

Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency (NCTPA)

Board of Directors

SPECIAL MEETING

Continuation of the June 17, 2009 NCTPA Board Meeting

MINUTES

Wednesday, July 1, 2009

8:45 a.m.

ITEMS

1. Call to Order

Chair Jim Krider called the meeting to order at 8:50 a.m.

2. Pledge of Allegiance

Dana Smith, Assistant City Manager, City of Napa, led the salute to the flag.

3. Roll Call

Members Present:

Leon Garcia	City of American Canyon
Joan Bennett	City of American Canyon
Michael Dunsford	City of Calistoga
Jack Gingles	City of Calistoga
Jim Krider	City of Napa
Jill Techel	City of Napa
Bill Dodd	County of Napa
Keith Caldwell	County of Napa
Del Britton	City of St. Helena
Eric Sklar	City of St. Helena
Lewis Chilton	Town of Yountville
Cynthia Saucerman	Town of Yountville

Members Absent: - None

Non-Voting Members Absent:

JoAnn Busenbark

Paratransit Coordinating Council

***MSC - Motioned, Seconded, and Unanimously Carried**

4. REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS - TRANSPORTATION

4.1 Continuation of Public Hearing on Napa Downtown Trolley and Route 11

Staff reviewed the proposed fare increases for the VINE and VINE Go services, the discontinuation of VINE Route 11 and Downtown Napa Trolley services, as well as, recommendations to reallocate approximately 2, 200 Trolley hours to a new VINE Route 1C service that will travel westbound on First Street and eastbound on Second Street. This new service will operate on a 20-minute frequency during core hours Monday-Saturday with anchor bus stops at Dwight Murray Plaza on First Street and the Premium Outlets.

Chair Krider opened the Public Hearing at 9:08 am on the proposed VINE and VINE Go fare Increases and the Discontinuation of VINE Route 11 and the Downtown Napa Trolley. Being no public comment, Chair Krider closed the Public Hearing at 9:08 a.m.

Member Lewis Chilton stated that he does not support the rate increases due to the current economic crisis it doesn't makes sense to tell our current riders that we are going to put forward an 8-10% increase in what we charge them when our entire point is to get more people to ride (transit). Further Member Chilton would like more discussion about what are the alternatives for lowering the other 84% cost.

The Board requested action be taken on this item in three separate motions as follows:

VINE and VINE Go Fare Increases:

MS BRITTON / DUNSFORD to APPROVE, with CHILTON OPPOSING, the fare increases to the VINE and VINE Go services as shown in the following Tables 1-4:

**Table 1
Existing and Proposed VINE Fares
Intra-City Routes 1- 6**

Cash Fare Category	Current Fare	Proposal Fare	Change
Base - Adult (19-64)	\$1.25	\$1.35	10-cents
Youth (6-18)	\$1.00	\$1.10	10-cents
Reduced*	\$0.60	\$0.65	5-cents
Seniors (90+ with Lifeline Pass)	Free	Free	none
Children 5 & under (2 per paying Adult)	Free	Free	none
Additional children under 5	\$1.00	\$1.10	10-cents

*MSC - Motioned, Seconded, and Unanimously Carried

* Reduced fare category includes seniors (age 65+), Disabled individuals of any age and persons with a valid Medicare ID Card.

**Table 2
Proposed Cash Fares for VINE Route 10
Regional Service (Calistoga to Vallejo)**

Cash Fare Category	From/ To	Zone 1	Zone 2	Zone 3
		Calistoga/ St Helena/ Rutherford/ Oakville	Napa/ Yountville	American Canyon/ Vallejo
Base - Adult	Zone 1	\$1.35	\$2.15	\$2.90
Youth		\$1.10	\$1.60	\$2.00
Reduced *		\$0.65	\$1.00	\$1.25
Base - Adult	Zone 2	\$2.15	\$1.35	\$2.15
Youth		\$1.60	\$1.10	\$1.60
Reduced *		\$1.00	\$0.65	\$1.00
Base - Adult	Zone 3	\$2.90	\$2.15	\$1.35
Youth		\$2.00	\$1.60	\$1.10
Reduced *		\$1.25	\$1.00	\$0.65

**Table 3
Proposed Discount Passes and Special Passes
Day Passes may be used on any of the VINE Transit Services**

Fare Category	Punch Pass		Monthly Pass		Day Pass **
	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed	
Base - Adult (19-64)	\$23	\$25	\$40	\$43	\$4
Youth (6-18)	\$18	\$20	\$30	\$33	\$3
Reduced *	\$11	\$12	\$20	\$22	\$2
Seniors (90+ with Lifeline Pass)	Free		Free		Free

