

INTERCITY TRANSIT  
COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
AGENDA

June 21, 2021 - Virtual Meeting  
5:30 PM

Pursuant to [SCR 8402](#) this meeting will be through remote access. Please join the meeting from your computer, tablet, or smartphone by clicking the following link:  
<https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/843437413>.

You can also dial in using your phone (for supported devices, tap a one-touch number below to join instantly). United States: +1 (646) 749-3122 - One-touch: <tel:+16467493122,843437413>  
Access Code: 843-437-413

CALL TO ORDER

- |       |   |         |
|-------|---|---------|
| I.    | APPROVE AGENDA  | 1 min.  |
| II.   | INTRODUCTIONS   | 1 min.  |
|       | A. Intercity Transit Authority Representative CLARK GILMAN        |         |
| III.  | MEETING ATTENDANCE  | 3 min.  |
|       | A. July 7, 2021, Work Session - <i>(need volunteer)</i>           |         |
|       | B. July 21, 2021, Regular Meeting - <i>(Ty Flint)</i>             |         |
|       | C. August 4, 2021, Work Session - <i>(need volunteer)</i>         |         |
| IV.   | APPROVAL OF MINUTES - May 17, 2021                                | 1 min.  |
| V.    | NEW BUSINESS  |         |
|       | A. Bus Stop & Service Development Standards <i>(Mike Burnham)</i> | 45 min. |
|       | B. CAC Fall Recruitment <i>(Ann Freeman-Manzanares)</i>           | 10 min. |
| VI.   | CONSUMER ISSUES - All   | 15 min. |
| VII.  | REPORTS   |         |
|       | A. May 19, 2021, Authority Meeting <i>(Ursula Euler)</i>          |         |
|       | B. June 2, 2021, Authority Meeting <i>(Ursula Euler)</i>          |         |
|       | C. June 16, 2021, Authority Meeting <i>(Allison Spector)</i>      |         |
|       | D. General Manager's Report <i>(Ann Freeman-Manzanares)</i>       |         |
| VIII. | NEXT MEETING - July 19, 2021                                      |         |
| IX.   | ADJOURNMENT   |         |

Attendance report is attached.

*Intercity Transit ensures no person is excluded from participation in, or denied the benefits of its services on the basis of race, color, or national origin consistent with requirements of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and Federal Transit Administration guidance in Circular 4702.1B.*

*For questions, or to file a complaint, contact Intercity Transit customer service at 360-786-1881 or by email to [TitleVI@intercitytransit.com](mailto:TitleVI@intercitytransit.com).*

*If you need special accommodations to participate in this meeting, please call us at (360) 705-5857 three days prior to the meeting. For TDD users, please use the state's toll-free relay service, 711 and ask the operator to dial (360) 705-5857.*

*Please consider using an alternate mode to attend this meeting: bike, walk, bus, carpool, or vanpool. This facility is served by Routes 62A, 62B (on Martin Way), and 66 (on Pacific Avenue).*

**Minutes**  
**INTERCITY TRANSIT**  
**COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
**May 17, 2021 - Virtual Meeting**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Euler called the virtual May 17, 2021, meeting of the Community Advisory Committee (CAC) to order at 5:30 p.m. at the administrative offices of Intercity Transit.

**Members Present:** Chair Ursula Euler; Vice-Chair Walter Smit; David Bonauto; Jihan Grettenberger; Ty Flint; Marilyn Scott, and Joan O'Connell.

**Absent:** Billie Clark; Jonah Cummings; Isha Gabriel; Jini Namboothiri; Scott Paris; Marie Lewis; John Gear; Nikki Crist; Gene Angel; Carissa Putt; Allison Spector and Denise Clark.

**Staff Present:** Ann Freeman-Manzanares; Nancy Trail; Eric Phillips; Emily Bergkamp; Rob LaFontaine; Brian Nagel; Mike Burnham; Amanda Williams; Steve Swan; Kevin Karkoski; Daniel Van Horn, and Roshan KC.

**Others Attending:** Tim Payne; Kyle Taniguchi, and Ashankh Jaishankar all of Nelson Nygaard.

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

It was M/S/A by **JIHAN GRETTEBERGER** and **MOLLY CARMODY** to approve the meeting agenda.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

It was M/S/A by **JOAN O'CONNELL** and **WALTER SMIT** to approve the minutes of the April 19, 2021 CAC Meeting.

**INTRODUCTIONS**

Euler introduced Authority member, **MOLLY CARMODY**, as the ITA representative attending the meeting.

**MEETING ATTENDANCE**

- A. May 19, 2021, Work Session - Allison Spector
- B. June 2, 2021, Regular Meeting - Gene Angel
- C. June 16, 2021, Work Session - Allison Spector

**NEW BUSINESS**

- A. **DIAL-A-LIFT STUDY - LONG RANGE PLAN PRESENTATION** - *(Eric Phillips and Tim Payne)* Phillips shared that shortly after the passage of Proposition 1 staff went to the Authority for some quick action items including two of the big follow through projects including the Zero Fare study and a comprehensive review of the Dial-A-Lift (DAL) program. This is the first long range DAL plan for IT. Tim and his team at Nelson Nygaard did a deep dive into the data. They looked at a lot of the history of the program, have a broad perspective

based on their work around the nation, and will focus on ridership and our existing policies. It was set up so everyone can absorb a lot of the data and have a thorough conversation. Staff was anticipating bringing this forward around March of 2020, but the pandemic hit. The consulting team took the time to take a closer look at some of the scheduling data to get a better handle on the functional work of how the daily assignments were happening to confirm some of the information they had seen. Also to take a look at what was happening with the pandemic and ridership. Over the last few months they have updated some of the projections as they finalized the report. The good news is they have been able to look at some of the information they will need to pay closer attention to as they come out of the pandemic. Phillips introduced Tim Payne of Nelson Nygaard to present the findings of the study.

