

# Attachment A      Common Acronyms

## COMMON ACRONYMS

AARP	American Association of Retired Persons
ACS	American Community Survey
ADA	Americans with Disabilities Act
AVL	Automatic Vehicle Location
BRT	Bus Rapid Transit
CAT	TriMet Committee on Accessible Transportation
CAR	Catch-a-Ride
CCAM	Coordinating Council on Access and Mobility
CCO	Coordinated Care Organization
CCSSD	Clackamas County Social Services Division
CL	Central Loop
CTP	Community Transportation Program
DAR	Dial-a-Ride
EDTP	Tri-County Elderly and Disabled Transportation Plan
FAST	Fixing America's Surface Transportation
FLAP	Federal Lands Access Program
FY	Fiscal Year
FTA	Federal Transit Administration
JPACT	Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation
MTP	Medical Transportation Providers
NADTC	National Aging and Disability Transportation Center
NTI	National Transit Institute
ODOT	Oregon Department of Transportation

OHP	Oregon Health Plan
OSHU	Oregon Health Sciences University
PNA	Pedestrian Network Analysis
POV	Privately Owned Vehicle
PSU	Portland State University
RTP	Regional Transportation Plan
RTCC	Regional Transportation Coordinating Council
SAM	Sandy Area Metro
SCTD	South Clackamas Transit District
SMART	South Metro Area Rapid Transit
SPD	Seniors and People with Disabilities (formerly SDSD)
STF	Special Transportation Fund (Discretionary and Formula)
STFAC	Special Transportation Fund Advisory Committee
STIF	Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund (Formula and Discretionary)
TAC	Transit Advisory Committee
TCRP	Transit Cooperative Research Program
TMA	Transportation Management Association
TNC	Transportation Network Company
TRP	Transportation Reaching People
WCDAVS	Washington County Disabilities, Aging, and Veterans Services
WTS	Woodburn Transit
WVDO	Willamette Valley Development Officers



# Attachment B      Glossary of Terms

## GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Accessibility	The extent to which facilities, including transit vehicles, are barrier-free and can be used by people who have disabilities, including wheelchair users.
ADA	Americans with Disabilities Act: Passed by the Congress in 1990, this act mandates equal opportunities for persons with disabilities in the areas of employment, transportation, communications and public accommodations. Under this Act, most transportation providers are obliged to purchase lift-equipped vehicles for their fixed-route services and must assure system-wide accessibility of their demand-responsive services to persons with disabilities. Public transit providers also must supplement their fixed-route services with paratransit services for those persons unable to use fixed-route service because of their disability.
ADA Eligible	ADA Eligible refers to eligibility for complementary fixed route paratransit. Individuals who qualify must be unable to use fixed route due to a disability.
Boarding Rides	Boarding rides are counted each time a person enters a vehicle. Boardings and rides all refer to boarding rides.
Boarding Rides per Vehicle Hour	The number of boardings divided by the vehicle hours of service. Describes a route's productivity.
Brokerage	A method of providing transportation where riders are matched with appropriate transportation providers through a central trip-request and administrative facility. The transportation broker may centralize vehicle dispatch, record keeping, vehicle maintenance and other functions under contractual arrangements with agencies, municipalities and other organizations. Actual trips are provided by a number of different vendors.

<p>Complementary Paratransit</p>	<p>Paratransit service that is required as part of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) which complements, or is in addition to, already available fixed-route transit service. ADA complementary paratransit services must meet a series of criteria designed to ensure they are indeed complementary.</p>
<p>Coordination</p>	<p>A cooperative arrangement between transportation providers and organizations needing transportation services. Coordination models can range in scope from shared use of facilities, training or maintenance to integrated brokerages or consolidated transportation service providers.</p>
<p>Corridors</p>	<p>The Corridor concept is from the 1997 Regional Framework Plan. Corridors are not as dense as centers, but also are located along good quality transit lines. They provide a place for densities that are somewhat higher than today and feature a high quality pedestrian environment and convenient access to transit. Typical new developments would include row houses, duplexes and on to three story office and retail buildings, and average about 25 persons per acre.</p>
<p>Curb-to-Curb Service</p>	<p>A common designation for paratransit services. The transit vehicle picks up and discharges passengers at the curb or driveway in front of their home or destination. In curb-to-curb service the driver does not assist the passenger along walks or steps to the door of the home or other destination.</p>

Demand-Response Service	The type of transit service where individual passengers can request transportation from a specific location to another specific location at a certain time. Transit vehicles providing demand-response service do not follow a fixed route, but travel throughout the community transporting passengers according to their specific requests. Can also be called dial-a-ride. These services usually, but not always, require advance reservations.
Deviated Fixed Route	This type of transit is a hybrid of fixed-route and demand-response services. While a bus or van passes along fixed stops and keeps to a timetable, the bus or van can deviate its course between two stops to go to a specific location for a pre-scheduled request. Often used to provide accessibility to persons with disabilities.
Disability	The limitation of normal physical, mental, social activity of an individual. There are varying types (functional, occupational, learning), degrees (partial, total) and durations (temporary, permanent) of disability.
Door-to-Door Service	A form of paratransit service which includes passenger assistance between the vehicle and the door of his or her home or other destination. A higher level of service than curb-to-curb, yet not as specialized as door-through-door service (where the driver actually provides assistance within the origin or destination).
Fare Box Revenue	A public transportation term for the monies or tickets collected as payments for rides. Can be cash, tickets, tokens, transfers and pass receipts. Fare box revenues rarely cover even half of a transit system's operating expenses.



Fixed-route	Transit services where vehicles run on regular, pre-designated, pre-scheduled routes, with no deviation. Typically, fixed-route service is characterized by printed schedules or timetables, designated bus stops where passengers board and alight and the use of larger transit vehicles.
Frequent Service	TriMet service that operates every fifteen minutes or better, every day. 16 bus routes and all MAX lines meet this level of service.
FY (Fiscal Year)	In Oregon, public agency Fiscal Years start on July 1 of the preceding calendar year. FY 2005 is from July 1, 2004 to June 30, 2005.
JARC (Jobs Access Reverse Commute)	Federal formula funds available to provide transportation to assist low income individuals get to work.
Match	State or local funds required by various federal or state programs to complement funds for a project. A match may also be required by states in funding projects, which are joint state/local efforts. Some funding sources allow services, such as the work of volunteers, to be counted as an in-kind funding match. Federal programs normally require that match funds come from other than federal sources.
Medicaid	Also known as Medical Assistance, this is a health care program for low-income and other medically needy persons. It is jointly funded by state and federal governments. The Medicaid program pays for transportation to non-emergency medical appointments if the recipient has no other means to travel to the appointment.
New Freedom	Federal formula funds for transit agencies to provide services to people with disabilities that are above and beyond what the ADA requires.