** No fare change is recommended for the VINE Day Pass usage.

**Table 4
VINE Commuter Express Route 29**

Fare Category	June 2009 Phase I	July 1, 2011 Phase II
All Passengers	\$2 one-way	\$3 one-way

*MSC - Motioned, Seconded, and Unanimously Carried

Downtown Napa Trolley Service:

MSC* BRITTON / DUNSFORD to **APPROVE** the following recommendations regarding the Downtown Napa Trolley Service:

- Discontinue Trolley Service effective August 29, 2009 and utilize buses in another capacity (TBD or sold).
- Reallocate 2,200 Trolley hours to the new VINE Route 1C service (Trolley has operated 4,950 annual hours).
- Operate 20-minute frequency during core hours Monday to Saturday.
- Anchor bus stops shall be at Dwight Murray Plaza on First Street and the Premium Outlets.
- Route 1C alignment will travel westbound on First Street and eastbound on Second Street and turn around at Main Street.
- Promote FlexRIDE service for weekday evening hours (6pm to 10 or 11 pm) and Sunday (8am to 7 pm or later) for employees, locals and visitors.
- FlexRIDE has offer same day, on demand service within Napa city limits.

VINE Route 11 Service:

Member Jack Gingles requested support for the continuation of Route 11, and would like modifications made to increase ridership; supports incorporating into Route 11 Options 1 and 2 (as shown in PowerPoint presentation handout) to make Route 11 a hybrid service modifying it to an on-demand service similar to the Napa Shuttle servicing Kaiser facilities in Santa Rosa, and to travel during school bell times. Further supports the possibility of public-private transportation partnerships and funding which may include coordinating with Cardinal Newman and Ursuline schools for work and school related trips and coordination of fleet resources with a human services agency to provide transportation.

Chair Jim Krider stated that there as is a cost factor involved (in running Route 11) and would suggest some sort of subsidy as the City of Napa provided with the Trolley service to help make up the farebox recovery ratio.

Suggestion was made that the Cities of St. Helena and Calistoga could possibly help subsidize farebox ratio of the Route 11 service.

Member Joan Bennett stated there is also the human element involved in eliminating Route 11 in that there may be people who this route services are people who may not be able to find other ways to get to where they need to go. Member Bennett suggested a six-month time

frame in order to provide other ways in which to keep service as she doesn't support abruptly discontinuing Route 11.

Member Bill Dodd stated that at some point if we don't become good financial stewards of the entire transit system we (NCTPA) put ourselves in jeopardy of losing our funding. Further stated the need to be creative and find a way to make this route work. The responsible thing to do would be to bring in extra dollars (to help subsidize) so we don't risk losing funding by not meeting our required farebox ratio.

Member Jill Techel requested information as to the cost to run the service modifying it to an on-demand service similar to the Napa Shuttle servicing Kaiser facilities in Santa Rosa, and to travel during school bell times.

MSC* SKLAR / DUNSFORD to APPROVE (1) continuation of the Route 11 discussion until the July 15, 2009 Board meeting, (2) directing staff bring back detailed options (for Route 11), (3) directing staff to explore the Grant options, and (4) that the two Councils (City of Helena and City of Calistoga) explore the possibility of contributions (\$6000 each) for Route 11.

4.2 Continuation from the June 17, 2009 NCTPA Board Meeting on the ESRC Report for RFP #09-01 Operations, Maintenance of Facilities, and Maintenance of Equipment of the NCTPA Transit Services

Chair Krider asked for disclosures as to whether any of the Board members have had conversation(s) with either of the outside vendors (Veolia and/or MV Transportation).

Joan Bennett	Was contacted by both, but did not respond to either
Jill Techel	Yes, met with both MV Transportation & Veolia
Jack Gingles	Yes, met with both MV Transportation & Veolia
Eric Sklar	Yes, met with both MV Transportation & Veolia
Michael Dunsford	Yes, met with both MV Transportation & Veolia
Del Britton	Yes, met with both MV Transportation & Veolia, further stated he needed to leave the meeting and supports staff recommendation to contract with MV Transportation
Cindy Saucerman	No, did not meet with either MV Transportation or Veolia
Bill Dodd	Yes, met with both MV Transportation & Veolia
Lewis Chilton	Was contacted by both and declined to meet with either MV Transportation & Veolia
Keith Caldwell	Yes, met with both MV Transportation & Veolia

*MSC - Motioned, Seconded, and Unanimously Carried

Leon Garcia	Was contacted by both and declined to meet with either MV Transportation & Veolia
Jim Krider	Was contacted by both and declined to meet with either MV Transportation & Veolia as well as requested no further communication until today meeting.