Payne introduced himself and his two colleagues Kyle Taniguchi and Ashankh Jaishankar of Nelson Nygaard. Ashankh completed a significant amount of the data analysis they have gone through. Kyle will provide the highlights of the analysis. Payne provided an overview of what the project was trying to accomplish and then will go into the results of the project. They will cover ridership, quality of service evaluation, eligibility analysis, cost effectiveness analysis and ridership costs and forecasts. They will then present their key findings. This is one of the first overall assessments of the DAL program that is designed to answer a number of key questions. Since the mid 2000's ridership has continued to climb. Why is that? What is driving it? And what is the long-term outlook? These were the essential questions they began to look at and then they were interrupted by COVID-19, but this gave them the opportunity to look at some other interesting aspects. One of the other things they were looking at was to compare the service quality that customers see on a regular basis and ensure that IT is in compliance with ADA regulations and guidelines as well as comparisons to other agencies that have adopted standards. They also looked at costs of some of the other agencies to determine if they saw anything that would allow them to make recommendations to control or contain the long terms costs of DAL. This is an expensive but necessary service. Then they looked at the long-term capital implications of continuing on the ridership forecast.

Taniguchi shared that the data received for the project was a robust data set from 2006 through 2019, or 14 years of data to include over 1.5M trips. As indicated they were in the process of wrapping up most of the work when COVID-19 hit. The ridership information he was presenting didn't have COVID-19 information considered. In the ridership estimation section they did consider available COVID-19 data and built that into the forecast. The data included attributes with the trips that were taken including what time it started, where it ended, and the attributes of the riders. This was what formed the analysis of both ridership and service quality pieces. He shared information on the ridership assessment including that ridership for DAL system has been growing year over year since 2006. There has been a steady 2% increase in the number of trips per year. Talking about the number of trips means the number of one-way trips by certified riders and doesn't include personal care attendants or travel companions that may be traveling with an individual. He noted the dotted line that shows a trend line and it tracks pretty closely and shows that barring any kind of unknowns or external influences this type of increase would have continued into the future. This is where the growth was headed pre-covid. They also looked at the historical number of riders using DAL was close trending to the historical data and barring anything like COVID-19 that would have continued forward. The take-away is the addition of new riders to the system is driving increased trip activity. The next thing they asked themselves is could population growth be causing the increase. They collected historical census data that shows the change

in population in Thurston County from 2007 to 2017 which shows during that time period it grew by 16% however the senior population of 65-74 year old's grew pretty substantially by 82%. While they know that age alone isn't a qualifier to ride DAL as individuals get older they are more likely to have disabilities and a greater likelihood they will be using DAL service. Some of the increase in the senior population could be a natural progression of aging in Thurston County and some could also be an immigration from other parts of the state and country. Age is certainly playing a role in the increase in ridership. He shared a chart showing the distribution of the age of riders. They took snapshots of the data beginning with 2006, and 2012 being roughly in the middle and 2018 at the tail end. Seniors comprise the majority of the riders and since 2006 it has increased from 60% to 64%. They also looked at trip activity per rider and the average number of trips they have taken since 2006. Similar to the other data it is pretty consistent at about 80 trips per year. What this tells them when they look at the other data is the ridership increases are more directly influenced by the number of new riders added to the system rather than any other kind fluctuation in trip making activity. The rider tenure shows the number of years someone is riding with DAL and there are a lot of people using DAL for one year and this is pretty consistent with other agencies across the country. Half of the ridership base turns over each year. The rider tenure and trip frequency shows that in year one the majority are pretty infrequent users but over time there is a higher probability they are taking more trips. Some of that is just comfort with the system and as they get more familiar they realize they can take it for other things. The frequency of usage by rider shows an upward trajectory as DAL adds riders. The proportion of individuals who take a certain amount of trips per year has remained remarkably steady. This feeds into the idea that pre-covid the system was really stable. He shared a map of the top 20 destinations and included some geospatial analysis and what it shows is the top destinations that have survived the test of time are the social facilities like adult day health, shopping, as well as medical facilities. Interestingly pre-covid the Lacey Senior Center was the largest generator of trips and in 2018 they saw almost 6k trips and the others were roughly in the neighborhood of 1k-3k. As they emerge from COVID-19 it is unclear what adult day health might look like there hasn't been a lot of guidance coming out for that and they are not sure what kind of future DAL will have in serving those trips. Medical trips have bounced back and they are hard to do virtually. At this point it is unclear what the future holds. Some of the key take-aways on ridership is that it is predominately seniors. As the population grows ridership will grow on the system. Trips taken per year/per rider and rider turnover are pretty consistent and baring COVID-19 they would have continued on their upward trajectory. Something to point out in ridership increases that could feed into that is the population pool. The population pool is this large group of riders who are potentially eligible due to their disability but they just don't take it or aren't registered. Then there is a smaller pool of the registered rider pool actively taking trips. One of the possibilities is the migration of the larger to the smaller rider pool as people tell their friends and they start taking trips. Another is just an increase in population growth. There is going to be a small proportion seeking out these types of services. By growing that pool in the population will inherently see increase in ridership.