Paratransit	Types of passenger transportation that are more flexible than conventional fixed-route transit but more structured than the use of private automobiles. Paratransit includes demand-response transportation services, subscription bus services, shared-ride taxis, carpooling and vanpooling, jitney services, and so on. Most often refers to wheelchair-accessible, demand-response van service.
Service Route	Another hybrid between fixed-route and demand-response service. Service routes are established between targeted neighborhoods and service areas riders want to reach. Similar to deviated fixed routes, service routes are characterized by flexibility and deviation from fixed-route intervals. However, while deviated fixed routes require advanced reservations, service routes do not. A service route can include both regular, predetermined bus stops and/or allow riders to hail the vehicle and request a drop-off anywhere along the route.
Special Transportation Fund (STF)	State funds for transportation for elderly and people with disabilities.
Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund (STIF)	State funds from an employee payroll tax to improve public transportation services in low-income communities.
Total Transit System	TriMet's term for all of the attributes that make transit an attractive choice for riders, including customer information, easy access to transit, comfortable places to wait, high quality transportation (frequent, reliable, comfortable), safety and security.

Trip	A one-way movement of a person or vehicle between two points. Many transit statistics are based on unlinked passenger trips, which refer to individual one-way trips made by individual riders in individual vehicles. A person who leaves home on one vehicle, transfers to a second vehicle to arrive at a destination, leaves the destination on a third vehicle and has to transfer to yet another vehicle to complete the journey home has made four unlinked passenger trips.
Urban Growth Boundary (UGB)	The UGB controls urban expansion onto farm, forest and resource lands. Metro, the regional government, manages the UGB as required by state law.
Vanpool	A prearranged ridesharing service in which a number of people travel together on a regular basis in a van. Vanpools may be publicly operated, employer operated, individually owned or leased.
Vehicle Hours	Vehicle hours include revenue hours plus the time it takes a vehicle to travel from the garage to the end of the line.



Attachment C      STFAC Membership Roster

## STFAC MEMBERSHIP ROSTER (APRIL 2020)

Membership Category Description	Number of Persons	Committee Members	
		Name	Through Year
Those interested persons who are members of the TriMet Committee on Accessible Transportation (CAT), excepting the CAT member who is a Board member	Up to 14	Jan Campbell, Chair	2019
		Claudia Robertson, Vice Chair	2019
		Annadiana Johnson	2020
		Leon Chavarria	2019
		Ryan Skelton	2020
		Patricia Kepler	2019
		Zoe Presson	2020
Seniors or persons with disabilities who reside in Multnomah County	2	Carin Topliff	2021
		vacant	
Seniors or persons with disabilities who reside in Multnomah County	2	Andrea Belcher	2020
		vacant	
Seniors or persons with disabilities who reside in Washington County	2	Elaine Wells	2021
Seniors or persons with disabilities who reside outside the TriMet District	2	Glenn Koehrsen	2021
		Eric Olsen	2021
Staff representatives of the respective County Agencies on Aging and Disability; one per county	3	Teresa Christopherson, Clack. Co.	2021
		Mjere Simantel, Wash. Co.	2021
		Monika Johnson, Mult. Co.	2021
Staff representative of TriMet	1	Margo Moore	2021
Staff representative of Ride Connection	1	Julie Wilcke	2021
Staff representatives of public transit agencies other than TriMet, including rural transit entity representative	2	Andi Howell, City of Sandy	2020
		Elli Work, City of Wilsonville	2021
Seniors or Persons with Disabilities Living in the Service Area	3	David Keyes	2021
		Mike Foley	2020
		Mary Lou Ritter	2020

## Attachment D      STFAC Meeting Summaries

**STFAC Meeting #1  
Friday, January 18<sup>th</sup>, 2019  
Meeting Summary**

No attendance recorded.

**Discussion Items**

- Confirm w/ Julie about upcoming funding will receive 40% reduction and not current funding
- Assume full funding
- Reconvene when know what funding will come in
- Motion – proceed w/ the full funding levels with the recognition that if receive cutbacks then would reconvene
- Advocate at senior day at May 9<sup>th</sup>
- Subcommittee to discuss advocacy

Interested Subcommittee members:

- Zoe
- Mary
- Glenn
- Rebecca
- Julie
- Margo
- Jan
- Elaine
- Claudia

Julie will lead the subcommittee

**Follow-up Tasks**

- Find out if can speak on behalf of the STFAC when advocate and let subcommittee know
- Everyone needs copies
- Get list of FY16 discretionary funded operating
- Hardcopy of CTP to Eric
- Link to everyone
- List awards of FY16 discretionary funding



**STFAC Meeting #2  
Thursday, July 25<sup>th</sup>, 2019  
Meeting Summary**

**Attendees:**

- Attendees:

• Teresa Christopherson	• Tom Strader
• John Whitman	• Monika Johnson
• Mike Foley	• Jan Campbell
• Annadiana Johnson	• Jeff Hill
• Tangerine Behere	• Andi Howell
• Elli Work	• Elaine Wells

**Priorities:**

- No change on priorities
- How to meet #4 if STF and STIF merge – Elli
  - Glenn – may not get there but it’s still a priority
  - Elaine – Agrees with Glenn
- Elli - #9 change to #1

**Strategies:**

- Glenn – in general they are good but we haven’t done any of them.
- Margo – how would we do this.
- Permanent subcommittee meeting
- Elaine –Wants us to be thinking about new ways to provide expanded service, especially in rural areas. Supports Andi – this plan should be used in the application and providers have been doing
- Elli – change
- Vanessa clarified that one subcommittee will address multiple items. Jan & Vanessa – we can wordsmith items.

**Actions:**

- No changes except for the date.
- Annadiana – have time limit and milestones.
- Need to establish a charter and drill down on actions with the subcommittee.
- Subcommittee – be clear on what’s expected of providers and work with them before they submit their applications.
- Glenn – need a specific group of people identified with a firm chair.
- Jan – will ask if people want to continue on the subcommittee after the CTP update is complete.

- Change dates to 2020 and work with subcommittee on benchmarks.

