

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section 1 – Introduction.....	1
Section 2 – Mandatory TDSP Requirements	4
Section 3 – Updated Tables and Statistics	21
Section 4 – Conclusion.....	28
Appendix A – 2015 CTC Evaluation	29
Appendix B – PTNE Response to 2015 CTC Evaluation	47
Appendix C – FDOT SSPP, SPP and Vehicle Maintenance Reviews of Collier Area Transit Cover Letter	51

List of Tables

Table 1: Implementation Schedule/TD Capital Improvements Program	12
Table 2: Implementation Plan	15
Table 3: CTD Calculated Rate - FY2015/2016 CTD Rate Model	18
Table 4: Current Collier County Adopted Fare Structure	19
Table 5: Collier Area Paratransit Fare Structures	19
Table 6: Population and Population Density	22
Table 7: Population Age Distribution	22
Table 8: Annual Household Income Distribution	23
Table 9: Employment Characteristics	23
Table 10: Vehicle Availability Distribution	24
Table 11: Travel to Work - Commute Times	24
Table 12: Mode of Travel to Work	25
Table 13: Names and Locations of Local Universities	25
Table 14: Educational Attainment	26
Table 15:TD Population Forecast	27

TDSP Certification

The Collier County Local Coordinating Board hereby certifies that an annual evaluation of the Community Transportation Coordinator was conducted consistent with the policies of the Commission for the Transportation Disadvantaged and that all recommendations of that CTC Evaluation have been incorporated in this Service Plan.

We further certify that the rates contained herein have been thoroughly reviewed, evaluated and approved. This Transportation Disadvantaged Service Plan was reviewed in its entirety and approved by the Board at an official meeting held on May 6, 2015.

Date

Local Coordinating Board Chairperson

Approved by the Commission for the Transportation Disadvantaged:

Date

Steven Holmes, Executive Director of the
Commission for the Transportation
Disadvantaged

LCB ROLL CALL VOTE
for Approval of Collier County's
Paratransit Plan Update
May 6, 2015

Name	Representing	Yes	No	Absent
Commissioner Donna Fiala	Chairwoman	X		
Harold Kurzman	Elderly	X		
Ellie Roberts	Citizen Advocate /Non User			X
Dylan Vogel	Citizen Advocate/User	X		
Joyce Austin	Children at Risk			X
Olga Hernandez	Community Action (economically disadvantaged)			X
David Ogilvie	Public Education	X		
Richard Shine	Florida Dept. of Transportation	X		
Felix Soto	Florida Dept. of Children and Families			X
Theresa Davis	Florida Dept. of Elder Affairs			X
Lisa O'Leary	Florida Dept. of Education -Division of Vocational Rehabilitation Services			X
Joe Martinez	Agency for Health Care Administration	X		
Susan Corris	Southwest Florida Regional Workforce Development Board	X		
Gary Vincent	Veteran Services			X
Deborah Chesna	Local Medical Community	X		
N/A	Local Mass Transit			
VACANT	Citizens with Disabilities			
VACANT	Private Transportation Industry			

SECTION 1 INTRODUCTION

Chapter 427 of the Florida Statutes establishes the Florida Commission for the Transportation Disadvantaged (CTD) and directs the CTD to “accomplish the coordination of transportation services provided to the transportation disadvantaged.” In accomplishing this purpose, the CTD approves a Community Transportation Coordinator (CTC) for five years for each county of the state which is charged with arranging cost-effective, efficient, unduplicated services within its respectful service area. The Collier Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) is approved by the CTD, charged with creating the Local Coordinating Board (LCB) and providing technical assistance to the LCB. The LCB acts as an advisory board and such provides guidance, monitors, evaluates and supports the transportation activities of the CTC.

The Transportation Disadvantaged Service Plan (TDSP) is an annually updated tactical plan developed by the CTC and the MPO under the guidance and approval of the LCB in accordance with the requirements set out in Rule 4102, F.A.C. Chapter 427, F.S., requires each County to develop a Transportation Disadvantaged Service Plan (TDSP) for the Transportation Disadvantaged program, with a Major Update every five years, at a minimum. This 2015 Minor Update is outlined to meet the requirements established by the State of Florida that require each county to develop a TDSP. The 1979 Florida Legislature passed the Transportation Services Act, Chapter 427, Florida Statutes (F.S.), which called for the coordination at the County level of all Federal and State expenditures for the "transportation disadvantaged."

The CTD Guidelines for TDSP Amendments and Updates mandates that only the following components of the Plan are updated annually:

- 1) Previous TDSP Review Letter
- 2) Needs Assessment
- 3) Goals, Objectives and Strategies
 - a) Ensure that objectives indicate an implementation date/accomplishment date.
 - b) Note deficiencies & corrective actions.
 - c) Note service improvements or expansions.
 - d) Section should be logical and mirror the format from the previous year.

- 4) Implementation Plan
 - a) Transportation Disadvantaged Improvement Plan (TDIP) should cite progress, setbacks, adherence to schedules.
 - b) Implementation schedule revisions as necessary.
- 5) Cost / Revenue Allocation and Rate Structure Justification
 - a) Review current and updated projected expenses, revenues and levels of service and make adjustments accordingly. A new Service Rates Summary page as well as Rate Model Worksheets must be submitted.

The CTD Guidelines for TDSP Amendments and Updates also provide an option for the update of the following components of the Plan:

1) DEVELOPMENT PLAN

- a) Organization Chart updated as necessary.
- b) LCB certification page (members, agencies, alternates and term) to include any changes as previously submitted in TDSP or updates.
- c) Any significant changes to major trip generators/attractors that have significantly altered service delivery.

2) SERVICE PLAN

- a) Changes in types or hours of service
- b) Significant changes in system policies (priorities, eligibility criteria, etc.)
- c) New service innovations or cancellation of services
- d) Changes in operators/coordination contractors
- e) Changes in vehicle inventory
- f) System Safety Program Plan (SSPP) certification if expired and renewed.
- g) Include new acceptable alternatives
- h) Changes in narrative for adoption of new service standards
- i) Changes to the Grievance and Evaluation process

3) QUALITY ASSURANCE

The TDSP is used by the Community Transportation Coordinator (CTC) and the LCB to maintain and/or improve transportation services for the transportation disadvantaged and to serve as a framework for performance evaluation.

For the purposes of this minor update, only mandatory components will be provided and only those items that contain information that needs to be updated will be modified. As the 2014 TDSP Major Update was just completed recently, information contained in sections dealing with possible optional updates is still current and therefore is not included in this document.

SECTION 2

MANDATORY TDSP REQUIREMENTS

As previously noted, CTD Guidelines for Transportation Disadvantaged Service Plan (TDSP) Amendments and Updates require certain elements be updated annually. This section of the document will address those mandated components and provide applicable updated information.

1. Previous TDSP Review Letter

The CTD Guidelines require that all items cited as deficient or inadequate and needing follow-up as part of the prior TDSP Review should be addressed in the update. To date, there were no TDSP reviews that indicate deficiencies.

Needs Assessment

The purpose of this section is to assess the transportation needs and demands for individuals with disabilities, elderly, low income and high risk and at risk children. This section attempts to identify any gaps in transportation services that are needed in the service area. The section also provides a quantitative transportation needs profile for the applicable TD populations and indicates unmet need for transportation in the Collier County service area.

The Collier County TD population is discussed in Section 3 (Updated Tables and Statistics) of this document. In 2013, Collier County had a large senior citizen population, with 28.5% of the population aged 65 or older. This is higher than the state average of 18.5%. These conditions are key indicators of transit/paratransit use, as are automobile availability, income, traffic, urban growth and land use/site planning. All of these factors contribute to the need for public transit in Collier County.

In 2013, CUTR released the Paratransit Service Demand Estimation Tool that replaced the 1993 methodology used to forecast paratransit demand. While the TDSP guidance handbook has not been updated, the new tool was used for the development of TD population forecasts in the 2014 TDSP Major Update adopted by the LCB on October 25, 2013. The data prepared in the TDSP Major Update indicates that the Collier County forecast of TD population in 2014 is 144,078. This includes all disabled, elderly and low-income persons and children who are “high-risk” or “at-risk”. These population groups are further refined to identify the “Critical Need TD” population. This population includes individuals who, due to severe physical limitations or low incomes, are unable

to transport themselves or purchase transportation, and are dependent upon others to obtain access to health care, employment, education, shopping, social activities, or other life sustaining activities. The Critical Need TD Population for 2014 is forecasted to be 13,939.

Barriers to Coordination

In Collier County and across the State of Florida, there is more demand for TD services than supply. Even though financing for TD services has seen modest increases over time, rising fuel costs, inflation, and a rapidly-increasing population all contribute to less money being available and having transport more people.

Some social service agencies have had their transportation funding reduced. This trend adds to the burden on the TD program due to the shift of individual trips from a “sponsored” to non-sponsored trip status. If this practice occurs, other agencies may either reduce their transportation budgets or eliminate sponsoring trips, potentially impacting the TD program.

Other barriers to TD coordination include:

- Collier County is the single largest county in Florida in terms of land area (2,026 square miles). The TD population is spread throughout the county, creating the potential for long distance trips, which, in turn increases the cost per trip per passenger.
- Funding for transportation services has remained relatively constant over the past several years, but has not kept up with the increasing travel demands. As a result, Collier County is struggling to maintain existing service levels and does not have the financial resources to pursue new or expanded service.
- The unavailability of adequate pedestrian access / sidewalks to CAT bus stops limits the ability of some TD passengers to safely access the fixed route system.

2. Goals and Objectives

A review of the 2014 TDSP Major Update’s goals and objectives was conducted and no changes are recommended at this time. They are included in this report for ease of reference and are as follows:

The mission of the Collier County Local Coordinating Board is:

To carry out a coordinated and comprehensive approach to planning, developing, and providing transportation services that meet the needs of transportation disadvantaged persons.

CAT's mission is:

Collier Area Transit is committed to providing safe, accessible, and courteous public transportation services to our customers.

Collier Area Paratransit's mission is:

Identify and safely meet the transportation needs of Collier County, through a courteous, dependable, cost effective and environmentally sound team commitment.

The following goals and objectives have been adopted to further the missions above.

GOAL 1: Implement a fully coordinated transportation system.

Objective 1.1

Maximize coordination with public, private, and human service agencies, and other transportation operators.

Objective 1.2

Coordinate efforts with Collier Area Transit.

Objective 1.3

Communicate and coordinate with other counties to promote ride-sharing practices and transportation arrangements.

GOAL 2: Provide an efficient and effective coordinated transportation service.

Objective 2.1

Increase effective use of transportation services.

Objective 2.2

Consistently provide on-time service.

Objective 2.3

Track and improve call-hold time.

Objective 2.4

Maximize effective transfer of individuals to the fixed-route system.