Payne discussed the quality of service and the most important part is defining what they mean by quality of service. This includes the pick-up window and how service is provided in that window. The definition that DAL uses is +/- 15 minutes of the scheduled pick up time. The on-time performance goal of IT is 95% of the trips to be inside that 30 minute window. Missed trips are a situation where a person is waiting for a trip to show up and the vehicle never shows up due to fault of the agency. The goal for missed trips is 0% as the

adopted standard for the agency. Trip denials is another standard when someone calls to make a reservation and they don't have space to take them within the reservation window. That standard of performance is 0%. The excessively long trips standard is that DAL service is meant to be a compliment to fixed route service. It should take about the same amount of time it would on fixed route within the service area boundary from one point to another. The question then is how does IT stack up against some of the other organizations. Looking at on-time performance IT's goal is at 95%. Some of the other systems like Ann Arbor, MI is 97%, Pierce Transit is 90%, Kansas City, is 92%, and Milwaukee is 92% as an example of standards not how they perform. The quality of DAL service summarized is consistently high quality. Year in and year out the on-time performance is 93% and the goal is 95%. Historically it dipped down in the high 80's a few years ago. Staff got busy and continued to improve that. The goal of 95% has not been met but if the current trend continues there is a good probability that the 95% goal may well be met. Missed trips has been performing at 0.3% and that is 3 out of 1,000 trips that the agency misses the goal. The number of excessively late trips is really small at 0.03% picked up 45 minutes after the window. They looked at excessively long trips focusing on the later years and noting that the standard of comparison changes as the fixed route system changes so they used data from 2018. About 12% of trips provided on DAL are slower than fixed route. That means that 88% of the trips on DAL are equal to or faster than fixed route. Some agencies calculate this differently. DAL is a door-to-door service and fixed route is not. There is some access time on both ends of the fixed route trip, not just from bus stop to bus stop but also the access time in the trip. King County Metro adds 15 minutes and that is their standard of comparison if their ADA paratransit service is meeting the intent of the ADA with comparability to fixed route. If using a comparable standard for IT, it means that 98% are comparable and that is a very good overall number for the agency to be hitting.

Payne discussed the eligibility analysis findings indicating they are complicated. To make it clear eligibility is the process by which people get certified to use DAL service. They went back in history and looked at the classifications of people who applied for and were approved. There are three types of eligibility criteria bestowed on people who apply for DAL service. The first is full eligibility, another is temporary full eligibility for someone who has some temporary disability like hip surgery and is immobilized until rehabbed. Then there is conditional eligibility and this is one of the more interesting parts the ADA recognizes that some people sometimes can use the fixed route service. An easy example is someone who has night blindness. They have no issues during the day but their sight is impair during hours of darkness. They would be conditionally eligible to use the service during times of darkness. Up until 2018 the number of conditional eligibility had dropped substantially. It wasn't a focused in terms of granting eligibility. In looking at the administration of eligibility more recently, IT is paying more attention which is good from a financial perspective and is likely more in line with the ADA requirements. There are two parts to that knowing they have a condition and under what situation they should and should not use the service and helping them plan their trips for the most appropriate mode. That is the piece that is the next area of focus for IT. Talking about the number of annual trips and why this is important is because people who are conditionally eligible tend to take more trips than those who are fully eligibility. They tend to be more active and use the service more. This is a really important tool for managing long term growth and demand. Not cutting them off but managing the resource so it meets the needs of those who really need it. A quick summary of the data does not show the most recent activity for eligibility procedures and if it did they are definitely headed in the right direction. Conditional

eligibility is now being actively assessed. The next piece is focusing on how conditional eligibility in service provision could have long-term growth control benefits. They tend to take more trips and become a demand management tool.

Payne discussed the cost-effectiveness analysis tool regardless of the metric that is used not only is ridership growing but costs of providing DAL service have continued to rise above what the demand has been regardless of how it is measured. Nationwide with ADA paratransit service the costs go up in direct proportion to ridership. Unlike fixed route service where you can put more people on the same resource per unit of service it reduces the overall cost per person. On DAL that is not true and for every person added the cost goes up. It is important to continue to look at it long term and ask the question will IT have the funding to provide all of their programs that are important for the region and continue to meet the needs of DAL in Thurston County. Their conclusion is IT needs to look at some strategies to control costs long term. He added that controlling the increase in costs is not decreasing costs. It is a fool's errand to try to drive overall costs of paratransit down. It isn't an objective that can be met. It is possible to take the edge off the growth in DAL costs to make sure they have the funds they need to do everything the agency is trying to achieve. For purposes of comparison they looked at some other fare free systems and something they want to acknowledge is that just before COVID-19 struck all of IT went fare free. There wasn't enough data to tell what would have happened after COVID-19 was over. It has had a stimulating effect on fixed route for certain. The few month's of data they looked at in early 2020 show it would also have a stimulating effect on DAL service. They looked at some other systems in Washington state because there are a number of factors that affect costs across the system. Some of it is how other systems account for their costs in overhead and part has to do with other parts of country have lower costs to operate. Some parts of the country start at below \$15/hr. but it is higher here. These costs are geographic and not always directly comparable from one place to another. Something else they looked at is alternative services to DAL as a way to benefit riders and help control costs. Again this is hitting some highlights in the overall operating expense per passenger trip at \$53.21/per trip at IT (2018). Island Transit is \$49.77, but Missoula MT where the labor rates are a lot lower is \$28.51, and AppalCart in NC is \$17.17. DAL service is relatively expensive. Looking at what's going on in Washington state generally, IT is not out of line with other systems in the state overall. They are not the highest, or lowest and the costs per trip are not unusual to similar systems. They looked at several pilot programs for alternative services going on in the country. They are not necessarily recommending these be applied to IT but at the same time they provide some insight into what may be possible. The one thing to emphasize is they are not ADA paratransit service but they are offered as a supplement to paratransit services and the idea is that they offer benefits to riders that attract riders to the point that they say they want to use the supplemental service instead. Riders get benefits as does the agency and they cost less to operate. In every single case the vehicles and the operators are shared across multiple services. The first example is MBTA in Boston in a partnership with Lyft and Uber. The sharing there is the general marketplace and the vehicles if not going a trip for MBTA pilot they are doing a regular Lyft or Uber trip. There is the economy of a shared vehicle not dedicated solely ADA paratransit service. This has been going on for about 5 years and this month was extended to make it a permanent thing. The important thing is the ADA paratransit equivalent transportation network company service where someone can get on an app, summon a vehicle, and it shows up in 15 minutes. They get their ride exclusively from their starting point to their ending point and that is the service model being used. MBTA found in the early days after about the first 6 months of the