Paul Price, NCTPA Executive Director provided a review of the Transit Service Provider Evaluation and Selection Committees Evaluation Report, which included the General Evaluation Activities, Deviations from the Evaluation Manual, Technical Analysis, Summary and Recommendation.

George Blackstock, Napa resident, asked that when making the decision the Board take into consideration the amount of people we will lose if changing to a new contractor.

Board Member Lewis Chilton, stated his frustration with all the safety numbers is he doesn't have a good understanding of what are the matrix that this Board should be looking at on, what should be a regular basis, on how safety numbers are calculated. Further, Member Chilton stated that he doesn't feel he is in a position to say if there is or is not a safety problem because it all feels antidotal. There should be a matrix that the whole industry uses which provides a "full Picture" of this information and the Board should receive a report every quarter for review.

Note: Extensive public testimony was received on this item at the June 17, 2009 meeting. The two Proposers on RFP 09-01 (MV Transportation and Veolia) were allotted fifteen minutes (15) time for a brief presentation to address the factual analysis underlying the recommendation before the Board's final determination.

Chair Krider opened Public Comment at 10:15 a.m. As there were no public comment, closed the Public Comment at 10:15 a.m.

Member Comment:

Eric Sklar, agreed with Member Chilton that as a management question we need much better information, we need it timely, and we need to know that its objective. However, what we have that is objective, and is apples to apples, is the CalTIP information. It may not be as useful for correcting the problem as we would like it to be, but it does look at all different cities in the same exact way and the same time frame therefore he thinks it is very useful and relevant information to this process.

Jack Gingles stated that after looking all the information he won't be supporting staff in their recommendation (to award the contract to MV) basically because of the cost factor. Veolia's proposal was \$.5M lower

***MSC - Motioned, Seconded, and Unanimously Carried**

than MV's. With today's budget (crisis), and ever jurisdiction cutting their budget and the fact that this Board just approved a fare increase, it seems that we (NCTPA) should also cut back on costs. Further, regarding the safety issue, Mr. Gingles feels that it isn't fair to penalize Veolia for the safety issue when this Board was not aware it existed. The main factor in supporting Veolia is the cost factor, we have a system that is in place, is working, and has been working.

Jill Techel recommended including in the contract Management Strategies that specifically address safety.

Joan Bennett stated that she agrees with Member Gingles comment regarding the \$500K cost factor difference. Further stated that she feels Veolia had a more honest answer to the "Extra Work" costs (than MV) in that Veolia didn't use exact amounts in their estimate of replacement parts etc. She knows that sometimes you might think work being preformed will cost a certain amount, but in the end the work could wind up cost more because of this, that, and the other thing. Ms. Bennet stated that she may not be so conflicted with this decision if Veolia had also included in there proposal what is standard amount. Further, she stated that she not clear on the safety issue either, as well as, the lack of public testimony regarding MV (compared to the amount of public comment in support of Veolia) colors her thinking. However, in saying all of this, Ms. Bennett stated that she would be more inclined to go along with Jack (Gingles) in supporting Veolia.

Keith Cardwell, stated as a transit agency, we provide a service to our customers and part of that service is to provide an innovative service, especially with the downturn in the economy, we need to make sure we get the biggest bang for our buck. He is a little concerned that in his experience the way that we have handled the insurance and the way that we have handled claims from a risk management standpoint is that this agency certainly has room for improvement. It is difficult to compare apples to apples. The fact that statistical data can be changed one way of the other – add a month here, do this, do that, - he believes the CalTIP information that looks at each and every city is certainly information that this Board should take interest in, every transit agency is looked at the same exact way. He thinks, what we want in moving forward in a 5-year agreement, is innovative service that looks at customer satisfaction no matter the cost (of the proposal). He thinks that this governing body should look at customer complaints, should look at safety record, and should look at on-time performance on a regular basis. Further stated that knowing there will be significant transition moving to another provider and that the contract will included performance measures he would not be supporting staff in their recommendation. His recommendation to the Board would be to stay with the current provider (Veolia).