Objective 2.5

Increase fixed route utilization.

Objective 2.6

Continue to review ridership trends and origin/destination data to determine if fixed routes should be reviewed for service expansions or realignment to allow greater use by current paratransit riders.

Objective 2.7

Increase the number of passenger trips per vehicle hour.

Objective 2.8

Continue to monitor private provider utilization rates and adjust as needed to provide timely, effective service.

Objective 2.9

Trend downward the cost per passenger trip.

Objective 2.10

Trend downward the cost per vehicle hour.

Objective 2.11

Maintain an optimal vehicle replacement program for paratransit vehicles and equipment.

Objective 2.12

Acquire new and upgraded paratransit vehicles and equipment, as funding permits.

Objective 2.13

Continually measure and analyze performance standards, as a basis for evaluating quality assurance.

GOAL 3: Educate and market paratransit services to current riders, the general public, agency sponsored clients, visitors, and other potential customers.

Objective 3.1

Maximize the accessibility of service information including alternative delivery formats such as Braille, auditory enhanced and alternative languages.

Objective 3.2

Utilize the electronic dissemination of marketing and education materials, including, but not limited to the internet, e-mails, listservs, websites, etc.

Objective 3.3

Ensure that all websites and other electronic media are compliant with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act, as amended in 1998. (Under Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act, 29 U.S.C. 794d, agencies must give persons with disabilities, employees and members of the public access to information that is comparable to the access available to others. This includes access to electronic and information technology applications).

Objective 3.4

Provide a "Rider's Guide" to paratransit patrons covering the paratransit services offered (ADA, TD). Produce the guide in alternative formats and alternative languages including Creole or others that may be necessary.

GOAL 4: Operate a safe transportation system.

Objective 4.1

Ensure that services are provided in a safe and secure manner in accordance with the CTD and FDOT standards and recommendations.

Objective 4.2

Ensure consistency and compliance with Chapter 14-90, Florida Administrative Code, *Equipment and Operational Safety Standards for Bus Transit Systems*.

Objective 4.3

Ensure consistency and compliance with the 49 CFR Part 655, Federal Transit Administration Prevention of Alcohol Misuse and Prohibited Drug use in Transit Operations including the adopted Substance Abuse Policy and policy statements.

Objective 4.4

Ensure consistency and compliance to 49 CFR Part 40, Procedures for Transportation Workplace Drug and Alcohol Testing Programs.

Objective 4.5

Ensure consistency and compliance or FTA covered contractors to 49 CFR Part 655, Federal Transit Administration Prevention of Alcohol Misuse and Prohibited Drug Use in Transit Operations.

Objective 4.6

Ensure consistency and compliance with any local drug and alcohol service standards.

Objective 4.7

Ensure consistency and compliance with the annually updated System Safety Program Plan and Security Program Plan.

Objective 4.8

Ensure consistency and compliance of an accident/incident procedure as part of the bus system safety program.

Objective 4.9

Continually review accident/incident data to identify trends that may need to be addressed through training or procedural changes.

Objective 4.10

Review Operator training program to ensure inclusion of consistent boarding techniques for passengers.

Objective 4.11

Ensure that new bus stops are readily accessible to persons with disabilities and meet ADA Accessibility Guidelines (ADAAG) compliance requirements.

Objective 4.12

Ensure that existing bus stops are inventoried for their accessibility and the availability of sidewalks as outlined in the Collier County ADA Transition Plan. Ensure that existing bus stops are renovated to be consistent with Collier County's ADA Transition Plan. Establish a retrofit plan for those stops that do not have accessible shelters and/or sidewalks.

GOAL 5: Provide quality transportation services.

Objective 5.1

Maintain the accountability of transportation service providers through the CTC Quarterly Reports.

Objective 5.2

Continue to review ridership trends and origin/destination data to determine if fixed routes should be reviewed for service expansions or realignment to allow greater use by current paratransit riders.

Objective 5.3

Conduct continuing surveys of passengers to ensure that quality services are being provided.

Objective 5.4

Conduct immediate follow-up on any complaint or concern brought forward.

GOAL 6: Secure funding necessary to meet above stated goals.

Objective 6.1

Explore any and all sources of funding to meet future goals of provision of service.

Objective 6.2

Maximize efficiency of utilization of all current state, federal and local resources.

Objective 6.3

Coordinate with all public, quasi-public, and non-profit entities in order to maximize all potential funding opportunities for public transportation services in Collier and Lee counties.

Objective 6.4

Identify and pursue opportunities for establishing and coordinating privately-sponsored public transportation services in meeting local transit needs.

3. Implementation Plan

CTD Guidelines require that the three-year Transportation Disadvantage Improvement Plan (TDIP) should cite progress, setbacks, and adherence to schedules noted in the prior year TDSP, including all necessary revisions to the Implementation schedule. **Table 1** reflects the applicable updates/status of the elements in the implementation plan and **Table 2** summarizes implementation activities that have been accomplished per fiscal year and offers an implementation schedule through FY2017/18.

Table 1: Implementation Schedule/TD Capital Improvements Program

Ongoing System Improvements/Review	Status Update										
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase fixed-route utilization 	Ridership is increasing										
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to review ridership trends and origin/destination data to determine if fixed routes should be reviewed for service expansions or realignment to allow greater use by current paratransit patrons. 	Ridership trends are reviewed monthly										
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to monitor private provider utilization rates and adjust as needed to provide timely, effective service 	Private provider invoices are reviewed monthly										
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase the number of passenger trips per vehicle hour 	Increased 18% over 2010 passenger trips per driver hour										
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain the cost per passenger trip 	<p>The cost per passenger trip since 2010 is as follows:</p> <table> <tr><td>FY 2010</td><td>\$28.04</td></tr> <tr><td>FY 2011</td><td>\$31.14</td></tr> <tr><td>FY 2012</td><td>\$37.62</td></tr> <tr><td>FY 2013</td><td>\$34.95</td></tr> <tr><td>FY 2014</td><td>\$36.26</td></tr> </table> <p>Costs increases are attributed to increased ridership not trending to the degree of the increased operations costs including but not limited to fuel costs.</p>	FY 2010	\$28.04	FY 2011	\$31.14	FY 2012	\$37.62	FY 2013	\$34.95	FY 2014	\$36.26
FY 2010	\$28.04										
FY 2011	\$31.14										
FY 2012	\$37.62										
FY 2013	\$34.95										
FY 2014	\$36.26										
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain the cost per vehicle hour 	<p>The cost per driver hour since 2010 is as follows:</p> <table> <tr><td>FY 2010</td><td>\$35.59</td></tr> <tr><td>FY 2011</td><td>\$52.49</td></tr> <tr><td>FY 2012</td><td>\$58.40</td></tr> <tr><td>FY 2013</td><td>\$59.40</td></tr> <tr><td>FY 2014</td><td>\$60.70</td></tr> </table> <p>Costs are consistent with each year Annual Operating Report. Costs increases are attributed to increased operations costs including but not limited to fuel costs.</p>	FY 2010	\$35.59	FY 2011	\$52.49	FY 2012	\$58.40	FY 2013	\$59.40	FY 2014	\$60.70
FY 2010	\$35.59										
FY 2011	\$52.49										
FY 2012	\$58.40										
FY 2013	\$59.40										
FY 2014	\$60.70										

Ongoing System Improvements/Review	Status Update
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain grant application process for FTA Section 5310 funds – specifically for replacement vehicles 	Ongoing, grant applications have been submitted for replacement vehicles
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to coordinate with Lee County Transit and other providers regarding the provision of intercounty transportation services 	Coordination is on-going. The fixed route connection called LinC began service in October 2011 as an express route
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue providing information to patrons regarding cancellation/ no-show and co-pay policies 	Ongoing
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitor CAT's effectiveness in enforcing cancellation/ no-show and co-pay policies and strengthen enforcement where needed 	Ongoing. Staff recognizes the cost implications of no-shows and cancellations. 90% tolerance no pay policy has been adopted and implemented
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pursue alternative funding sources to provide additional transportation services and/or capital equipment 	Numerous grants have been submitted and the cycle for applications is being tracked
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that transportation services are provided in accordance with the CTD and FDOT safety standards and recommendations 	On-going review of transportation services and the CTD and FDOT safety standards
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that all system drivers are adequately trained in system safety and security preparedness and response 	Ongoing
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continually review current training, available training, mandatory annual training curriculum and safety/security best practices 	Ongoing
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct annual safety reviews of all contracted operators 	Ongoing
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure the drug and alcohol testing requirements are being implemented system wide 	Collier County is ensuring that drug and alcohol testing requirements are met
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve frequency of service and expand service hours 	Ongoing
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maximize the accountability of system transportation service providers 	Ongoing
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strictly enforce monetary penalties for failure to provide adequate service 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitor equipment and vehicles and replace as needed 	Replacement vehicle needs are being tracked

Ongoing System Improvements/Review	Status Update
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inspect all Collier County paratransit vehicles on a daily basis 	On-going and continuous with vehicle inspection sheet
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explore all sources of funding to meet future service needs 	Additional funding sources are being explored both traditional transit funding as well as innovative sources and one time opportunities
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop contacts with agencies that provide or coordinate transportation services to TD eligible residents to determine options for future cost sharing of trips 	Continuous agency coordination is being pursued to discuss options
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide trips on Sundays for religious services 	Ongoing

Table 2: Implementation Plan

Improvement Date	Capital/Service Improvements	Comments/ Status	Potential Funding
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FY 2013/2014 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintain existing service Bus Shelters / Benches Replace paratransit vehicles 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Routes have stayed the same due to budget considerations Grant applications have been submitted for Bus Shelters/ Benches. Bus replacements have been pursued. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FTA Section 5310 - Transportation for Elderly Persons and Persons with Disabilities, FTA Section 5311 American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA), FDOT Service Development Grants Program, and CTD Shirley Conroy Rural Capital Equipment Grant. MPO STP funds for CMS/ITS projects
FY 2014/2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintain existing service Bus Shelters / Benches Replace paratransit vehicles 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FTA Section 5310 - Transportation for Elderly Persons and Persons with Disabilities, FDOT Service Development Grants Program.