demonstration it was so successful and so convenient that even among a group of individuals they had selected to test the pilot service it was so successful it was generating additional trips and it was costing them more money to operate the supplemental service than it was saving. It was too much of a good thing and they had to cap the number of trips on the supplemental service in the range of 20 trips per month. The important thing is the overall cost per trip is about \$45 and the alternate service is about \$17. The idea is if they can encourage people to use the supplemental service they save money. Another example from Jacksonville, FL where they have added a third layer onto their ADA paratransit service and people can book same day up to 2 hours in advance. These are quasi dedicated vehicles with other jobs that they do. The costs are a little higher and Jacksonville pays the contractor per mile plus a booking fee to operate. Their ADA is \$38.40 and the on demand is \$22.09. The more they can offer those trips up to a point so as not to generate new ridership helps reduce the overall costs for the agency. It hasn't turned their overall cost curve around, it isn't going down it is increasing at a much slower rate with this service. Another example is Big Blue Bus in Santa Monica, CA the ADA paratransit is created by Access Services which provides services through LA county. A person who wants to book an ADA paratransit trip calls Access Services. The city of Santa Monica for years has had a supplemental service for people above a certain age plus people with disabilities as a benefit for people who live in Santa Monica who are traveling just inside Santa Monica. It is a special service that the city has funded for a long time. After Access Services came in and took over in the late 80's they continued to offer the service with dedicated vehicles. They explored a different model in 2018 as the costs were getting out of control and began working with Lyft for people in the city to allow them to book on the alternate service. The important thing to note is the service they were offering before wasn't ADA paratransit so they weren't prohibited by law from denying trips which was happening because there was a limitation on the number of vehicles to be used for this service. In this pilot they have been able to practically eliminate the trip denial on this service. People have a more convenient trip and the costs to the agency have stabilized and people ended up with better service. The last one is Greater Richmond in Virginia beginning in 2017, and again they are looking to do two things to provide another option to travel and people are able to book on demand. It costs double what the standard ADA paratransit service. The service costs less because they are not dedicated to ADA paratransit. The overall cost structure is lower there than it is here and the differential between their regular ADA and the on demand is not as great but still providing better service as well as control overall increase in costs. They looked at a number of non ADA general public services available and there are a number of resourceful and interesting pilots going on across the country for IT to evaluate some of these services to help control the increase in DAL costs. A few key findings there are a couple challenges to adapting non ADA services like Lyft and Uber into an ADA environment. They have to provide access to people who don't have a smart phone or an app, or can't use a smart phone or app. There has to be a way for them to access the service on an equal basis with other people. Fares are not a big concern for IT but there are a significant amount of people who are unbanked and they must have a methodology to pay the fares. They haven't found an area with no fares with a pilot service. The best way to test these in Thurston County is to do a pilot service. The important thing is to establish the objective. Is it greater mobility at a lower cost than DAL or are there other objectives. Coming out of COVID-19 and the additional phases of Healthy Washington, social distancing becomes a non-factor. The amount of capacity on DAL goes down maybe utilize that to do something like this. The important thing is to set up objectives ahead of time.



Payne continued sharing analysis on ridership and cost forecasts. This is where they were thrown into a whirlwind with respect to COVID-19. Before COVID-19 hit in the early part of 2020 they talked about the given population dynamics in Thurston County and the predictability of where the senior population was going, the relatively stable number of trips per rider, and with the relative stability of the ridership makeup they were able to predict what was going to happen to DAL service in a fairly narrow range out to 2040. They were confident that their projection would fall within a certain range and then COVID-19 hit. Dialysis for instance, is a trip need that does not change. If someone needs dialysis, it is a matter of life and death that they get to their appointment. General medical trips are not quite back to normal but are still a high percentage of trips taken. Shopping trips are not quite back to normal but relatively normal. The trips that are missing are the high volume of overall demand levels to adult day health services, senior congregate sites and the third one is supported employment sites which has practically disappeared during COVID-19. No one really know where that will end up long term. State has made no pronouncements about the resumption of services that are provided by organizations like the Area Agency on Aging. The state is taking a really strong look at adult day health services and the costs and benefits of in-home adult day health services which could have a huge impact. What has happened during COVID has greatly increased the level of uncertainty of where DAL will go in the future. Could return to pre-COVID numbers. Could stay similar to COVID level trips. Starting from COVID level trips, which are a much lower base, the overall trend in ridership will be lower. What is important about this are the impacts on costs and it is really hard to know because IT has done a number of things to be in a position to provide services. When social distancing came into play, IT cut the capacity of vehicles and there was enough capacity because demand was so much lower. They used the service to fill in some of the gaps of the fixed route reductions. They make good use of that capacity and exactly where that shows up with all the other factors that have gone on, paying overtime, cleaning vehicles, and taking extra precautionary steps is a little unknown where that is going to be. Watching the demand generators like adult day health and the Area Agency on Aging funding congregate meal and activity centers and supported employment will have a lot to do with where IT ends up on the long-term curve. If IT were to put into place some of the more aggressive cost control measures with the use and deployment of conditional eligibility and putting a pilot service that gave people a supplemental service choice rather than using standard DAL service would impact costs. The costs don't go down, they just don't go up as fast. Again, the important message here is that these things are cost control measures, not cost reduction measures. The last thing they looked at was what happens with the vehicle fleet which is at about 47 right now. If it weren't for social distancing factors and using DAL to fill in the gaps for fixed route the vehicle need would have been in the mid 20's. It will recover in direct proportion to what ridership does. Currently the DAL fleet is sized appropriately but as it gets replaced in the next few cycles taking stock of where the agency is allows it to continue to be appropriately sized. A few key findings on ridership that have changed as a result of COVID-19 includes some of the ridership lost may never come back. Operations, maintenance and capital costs will continue to rise and planning conservatively for the long term to make sure into the mid 2030's that IT is not faced with not being able to fund all of the planned programs and projects. Shifting trips and conditional eligibility will keep capital costs down. They did look carefully at ways the DAL staff could potentially use the fleet more effectively and they didn't find a lot there. The staff does an excellent job providing a high quality service. They are extremely knowledgeable, and they work really hard at maintaining the efficiency of the system. Even so they still have