### **Chapter 2:**

- Margo – want to confirm that all these providers are still in place.
- Update with assistance from providers.
- Elaine – would like more time to review CTP with a rural provider lens
- Andi – doesn't feel like she needs more time
- Tom – either way for him. Could use more time but doesn't have to.
- Send additional changes to Vanessa and she will send them out
- Glenn – 5.13, need to add first mile and last mile accommodations
- Vanessa – follow up with ODOT about if need to incorporate anything

### **Next Meeting**

- Tuesday, August 27<sup>th</sup>
- 9:30am-11:30am at Mobility Center
- Teresa – can't attend but meet without her
- Andi – will try and miss her standing meeting
- Tom - will work
- Comments by August 15<sup>th</sup> and I will incorporate and send them to you and review
- More than 2 subcommittee meetings a year / once a month and two full meetings – after the STFAC meeting
- Reports – ask for feedback from providers on form before finalizing it.
- Glenn – CCO announcement. We need to get involved.
- Vanessa will send out CCO announcement to group. Include STF and STIF merge email. Discuss advocacy operations and approach as subcommittee at future sub meetings.

**STFAC Meeting #3  
Tuesday, August 27<sup>th</sup>, 2019  
Meeting Summary**

**Attendees:**

- Attendees:

• Teresa Christopherson	• Monika Johnson
• John Whitman	• Jan Campbell
• Mike Foley	• Jeff Hill
• Annadiana Johnson	• Andi Howell
• Tangerine Behere	• Elaine Wells
• Elli Work	• Julie Wilcke
• Claudia Robertson	• Vanessa Vissar
• Tom Strader	• Tom Mills
•	• Margo (TriMet)

**Review Comments – Revising the Coordinated Transportation Plan for Seniors and Persons with Disabilities**

- Vanessa discussing what has been done and what transit law requires of plan Coordinated Transpo Plan FTA requirement for section 5310 funding must be developed with seniors, PWD, and reps of public and nonprofit transportation providers.
- Vanessa: "The approach this time is to perform minor update." Included in CTP to date is:
  - Introduction
  - Chapter 2
  - Chapter 3
  - Chapter 4
  - Chapter 5
  - Chapter 6
  - Conclusion
- During the last meeting, the group focused on Chapter 5, asking for revisions By 08/15, they received some from Julie and (who else?) Vanessa is also updating maps and data to reflect current info.
- "Is it our intent to use this basic document, make changes with the same format? Is it acceptable to everyone?"
- Vanessa is working with FTA and Metro to ensure compliance, but so far, so good. She'll know by the end of the week if there are any major issues with FTA.
- 5310 Circular definition on back of agenda, being read by Jan Campbell Questions?
- "I'm assuming since we're meeting the federal requirement, the fact we're including STIF is (important)?"

- "This was a preliminary attempt to test out my thinking as to what we need to do."
- Claudia: Another question: "Have we ever included low-income strategy?" "Low income was mentioned several times,"
- "TriMet's definitions may have changed since I started."
- Jan: Many persons with disabilities and seniors disproportionately poor.
- Glen raised the concern, and expressed surprise that ethnic diversity is not being included in this context.
- Monica: "Being that this is the federal language, will you include Title VI, because if so, we cover all of those protected classes."
- Glen and Julie went over their revisions before going on to Chapter 5.
- Glen: in intro, they made updates, know that coordinated care orgs need to address socially determined health He updated it to the current situation, and is waiting to see whether he went too far or not far enough based on feedback. He noted that he received critical feedback in the past.
- "I have to say Glen, from day 1 how thoroughly you review documents."

**Table 2-1 Transportation Services in Washing, Multnomah and Clackamas Counties**

- Julie: They went through all Ride Connection programs to ensure accuracy, reflecting new services such as Hillsboro Connector and new partners. On table 2.1, they attempted to clarify from the previous table. "Everything was in the shuttle service area. Actually, this, I'm not positive if this is our change doc in here."
- Vanessa took revisions.
- They essentially rearranged the categories in table 2.1 to better differentiate between the various types of shuttle services being provided.
- Vanessa: "Do you remember why this was included?"
- Glen: refers to the consultant's involvement in this matter.
- Jan: "just thought it would be easier to read an overview."
- Glen: "Ride Connection is the only organization so far to make these updates."
- Vanessa: "there is no deadline for the providers yet."
- Glen: "Andy, are you working on this?"
- Andy: "Yes, we're providing the same services as bf."
- Jan: "We'll see a final draft before the next STFAC meeting."
- Claudia wants this table included.
- Glen: "Is this plan every 3 or every 4 years?"
- Vanessa says it is 3.
- Tom: "My comment is that the chart gives a nice summary of services offered, and helps someone who's new to the organization."
- Glen has the same inclination.
- There was consensus to keep the table in.
- Julie: There is another map which needs updating. They sent questions beyond the updates via email regarding demographics and other community indicators.
- They are also working to include CCOS in this data in addition to transportation network information.
- Glen participated in a meeting in Salem regarding rulemaking on version 2.0.

- "I tried addressing some of that in my notes, maybe not accurately."
- Jan: "Are you going to address those questions?"
- Vanessa is looking in her email.
- Glen has time in the next few weeks to address issue if others are not available to do so.
- Claudia: "Did First do waiver nonmedical?"
- Vanessa: "Who wants to draft something?"
- Glen indicates interest.
- Jan: "Anyone else that wants to include or delete?"
- Vanessa: "So far, CCO and Title VI were added."
- Glen: "I'm assuming that many attachments won't be included since they're talking about needing notes from 2015-16."
- Vanessa: "We're updating all of that."
- Jan: They're looking for a timeline of draft completion; everyone will get a final draft.

### **Chapter 5 Priorities, Actions and Strategies**

- The other thing the committee focused on was Chapter 5, revisiting the action again, "because in the small committee, the only changes we saw were the date."
- Now they are going through each one, now on page 5.5, plan to oversee implementation
- Glen: "We should identify why we didn't act on the actions several years ago."
- Vanessa wants to go through each one to ensure everyone is on the same page.

### **Action #1 Develop STAFAC subcommittee**

There is contention regarding the interpretation of item 1 around creating a subcommittee. Glen thinks the bylaws weren't followed. Vanessa thinks they were.