Improvement Date	Capital/Service Improvements	Comments/ Status	Potential Funding
FY 2015/2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain existing service • Establish new service • Extend service hours - night service for job access on both fixed route and paratransit systems • Improve frequency of service • Add more frequent transit service – including weekend and personal trips that fall out of the established prioritization schedule • Add Bus Shelters / Benches • Replace paratransit and support vehicles and purchase new vehicles 		
FY 2016/2017	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain existing service • Extend service hours - night service for job access on both fixed route and paratransit systems • Improve frequency of service • Add more frequent transit service – including weekend and personal trips that fall out of the established prioritization schedule • Add Bus Shelters / Benches • Replace paratransit and support vehicles and purchase new vehicles 		

Improvement Date	Capital/Service Improvements	Comments/ Status	Potential Funding
FY 2017/2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain existing service • Extend service hours - night service for job access on both fixed route and paratransit systems • Improve frequency of service • Add more frequent transit service – including weekend and personal trips that fall out of the established prioritization schedule • Add Bus Shelters / Benches • Replace paratransit and support vehicles and purchase new vehicles fleet 		

4. COST / REVENUE ALLOCATION AND RATE STRUCTURE JUSTIFICATION

CTD Guidelines state that TDSP Updates/Amendments should include a complete explanation for any rate changes or new service changes. The explanation should include a discussion of the review process as well as detail of LCB involvement and approval. A new summary rate sheet should be presented if there are any changes.

During the review period Collier County implemented the 2015 Rate Calculation Worksheet (shown below), which was developed using the TD Commission model used by all Florida counties. The 2015 CTD rate changes went through a public involvement process and were reviewed with the LCB prior to adoption by the Collier County Board of County Commissioners (BCC). The 2015 CTD Rate Calculation Worksheet will be submitted to the LCB for review and approval.

COST REVENUE ALLOCATION

The rate structure is based on the type of trip (i.e. ambulatory, ambulatory group, wheelchair, etc.) in the service area.

Table 3: CTD Calculated Rates - FY2015/2016 CTD Rate Model
Transportation Disadvantaged Trust Fund Service Rates
Effective Date: 7/1/2014

Ambulatory Trip	\$30.65
Wheelchair Trip	\$52.53
Group Trip	\$31.66
Escort Trip	\$5.00
Bus Pass (daily-full fare)	\$4.00
Bus Pass (daily-reduced fare)	\$2.00
Bus Pass (weekly-full fare)	\$15.00
Bus Pass (weekly-reduced fare)	\$7.50
Bus Pass (monthly-full fare)	\$35.00
Bus Pass (monthly-reduced fare)	\$17.50
Marco Express (monthly-full fare)	\$70.00
Marco Express (monthly-reduced fare)	\$35.00

Sources: Service Rates, Commission for the Transportation Disadvantaged, 2011
Worksheet for Multiple Service Rates, Public Transit and Neighborhood Enhancement Department, 2012.

Table 4: Current Collier County Adopted Fare Structure

CAT full-fare one-way ticket	\$1.50
CAT full-fare one-way ticket Marco Express	\$2.50
CAT reduced fare one-way ticket	\$0.75
CAT reduced fare one-way ticket Marco Express	\$1.25
CAT Transfers	\$0.75
CAT full-fare monthly pass	\$35.00
CAT full-fare monthly pass Marco Express	\$70.00
CAT reduced fare monthly pass	\$17.50
CAT reduced fare monthly pass Marco Express	\$35.00
CAT weekly pass - full fare	\$15.00
CAT weekly pass - reduced fare	\$7.50
CAT all day pass	\$4.00
CAT all day reduced pass	\$2.00

Resolution 2013-28 was adopted by the Board of County Commissioners on February 12, 2013, which modified the fixed route fares. The fixed route fares are listed below.

Reduced fares are for members of Medicare, Disabled community, those 65 years and older and children 17 and under.

The fare structure for ADA, TD and Medicaid trips was discussed by the LCB on March 21, 2012. The recommendation was to implement a uniform \$1.00 fare increase for the TD fare structure. The recommendation did not include ADA or Medicaid trips. The LCB also recommended not renewing the Medicaid contract when it expires on June 30, 2012. The BCC approved a new fare structure effective October 1, 2012, as indicated below:

Table 5: Collier Area Paratransit Fare Structures

	Previous Fare Structure	Fare Structure Approved by the BCC effective 10/1/12
ADA fare – At or above Poverty Level	\$2.00	\$3.00
Medicaid fare – Fee for Service	\$1.00 fare or copayment	\$1.00 fare or copayment
ADA & TD fare - Under Poverty Level	\$0.00	\$1.00
TD fare - 101% to 150% of Poverty Level	\$2.00	\$3.00
TD fare - 151% to 225% of Poverty Level	\$3.00	\$4.00
TD fare - 226% to 237% of Poverty Level	\$4.00	\$5.00
TD fare - +337% of Poverty Level	\$6.00	\$7.00

QUALITY ASSURANCE

In accordance with the CTD's Guidelines the service standards established in the TDSP were reviewed. The Medicaid Grievance Process was developed and is included here by reference. Additionally, no changes were made to the Evaluation Process or the local Grievance Process.

CTC EVALUATION PROCESS

An annual evaluation of the Collier County CTC was conducted by the LCB, based on the Standards, Goals, and Objectives contained within the local TDSP and using the Evaluation Workbook of the CTD. This year the CTC evaluation team performed a desk audit using the Evaluation Workbook of the CTD, conducted site visits, surveys and paratransit rides during the winter season when there is a higher seasonal population and more traffic. The CTC evaluation team presented the LCB with the CTC-LCB Review document. The CTC-LCB Review acknowledged recent progress in on-time performance monitoring and recommended a continuation of those activities. The LCB reviewed and approved the CTC-LCB Review document (see **Appendix A**) at their March 4, 2015 meeting.

The CTD conducts triennial Quality Assurance and Program Evaluation Reviews as a part of the Commission's oversight and monitoring activities. The review is conducted by the Commission's Quality Assurance and Program Evaluation (QAPE) staff and includes a series of interviews with the CTC staff and a review of the system's records. The review includes a survey of riders and the operators of service. Further, the QAPE evaluates the system based on compliance with Chapter 427, F.S., Rule 41-2, F.A.C., Commission standards, local standards, and ADA Requirements.

SECTION 3

UPDATED TABLES AND STATISTICS

A number of the tables in the TDSP have been updated in an effort to evaluate the system progress. A summary of the findings is provided when there is a significant change in the activity.

SERVICE AREA PROFILES AND DEMOGRAPHICS

An Overview of Collier County

Collier County, located on Florida's west coast, occupies a land area of 2,026 square miles, making it the largest county in Florida. Broward and Dade counties are located on Collier's eastern border, Lee and Hendry counties are on the northern border, and Monroe County is on the southern border. The county contains three incorporated areas: Naples, Everglades City, and Marco Island. Collier County includes the Bonita Springs-Naples urbanized area, as designated by the Year 2000 Census.

Collier County has nearly 50 miles of public beaches, along with a number of local, state, and national nature preserves. It was established in 1923. Its early economic growth has been associated with a millionaire from Memphis, Barron Gift Collier, who acquired his fortune through streetcar advertising. When Collier came to the area, he introduced paved roads, electric power, telegraphs and many new businesses to the people of the area. These additions attracted many people to the area. In 1950, the number of residents in Collier County was 6,488. By 1980, the County's population had grown to 85,000, in 2000, the population was 251,377 and in 2011 the population was estimated to be 321,520.

Collier County Demographics

According to the U.S. Census, the most populous city in the county is Naples with an estimated 2013 population of 20,537. The City of Marco Island is the second largest in Collier County, with an estimated population of 17,163. The population of the county's unincorporated area is quite large as compared to the cities, with about 285,170 residents. During the time period of 2000 to 2013, Collier County saw its population increase from 251,377 to 339,642, approximately a 35% increase.

It should be noted that the following population data and demographic and socioeconomic analysis is based on 2010 - 2013 U.S. Census Bureau American Community Survey (ACS) data, which is the most recent source of census data available.

Table 6 displays population, population growth, and population density for Collier County and Florida as a whole. From 1990 to 2013, Collier County grew at a rate much higher than that of the State of Florida. Collier County population grew at over 30 percent, while the state population grew at over 19 percent. The population density that exists in Collier County, however, is much less than the overall population density for the state, with 167 persons per square mile versus 362 persons per square mile. This is due to the vast amount of land that is in a natural state or environmentally protected by the federal or state government.

Table 6: Population and Population Density

Area	Population (1990)	Population (2000)	Population (2013)	Population Growth (2000-13)	Land Area (Sq. Miles)	Density (2013) (persons per square mile)
Collier	152,099	251,377	339,642	35.11%	2,025.34	167
Florida	12,938,071	15,982,378	19,552,860	22.34%	53,926.82	362

Source: US Census Bureau, 2000 Population Data
 Bureau of Economic and Business Research (BEBR, University of Florida, Florida Population by county and Municipality, April 1, 2009, (Release Date: November 2009)
 2013 U.S. Census Bureau American Community Survey 1 year estimates

Population Age Characteristics

Table 7 charts the age group percentages for both Florida and Collier County. According to American Community Survey (ACS) estimates provided by the U.S. Census, 28.5% of Collier County's population is 65 years of age or older. This is 10% higher than the state of Florida. The 55-64 age cohorts category continues to comprise the smallest portion of the population in Collier County and the State of Florida, with approximately 13 percent of the population. The 0-19, 20-34, and 35-54 age cohorts are all somewhat less than those for the State of Florida.

Table 7
Population Age Distribution, 2013

	Age Cohorts				
Area	0-19	20-34	35-54	55-64	65 +
Collier County	20.5%	15.3%	22.6%	13.2%	28.5%
Florida	23.1%	19.1%	26.3%	12.9%	18.5%

Source: 2013 U.S. Census Bureau American Community Survey 1 year estimates

Income Characteristics

Table 8 compares the distribution of household income in Florida and Collier County. The percent of households with incomes in the categories under \$25,000 is lower than the percentage for the State of Florida. On the other hand, Collier County is higher than the State of Florida in the category over \$75,000. According to 2013 American Community Survey 5-year estimates, the median household income for the State of Florida is \$46,956. Collier County has a significantly higher median household income of \$55,843.

It is important to note that while the county as a whole is predominantly more affluent than that for the State of Florida, there are anomalies that exist. The Immokalee area falls within a statewide area of critical economic concern and has been designated as a “rural enterprise zone” with higher than average unemployment, children living in poverty, and families who fall under the federal poverty thresholds. Transportation to employment, job training, and critical health and social services available in the western portions of the county must continue to be available to residents of Immokalee area.

Table 8
Annual Household Income Distribution, 2013

Area	Annual Household Income											
	\$0 - \$9,999		\$10,000 - \$24,999		\$25,000 - \$34,999		\$35,000 - \$49,999		\$50,000 - \$74,999		Over \$75,000	
	Pop	%	Pop	%	Pop	%	Pop	%	Pop	%	Pop	%
Collier	6,733	5.5%	16,666	13.6%	13,838	11.3%	17,447	14.2%	22,865	18.6%	45,423	36.9%
Florida	558,329	7.8%	1,280,137	17.9%	846,131	11.8%	1,090,027	15.2%	1,305,146	18.2%	2,079,210	29.0%

Source: 2013 U.S. Census Bureau American Community Survey 1 year estimates

Employment Characteristics

Table 9 compares the Collier County labor force employment characteristics to the State of Florida employment characteristics. As of December 2014, approximately 4.7% of the Collier County labor force was unemployed, with the labor force defined as persons 16 years of age and older. This is slightly lower than the Florida labor force unemployment rate of 5.7%.