a little bit and everybody does, that some efficiency could be gained by 2/3 vehicles per day to help take edge off the long term cost curve.

*Phillips and Payne answered questions.*

*Bonauto* – regarding using alternative services like Uber and Lyft, as someone who does a lot of work on labor issues, I have a concern providing supplemental service in that way unless they change how they interact with labor. I still realize we have a concern about costs delivering these services so as not to negatively impact the ability to provide service for the entire community.

*Payne* – indicated there have been partnerships with Lyft and Uber and there could be other alternatives as well. Some of the more creative things done are services where a provider will actually have vehicles available to do services for DAL but when not doing DAL they also make them available for Lyft and Uber services. The operator themselves are actually paid a wage instead of per trip basis. It has been used in several contracting opportunities throughout the United States as a way to take advantage of Lyft and Uber being there and providing that opportunity to share the use of those resources and recoup some of them when they're not being used and be fair to organized labor. There's not any point in providing great services and then starving the people who are providing the service.

*Carmody* – inquired if they have done any studies that show how many people are currently using DAL that require the full wheel chair accessible lift vehicles.

*Payne* – indicated going from memory he thinks in King County it is about 42% of the riders require the use of a lift. When they last looked at IT he thinks it was about 25% of the trips use vehicles with a lift. Going back to the creative pilots one of the real challenges is that a typical fleet in Lyft/Uber doesn't have any lifts in them. It is important to provide equal access to those that utilize a mobility device so they have equal access to the supplemental service.

*Euler* – inquired about eligibility being accessed better.

*Payne* – indicated that he was talking about conditional eligibility. The team at IT went back and looked at how they were assessing and awarding eligibility trying to apply more conditional eligibility as a precursor to match functional capability. There is a regular cycle of recertification at regular intervals say every 3-5 years people are recertified. As the cycle of recertification has gone on the staff is looking at the ability to apply conditional eligibility principles.

*Euler* – remarked about 50% of the ridership turns over every year but new riders brings it right back up.

*Payne* – added that some of the people who have temporary eligibility due to some life event that happened and then they recover and they go out and their place gets taken by someone else. Life event happens that make them become eligible. Disability is one of the very few things in life that every person breathing on the earth can be one life event away from.

*Euler* – remarked about how economies of scale under the current operations is either not in the cards or very difficult.

*Payne* – indicated part of the challenge with social distancing the capacity of the vehicles is limited, but the general rule used during covid is only people from the same household travel together. So it is more like a cab service instead of a shared ride service.

*Euler* – added that under non-covid times economies of scale are an option.

*Payne* – stated that the advantage of using shared vehicles and shared resources is that you get economies of scale because demand is greater for shared resources so there is more demand over which to spread the cost. So even if the cost is exactly the same, but you're able to use the same vehicle and same operator to accommodate 20 trips per day instead of 10 trips per day the cost per trip actually drops in half. Something else has to be explored. There aren't significant opportunities within the current model to significantly expand economies of scale. In terms of the model that's currently being used, where DAL staff is dedicated to providing DAL service and a person that's called in and paid "x" amount per day to provide that service and it doesn't make any difference if there's nobody that rides, or if they're busy all day long. There the size of the staff is sized to what the expected demand is. So if the expected demand doesn't materialize for some reason or another goes over, then they have to find alternatives in between. But as long as that staff to demand relationship is there, there really are very limited capabilities of executing economies of scale.

*Euler* – inquired if expectations are changed is there an option at IT.

*Payne* – added that is an interesting policy question and all have implications on the way labor is organized and the employee force is organized. He wouldn't say that anything is impossible because he has seen all kinds of different combinations of services used to provide ADA paratransit service, but they all have a whole set of implications that go well outside simply providing the service. As an example a current client in California uses a broker and the trip reservationists and quote dispatcher all work for broker and ADA paratransit is provided by people calling the broker arranging the trips. The broker then goes into the local marketplace saying they have a trip from A to B here is the amount of money they are willing to pay for it will you take the trip. It is almost a bidding type of system that's brokered out to a number of different providers in the area. They actually have a fairly low cost per trip so they'll get Lyft/Uber/Taxi's. They have lift equipped cabs who happen to operate in the community and they have some Medicaid providers who provide services to them. Their offices are not in the community and are located in the mid-united states and it is a fairly unusual model.

