Jo Garcia
Five representatives from Santa Clarita	Connie Worden-Roberts Ben Jarvis Shelly Mannino Corie Hill Leo Murillo
Five representatives from the Antelope Valley	Marlene Mallory Shannon O'Brien Barbara Little Al Rangel Terry Stubbings

### **Hearing and Meeting Dates**

The Hearing Board held public hearings in Palmdale on February 21, in Lancaster on February 24, in Santa Clarita on March 1, in Avalon on March 6, 2001. 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 D.

The SSTAC met on April 18, 2001. Attachment E contains the SSTAC's recommendations, which were considered by the Hearing Board at its April 30, 2001 meeting.

## **Permanent Adoption of Unmet Transit Needs Definitions**

Definitions of Unmet Transit Need and Reasonable to meet transit needs were originally developed by the SSTAC and Hearing Board and adopted by MTA 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 MTA Board did re-approved the definitions of unmet transit need and reasonable to meet transit need at its meetings June 25, 1998 and June 24, 1999.

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

## ATTACHMENT D

### COMMENTS FY 2002 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 the Antelope Valley, there were 11 speakers at the Palmdale hearing, and 3 speakers at the Lancaster public hearing. With the inclusion of mail received within two weeks of the meetings, there were a total of 451 comments of, which 9 were received after the deadline, from 156 individuals.

For the Santa Clarita Valley, there were 13 speakers at the public hearings. With the inclusion of mail received within two weeks of the meeting, there were a total of 66 comments from 39 individuals.

One comment was received at the Avalon hearing.

Many of the letters and speakers touched on multiple topics. In order to facilitate the counting of comments on specific topics each line contains a specific comment. Therefore, some letters or speakers take up several lines, and there are thus more individual comments listed than there were letters or speakers.

**TDA ARTICLE 8 UNMET NEEDS PUBLIC TESTIMONY AND  
WRITTEN COMMENTS**

**SUMMARY OF COMMENTS IN THE SANTA CLARITA VALLEY**

	<u>Comment</u>	Number of Comments
1	Overall increase in service, including longer hours, higher frequency, and/or more days of operation per week	0
1.1	More service in evening/longer span of service	7
1.2	Weekend/Sunday service	4
1.3	Route design/special destinations/new bus stops	0
1.4	Frequency/relief of overcrowding	1
1.5	Expansion of Commuter Service hours, days, frequency, etc.	1
1.6	Mid-day commuter service	8
1.7	Expansion of both local and commuter routes	3 official, 1 after deadline
2	Scheduling, reliability, transfer coordination	0
3	Demand responsive service	0
3.1	Dial-a-Ride Availability	1
3.2	Access Services Incorporated	0
4	Inoperable wheelchair lifts and tie-downs, wheelchair pass-ups, more wheelchair positions	1
5	Need better-trained and compensated drivers, less driver turnover	1
6	Security at Park-N-Ride lots, bus stops, and on buses	0
7	Fares	1
8	Park-N-Ride and bus shelter issues	3
9	Air conditioning on buses	0
10	Other: MetroLink issues, better public information needed, cleaner buses needed	10
10.1	Improve pick up methods, not close enough to the curb	0

10.2	Increased locations to pick up special bus passes	0
10.3	Improve customer service	2
10.4	Develop a transit hub/ community shuttle	1
10.5	Appropriate size of transit vehicle based on demand	1
11	Transit Summit	1

Total of 66 comments made by 39 individuals.

\*\* Local Issue- received petitions signed by 1,200 people regarding this issue

\* Received after the deadline

**TDA ARTICLE 8 UNMET NEEDS PUBLIC TESTIMONY AND  
WRITTEN COMMENTS**

**SUMMARY OF COMMENTS IN THE ANTELOPE VALLEY**

	<u>Comment</u>	Number of comments
1	Overall increase in service, including longer hours, higher frequency, and/or more days of operation per week	6
1.1	More service in evening/morning, longer span of service	102
1.2	Weekend/Sunday/Holiday service	16
1.3	Route design/special destinations/new bus stops or more/ upgrade bus signage	37 official and 1 after deadline
1.4	Frequency/relief of overcrowding	14
1.5	Expansion of Commuter Service hours, days, frequency, etc. Increase service to Los Angeles, Santa Monica, Westwood, and Century City	25
1.6	Mid-day commuter service	0
1.7	Expansion of both local and commuter routes	44 official and 1 after the deadline
2	Scheduling, reliability, transfer coordination	4
3	Demand responsive service	0
3.1	Dial-a-Ride Availability	7 official and 1 after deadline
3.2	Access Services Incorporated	1 official and 1 after deadline
4	Inoperable wheelchair lifts and tie-downs, wheelchair pass-ups, more wheelchair positions	1
4.1	Overall improvement of handicap accommodations	14
5	Need better-trained and compensated drivers, less driver turnover, friendlier drivers	5
5.1	Higher wages for drivers	4
6	Security at Park-N-Ride lots, bus stops, and on buses. Include safety measures of cameras, police surveillance etc.	67 official and 1 after deadline