Table 9
Employment Characteristics for Collier County, 2014

Area	Percentage of Labor Force Unemployed
Collier	4.7%
Florida	5.7%

Source: Bureau of Labor and Employment Statistics, US Department of Labor, Employment Figures Released December 2014

Vehicle Availability

Table 10 shows the number and percentage of households who have access to a vehicle. Collier County's ratio is very similar to that of the State of Florida.

Table 10
Vehicle Availability Distribution, 2013

Household Vehicle Availability				
Area	None	% of Total	One or More	% of Total
Collier	7,889	6.0%	122,725	94.0%
Florida	520,686	7.2%	6,690,898	92.8%

Source: 2013 U.S. Census Bureau American Community Survey 1 year estimates

Travel to Work

Table 11 compares the distribution of travel time to work for Collier County and Florida. Approximately 67% of Collier County residents have a commute of less than 30 minutes, while approximately 61% of Florida residents have a commute of less than 30 minutes.

¹
Travel to Work – Commute Times

Area	Less than 10 min	10-19 min	20-29 min	30-44 min	45-59 min	60 + min
Collier	12.5%	32.3%	22.2%	20.3%	6.6%	6.2%
Florida	9.7%	28.1%	23.2%	23.7%	8.3%	6.9%

Source: 2013 U.S. Census Bureau American Community Survey 1 year estimates

Mode of Travel to Work

Table 12 shows the distribution of workers' mode of transportation to work in Collier County and Florida. Collier County has a slightly lower percentage of drive alone travel, and a higher rate of carpool/vanpool travel when compared to statewide results. Public transportation use in Collier County is slightly lower than that of the State of Florida, with 1.1% of workers using it to travel to work at the county level and approximately 2.0% usage statewide. Collier County has a higher percentage of employees who work at home when compared to the statewide results.

Table 12
Mode of Travel to Work Distribution

Area	Drive Alone	Carpool or Vanpool	Public Transportation	Walk	Other Means	Work at Home
Collier	100,130	16,470	1,461	2,376	5,240	7,492
Collier (%)	75.2%	12.4%	1.1%	1.8%	3.9%	5.6%
Florida	6,370,889	791,693	167,591	121,801	171,793	368,113
Florida (%)	79.7%	9.9%	2.1%	1.5%	2.1%	4.6%

Source: 2013 U.S. Census Bureau American Community Survey 1 year estimates

(1) Housing Classifications and Patterns

As the previous tables have indicated, most households in Collier County have access to at least one vehicle. There are two main locations where zero car households are most prevalent: in Immokalee, as well as in areas near Collier Boulevard/SR 951 and US 41. Smaller concentrations of zero car households may be found near Naples Manor and Lely Resort, near US 41 and Davis Boulevard and near Davis Boulevard and Santa Barbara Boulevard. These areas are also locations of more rental and workforce housing.

Educational Profiles

A number of colleges and universities are located within Collier County and in neighboring communities and are listed in **Table 13**.

Table 13
Names and Locations of Local Universities

Institution Name	Location
Ave Maria University	Ave Maria
Barry University	Ft. Myers
Florida Gulf Coast University	Ft. Myers
Florida SouthWestern State College	Naples/Ft. Myers
Hodges University	Naples
Nova Southeastern University	Bonita Springs

In addition to these colleges and universities, the County is also home to a number of technical institutes and training programs. Adult and workforce education is provided through Collier County Public Schools and includes the secondary technical training schools of Lorenzo Walker Institute of Technology (LWIT) and Bethune Education Center (BEC). In addition, Immokalee Technical Institute (iTECH) is a technical training center focusing on technical education programs for high

school students and adults. The center also offers Adult Basic Education (ABE), General Education Development (GED), and adult literacy programs.

Table 14 depicts the educational attainment for Collier County compared to the State of Florida. More residents of Collier County have received a Bachelor's degree than those of the State of Florida as a whole; however most of the other categories have very similar data.

Table 14
Educational Attainment

	Collier County	Florida
Less Than High School	12.4%	13.2%
High School or Equivalent	28.3%	29.5%
Some College but no Degree	17.8%	20.7%
Associate Degree	9.1%	9.5%
Bachelor's Degree	17.6%	17.6%
Master's Degree	9.2%	6.6%
Professional School Degree	3.4%	2.0%
Doctorate Degree	2.2%	1.1%

Source: 2013 U.S. Census Bureau American Community Survey 1 year estimates

TD Population Forecasts

The Paratransit Service Demand Estimation Tool serves as an aid in the development of TD population and travel demand estimates. This tool was used in the 2014 TDSP Major Update, adopted by the LCB on October 25, 2013. The tool defines two categories of TD population in the State of Florida. The first category is the "General TD" population. This includes all disabled, elderly and low-income persons and children who are "high-risk" or "at-risk". These population groups are further refined to identify the "Critical Need TD" population. This population includes individuals who, due to severe physical limitations or low incomes, are unable to transport themselves or purchase transportation, and are dependent upon others to obtain access to health care, employment, education, shopping, social activities, or other life sustaining activities. **Table 15** displays the population forecast for Collier County and the General TD Population versus the Critical Need TD Population.

Table 15: TD Population Forecast

	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Total Population	344,032	351,254	358,627	366,156	373,842	381,690
General TD Population	144,078	147,102	150,190	153,343	156,562	159,848
Critical Need TD Population	13,939	14,231	14,530	14,835	15,146	15,464

Source: TD Population Forecast is from the 2014 TDSP Major Update adopted on October 25, 2013. The data and the methodology are consistent with the Instruction Manual for the TDSP from the CTD and based on 2010 U.S. Census Bureau American Community Survey 1 year estimate and 2013 CUTR Forecasting Paratransit Services Demand Tool and Methodology.

According to the table, the General TD Population will make up 41.8% of Collier County's total population. The Critical Need TD Population is 4.0% of the total population and 9.7% of the General TD Population. The percentages established in the 2014 TDSP Major Update were used to forecast the populations through 2020.

SECTION 4 CONCLUSIONS

The large geographical size of the County in the terms of land area (2,026 square miles) causes the TD population to be spread throughout the county, creating the potential for longer trips. The funding for transportation services has remained relatively constant over the past several years and not kept up with the increasing travel demands. As a result, Collier County is struggling to maintain existing service levels and does not have the financial resources to pursue and/or expand service. All of these factors combined with the financial challenges that all government transit agencies are facing due to the economy downturn, serve as a pre-amble for the conclusion of this report.

The CTC must ensure that the vendor is providing the required services in accordance with local developed standards in addition to those that are required by Section 41-2.006, Florida Administrative Code. The CTC should continue to provide information to the Local Coordinating Board regarding performance reports and summaries of customer surveys.

The CTC mentioned that they were obtaining new technology including automatic vehicle locator devices which will be used to automate and improve on-time performance reporting for all trips. These new technologies, when implemented, would improve efficiency by providing real time notification, monitoring service delivery, scheduling service, on-time performance and vehicle readiness. On-time performance must continue to be tracked and evaluated.

In conclusion, this document reflects several areas of opportunities for improvement in the area of efficiency. The paratransit system is an essential service that continues to provide the customers of Collier County assistance with good, respectful and courteous service. The conclusions and recommendations of this report are intended to improvement the system as it continues to grow, mature and move forward.

APPENDIX A
2015 CTC EVALUATION
JULY 2014 – JUNE 2015

Counties served: Collier County

Item 7B, Attachment A

Date(s) of Review: January, 2015 for July 2014 through June 2015

Staff Assigned to Review: Lorraine M. Lantz

I. Records and Areas of Review

- A. General Information
- B. Chapter 427, F.S.
- C. Rule 41-2, F.A.C.
- D. Americans with Disabilities Act
- E. Bus/Van Ride
- F. Surveys
- G. Follow-up of previous QAPE Review
- H. Additional Observations
- I. Current Year Trip and Equipment Grant

II. Findings and Recommendations

A. General Information

Collier Area Transit was designated as the CTC for Collier County on July 1, 2013. *Collier Area Transit* operates Government Paratransit System in a rural and urban area as a complete broker.

Area of Noncompliance: None

Recommendation: None

Timeline for Compliance: None

B. Chapter 427, F.S.

The CTC contract provider is adhering to Chapter 427, F.S. In October 2010, TecTrans (now known as Keolis) began its contract with Collier County to run the Collier Area Transit (CAT) and Paratransit systems. Collier County monitors its contractor Keolis continually with site visits, ride-alongs and desk audits of paperwork / reports.

Area of Noncompliance: None

Recommendation: None

Timeline for Compliance: None

C. Rule 41-2, F.A.C.

Overall, the CTC contract provider works relatively well to ensure that service is provided in a safe, accessible and efficient manner as required under statutory and local requirements.

Upon review of documentation provided by the CTC and the contract provider (Keolis), as well as the on-site / on-board observations, some areas have issues, and we recommend these areas be addressed or reviewed for possible improvements.

Area of noncompliance with commission standards:

1. During the on-board / on-site evaluation, it was observed that a **vehicle did not have any phone number inside or outside of the vehicle.** Upon investigation, the required contact information was missing from Van 34 and Van 35.

Recommendation:

1. Once told that the vehicles did not have the appropriate phone numbers and contact information, CAT staff stated they would immediately rectify the issue. It is noted that the reviewer was told that these vehicles were used for other purposes. Since these vehicles may only be used occasionally **it is recommended that the CTC place removable signs in these vehicles.** While this area of non-compliance can be quickly rectified, **it is recommended that a vehicle check be completed prior to any vehicle being placed in service.** This recommendation has continually been suggested and should be implemented so a practice can be documented.

Additional areas where the Paratransit system could improve:

1. During the site observations, the CAT receptionist was asked what the Paratransit phone number was. The reviewer was given a Paratransit Application (which contains the contact information) but was not provided the phone number directly. **The recommendation is to re-train the receptionist and all who are in contact with the Paratransit system of the phone number.**
2. In addition, it may be beneficial to provide agencies that use the Paratransit services regularly with updated contact information (such as Paratransit Users Guides and business cards) so they can distribute information, as necessary.