*O'Connell* – thanked them for their presentation and remarked how fortunate the agency was to benefit from his 40 years of experience.

*Payne* – added that they basically took 2 years worth of information collection and analysis and shoved it into a little over two hours worth of presentation so it is a lot. There are a lot of things they looked at that they haven't even touched on.

*Euler* – surmised it would be quite a change in approach and would take a lot of thought.

*Payne* – indicated that it needs to be done thoughtfully for a couple of different reasons. The major reason is that the service is of critical important to some of the most vulnerable in the community. To ensure they continue to meet the needs but also don't detract from the agency's ability to meet the other needs of the community. It is not a set of decisions that should be taken cavalierly. Maintaining the balance of trying to control costs, make sure labor is well cared for, and that customers receive high quality service. They are all policy level questions that require a significant amount of thought before one just launches off and does something different with the program.

*Euler* – asked for some more information about the projection slide pre/post covid.

*Payne* – shared that it really indicates that before COVID-19 they were able to predict what the ridership would look like, but since many of those trips have gone away they are not sure how quickly they will come back. They don't know what the economic rebound is going to look like. The amount of uncertainty is very high. From the data they have from early in 2021 and it's not halfway through the year yet it shows trending toward the lower side rather than the upper side. DSHS could come out and say everything is great and the Area Agency on Aging could restart all of the congregate meal/activity sites and be full tilt by September. Many of the adult day-health centers are still doing in home services. Which of those is more beneficial is hard to know for sure. The state may elect to provide services at single sites and that is a major driver of DAL service demand and it is throughout the United States.

*Euler* – shared that she feels sorry for Uber/Lyft drivers because if someone does that for a living she doesn't see where that provides a morally and ethically good basis for making a living. She worries about the sustainability and bringing that into an area for someone who needs a ride every other Thursday to get their kidney cleaned.

*Payne* – added that there is a whole policy debate that needs to go on about the economy and if it fits or doesn't fit with public transportation. Some areas are still experimenting like King County Metro who has been contracting with a company called Via Services and they're providing this dedicated service in the Rainier Valley to pick people up at their front door and take them to the rail stations. Those are dedicated vehicles and dedicated employees. They have been able to improve the mobility of people in the Rainier Valley. Their fixed route service is all still there but they have substantially improved the mobility of people and do it at a lower cost than if they flooded the area with more fixed route services. It is important to keep in mind what the objectives are. The typical dialysis patient goes three days per week. The one thing that most agencies that have started these supplemental programs with Lyft/Uber have found they end up with a smaller group specially trained to work with people with disabilities and the characteristics/knowledge to recognize certain things going on with an individual and able to treat them with respect is different than those showing up at a bar at 2:00 am. It is a completely different experience and a different skillset. In most instances there's actually a subset of Lyft/Uber drivers that are certified to do alternative services. The whole living wage issue is a whole other policy discussion before deciding to move forward. Deciding if this is what the agency is trying to support is a much deeper policy

level conversation. Or is there a different pathway to improve mobility without essentially taking advantage of the people providing the mobility.

*Euler* – remarked that in fairness people will only do something for any length of time if it is fair. It might be a short term patch for people and they move on to something else versus an employer who employs someone.

*Payne* – shared that he has talked to several people and some go at it as a part time thing and some make a living at it. Some are in for a short period of time to tide them over because they could get into it relatively easily. It is an interesting work force with a lot of different motivations.

*Euler* – inquired if the committee needed to provide some recommendation to the ITA.

*Phillips* – indicated the presentation was for information and discussion. The committee will hear from Ann later on the strategic plan and budget process. Staff will discuss the long range perspective of keeping the financial model intact. As Tim mentioned they are in a period of instability. The event hasn't ended. As they get a better handle on the recovery trajectory the key fact is that the ridership patterns are changing. What you'll hear from staff is more of the conservative recommendation on the long range outlook. In the interim as the recovery cycles are looked at annually the committee may see some adjustments that respond to the recovery of ridership within the region. Two years ago the agency was looking at innovative service zones and how to add service to the areas that aren't currently served. There are different reasons to choose maybe more than one model for different parts of the service area. It gets more complicated. The good news is there is a data history. They have those data points to track annually because there's been such a big shift. There will be more discussions with the CAC about service models for a variety of services in the future. He gave a shout out to the internal team that supported the project including Emily, Kevin, Curtis, the planning staff and Lee for the support with all the data.

*Freeman-Manzanares* – added that the DAL study is so appreciated and is a great starting point to kick off more in depth conversations.

## **CONSUMER ISSUES**

- Bonauto – shared that he has not had any additional issues with his bus. It has been on time and the drivers are all nice as usual.

## **REPORTS**

- **April 21, 2021 Authority Meeting** – Euler provided the report including that the ITA received the same presentations the CAC received two days earlier on flat fee for vanpool.
- **May 5, 2021 Authority Meeting** – Euler provided the report including that the ITA concluded their discussion on the strategic plan and policy positions. They noted that non-fossil fuels need to continue to be studied and considered as a possible more environmentally friendly solution. Zero fare was mentioned because it is a five year pilot program but with the pandemic they have lost some valuable time and data. It might need

to be redefined as five years where data can be collected. The mask mandates remain in place on buses and transit centers until September 13, 2021.