***MSC - Motioned, Seconded, and Unanimously Carried**

Lewis Chilton, stated for him, the struggle is that we have RFP results that are very close, but what it comes down to is the qualification and experience section that talks about safety. He understands this data and how Veolia has preformed in this area, and he also believes it appears that they were penalized for their safety record; however, he does not know how it (safety data) was taken into account for MV when we do not have actual results. From his perspective, it is a very serious decision that this Board will make to override staff's recommendation. Member Chilton asked for more information on how MV was treated safety wise when there we do not have actual experience data.

Paul W. Price, NCTPA Executive Director reviewed the CalTIP report highlighting the properties operated by MV, those operated by Veolia, and those, which are publicly operated. As this data was accumulated, acquired, and reported the same way, the Evaluation Committee used this data for comparison purposes.

Michael Dunsford stated that he is not a transportation expert, but feels that the Executive Director is a transportation expert, yes, we have been given a lot of data, this Board has already gone along with staff's recommendation to go with a change last year, and again this year staff is making the same recommendation. Further, he agrees with Member Chilton that it is a big deal for this Board to not support staff and therefore he will favor staff's recommendation.

Bill Dodd stated that his decision in not supporting staff's recommendation has no bearing on our new Executive Director or our staff. However, if the Board had had (Veolia's) safety and service reports on file month after month, he would be supporting staff's recommendation. Further, he feels that there is an opportunity to improve and recommended establishing a sub-committee of the Board who would serve on a transit committee so that the Board is better understanding of transit related issues.

Leon Garcia agrees with Member Dodd's statement regarding staff. He decision to go against staff's recommendation is based on the economic factor, as well as, the fact that Veolia has new leadership and there seems to be a concerted effort to turn things around and requests that the Board receive safety and customer satisfaction reports on a quarterly basis.

Cynthia Saucerman stated that both sides (Veolia and MV) have presented compelling arguments and the Board has received a lot of good information. She feels that she has received enough information to make decision and is a firm believer in the RFP process and can support staff's recommendation as we have gone though this process twice.

MS GINGLES / SKLAR to APPROVE with DUNSFORD and SAUCERMAN OPPOSING, Veolia as the incumbent, with language changes (to the contract) suggested by Board member Jill Techel (as stated below), and to further authorized the NCTPA Executive Director to negotiate the contract and bring back to the Board for final approval.

Roll Call Vote as follows:

Leon Garcia, City of American Canyon	Yes (1 voting power)
Joan Bennett, City of American Canyon	Yes (1 voting power)
Michael Dunsford, City of Calistoga	No (1 voting power)
Jack Gingles City of Calistoga	Yes (1 voting power)
Jim Krider, City of Napa	Yes (6 voting power)
Jill Techel, City of Napa	Yes (4 voting power)
Bill Dodd, County of Napa	Yes (2 voting power)
Keith Caldwell, County of Napa	Yes (2 voting power)
Eric Sklar, City of St. Helena	Yes (1 voting power)
Lewis Chilton, Town of Yountville	Yes (1 voting power)
Cynthia Saucerman, Town of Yountville	No (1 voting power)

Total Weighted Votes: 19 Yes, 2 No

Suggested language and clarification requests were presented by Board member Jill Techel, Mayor, City of Napa, is as follows:

- Management Structure
 - Identify management strategies including, but not limited to, established goals and objectives, training, written documents, etc. that are designed to reduce accidents and incidents.
- Performance measures for accident rates
 - The contract should specify that the contractor shall improve the accident safety record within a two (2) year period.
 - The contract should specify that the improved safety record target will be based upon the average accident rates compiled by CalTIP.
 - The contract should specify that the accident rate will be measured midway between the two (2) year period. This measurement must demonstrate a reduction.
 - The contract should link the effectiveness of the Management Structure (identified above) with the actual performance standards.
- Consequences
 - The contract should specify that if, at the midway point of the two (2) year period, accident rates are not improved, the

*MSC - Motioned, Seconded, and Unanimously Carried

contractor shall identify specific measures that will be taken to improve said record.

- The contract should specify that if, after the two (2) year period, the accident rate has not substantially improved, NCTPA may terminate the contract.

5. **ADJOURNMENT**

Approval of Next Regular Meeting Date of Wednesday July 15, 2009 and Adjournment

The next meeting will held in the NCTPA Conference Room on Wednesday July 15, 2008.

The meeting was adjourned by Chair Krider at 10:50 a.m.

APPROVED