Area of noncompliance with local standards:

1. The CTC reported the on-time performance at the December LCB meeting for January – September of 2014. The reviewer asked for an updated report which is included below. The on-time percentage for 2014 was 88.16%. The on-time performance standards established in the Transportation Disadvantaged Service Plan (TDSP) are 90%. **The Paratransit system is operating just below the on-time performance standard.**

ON TIME PERFORMANCE										
2014	Total Drop Off Trips	Total Late Trips	Percentage On Time	1 - 5 Minutes Late	6 - 10 Minutes Late	11 - 15 Minutes Late	16 - 20 Minutes Late	21 - 25 Minutes Late	26 - 30 Minutes Late	> 30 Minutes Late*
January	3262	403	87.65%	120	72	64	16	14	9	108
February	3408	886	74.00%	241	183	94	133	68	40	127
March	3409	593	82.60%	239	140	48	54	14	13	85
April	3682	526	85.71%	238	71	54	29	32	17	85
May	3506	467	86.68%	217	78	58	17	13	11	73
June	3504	376	89.27%	168	88	59	19	10	9	23
July	3311	274	91.70%	145	47	43	10	6	1	22
August	3397	286	91.55%	137	53	35	24	7	4	26
September	3552	307	91.30%	142	37	46	32	23	5	22
October	3940	328	91.68%	153	50	29	26	19	12	39
November	3198	212	93.56%	113	40	16	12	4	5	22
December	3518	272	92.16%	114	53	34	19	13	6	33
Total	41687	4930	88.16%	2027	912	580	391	223	132	665

* High number is based on how operator is scheduling group trips that require a longer amount of time for loading of passengers as well as need for additional driver training to ensure they are utilizing the new technology.

6/30/2015

Recommendation:

1. **On-time performance.** The TDSP states that the CTC will have a 90% on-time performance rate. It is noted that the annual average on-time performance rate for 2013 was 89.54% and the rate for 2014 was 88.16%. The rates for both years are only slightly below the required rate in the TDSP. The reviewer acknowledges that the CTC is working hard to achieve the required on-time performance rate. **The recommendation is for the CTC to continue to review their on-time performance rate.**

Timeline for Compliance: The CTC must address the phone numbers in the vehicles immediately. All other comments in this section are recommendations for system improvements.

D. Americans with Disabilities Act

The CTC contract provider adheres to the Americans with Disabilities Act by completing ADA service requirements, training and vehicle maintenance.

Area of Noncompliance: None

Recommendation: None

Timeline for Compliance: None.

E. Bus/Van Ride (see attached Field Notes)

On-Site Observations were conducted on January 23 and 27, 2015 at various locations to maximize the number of trips surveyed. The CTC Evaluation Field Notes are attached to this report. A brief description of the van ride along is below.

On January 23, 2015 Lorraine Lantz – Principal Planner for the Collier MPO observed the arrival of an empty paratransit vehicle (van – 34) and the pick-up and boarding of an ambulatory passenger. The MPO staff member rode with the passenger to their drop-off location. The MPO staff member observed the drop-off of that passenger and the vehicle depart empty for the next pick-up.

Area of Noncompliance: Vehicle signage as discussed previously in Section C.

Recommendation: Since these vehicles may only be used occasionally it is recommended that the CTC place removable signs in these vehicles.

Timeline for Compliance: Immediate.

F. Surveys

MPO staff conducted informal surveys at the pick-up and drop-off locations and while on-board the vehicles to minimize the impact on capacity of the system. MPO staff spoke to the drivers, passengers and some agency representatives about the following topics:

- **“Will Call” Policy**

- Generally, if passengers are placed on “Will Call” they have to wait for a vehicle to be in the area to pick them up. While this is an inconvenience to the passengers, it also becomes a burden on the system. There is an opportunity for improvement if there is better communication between the CTC and the agency. If certain passengers are regularly being placed on “Will Call” because they require a later pick-up, maybe the requested pick-up time should be changed. This may help to decrease the amount of passengers placed on “Will Call”. However, if a passenger is not ready at the time the vehicle arrives to pick them up because the vehicle arrives earlier than the requested time, will the passenger be moved to “Will Call” or will the vehicle wait? From a passenger’s perspective, the vehicle should wait until the requested pick-up time or circle back to the location without placing the passenger on “Will Call”. From an operations perspective, constantly circling back or waiting may cause other trips to be late. **Recommendation is to have communication with the agencies that are constantly having their passengers placed on “Will Call” and work out a mutually beneficial solution.**

- **Phone System – including returning phone calls and voicemail**

- During prior evaluations it was noted that the on-hold time was excessive. There were no complaints regarding on-hold time during this evaluation. It is noted that phone upgrades were discussed during prior CTC evaluations; however the on-hold statistics have not been reported to the LCB.
- Several passengers stated that they called the Paratransit phone number after hours or on Saturday and left messages but they were never responded to. **The CTC should work on their customer service techniques and procedures. Messages should be responded so that the passenger knows that they are being listened to.**

- **No Show / Cancellation Confirmations**

- The passengers are now receiving confirmation numbers; however, the CTC does not seem to be documenting the confirmations correctly. Passengers stated that they have received phone calls from the CTC warning them about a no show. The passengers stated that once they provided the CTC with the confirmation number, the CTC confirmed there was no need for a no show warning. While it is commendable that the passengers I spoke to are becoming their own advocates, the CTC should not be inaccurately documenting the no shows and making phone calls incorrectly. **The CTC should have a method of double checking the no show confirmation log before making calls or contacting passengers.**

Area of Noncompliance: None
Recommendation: Stated above.
Timeline for Compliance: None

G. Follow-up of previous QAPE Review

Previous Area of Noncompliance:

1. **Three Paratransit vehicles had the incorrect phone number on the outside of the vehicle.** The vehicles were observed in operation and all three contained the correct phone number. This issue has been addressed.
2. **The CAT receptionist stated an incorrect Paratransit phone number.** The issue was discussed in Section C.
3. **Long on board times** – This issue seems to have been addressed.
4. **On-Time Performance** – as previously discussed in Section C, this continues to be an issue.
5. **On-Hold Times** - It is recommended that the CTC incorporate the call volumes and hold times into the quarterly CTC report at the regular LCB meetings. This will give the LCB the opportunity to evaluate the hold time policy and the ability of the vendor to effectively staff the call center. It is noted that the MPO has not received any complaints regarding hold times, since the previous CTC Evaluation.

Recommendation:

1. CTC management should continue to work on the on-time performance as discussed earlier in the evaluation.
2. Although the hold time issue does not seem to be reoccurring, it may be beneficial if discussed as part of the CTC Quarterly Report.

H. Additional Observations

During the bus ride and observations, the bus drivers seemed friendly and knew the passengers very well. The passengers seemed happy with the services they were provided and the Paratransit system.

I. Current Year Trip and Equipment Grant

The Trip and Equipment Grant for Collier County currently runs from July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015.

Area of Noncompliance: None

Recommendation: None

Timeline for Compliance: Not applicable

III. Conclusion

We recommend that the CTC continue to review their on-board signage, phone system and their on-time performance. Ultimately, the CTC must make some business decisions regarding grouping trips, the vehicle and trip costs and spare vehicle availability.

Report completed by: Lorraine Lantz

Title: MPO Principal Planner

Date: March 4, 2015

ATTACHMENT

CTC EVALUATION FIELD NOTES:

On Friday, January 23, 2015, I received 19 manifests from the CTC / CAT. My objective was to observe several vehicles and contact several of the agencies that expressed concerns about the service last year to see if those issues were addressed. Of the 19 manifests I observed / rode along with 9 vehicles in operation and 4 vehicles at fleet.

I spoke to Michele at the Fresenius Medical Care.

- She said that approximately 10 patients use the Paratransit system each day for their transportation to and from the facility. In her experience, some patients are not ready for transportation when they come off of dialysis treatment. She stated that when the bus arrives to pick them up, and they are not ready, the patients are moved onto the “Will Call” status. This means that when they are ready, a bus has to be dispatched or re-routed to pick them up. She further stated that patients wait long periods of time for that “Will Call” bus to arrive and it has caused her patients to want to finish their treatment earlier so they do not miss their bus. She stated that this happens approximately once a week. She stated that the problem is not with the arrival time of the passengers (bus arriving late to the facility in the morning), **but rather the pick-up vehicle arriving too early and not waiting** OR the patient not being ready.
- Michelle said that the drivers are friendly but it would help if there was better communication from the dispatcher to her facility. **She indicated that it would help if when passengers were put into the “Will Call” status, they were given an approximate pick-up time. In addition to helping with passenger to CTC communication, it may allow to the passenger the opportunity to get a ride from a care giver if they determine that the wait is too long.** I also spoke to a patient in the waiting room who stated that worst part of the process was the waiting room – both before and after treatments. It is noted that this patient was not a paratransit rider.

I then observed 1 bus pick-up a passenger.

- CC2-681 – Manifest 208. The bus arrived at 9:57. The manifest had the requested arrival time as 10:15 for 1 passenger. The driver left the vehicle to check on the passenger’s status. The bus began loading at 10:00 and finished at 10:00. 5 passengers were on the vehicle when it arrived. The 1 passenger who boarded was ambulatory. The vehicle departed at 10:01 with 6 passengers.

Observations:

The vehicle was clean and depicted the correct contact numbers. I spoke to the driver briefly who said the passenger was almost ready so he was going to wait. I greeted the passengers on board but they did not engage in conversation when I tried to ask about the service. The passenger was ready almost instantly and the vehicle departed.

6/30/2015

Based on the discussion with the facility, it is noted that the requested arrival time was 10:15. If the passenger was not ready until 10:15, would the vehicle have waited the 15 minutes, or would the passenger been put on "Will Call"? Operations follow-up - How long does a vehicle wait for a passenger if it arrives earlier than the requested pick-up time? Is the option to wait something the driver controls or something the dispatcher controls?

I then drove to Anytime Fitness to conduct the ride along.

- VAN34 – Manifest 213. The mini-van arrived at 11:25. The manifest had the requested arrival time as 11:30 for 1 passenger. The 1 ambulatory passenger and I boarded and the vehicle and it departed at 11:30. The passenger requested a change of drop off location from one store in a plaza to an out-parcel in the same plaza. The driver radioed dispatch and they approved the change. The vehicle unloaded at 11:42 and departed empty. The vehicle did not have the Route-Match software device but was using a removable Garmin GIS device and a 2-way radio. **The vehicle had removable signage for "No Eating or Drinking" but did not have the required contact information or phone numbers inside or outside the vehicle.** It is noted that the exterior signage on the driver's door consisted of two magnetic signs one for Keolis and one with the CAT logo. The signage on the passenger door contained only the Keolis logo.