- Glen also says that no nominating committee was established, and reiterates that the bylaws weren't followed.
- "We have Dick Jones who isn't coming back again, and we haven't identified a replacement."
- Jan: "We can't go back, we need to go forward."
- Glen still insists that there are problems.
- Monica makes a motion to table the bylaws discussion, as there are only 1.5 hours left.
- No motion is needed; everyone agreed by consensus to move on, including Glen.
- *The* timeframe has been moved back to 2024. The next step is to create a subcommittee charter, nominate members, create a workplan, etc.
- Glen is still frustrated, saying "It states we'll form a subcommittee by 2024," He says it needs to happen ASAP" recommends changing to 2021
- A motion was made and seconded by Monica to do just that, and passed, with Glen abstaining. He is still concerned that they're pushing it off.
- Andy: "To clarify, what does timeframe actually mean? Will it be complete by '21, begin in '21?"
- It is agreed that the committee will be established and a plan documented by 2021.
- Claudia: "committee is very amorphous; some will stay for a while, others will move on."
- "2021 gives us enough time to establish a committee and workplan."

- Vanessa: Clarify next steps?
- Glen says he is on a different wavelength from everyone, and doesn't really care now.
- Julie: "We can be working on this stuff simultaneously," and "any timeline sooner than that is aggressive, and we'd set up ourselves for failure if we accelerated the timeline."
- Vanessa: "We'll have to revisit STFAC's duties once the STFAC/STIF merge is complete."

### **Action #2 Estimate Cost for Actions**

- Vanessa: Is this needed?
- Andy: It's a very heavy lift, with many actions in the plan throughout each county. She sees the value, but the cost and time commitment needed for a consultant is a very heavy lift.
- Elaine agrees with Andy, and thinks it needs to be the full committee's responsibility.
- Andy: "We thought at the time it could be very helpful, but when you actually look at STFAC action, there is just such a range of what could be implemented, and it's hard to put a price on many of these actions."
- Tom: "It would take a lot of time, effort, resources."
- Elli made a motion to remove 2 which passes, Margo seconds

### **Action #3 Develop Advocacy Strategy from STFAC**

- Identify subcommittee workplan
- Glen: "We all talk to our legislators, and should have a common white sheet of our issues, since they don't know these?"
- Other: "It depends on what's coming up. We all wrote draft letters. "It depends on what's in the Governor's budget."
- Claudia: "We may have a strategy in hand when we think we're losing them."
- The item is being kept.

### **Action #4 Periodically Review CTP**

- Review STFAC to determine progress
- One agrees that there should be milestones to keep everyone on task.
- Also, define periodically.
- Andy: "Just leave it in the plan, and that would be the committee that would put a timeframe on it; we don't want to put a timeframe on the whole plan."
- Julie: "We should also revisit the process since there's a difference in interpretation on that."
- This is a Tier 1 issue.

### **Action #5 Application Processes**

- Claudia: The formatting of the plan needs to be changed to be easier to navigate and read overall.
- Elaine: clarify?
- Glen teases Elaine about losing WashCo money.
- Vanessa: "Julia mentioned changing it to," (didn't catch what exactly).
- Jan: Are we keeping this all at Tier 1?

- Andy: "I got hung up on 1." "started doing research and typing a draft, just read in the bylaws that the chair will select subcommittee members and designate a chair."
- "Should we change that so it matches our bylaws?"
- Claudia says that these are two different things.
- Jan: "I'm wondering if we need to review the bylaws and put that in here."
- Andy: "The subcommittee could review them."
- Updating and reviewing the bylaws is being made an action.
- Margot: "How often? It needs to be looked at consistently."
- Monica: "annually"
- Claudia: "Put a time limit on it, and redo the timeframe when the plan is updated in 2021."
- Vanessa: "normally yes, except for the merge, so we must wait until that's done before revisiting this."
- Andy: "I don't think ODOT's recommendation is due for a couple of months."
- Vanessa: "It should be out by October, and will probably go through short session in 02/20."
- Julie also believes that it will go to short session. Claudia thinks that admin rules will be drafted after that session.
- Vanessa: review annually?
- Others believe it should be as needed.
- Elaine: "What about adding something like "to be concurrent with the merge?""
- Monica: "We're adding 7?"
- Jan: "Yes."
- What are next steps?
- Claudia: Subcommittee, then workplan, as well as periodic work review
- She emphasizes that it is ongoing.

### **Measure Program and Project Performance**

- Julie: "Is it up to STFAC as to what reports are reduced?"
- Vanessa: "They have their preference."
- What we've done is combine ODOT and STFAC into one quarterly document.
- Glen: "Can someone from TriMet accounting come to the meeting and explain the need for the report?"
- "What good is the report? It takes a lot of time and effort."
- "We're updating the reporting requirements."
- Glen: "The subcommittee will do all these tasks, but may have different priorities."
- Claudia: "If we don't get these numbers from the reports, we won't know if whether or not TriMet's withholding of the funding for these services is arbitrary or not."
- Now moving on to Page 5.15.
- Vanessa will restructure this so it looks nicer.
- Glen: "If "ongoing" is acceptable here, why isn't it accepted on the other tables?"
- "We did, we have it as ongoing."
- Jan: "How do people feel on the timeframe?"
- Monica: "Are we reverting to "ongoing" for the items to be completed in 2021?"

- Glen: "We'll have a date to set up the subcommittee, who will determine the timeframe."
- Going to page 5.15; supporting expanded travel training programs
- Vanessa: "Isn't that what we do?"
- Julie: "It is ongoing, expanding, shifting. RIDE Connection just hired a fantastic new mobility specialist/travel trainer. Wilsonville's needs have shifted."
- Claudia and Glen are discussing how TriMet is not listening to them about the plan.
- 
- Jan: "Is 7 good?"
- Everyone agrees.
- 
- Moving on to 8.
- Vanessa: "Action 8 is done."
- Andy disagrees.
- "Every time we go for our new STIF plan, we'll look to this for feeder services."
- Everyone agrees to keep Action 8.
- Elaine: "WashCo still working on their plans, so we should expand the community connectors piece to include a broader area."
- 9
- public restrooms in transit centers, identify which transit centers to prioritize
- Jan: "What do people thinking about removing it?"
- Andy: "X's a Tier 3. Unless there's a really good reason to remove it, we shouldn't." She suggests expanding it to include other amenities.
- "Anything we can get to improve our shelters is good."
- Julie thinks that may be beyond the scope.
- Elaine believes that this was put in here to address long travel times for some riders. It should stay in.
- Tom also agrees that it should be beefed up to include more amenities.
- Elaine and Julie agree. Julie serves on the Ptax ADA work group which is looking at best ADA practices among transit systems. "We should look at amenities which exceed ADA standards."
- Vanessa reads draft Language: improved amenities as opposed to just public restrooms.
- There was discussion on whether to broaden the responsible entities from transit agencies to other entities.
- Monica suggests adding language which says "exceeding ADA requirements"
- Managing ADA service demand, "still ongoing, right?"
- "Yes."
- 
- Items 10 and 11 kept
- now on Item 12
- TriMet is responsible for this item.
- Margot: "Some of it is done," HOP launched
- She is discussing the Sandbox TriMet has been working on which can be used by multiple transportation providers, including parking information.