- **General Manager's Report** – Freeman-Manzanares provided the General Manager's report including:
  - TSA extended the federal face mask requirement to September 13, 2021.
  - They anticipate opening OTC 2 June 1, 2021 and providing great customer service.
  - The state audit is beginning in June and is expected to last six to seven weeks after just getting the triennial review wrapped up.
  - The next Operator class is starting May 24, 2021.
  - Funding through the state process for the 2021-2023 biennium included a few disappointments but they ultimately did okay. If anyone has any questions about that please call or email.
  - The CAD/AVL project kicked off this month and that is very exciting. Staff will provide a presentation on the capabilities of the new system in the future. This is the first replacement with a lot of expanded capability for staff and customers.
  - It is BCC month and she encouraged everyone to get out and ride their bikes.

*Bonauto* – inquired if she knew what the indicators would be to end the mask mandate.

*Freeman-Manzanares* – responded that she does not, but staff is following TSA directives.

*Bonauto* – asked if she knew roughly what portion of drivers had been vaccinated.

*Freeman-Manzanares* – indicated she would have to check in with Administrative Services.

**NEXT MEETING: June 21, 2021.**

## **ADJOURNMENT**

**It was M/S/A by O'CONNELL and BONAUTO to adjourn the meeting at 7:39 pm.**

Prepared by Nancy Trail G:\CAC\Minutes\2021\CAC Minutes 20210419.docx

**INTERCITY TRANSIT  
COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
AGENDA ITEM NO. V-A  
MEETING DATE: June 21, 2021**

**FOR:** Community Advisory Committee

**FROM:** Mike Burnham, Associate Planner, (360) 705-5877

**SUBJECT:** Bus Stop & Service Development Standards Presentation

- 
- 1) **The Issue:** IT planning and development staff will discuss the purpose, process, and desired outcomes of their ongoing update of the Bus Stop & Service Development Standards, which guide the design and placement of bus stops and their surrounding zones.

---

  - 2) **Recommended Action:** For information and discussion.

---

  - 3) **Policy Analysis:** Updating the Bus Stop & Service Development Standards will help IT achieve Short- and Long-Range Plan goals for safe and accessible bus stops and zones that enhance the rider experience and speed up transit service.

---

  - 4) **Background:** IT last updated the Standards about five years ago. The updated Standards will integrate current state and federal guidance for the design and placement of bus stops and surrounding zones, as well as lead to more efficient and effective collaboration between IT and local jurisdictions and developers.

---

  - 5) **Alternatives:** N/A.

---

  - 6) **Budget Notes:** Updating the Standards has no impact on the 2021 budget. However, the Short- and Long-Range Plan identified about \$260,000 annually for passenger capital facilities.

---

  - 7) **Goal References:** **Goal #3:** *“Maintain a safe and secure operating system.”* **Goal #4:** *“Provide responsive transportation options within financial limitations.”* **Goal #6:** *“Encourage use of our services, reduce barriers to access, and increase ridership.”*

---

  - 8) **References:** N/A.

**INTERCITY TRANSIT  
COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
AGENDA ITEM NO. V-B  
MEETING DATE: June 21, 2021**

**FOR:** Community Advisory Committee

**FROM:** Ann Freeman-Manzanares, 705-5838

**SUBJECT:** 2021 Community Advisory Committee Recruitment

- 
- 1) **The Issue:** Present timeline and process information for the 2021 Community Advisory Committee (CAC) recruitment.

---

  - 2) **Recommended Action:** Provide the process, timeline and select three members to participate on an ad-hoc committee to interview candidates and make recommendations to the Authority.

---

  - 3) **Policy:** In 2001, the Intercity Transit Authority chartered a Community Advisory Committee. In 2011, the Authority approved an additional youth position, increasing the number of members from 19 to 20. It was the Authority's direction to conduct an annual recruitment. New members are appointed by the Transit Authority.

---

  - 4) **Background:** The Community Advisory Committee members serve three-year terms and may serve no more than two consecutive three-year terms. The exception is the youth position which is a one-year term. The youth member can apply for a three-year position if they wish. Each fall, staff conducts a recruitment to fill vacancies which may occur throughout the year, through expiration of terms, or if members do not seek reappointment.

The CAC is comprised of 20-members. The goal is to have a group that is representative of the diversity of our community. Each fall, staff conducts a recruitment to fill vacancies which may occur throughout the year, through expiration of terms, or if members do not seek reappointment.

Traditionally, three Authority members, along with three CAC members, will comprise the ad hoc committee which will conduct the interviews and make recommendations to the full Authority for appointment.

Applications are proposed to be available September 1, 2021 and due on October 8, 2021. The Authority will select interviewees on October 20, 2021. Interviews are



proposed for November 3 with candidate selection on November 17, 2021 or December 1, 2021.

---

5) **Alternatives:** N/A.

---

6) **Budget Notes:** N/A.

---

7) **Goal References:** An engaged Community Advisory Committee supports all agency goals.

---

8) **References:** N/A.

**Authority Meeting Highlights**  
***a brief recap of the May 19, 2021 Authority Meeting***

*This meeting was held remotely in accordance with [SCR 8402](#) extending certain gubernatorial orders issued in response to the COVID-19 state of emergency.*

**Wednesday night, the Authority:**

- Conducted a Public Hearing on the 2022-2025 Transportation Improvement Program.
- Confirmed the annual Transit Development Plan (TDP) update schedule, and authorized a public hearing for June 16, 2021, for the purpose of receiving and considering public comments on the 2020 Annual Report and the 2021-2026 TDP.
- Authorized the General Manager to execute an amendment to the contract with Nelson Nygaard Consulting Associates adding an additional \$55,000 to the contract for a revised not-to-exceed total contract amount of \$401,862 and extending the contract through December 31, 2022.
- Authorized the General Manager to execute project agreements with the Washington State Department of Transportation supporting the Martin Way Park-and-Ride Direct Access Project (JC-1486) and the Smart Corridors Project (JC-1487).
- Welcomed Tim Houdyshell, Operations Trainer and Art Snyder, Facilities Specialist.
- Received an update on the long-range Dial-A-Lift study findings and trends from Nelson Nygaard.