Observations:

I spoke to the driver about the vehicle and he stated that the van was a spare vehicle and was sometimes used when the other vehicles were being repaired. The passenger stated that she uses the system about four days a week and usually goes between the pick-up and drop-off location twice a week. She stated that she often changes her destination to somewhere else in the same plaza. She was very familiar with the driver and the procedure of calling dispatch to change drop-off locations. While this change does not seem to burden the system, it is noted that later in the day I spoke to an agency that expressed a scenario in which they were not allowed to change the drop-off location. Please see below. **The policies should be administered uniformly.**

It is noted that the passenger of the vehicle I rode with stated she received excellent service from Miguel, Edison, Roberto and Litiasha. She also stated that it is her practice to call CAT during the two hour window so she knows when the vehicle will arrive. She does this, because even though she has a standard schedule, she does not want to wait outside her pick-up location for a vehicle. She stated that she would rather call than not be ready or be waiting too long.

I then drove to ARA-Naples Dialysis Center to observe the pick-up and drop-off of 2 vehicles.

- CC2-335 – Manifest 209. The manifest had the requested arrival time as 1:15 for 1 passenger and 1:30 for 2 others. Upon arrival at 12:50 the vehicle was already there. I was told that none of the passengers were ready yet and the vehicle was going to wait for them. The driver then went into the facility and shortly after came out to report to dispatch that one passenger cancelled the trip at the location. The vehicle waited for the other 2 passengers (one ambulatory and one wheelchair) and departed at 1:21 with 2 passengers on board.

- CC2-521 – Manifest 211. The manifest had the requested drop-off time as 1:15 for 1 passenger and 1:30 for the other. The vehicle arrived at 1:18 and unloaded both passengers. The vehicle departed empty at 1:23.

I spoke to Josie and Keri at ARA-Naples Dialysis Center. They described several recent incidents regarding some issues their agency was experiencing.

- They mentioned that the buses tend to drop off the first group of patients extra early but by their second shift, the buses are late. The early patients cannot get on the machines any earlier, but they would rather the patients be early. The patients that are late then have reduced time on the machine because the third shift has to start on time. It is generally an issue for them on Thursdays and Saturdays. **They stated that this happens at least to one patient a week. They were concerned the patient's time on the machine has to be decreased when the vehicle is late.** In some cases they have to call the patient's doctor to see if they should be rescheduled instead of receiving partial treatment.
- Josie stated that sometimes the passengers were put into the "Will Call" status. She was also concern about the communications with the CTC about this. She stated that there was no one to call to find out when a bus would come get the passenger. She stated that this usually happens on Thursdays and Saturdays. **While the "Will Call" status seems to be working the way it was designed, a communication from dispatch to the agency or passenger might help.**
- Josie mentioned that when she calls to ask about onboard times she is told about the 2 Hour Window. She stated that her agency and patients would like a better understanding of the 2 hour window and crossing zones because it is confusing. **Better explanations or user training of the 2 hour window may help with this issue, especially if the zones are revised.**
- Josie mentioned that the CAT applications require the income verification from the entire household. She stated that some of her patients are seasonal and she was confused as to which household is required for verification. **This seems to be a communication /user training issue.**
- They described a concern they had when a passenger requested to change their destination enroute but was told that they could not go to different location. The passenger was then told that if they did not want to be dropped off at the old location they would be brought home. Josie stated that the doctor changed his location and therefore the patient needed to go to the doctor at the same campus just at a different building. She stated that the doctor (the patient's destination) and the agency (the patient's trip origin) all had to call CAT to confirm the change while the passenger was on board. Based on my previous experience with a destination change being done enroute, I am unsure if there is a policy or if this up to the driver and dispatch. **If there is a policy, it should be administered consistently to all passengers. If there is no policy, one should be developed.**
- They described a concern with a bus being extremely late the day before I arrived. They stated that the bus was over 2 hours late. They tried contacting CAT and had a difficult time getting to speak to someone and then were told that the driver did not have the correct manifest when he started the route. *The recommendation is to have better communication with the agency that was waiting for the*

passengers, especially since it is my impression most of the passengers were going to the facility. Operations follow-up - Do vehicles leave without a manifest? Can the Avail Software be loaded to a vehicle when it is enroute or does it have to be at CAT OPS to be updated? Does a paper copy of the manifest have to be onboard? **This may be an opportunity to retrain the drivers to make sure they pick up the manifest or download them into their vehicles, but it should also be an opportunity to review the procedures to see if the software can be updated in the field.**

- Keri and Josie discussed a recent situation where a passenger with an anxiety disorder was left on a bus with the doors shut while the driver left the vehicle to go into the building for the next pickup. The nature of the service is for drivers to leave their vehicles in order to assist passengers as they are picked-up or dropped-off. It was stated that this driver left his vehicle with the door closed for over 5 minutes and caused the passenger inside to become very anxious. Keri and Josie tried to call CAT regarding this incident. They stated that they were able to leave messages, but no one called them back. **The on-board video from the vehicle should be reviewed to see if driver acted within the CTC's policy. If not, the driver should be retrained. If the driver acted appropriately but the passenger is too anxious about this practice, maybe he cannot ride the system. Since the agency was involved, they should be updated as to the findings.**
- Keri and Josie mentioned that some of the applications take the entire 21 days to process. They stated that this can be an issue for the agency because the patients must receive service within 3 days of discharge from the hospital. *This seems to be more of a policy decision about the review and approval time of applications. The CTC has a 21 day review / determination policy for applications. Their practices are adhering to the policy. If the CTC is able to review the applications and make a determination earlier they should. Communication regarding the status of the application may help.*
- While discussing the application process, they mentioned that they heard from the CTC staff that there were certain zip codes that were not required to provide income verification. They asked what those zip codes were so they could complete some applications easier, but were not given a list. I stated that I was unaware of a list for exempt zip codes. Upon discussing this with the CTC, I was told there are no exempt zip codes from the income verification process. **This is an example of a possible miscommunication between the CTC and the agency.**
- They also stated that they found communicating with CAT difficult, especially on the weekends. Their issues were generally that the messages they leave on voicemail were not being replied to. **A review of the call log on Saturdays may help to determine if the volume of calls requires an additional staff person in the office to assist with incoming calls.**

While speaking with them, I also observed:

- G25-Turtletop 793 - CC2-793 – Manifest 215. The manifest had the requested arrival time as 1:45 for 1 passenger. The vehicle arrived at 2:05, loaded the ambulatory passenger and departed at 2:07.

I left ARA-Naples Dialysis Center and went to the CAT facility at Radio Road. I went into the lobby and asked the receptionist what the phone number for the Paratransit System was. He was very pleasant and gave me a Paratransit Application. When I asked for the phone number he asked me why I wanted it. I told him

who I was and that I was doing the CTC evaluation. I again asked for the phone number. He stated that if someone called he would transfer them to the correct number. I asked him to tell me the correct phone number and he refused. I told him it was part of the evaluation and he said if I wanted to know anything more I needed to talk to his supervisor. Trinity and Michelle were not available at the time, so I spoke to Yousi. *After last year's CTC evaluation, we were told that a place card containing the correct phone numbers would be placed in the receptionist area and that all who are in contact with the Paratransit system were re-trained on the phone number. I was unable to verify if this previous recommendation was implemented.*

While at the CAT facility, I requested the spare vehicle list. CC2-477 was in the shop for repair. There were three spare vehicles on the lot – CC2-591, CC2-254 and VAN-35. I walked to the spare vehicle location at the CAT facility and observed the vehicles on the list parked. I assume that means the rest of the fleet was in the field.

I then went to UCP to observe 4 vehicles load.

- B1-E3500 532 - CC2-532 – Manifest 204. The manifest had the requested arrival time as 3:00 for 6 passengers. The vehicle was empty at the location when I arrived at 2:43. The vehicle began loading at 3:05 and finished at 3:11. 2 passengers were ambulatory and 1 was in a wheelchair. The vehicle departed at 3:12.
- G27-Turtletop 795 – CC2-795 – Manifest 202. The vehicle arrived at 2:49 with 1 ambulatory passenger on board. The manifest had the requested time as 3:00 for 7 passengers. The vehicle began loading at 3:03 and finished at 3:10. 6 passengers were ambulatory and 1 was in a wheelchair. The vehicle pulled forward after loading but did not depart until 3:12. I asked about this because it was observed last year as well. The driver pulls forward so the vehicle behind him can begin loading while he is logging in the passengers who just boarded and referencing his manifest. *There is no issue with this procedure and the observation from last year has been adequately addressed.*
- B15-Turtletop 683 – CC2-794 – Manifest 201. The vehicle arrived at 2:57 empty. The manifest has the request time of 3:00 for 5 ambulatory and 1 wheelchair passengers. The bus began loading at 3:11. The vehicle departed at 3:18 with 6 passengers.
- B12-Turtletop 593 – CC2-593 – Manifest 203. The vehicle arrived at 3:01 empty. The manifest had the arrival time as 3:00 for 5 passengers. The bus began loading at 3:13 and finished at 3:20. 4 passengers were ambulatory and 1 was in a wheelchair.

Observations:

Before the vehicles began loading, I spoke to some of the drivers. I asked them how the vouchers were working. They stated that more of the passengers were using the vouchers as compared to last year, but some were still using cash. They also stated that if the passengers were using the vouchers, they were collecting vouchers for both trips at the beginning of the day. I asked them if they had enough vouchers on board in case passengers needed to buy any for the week and they stated that they had a packet and that was a good amount.

While it was observed that vehicle CC2-532 was at the location first, vehicle CC2-795 moved into loading position first. There was some discussion between the drivers about the order of loading the vehicles before they moved into loading position. Lisa from UCP stated that this discussion was typical. It is also noted that

the driver of CC2-532 assisted with the loading of vehicle CC2-795 for a few passengers and then began loading his vehicle. The recommendation from last year was to minimize loading time and try to load the vehicles simultaneously, if possible. This was witnessed as in practice. I briefly spoke to Lisa about the Paratransit service and she suggested I come back to speak with Holly or Ellie.

On Tuesday, January 27, 2015, I spoke to Holly at UCP to follow-up with some of the concerns she mentioned last year.

- Holly stated that the voucher system was working much better than last year. She asked if the passengers were refunded their vouchers if they paid for the return trip but cancelled it because of sickness. I stated I did not know but later found out that while it is an accounting issue, the CTC tries to refund the payment to the passenger if they paid for a trip they did not take.
- According to Holly, the vehicles still arrive early and sit idling in the morning. She said it is not as much of a problem in the afternoon. She stated that early arrivals in the morning are not disruptive to the facility and they are tolerable.
- Holly mentioned that the loading times for new drivers are long. She asked if the service is door to door because sometimes her staff has to help drivers load and seatbelt in order to expedite pick-ups. I asked about the recommendation last year for two vehicles to load at the same time. She stated that rarely happens. I then spoke to Lisa who says that she is the one to board buses to help seatbelt the passengers and works the lift from outside the vehicle to help expedite boarding. She indicated that she does this because boarding takes so long. She also stated that the drivers always seem to discuss the vehicle loading order prior to moving into position. The agency seemed frustrated by the loading time.
- Overall, they were less concerned with the on-board time as compared to last year and stated that it was improving.
- I asked if the passengers at her facility use the “will call” system. She stated that “will call” takes too long. If a passenger cannot take the planned ride, the care giver usually picks the passenger up.
- Holly stated that if she or the care givers call for a cancellation they know now to wait for a confirmation number. It has been her experience that someone from the CTC will call to state that there was a no show and the care giver has to dispute it by providing the confirmation number. She stated that care givers are keeping logs because this happens frequently and they do not want to be charged a no show incorrectly. She stated that once they provide the confirmation number to the caller, the issue seems to be resolved. *There seems to be an opportunity here to conduct a better internal check of the cancellations before the passengers are called. **A better process for logging in the cancellations should be developed so that passengers are not being called erroneously.** It is commendable that the passengers are becoming their own advocates, but it is concerning that a double check is not happening internally before the passenger is contacted. This may also help with communication issues between the CTC office / CAT and the passengers.*

I then observed drop-offs at that location.