- Vanessa suggests updating 12 13.
- Vanessa: "Still a lot to cover,"
- Glen thinks TriMet should update these.
- Julie: "Next steps?"
- Vanessa: "Since Trimet's the responsible party on many of them, we should take another stab at it."
- Julie points to 1D. "Which action does that tie to?"
- "Where do we have an action that supports addressing accessible bus stops?"
- Vanessa: "It should be covered under item 9."
- The committee is comfortable having TriMet update the remaining actions.
- Vanessa is wrapping up with next steps which are:
- The goal of this meeting was to do minor updates to have STFAC review. The goal is to present the items to the Board in December.
- The next date that the revisions can be reviewed is during the 9/20 subcommittee meeting.
- If more time is needed, they can meet

**STFAC Meeting #4**  
**Friday, September 20<sup>th</sup>, 2019**  
**Meeting Summary**

**Attendees:**

- Attendees:

• Mike Foley	• Andi Howell
• Annadiana Johnson	• Rebecca Miller
• Tangerine Behere	• Glenn Koehrsen
• Eric Olsen	• David Keyes
• Claudia Robertson	• Vanessa Vissar
• Tom Strader	• Tom Mills
• Monika Johnson	• Margo (TriMet)
• Jan Campbell	

**Merge:**

- Want to keep STFAC
- Don't want to rely on QE for funding and others
- Will send update at
- Offer public comment at other times other than the beginning
- Forward info to STFAC
- ODOT CAC for Recs by November
- Legislatures will consider it Jan-March.
- Goal to rec. how to merge the program. Seem to be getting off topic and suggesting changes to STIF
- Expect CAC to get input from constituents
- Will be getting input from STFAC when have something. Via email.

**Proposal:**

- Update CTP due by June 2020
- 5310 projects need to be in plan regardless
- Continue finalizing Actions
- Don't bring the plan to the board until March
- Reach Consensus on CTP Actions 10-44
- Discuss timeframe and priority for actions 1-9 later
- Simplify and combine for adequate rather than existing services, maintain services? Maintain access?
- Identify Subcommittee Next Steps

**Next Steps:**

- Share CAC information
- Offer public comment at other times other than the beginning
- STFAC Meeting on October 25<sup>th</sup>
  - Update from ODOT

- STF overview
  - Condense actions
  - Move others to Sub Workplan
  - Full meeting

**STFAC Meeting #5**  
**Friday, April 30th, 2020**  
**Meeting Summary**

**Attendees:**

- Attendees:

• Mike Floyd	• Andi Howell
• Annadiana Johnson	• Rebecca Miller
• Kristina Babcock (alt for Teresa Christian)	• Theresa Conley (for Jason Kelly, ODOT)
• Eric Olsen	• Elaine Wells
• Julie Wilcke	• Glenn Koehrsen
• Claudia Robertson	•
• Tom Strader	• Tom Mills
• Ryan Skelton	• David Bouchard (TriMet)
• Leon Chavarria, CAT Committee	• Cora Potter (TriMet)
• Monika Johnson	• Aaron Dees (TriMet)
• Jan Campbell, CAT Chair	• Margo Moore (TriMet)
• Elli Work	• Eileen Collins (TriMet)
• Mary Lou	• Andrew Mortensen

The meeting begins at 9:05

**Welcome**

- Jan Campbell welcomes everyone to the meeting. She has been thinking about everyone, and knows that it has been a very difficult time. She thanks everyone for everything they have done. She thanks staff for helping to get the meeting going, and keeping transit operating.
- Claudia echoes Jan's sentiments, and again thanks TriMet. She's glad we're getting together to resolve issues that have been pending for a while.
- Tom Mills gives everyone a brief overview of WebEx.
- Jan Campbell Reviews Agenda
  - Introductions
  - 1. Delivery of Food and Medicine
  - 2. PPE
  - 3. Unspent STF money; info and discussion
  - 4. CTP update and action
  - 5. Consolidation of STF/STIF
  - Adjourn

## Introductions

- Andi Howell; no updates
- Annadiana; no updates
- Claudia; no updates
- Elaine; Just a reminder that the CTAA Expo has been moved to November in Louisville, KY.
- Glenn; no updates
- Julie; no updates
- Kristina; no updates
- Leon; no updates
- Margo; no updates; LIFT continues to run in these crazy times.
- Jan Campbell asks Margo for info about the food delivery. LIFT is currently partnering with Meals on Wheels, and is also offering grocery pickup and delivery for LIFT customers. There are some other things in the works that will be shared when ready.
- Mary Lou; no updates
- Rebecca; She's been working in Washington County's EOC. Agencies will be receiving both Families First and CARE dollars, which offer flexibility in assisting vulnerable populations. She hopes that others have some great ideas to share either here or offline.
- Ryan; Things are still busy at Independent Living Resources, ILR.
- Elli Work; Elli praises Margo. SMART continues to show up every single day, and are doing some new and interesting things to support the operators.
- Jan asks Eileen to explain what was done to make online reservations easier. LIFT just began online trip booking, which can be done through a web portal either on a desktop or smartphone.

### 1. Delivery of Food and Medicine

- Tom: ODOT released guidance outlining flexibility in STF funding due to COVID. These funds can be used for meal deliveries, cleaning of vehicles, pharmaceuticals, and medical and emergency transport. STFAC is required to vote to allow this to occur. The members must determine that local citizens are unable to access essential services, particularly seniors and people with disabilities. We asked everyone by email to indicate their vote. They can backdate this vote to make it retroactive.
- Annadiana is pleased that medication deliveries are included. Leon has been unable to use LIFT to get them delivered.