**General Manager's Report:**

The State Audit begins in June and is expected to last about seven weeks.

Freeman-Manzanares shared a correction on the state grant award. Intercity Transit applied for funds to help support the Olympia Express Service to Pierce County starting July 1, 2021, at the conclusion of our Regional Mobility Grant which ends June 30, 2021. There was some question as to whether or not IT would qualify under the consolidated grant program. We didn't think they found room for us within the program, however, we received a letter of award this week for \$1,301,607 of the \$3,254,017 that we requested. We were requesting a 50% match – this is a 20% match.

Prepared May 20, 2021  
Pat Messmer/Clerk of the Board

**Authority Meeting Highlights**  
***a brief recap of the June 2, 2021 Authority Meeting***

This meeting was held remotely in accordance with Governor Inslee’s Proclamation 20-28.15 Safe Start/Roadmap to Recovery.

**Wednesday night, the Authority:**

- Adopted the 2022-2025 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for projects with anticipated Federal funding.
- Authorized the General Manager to enter into a contract with Gillig to provide coach replacement seat pads in an amount not-to-exceed \$150,000, including sales tax.
- Authorized the General Manager to execute a contract amendment with ALS to renew the contract for Landscaping and Grounds Maintenance Services for a period of one year in an amount not-to-exceed \$75,940, including sales tax.
- Authorized the General Manager to execute a Task Order with SCJ Alliance in the amount of \$242,000.
- Approved the process and timeline for the 2021 Community Advisory Committee Fall recruitment and selected three members of the Authority to participate on the Ad-Hoc Committee: *Justin Belk, Don Melnick, Debbie Sullivan, and alternate Clark Gilman.*

**General Manager’s Report:**

The OTC-2 building in downtown Olympia opened to the public on June 1, 2021. Greyhound continues serving the site and sales are anticipated to begin onsite September 13, 2021.

The current new Operator class graduates in mid-July, and we anticipate having enough staff to reintroduce the Olympia Express service on July 19, 2021.

Reminder – Intercity Transit is under the Federal mask mandate at all of our public facilities as well as all employee areas through September 13, 2021.



The Washington State Health Care Authority honored 34 agencies statewide recognizing outstanding Wellness Programs, and Intercity Transit was again a recipient of the Zo8 Award.

It’s been a challenge during this time of COVID, however, our Wellness Committee has been creative, focusing on the physical and emotional well-being of staff. The Wellness Committee adapted their programs to include social distancing by adding virtual events, such as:

- The Summer Walking Challenge
- Two Self-Care Challenges
- March Into Motion – Movement Challenge
- Heart Healthy Virtual Walks on Teams

- Provided Healthy Snacks for our front-line workers
- Created a Facebook page to keep people connected
- Virtual Healthy Cooking Class
- Farmer's Market tokens for those who contribute to the Wellness program.

We are really proud of the work the Wellness Committee does to support employees and to gain this recognition. **Let's congratulate them! A big shout-out to the Wellness Committee members: *Shannie Jenkins, Chair; Nancy Trail, Vice Chair; Katie Cunningham, Treasurer; Ally McPherson, Secretary; Joy Gerchak, Jessica Gould, Brian Nagel, and Larry Smathers.***

Everyone is invited (*invitation attached*) to attend the **Mountain View Elementary Traffic Garden Grand Opening** being held **June 9, 2021, from 2:30 to 3:00 p.m., located at 1900 College Street SE in Lacey.**

The miniature streetscape is a safe and fun place for youth to learn and practice bicycle and pedestrian safety skills. Mountain View's physical education teacher will use the Traffic Garden for the 4th and 5th grade bike unit and will be open to the public during non-school hours. The Traffic Garden is a partnership between Child Care Action Council's Safe Kids Thurston County, Intercity Transit's Walk N Roll Program, North Thurston Public Schools, and Alliance for a Healthier Generation. The project is being funded by a grant from State Farm. This is the first Traffic Garden in Thurston County, and we hope this project will inspire more in the future.

**Attached are photos of the Traffic Garden at Mountain View.** It's not complete yet but will be soon. Stay tuned...

Prepared June 3, 2021  
Pat Messmer/Clerk of the Board

## COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE ATTENDANCE RECORD

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
CAC	Members	Jan-21	Feb-21	Mar-21	Apr-21	May-21	Jun-21	Jul-21	Aug-21	Sep-21	Oct-21	Nov-21	Dec-21
Gene	Angel		Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent							
David	Bonauto												
Billie	Clark	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent							
Denise	Clark		Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent							
Nikki	Crist					Absent							
Jonah	Cummings	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent							
Ursula	Euler												
Ty	Flint	Absent			Absent								
Isha	Gabriel	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent							
John	Gear	Absent				Absent							
Jihan	Grettenberger												
Marie	Lewis	Absent	Absent										
Jini	Namboothiri	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent							
Joan	O'Connell	Absent	Absent	Absent									
Scott	Paris	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent							
Carissa	Putt	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent							
Marilyn	Scott				Absent								
Walter	Smit												
Allison	Spector			Absent		Absent							

**=** Joint meeting does not count against required meeting attendance