- B10-E3500 532 – CC2-532 – Manifest 204. The bus arrived at 8:41. The manifest has the arrival time as 9:00 for 6 passengers. The bus began unloading at 9:01 and finished at 9:03. All passengers were ambulatory. The vehicle departed at 9:04 empty.
- B12-Turtletop 593 – CC2-593 – Manifest 203. The bus arrived at 8:52. The manifest has the arrival time as 9:00 for 3 passengers. The bus began unloading at 9:04 and finished at 9:13. 1 passenger was

ambulatory and 2 were in wheelchairs. The vehicle had a problem with the lift after unloading the last wheelchair passenger. The driver stated that he would call in the issue to dispatch.

- B15-Turtletop 683 – CC2-683 – Manifest 201. The bus arrived at 8:51. The manifest had the arrival time as 9:00 for 5 passengers. The bus began unloading at 9:13 and finished at 9:18. 2 passengers were ambulatory and 1 was in a wheelchair – 2 passengers cancelled. The vehicle departed at 9:20 empty.
- G27-Turtletop 795 – CC2-795 – Manifest 202. The vehicle arrived at 8:53. The manifest had the arrival time as 9:00 for 11 passengers. The vehicle began unloading at 9:18 and completed unloading at 9:27. 9 passengers were ambulatory and 2 were in wheelchairs. The vehicle departed at 9:29 empty.

OVERALL COMMENTS:

- The drivers I spoke to said they sold the vouchers and were also still collecting cash. When I spoke to some of the passengers, they stated that the drivers were selling the vouchers. This seems to be an improvement from last year.
- When I spoke to some of the passengers and the agencies, they stated that their voicemail messages are still not being acknowledged by the CTC. They stated that when they call to cancel a trip, the phone tree usually gets them to someone but when they call with a concern other than a reservation or cancellation and they leave a message on the voicemail system, it is not returned. This is an improvement but there is an opportunity to do better. Open lines of communication with the passengers and the agencies should be maintained. If there are issues that the CTC is addressing, the agencies / passengers would benefit from a follow-up call acknowledging the issues even if they are not yet resolved. **Recommend establishing a call back / response policy so that the CTC calls the agency / passenger after a certain amount of days after the initial phone call and then again before the issue is closed out, in order to help communications.**
- The new phone/fax system decreased the concern last year regarding lost faxed applications and unanswered phone calls.
- It might be helpful to create a User Training Tutorial, a cell phone app or a U Tube Video and link it to the CAT website for policies and general travel training.
- The vehicles without phone numbers and contact information must be corrected. It is understood that because the vehicles are used for other purposes they can use less permanent signs. The appropriate signage with contact information is a state requirement.
- The “Will Call” policy seems to be necessary because of the nature of the service, better communication regarding the requested time and when the passengers are routinely ready may help decrease the amount of the “Will Calls”.
- Overall the CTC should continue to evaluate the route match software to make sure it is grouping trips when appropriate. This may also help with having a spare in the fleet which can operate if there are any “will call” trips. The CTC should continue to work on their communication with passengers and agencies.

APPENDIX B

PTNE RESPONSE TO 2014 CTC EVALUATION

Memorandum

TO: Lucilla Ayer, MPO Executive Director
Lorraine Lantz, MPO Principal Planner

FROM: Michelle Arnold, Director
Public Transit & Neighborhood Enhancement Department

DATE: February 9, 2015

SUBJECT: Responses to 2014 CTC Evaluation

The delivery of safe, courteous and convenience transportation is paramount to providing a high level of Demand Response services for the residents and visitors of Collier County. In order to achieve a high level of service, it is important to receive feedback both from our customers and through independent evaluations. That being said, Collier Area Paratransit (CAP) is open to feedback and suggestions that will result in improved service to the community.

Please find the Public Transit & Neighborhood Enhancement Department responses to the 2014 CTC Evaluation conducted by the Collier Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) staff on the CAP service.

If additional responses or clarification is necessary, please contact me at your earliest convenience.

II. Findings and Recommendations

- 1. General Information** - There were no areas of noncompliance noted.
- 2. Chapter 427, F.S.** - There were no areas of noncompliance noted.
- 3. Rule 41-2, F.A.C.** - Overall, the CTC contract provider works relatively well to ensure that service is provided in a safe, accessible and efficient manner as required under statutory and local requirements.

Upon review of documentation provided by the CTC and the contract provider (Keolis), as well as the on-site/on-board observations, some areas have issues, and we recommend these areas be addressed or reviewed for possible improvements.

Area of noncompliance with commission standards:

1. During the on-board / on-site evaluation, it was observed that a **vehicle did not have any phone number inside or outside of the vehicle**. Upon investigation, the required contact information was missing from Van 34 and Van 35.

Recommendation:

1. Once told that the vehicles did not have the appropriate phone numbers and contact information, CAT staff stated they would immediately rectify the issue. It is noted that the reviewer was told that these vehicles were used for other purposes. Since these vehicles may only be used occasionally **it is recommended that the CTC place removable signs in these vehicles.** While this area of non-compliance can be quickly rectified, **it is recommended that a vehicle check be completed prior to any vehicle being placed in service.** This recommendation has continually been suggested and should be implemented so a practice can be documented.

Response:

We agree with the recommendations noted and have already placed the correct signage in the vehicles. Previously we have implemented measures to ensure that all new vehicles have the correct signage prior to being placed in operations. In an effort to mitigate the issue, signage will be included in the pre-trip inspection for all paratransit vehicles.

Additional areas where the Paratransit system could improve:

1. During the site observations, the CAT receptionist was asked what the Paratransit phone number was. The reviewer was given a Paratransit Application (which contains the contact information) but was not provided the phone number directly. **The recommendation is to re-train the receptionist and all who are in contact with the Paratransit system of the phone number.**

Response:

The receptionist encountered during the audit is aware of the Paratransit phone number and provided that information in the form of the application. The contact phone number for Paratransit is on the documentation provided to the reviewer. During the encounter the reviewer noticed a County badge and asked the reviewer the purpose of their visit and once they realized that it was for an audit he referred the reviewer to another individual to assist with the audit. The reviewer was referred to a supervisor for additional information which is consistent with CAT's security procedures. It should be noted that in response to the prior year review, a card with all pertinent numbers is kept at the receptionist desk. A County employee happened to be near the reception desk during this encounter and stopped to speak to the reviewer, who was then shown the card.

2. In addition, it may be beneficial to provide agencies that use the Paratransit services regularly with updated contact information (such as Paratransit Users Guides and business cards) so they can distribute information, as necessary.

Response:

We agree with the recommendation noted and steps have already been underway to implement the distribution of user guides and contact information. The vendor has been given the responsibility of distributing this to the public.

Area of noncompliance with local standards:

The Paratransit system continues to operate outside the on-time performance standards established in the Transportation Disadvantaged Service Plan (TDSP).

1. The CTC reported the on-time performance at the December LCB meeting for January – September of 2014. The reviewer asked for an updated report which is included below. The on-time percentage for 2014 was 88.16%. The on-time performance standards established in the Transportation Disadvantaged Service Plan (TDSP) are 90%. **The Paratransit system is operating just below the on-time performance standard.**

Recommendation:

1. **On-time performance.** The TDSP states that the CTC will have a 90% on-time performance rate. It is noted that the annual average on-time performance rate for 2013 was 89.54% and the rate for 2014 was 88.16%. The rates for both years are only slightly below the required rate in the TDSP. The reviewer acknowledges that the CTC is working hard to achieve the required on-time performance rate. **The recommendation is for the CTC to continue to review their on-time performance rate.**

Response:

It should be noted that on-time performance may be affected by factors beyond the control of the CTC (late passenger, cancellations, heavy traffic, etc.) While the average does not meet the threshold, it should be noted that the CTC has met the on-time performance rate from July 2014 through December 2014. Furthermore, the amount of trips that are more than 30 minutes late has been significantly reduced since January 2014.

4. **Americans with Disabilities Act** - There were no areas of noncompliance noted.

5. Bus/Van Ride

On-Site Observations were conducted on January 23rd and 27th, 2015 at various locations to maximize the number of trips surveyed. The CTC Evaluation Field Notes are attached to this report. A brief description of the van ride along is below.

On January 23, 2015 Lorraine Lantz – Principal Planner for the Collier MPO observed the arrival of an empty paratransit vehicle (van – 34) and the pick-up and boarding of an ambulatory passenger. The MPO staff member rode with the passenger to their drop-off location. The MPO staff member observed the drop-off of that passenger and the vehicle depart empty for the next pick-up.

Area of Noncompliance: Vehicle signage as discussed previously in Section C.

Recommendation:

Since these vehicles may only be used occasionally it is recommended that the CTC place removable signs in these vehicles.

Timeline for Compliance: Immediate.

Response:

We agree with the recommendations noted and have already placed the correct signage in the vehicles. Previously we have implemented measures to ensure that all new vehicles have the correct signage prior to being placed in operations. In an effort to mitigate the issue, signage will be included in the pre-trip inspection for all paratransit vehicles.