- Ryan has a question in regards to this. If passed, roughly what percentage of the funds would be used for these services?
- Julie does not have an exact percentage, but all network partners are providing some form of goods delivery. STF already allows that. They are focusing on opportunities to get PPE. They have requested PPE through the emergency management systems. They have volunteers to make PPE, and have received assistance from distilleries.
- Andi says that SAM has been doing the same. They've partnered with Meals on Wheels and Fred Meyer's clip list grocery pickup program. They will only be using STF funds for grocery delivery, since they already have PPE sources.
- Rebecca has a couple questions. Can we add the purchase and delivery of durable medical equipment? They do this for OPI, delivering things such as undergarments.
- Theresa Conley; At this point, it's an eligible use of funding.
- Rebecca; One of the gaps is the actual shopping and grocery handling. Could providers potentially hire a staff person or volunteer coordinator to work with people who can physically pick up and deliver groceries and other items? Also, would this be FEMA reimbursable?
- Theresa encourages them to work with other agencies who are already doing this. It's a gray area when you hire people to do this.
- Eileen; When they launched their grocery delivery program, an agency offered to provide assistance, but this particular one is not a good option for them. The organization in question is unable to expand its services. She answered her own question regarding FEMA reimbursement.
- Ryan says that in relation to durable medical equipment, many of the shops themselves are able to handle pickup orders. Delivery is still more complex, depending on the nature of the disability.
- Elaine and Kristina have nothing to add.
- Leon; Is there a number I can call to find out about my deliveries for pharmaceuticals?
- Tom will refer him to that information at the end of the meeting, and Jan will also send him some information.
- Mike has no questions.
- Monika; What is the timeline for using these funds for COVID activities? They're also getting Families First and CARES funds. Will it stretch through the entire biennium?

- Theresa appreciates that Monika's thinking strategically about the sources, and encourages everyone to do so. CARES funds cover many of the things that these STF funds may be used for. If you don't need the funds for meal delivery, you might consider holding on to these funds.
- The motion is put on the floor.
- Claudia; Would this be restricted to only paratransit riders?
- Claudia motions that these services be available to fixed route riders. Mary Lou seconds.
- Claudia says that Jan had an issue with the word "citizen." Has this been resolved?
- Tom says that this has been changed. It was just an error in the presentation. The word "residents" will be used in place of "citizens."
- Ryan asks if it is possible to add "durable medical equipment" to the motion? Tom says that that will automatically be considered as eligible.
- The motion passes unanimously.

## **2. PPP**

## **3. Unspent STF Funds**

- Delivery of Food and Medicine Jan agrees.
- Elaine suggests calling this an emergency fund rather than a funding reserve.
- She also suggests that we put the remaining funds into an emergency fund.
- Jan would be most comfortable with a formal vote.
- Ryan seconds the motion.
- Rebecca also suggests that we get clarification from ODOT, and be prepared to take additional action as necessary.
- Claudia asks if this is an amendment. Rebecca says that it is not.
- The motion passes unanimously.

## **4. CTP Update**

- A number of committee members were on a subcommittee developing recommendations for the CTP.
- Cora was tasked with updating CTP for the 2020 update. It is required to be updated every 4 years. Federal transit law requires that 5310 programs be included in this CTP, and guidance from various members of the public, such as seniors, people with disabilities, and the general public.

The update this year will be minor, and includes an updated inventory of services, service providers, and funding sources, updated maps and statistics, and a list of reviewed priorities. The plan must be approved by TriMet's board by 6/30/2020.

The subcommittee met in the summer and fall of 2019, and developed a final draft for STFAC in November.

The draft priorities and strategies were also available for public input during TriMet open houses in late February.

- Cora reads the list of priorities and strategies.
- Currently, TriMet is working with Andrew Mortensen to review these revisions. Today, we're seeking approval of the priorities and strategies.
- Claudia wishes to reconcile the copy of the plan that she has with what Cora presented. What Cora presented was abbreviated, according to Claudia.
- Cora believes that Claudia is referring to the action tables.
- Claudia is interested in the wording of Priority 5.
- Ryan believes that it may be a question of bylaws versus what the CTP says. As long as the by-laws include advocacy as a function, then this is moot. The by-laws do not include advocacy, but the CTP does, says Cora. As a body, the STFAC can't advocate for things, but individuals can.
- Mary Lou has a question regarding Strategy 4. She wonders how we define equity. She has been looking at equity maps in her role on STIF. Is there an opportunity to recognize something in the strategy section around tying equity maps into what the STFAC does in setting up priorities and actions?
- Cora says that the CTP shows data on the service hours of a provider. The maps are also being updated to show where the populations are.
- Eileen also does not recall that defining equity has been discussed before.
- Cora; Every time the STFAC makes funding recommendations, they can view them through the lenses of each priority.
- Ryan; If we're looking for language to describe the idea of equity, I suggest putting something such as socioeconomic, racial, and geographical considerations. Essentially, categories of equity should be listed.
- Mary Lou believes TriMet's equity policy has a list of 10 criteria defining equity, determining what factors are used to determine if equity is being met in an area. Should the committee have a tutorial on TriMet's equity policies and principles?



- Tom confirms this. It is called the equity index. Individual census blocks can be scored on this index. However, some of those factors are irrelevant to this committee.
- Jan wants to mention that Annadiana is on TriMet's Equity Group.
- Annadiana says that currently there are no discussion around disability issues. She participates on TEAC.
- Claudia asks if the priorities and strategies were also available online.
- Tom doesn't believe that they were available online.
- Annadiana attended the open house, but there was very little information about what is being discussed at this meeting. She only saw information regarding the proposed service improvements in the area.
- Julie asks Cora to revisit the FTA statement. Does anything in the plan address the delivery of goods? With the STF/STIF consolidation, does the plan need to be updated to reflect this?
- Cora; The strategies only apply to FTA 5310 funds, but ODOT relies on these plans. She believes that there might be something in the actions regarding deliveries.
- Theresa says that ODOT anticipates that the CTP will include STF and 5310 funding.
- Elli believes that it is to our benefit to keep equity definitions vague, I believe.
- Claudia would like to see general language about emergencies. She suggests that the language suggest allocation funds as needs arise. It does not need to be specific.
- Jan wants to address Ryan's concern about defining equity. Ryan thinks it's good that equity is a broad category rather than a narrow one.
- Margo is in favor of specific language regarding equity in the CTP.
- Mike says that we need to be sure that we are all in agreement in how the term is being used. Elaine and Monika both agree.
- Monika would like to see some language from the Civil Rights Act, specifically Title VI language. That language should be in the draft documents, according to Monika.
- Andi; During the subcommittee meetings, we discussed this. The discussion was very long, and led to no ultimate decision. Andi is comfortable with Cora's language.
- Rebecca says that the equity definition concept is difficult. Washington County has adopted a race-led policy, as well as Multnomah County. She is

OK with the language as is for today, but emphasizes that the disparity remains.