7	Fares	39
8	Park-N-Ride and bus shelter issues and amenities	31
9	Air conditioning on buses	4
10	Other: MetroLink issues, better public information needed, cleaner buses needed, bus improvements, upgrades, increase fleet, access to transit board meetings, seat belts on buses, bus tokens, overpasses on train tracks,	16 official and 2 after deadline
10.1	Improve pick up methods, not close enough to the curb	1
10.2	Increased locations to pick up special bus passes	1 after deadline
10.3	Improve customer service	0
10.4	Develop a transit hub/ community shuttle	1 official and 1 after the deadline

Total of 451 (9 after deadline) coded comments made by 156 individuals.

\*\* Local Issue

\* Received after the deadline

**TDA ARTICLE 8 UNMET NEEDS PUBLIC TESTIMONY AND  
WRITTEN COMMENTS**

**SUMMARY OF COMMENTS IN AVALON**

	<u>Comment</u>	Number of comments
1	Overall increase in service, provide local transit for residents going to the downtown area	1

Total of 1 coded comments made by 1 individual.

## ATTACHMENT E

### RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE FY 2001-02 SOCIAL SERVICE TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COUNCIL

#### Proposed Recommendations

##### Santa Clarita

SCT to address the following and implement if reasonable to meet:

- Provide all day/ seven-day service fixed route service between the San Fernando Valley and Los Angeles basin area.
- Implement all day/ seven-day service on McBean and Decoro.

##### Santa Catalina Island

City of Avalon to address the following and implement if reasonable to meet:

- Upgrade transit equipment.
- Implement connecting services for commuters using the jitney service.

##### Antelope Valley

AVTA to address the following and implement if reasonable to meet:

- Longer hours on fixed routes.

ATTACHMENT F

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS AND ACTIONS  
 TAKEN DURING FY 2001  
 ANTELOPE VALLEY

Recommended Actions	Actions Taken
<p>Recommend that AVTA monitor and address, if appropriate, as determined by the AVTA Board of Directors, service frequencies, service area, hours of operation including night, weekends, and holidays, coordination between transit lines, dial-a-ride operations, and commuter services.</p>	<p>The AVTA Board of Directors examined the issues of service improvement expansions and authorized a study to be conducted to address all the proposed recommendations. The study is now complete as of April 2000. The study recommended adding Sunday service and increasing Saturday service, and redesigning the local system to improve transfer points, as well as, the direct connections to various locations in the transit system. The study did not recommend extending evening service. Based on the operation of other suburban systems studied, additional evening service is not a reasonable option to implement at this point. The study also did not advise increasing service frequencies until 2005, where the increase in ridership would warrant it. The study also demonstrated that at this time it was not feasible to increase service in areas not currently served. The AVTA Board of Directors has adopted the proposed recommendations.</p> <p>The AVTA has made numerous modifications to the system to improve transit in the community. The have hired a Marketing and Customer Relations manager and have instituted a policy to answer all customer inquiries by sundown of the same day. AVTA has also created a Commuter Advisory Committee that meets once a month. In addition, the Agency has hired a Contract Compliance Manager to monitor and verify all necessary safety and training activities, ensure compliance with federal and state laws and contractual obligations.</p>

SANTA CLARITA VALLEY

Recommended Actions	Actions Taken
Recommend that TDA Article 8 continue to fund transit in the City of Santa Clarita and street and road projects in the unincorporated areas of the Santa Clarita Valley.	TDA Article 8 funded the projects as recommended.

AVALON

Recommended Actions	Actions Taken
Recommend that the City of Avalon provide more information to the public about the jitney service.	The City has updated their signage program and distributed newly developed brochures throughout the jurisdiction.

ATTACHMENT G

TDA ARTICLE 8 APPORTIONMENTS  
FY 2001-2002

Jurisdiction	Population (1)	Article 8 Percentage	TDA Article 8 Revenue
Avalon	3,610	0.68%	99,139
Lancaster	132,400	25.05%	3,635,998
Palmdale	122,400	23.16%	3,361,376
Santa Clarita	151,300	28.63%	4,155,034
LA County Unincorporated	118,810	22.48%	3,262,787
Total	528,520	100.00%	\$14,514,334

(1) Population estimates are as of January 1, 2000 based on department of finance report on population. The unincorporated number still has to be revised.