Surveys –

MPO staff conducted informal surveys at the pick-up and drop-off locations and while on-board the vehicles to minimize the impact on capacity of the system. MPO staff spoke to the drivers, passengers and some agency representatives about the following topics:

- **“Will Call” Policy**

Generally, if passengers are placed on “Will Call” they have to wait for a vehicle to be in the area to pick them up. While this is an inconvenience to the passengers, it also becomes a burden on the system. There is an opportunity for improvement if there is better communication between the CTC and the agency. If certain passengers are regularly being placed on “Will Call” because they require a later pick-up, maybe the requested pick-up time should be changed. This may help to decrease the amount of passengers placed on “Will Call”. However, if a passenger is not ready at the time the vehicle arrives to pick them up because the vehicle arrives earlier than the requested time, will the passenger be moved to “Will Call” or will the vehicle wait? From a passenger’s perspective, the vehicle should wait until the requested pick-up time or circle back to the location without placing the passenger on “Will Call”. From an operations perspective, constantly circling back or waiting may cause other trips to be late. **Recommendation is to have communication with the agencies that are constantly having their passengers placed on “Will Call” and work out a mutually beneficial solution.**

Response:

During the survey’s generalizations were made that imply that the passengers are being picked up earlier than vehicles are arriving prior to the scheduled pick-up time and the passenger is being forced into a will-call situation. No specific passenger trip information was provided to verify or negate the accusation. The CTC’s policy is that if a vehicle arrives prior to the scheduled pick up time, the vehicle should wait for the passenger until the time of the scheduled trip. In fact, drivers have been criticized during prior reviews for waiting longer than the 5 minute wait time for late passengers. It should be noted that the passenger provides the time that they desire to be picked up for their return trip. If a passenger is continually not ready at their pickup time, perhaps they should revisit their schedule. However, the CTC’s vendor has reached out to agencies consistently having a will call concern to communicate the will-call policy.

- **Phone System – including returning phone calls and voicemail**

- During prior evaluations it was noted that the on-hold time was excessive. There were no complaints regarding on-hold time during this evaluation. It is noted that phone upgrades were discussed during prior CTC evaluations; however the on-hold statistics have not been reported to the LCB.

- Several passengers stated that they called the Paratransit phone number after hours or on Saturday and left messages but they were never responded to. **The CTC should work on their customer service techniques and procedures. Messages should be responded so that the passenger knows that they are being listened to.**

Response:

The CTC is in agreement with this recommendation and is in the process of retraining all staff members to ensure that voicemail messages are acknowledged in a timely fashion.

- **No Show / Cancellation Confirmations**

- The passengers are now receiving confirmation numbers; however, the CTC does not seem to be documenting the confirmations correctly. Passengers stated that they have received phone calls from the CTC warning them about a no show. The passengers stated that once they provided the CTC with the confirmation number, the CTC confirmed there was no need for a no show warning. While it is commendable that the passengers I spoke to are becoming their own advocates, the CTC should not be inaccurately documenting the no shows and making phone calls incorrectly. **The CTC should have a method of double checking the no show confirmation log before making calls or contacting passengers.**

Response:

The CTC has set up a process where all no-shows information is collected by the dispatcher and provided to the paratransit supervisor for verification prior to calls or letters being sent warning passengers of no show violations.

6. Follow-up of previous QAPE Review –

Previous Area of Noncompliance:

1. **Three Paratransit vehicles had the incorrect phone number on the outside of the vehicle.** The vehicles were observed in operation and all three contained the correct phone number. This issue has been addressed.
2. **The CAT receptionist stated an incorrect Paratransit phone number.** The issue was discussed in Section C.
3. **Long on board times** – This issue seems to have been addressed.
4. **On-Time Performance** – as previously discussed in Section C, this continues to be an issue.
5. **On-Hold Times** - It is recommended that the CTC incorporate the call volumes and hold times into the quarterly CTC report at the regular LCB meetings. This will give the LCB the opportunity to evaluate the hold time policy and the ability of the vendor to effectively staff the call center. It is noted that the MPO has not received any complaints regarding hold times, since the previous CTC Evaluation.

Recommendation:

1. CTC management should continue to work on the on-time performance as discussed earlier in the evaluation.

2. Although the hold time issue does not seem to be reoccurring, it may be beneficial if discussed as part of the CTC Quarterly Report.

Response:

1. This issue is continually being reviewed with the LCB and as such there has been noted improvement over the last 6 months or 2014. The CTC will continue to monitor and make necessary modifications to the areas within their control to improve the on-time performance.
2. The CTC had discussions with the LCB regarding information the group desired for reporting at its meeting. The hold time or other phone information was not requested by the LCB. If it is the desire for the LCB to receive this information Staff is prepared to include the average answer time for paratransit calls as well as the total number of calls monthly in the CTC report. We have included this information in this latest report so the LCB can make a decision on whether they wish to add this to the quarterly report.

Additional Observations - During the bus ride and observations, the bus drivers seemed friendly and knew the passengers very well. The passengers seemed happy with the services they were provided and the Paratransit system.

Current Year Trip and Equipment Grant - There were no areas of noncompliance noted.

APPENDIX C

APPENDIX C – FDOT SSPP, SPP AND VEHICLE MAINTENANCE REVIEWS OF COLLIER AREA TRANSIT COVER LETTER



Florida Department of Transportation

RICK SCOTT
GOVERNOR

801 North Broadway Avenue
Bartow, Florida 33830

JIM BOXOLD
SECRETARY

April 22, 2015

Ms. Michelle Edwards-Arnold, Director
Collier County Alternative Modes Department
Growth Management Division
2885 South Horseshoe Drive
Naples, Florida 34104

RE: System Safety Program Plan (SSPP), Security Program Plan (SPP), and Vehicle Maintenance Reviews of Collier Area Transit

Dear Ms. Edwards-Arnold

This letter pertains to the Florida Department of Transportation's Bus Transit System Safety Program, Security Program Plan (SPP), and Fleet Maintenance Reviews of Collier Area Transit (CAT), including Community Transportation Coordinator (CTC) services, on Monday, December 15 and Tuesday, December 16, 2014. The University of South Florida / Center for Urban Transportation Research (CUTR) and Florida State University's Preventive Maintenance Planning, Training and Technical Assistance (PrMPT) Program performed the on-site reviews at 8300 Radio Road, Naples, Florida.

Accompanying this letter, please your copy of the final *Bus System Safety and Security Review Report for Collier Area Transit* (Draft Report Date: March 5, 2015 / Final Report Date: April 20, 2015). At the conclusion of reviews, reviewers discuss any findings with local responsible staff. During the reviews, safety, security, or maintenance concern are discussed and corrective action is immediately scheduled, and often corrected while the review is in progress.

The purpose of this review was to determine CAT's compliance with the provisions of Rule Chapter 14-90, *Florida Administrative Code* (FAC) "Equipment and Operational Safety Standards Bus Transit Systems," as amended effective September 16, 2010, and Florida Department of Transportation procedural Topic Number 725-030-009-j, "Bus Transit System Safety Program," effective January 20, 2011. The provisions include the development of and compliance with a System Safety Program Plan (SSPP), performance of safety inspections of all operational buses, documentation of compliance with equipment and operational safety standards, and safety monitoring of covered contractors. The provisions also include the development of and compliance with a Security Program Plan (SPP). (Please note: Bus transit systems are prohibited from publicly disclosing, under any circumstance, their SPP or other security sensitive documents. The reviewers examined CAT's SPP while on site and the contents of the SPP are not summarized or discussed in the review report).

Review reports note "Deficiency" conditions, "Areas of Concern," and any "Observation." Those terms are defined in the accompanying report. Reviewers noted none of those in the "Safety Review Checklist Items" sections of the final report.

To: Ms. Michelle Edwards-Arnold, Director, Collier County Alternative Modes Department
RE: System Safety Program Plan (SSPP), Security Program Plan (SPP), and
Vehicle Maintenance Reviews of Collier Area Transit
Date: April 22, 2015,
Page: 2

In the "Findings, Recommendations, Requirements, and Corrective Actions" area of the final report, reviewers stated:

CAT was determined to be in compliance with the Equipment and Operational Standards for Bus Transit Systems established in Rule Chapter 14-90, FAC. There were two recommendations contained within the *Collier Area Transit Services Maintenance Review* that are provided in an effort to assist CAT with the reduction of unscheduled repairs and ongoing maintenance inspections and procedures for CAT facilities and other equipment. These are provided below and contained within Appendix A [of the final report].

Recommendation 1: It is recommended that unscheduled repairs conducted between preventative maintenance inspections be analyzed on a regular basis to determine if adjustments should be made to the preventative maintenance inspection program or if additional mechanic training is needed. *Table 3: Unscheduled Repairs* in Appendix A shows a summary of these repairs. A detailed description of the preventative maintenance inspection intervals and defects repaired between inspections is included as Exhibit C in Appendix A.

Recommendation 2: It is recommended that a written Facility and Equipment Maintenance Plan be established that includes detailed cleaning and maintenance procedures as well as schedules and checklists for all shop equipment. All of the shop equipment and buildings that currently do not have a regularly scheduled maintenance inspection should be placed on a maintenance schedule along with appropriate checklists. The schedule will depend on the type of equipment, frequency of use, and the manufacturer's recommended maintenance intervals. All internally generated checklists plus outsourced invoices and lists should be filed. A written cleaning schedule for the shop and how the cleaning duties are implemented is also recommended to be a component of that plan. A Facility and Equipment Maintenance Plan template is provided as Exhibit E in Appendix A.

The maintenance review section references one finding: It is

"...CAT was unable to produce a Facility and Equipment Maintenance Plan upon request."

Please see the two recommendations written above.

The reviews this office conducted during this cycle were broader and more comprehensive in comparison to the last cycle, while adhering to the set of compliance activities and documentation expectations of local grantees and providers as reference in State Statutes, Florida Administrative Code, and Department procedural requirements. District One participated with the State Transit Operations and Safety Office in process improvement in the public interest. A very important outcome of this cycle's approach is the development and roll-out of specific training and continuing education classes in safety, security and maintenance the Department has already begun to offer to support local transit systems, CTCs, and their subcontracted management firms and carriers. We will appreciate your enrolling appropriate staff in those classes as they are announced.

To: Ms. Michelle Edwards-Arnold, Director, Collier County Alternative Modes Department
RE: System Safety Program Plan (SSPP), Security Program Plan (SPP), and
Vehicle Maintenance Reviews of Collier Area Transit
Date: April 22, 2015,
Page: 3

In the "General Comments" section of the report, the reviewers commented:

The reviewers would like to thank the management and employees of Collier County and Keolis for the assistance they provided during the conduct of the Bus System Safety and Security Review. Without exception, they were extremely helpful, accommodating, and responsive to our requests for documents and other needs during and following the review.

Thank you for your participation in this process. I recognize with appreciation Collier County's good performance as documented in this review.

Sincerely,

for Debra Stephens
Transit Projects Coordinator

Enclosures: 1
S/.

cc:

Robert Westbrook, Florida Department of Transportation, State Transit Operations and Safety Office
Lisa Staes, University of South Florida, Center for Urban Transportation Research (letter)
Paul A. Simmons, Florida Department of Transportation, District One, Intermodal Systems Development Office/Modal Development Office
Debra Stephens, Florida Department of Transportation, District One, Intermodal Systems Development Office/ Modal Development Office /Public Transit
Michelle Peronto, Florida Department of Transportation, District One, Intermodal Systems Development Office/ Modal Development Office Public Transit
Richard Shine, Florida Department of Transportation, District One, Intermodal Systems Development Office/ Modal Development Office Public Transit