- Eileen; We need to address two different forks of equity; populations that we serve, and the agencies who provide transportation, and how funding decisions are made there, particularly for agencies that serve multiple counties.
- A motion to update the language is made by Jan, and seconded by Mary Lou and Rebecca.
- Ryan wants to make sure that Mike-who is blind-is able to access the information.
- The motion passes unanimously.

## 5. **STF/STIF Merge**

- Aaron Deas is presenting on this topic.

We now expect to have 1-3 special emergency sessions before the upcoming long session. Discussion on what will be tackled have been all over the place. Perhaps STIF funding will be used to maintain services. In a longer session, we can expect to see a merge of the two programs, depending on the nature and depth of the Recession.

- Claudia says that this doesn't address next biennium's funding cycle, and what happens to the legacy funding.
- Ryan; How viable are those funding sources in the future?
- Tom; The legacy funding sources continue with a backfill from STIF to keep STF solid. There are threats to cigarette funding. The cigarette tax measure could be an issue, but it sounds like there are plans to hold STF harmless. The lawnmower tax may also be an issue.
- Elaine wonders if local entities are covered under the payroll protection act.
- Leon wonders if there is a website explaining the difference between STF and STFAC.
- Tom says that ODOT has a webpage. Google ODOT STF/STIF Merge. Aaron says that they have a couple of very good fact sheets.

The meeting adjourns at 11:59 AM.

## Attachment E Transit Provider Fleet Data

## TRANSIT PROVIDER FLEET DATA

### **TriMet Vehicle Fleet**

The 267 LIFT vehicles listed in **Table E1** are all owned and operated by the TriMet. All the vehicles in the fleet are currently in active use. Nearly 75 percent of the vehicles are Chevrolets, with the rest of the vehicles' make either Ford or Dodge. The majority of the vehicle fleet is comprised of medium-size light-duty buses that have more than ten general use seats and three ADA seats. 15 vehicles are E-3 modified minivans that have three seats and one ADA seat. Nearly half of the vehicles in the fleet are five years old or older. Currently, approximately one-third of the vehicles in the fleet have passed their usable life end date, and all vehicles will be past their usable end of life date by 2021. Less than 20 percent of the fleet is considered to be in excellent condition, approximately 25 percent of the vehicles' conditions are identified as marginal, and the rest of the fleet is classified as being in adequate or good condition.

### **Sandy Area Metro (SAM) Vehicle Fleet**

The SAM vehicle fleet in **Table E2** is owned and operated by the City of Sandy. All nine vehicles in the fleet are active and comprise several different makes and models. Six of the vehicles are five years old or older and five vehicles have over 100,000 miles. There is one vehicle in poor condition and this vehicle has an end of usable life date in January 2015. The newest vehicle is from 2014, has just over 17,000 miles, and has an end of usable life date in November 2019. Two vehicles, including the newest vehicle, are classified as being in excellent condition.

### **South Metro Area Regional Transit (SMART) Vehicle Fleet**

**Table E3** shows detailed information on the SMART vehicle fleet. All 12 SMART vehicles are owned and operated by the City of Wilsonville and are currently in active use. Most of the vehicles are Ford or Eldorado models and are medium-size, light-duty buses with two ADA seats apiece. Three vehicles are considered to be in poor condition, and more than half of the vehicles are five years old or older. The oldest vehicle is from 2002 has passed its usable life end date in January 2007. The four newest vehicles are from 2013 and have an end of usable life end date in September 2018. Half of the fleet vehicles have more than 100,000 miles.

### **Canby Area Transit (CAT) Vehicle Fleet**

The City of Canby owns and operates the CAT fleet detailed in **Table E4**. The seven vehicles are all active and have less than 30,000 miles each. Most of the vehicles are either Chevrolets or Gilligs, and range from small, light-duty buses to large, heavy-duty buses. Most of the vehicles either have two or four ADA seats, and one has 16 ADA seats. The smallest buses have five seats and largest buses have 35 seats. All the buses are considered to be in good condition. The oldest bus was placed into service in 2010 passed its end of usable life date in June 2015. The newest bus is from 2014 and is still in excellent condition has an end of usable life date in January 2018. The two large, heavy-duty buses have an end of usable life date in January 2026.

### **South Clackamas Transit District (SCTD) Vehicle Fleet**

The South Clackamas Transportation District owns and operates all four vehicles from the SCTD vehicle fleet shown in **Table E5**. Each vehicle is a medium, light-duty bus with two ADA seats and 14 non-ADA seats. Half of the fleet is in good or marginal condition and the other half is in poor condition. Currently, only three vehicles are active. The backup or spare vehicle is the oldest vehicle and passed its end of usable life date in February 2013. The newest vehicle is from 2014 and has an end of usable life date in June 2021.

### **Ride Connection Vehicle Fleet**

All 116 vehicles in **Table E6** are owned and operated by Ride Connection, Inc. Most of the vehicles are medium, light-duty buses with more than 10 seats and either two or four ADA seats. There are 39 vehicles that have fewer than two ADA seats or no ADA seats available. These vehicles are considered small buses or vans and have less than eight seats. More than half of the fleet is five years old or older. Approximately 44percent of the vehicles are in good or excellent condition. 67 percent of the vehicles are lift equipped and 28 percent of the vehicles have an accessible ramp.

### **Clackamas County Vehicle Fleet**

**Table E7** shows the five active vehicles in Clackamas County's fleet. Three of the vehicles are medium-sized, light-duty buses with more than two ADA seats in a 14 seat configuration. The newest vehicles are large, heavy-duty vehicles delivered in 2015 and have 37 seats and two ADA seats. Most of the vehicles are in good

condition and have fewer than 90,000 miles. The oldest vehicle is from 2009 has passed its usable life end date in August 2014. The newest vehicle was delivered in 2015 has an end of useable life data in August 2026.

**Table E1: TriMet Vehicle Fleet**

Asset Number	VIN	Fleet #	Asset Make	Asset Model	Year	Seats	Seats ADA	Last Condition	Asset Last Odometer Reading 6/16/20	Status	End of Usable Category	End of Usable Start Date	End of Usable Life End Date
9800	1GB6G58L3 C1143800	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	218,782	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	6/9/12	6/9/17
9801	1GB6G58L5 C1159545	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	224,489	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	5/23/12	5/23/17
9802	1GB6G58L7 C1159451	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	213,498	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	5/23/12	5/23/17
9803	1GB6G58L9 C1159306	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	228,836	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	5/23/12	5/23/17
9804	1GB6G58L0 C1159873	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	210,256	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	8/2/12	8/2/17
9805	1GB6G58L0 C1160067	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	195,249	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	5/27/12	5/27/17
9806	1GB6G58L2 C1159776	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	205,715	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	6/9/12	6/9/17
9807	1GB6G58L1 C1160174	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	222,897	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	5/27/12	5/27/17
9808	1GB6G58L9 C1160424	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	243,260	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	5/27/12	5/27/17
9809	1GB6G58L2 C1160541	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	218,794	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	6/3/12	6/3/17
9810	1GB6G58L5 C1159626	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	238,307	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	6/23/12	6/23/17
9811	1GB6G58L4 C1161464	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	244,392	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	6/16/12	6/16/17
9812	1GB6G58L3 C1160757	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	228,491	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	6/3/12	6/3/17
9813	1GB6G58L2 C1160653	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	226,735	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	6/23/12	6/23/17
9814	1GB6G58L6 C1161160	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	234,579	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	6/23/12	6/23/17
9815	1GB6G58L3 C1161102	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	229,167	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	6/23/12	6/23/17
9816	1GB6G58L2 C1161656	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	205,898	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	6/16/12	6/16/17
9817	1GB6G58L0 C1160988	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	234,582	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	6/9/12	6/9/17
9818	1GB6G58L2 C1161396	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	224,537	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	6/9/12	6/9/17
9819	1GB6G58L3 C1161536	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	203,768	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	6/16/12	6/16/17
9820	1GB6G58L8 C1167218	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	221,318	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	6/23/12	6/23/17
9821	1GB6G58L3 C1166557	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	218,314	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	6/16/12	6/16/17
9822	1GB6G58L3 C1166932	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	228,078	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	6/16/12	6/16/17
9823	1GB6G58L1 C1166685	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	224,931	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	6/16/12	6/16/17
9824	1GB6G58L3 C1166865	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	213,154	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	6/23/12	6/23/17
9825	1GB6G58L6 C1168092	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	200,947	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	6/30/12	6/30/17
9826	1GB6G58L4 C1169192	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	226,529	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	6/30/12	6/30/17
9827	1GB6G58L9 C1168474	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	220,448	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	6/30/12	6/30/17
9828	1GB6G58L9 C1169009	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	243,884	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	6/30/12	6/30/17
9829	1GB6G58L5 C1168259	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	229,174	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	6/30/12	6/30/17
9830	1GB6G58L7 C1169350	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	206,985	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	6/30/12	6/30/17
9831	1GB6G58L6 C1168903	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	213,523	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	7/5/12	7/5/17

Table E1: TriMet Vehicle Fleet													
Asset Number	VIN	Fleet #	Asset Make	Asset Model	Year	Seats	Seats ADA	Last Condition	Asset Last Odometer Reading 6/16/20	Status	End of Usable Category	End of Usable Start Date	End of Usable Life End Date
9832	1GB8658L6 C1168707	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	203,139	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	7/5/12	7/5/17
9833	1GB8658L2 C1172432	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	237,484	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	10/2/12	10/2/17
9834	1GB8658L8 C1167624	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	235,014	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	10/2/12	10/2/17
9835	1GB8658L9 C1167891	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	228,917	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	10/2/12	10/2/17
9836	1GB8658L9 C1169608	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	214,376	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	10/2/12	10/2/17
9837	1GB8658L8 C1167736	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	233,680	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	10/2/12	10/2/17
9838	1GB8658L1 C1161227	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	206,065	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	10/2/12	10/2/17
9839	1GB8658L7 C1169123	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	220,592	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	10/2/12	10/2/17
9840	1GB8658L3 C1172262	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	228,678	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	10/2/12	10/2/17
9841	1GB8658L2 C1172317	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	216,607	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	10/2/12	10/2/17
9842	1GB8658L1 C1172552	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	219,556	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	10/2/12	10/2/17
9843	1GB8658L6 C1172711	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	243,914	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	10/2/12	10/2/17
9844	1GB8658L2 C1172494	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	221,717	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	10/2/12	10/2/17
9845	1GB8658L7 C1172605	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	231,646	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	10/2/12	10/2/17
9846	1GB8658L6 C1172188	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	234,113	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	11/1/12	11/1/17
9847	1GB8658L9 C1172962	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	223,094	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	9/26/12	9/26/17
9848	1GB8658L8 C1172807	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	235,710	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	9/26/12	9/26/17
9849	1GB8658L0 C1172753	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	228,068	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	10/25/12	10/25/17
9850	1GB8658L0 C1174003	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	224,580	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	9/26/12	9/26/17
9851	1GB8658L3 C1173234	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	223,895	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	9/26/12	9/26/17
9852	1GB8658L6 C1173860	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	210,262	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	9/26/12	9/26/17
9853	1GB8658L0 C1173742	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	222,510	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	10/30/12	10/30/17
9854	1GB8658L9 C1173352	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	237,915	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	9/26/12	9/26/17
9855	1GB8658L4 C1174036	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	218,600	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	11/2/12	11/2/17
9856	1GB8658L4 C1173498	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	235,028	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	9/26/12	9/26/17
9857	1GB8658LX C1173683	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	216,595	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	9/26/12	9/26/17
9858	1GB8658L3 C1174433	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	207,309	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	9/26/12	9/26/17
9859	1GB8658L6 C1173390	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	231,704	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	11/2/12	11/2/17
9860	1GB8658L1 C1174513	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	232,161	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	11/2/12	11/2/17
9861	1GB8658L7 C1174483	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	218,707	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	10/26/12	10/26/17
9862	1GB8658L5 C1173803	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	218,803	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	11/8/12	11/8/17
9863	1GB8658L4 C1174165	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	213,614	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	11/9/12	11/9/17



Table E1: TriMet Vehicle Fleet													
Asset Number	VIN	Fleet #	Asset Make	Asset Model	Year	Seats	Seats ADA	Last Condition	Asset Last Odometer Reading 6/16/20	Status	End of Usable Category	End of Usable Start Date	End of Usable Life End Date
9864	1GB6G5819 C1173531	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	228,130	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	11/9/12	11/9/17
9865	1GB6G5815 C1174403	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	227,001	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	10/30/12	10/30/17
9866	1GB6G5811 C1173295	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	200,405	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	11/9/12	11/9/17
9867	1GB6G5816 C1173020	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	225,045	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	10/30/12	10/30/17
9868	1GB6G5819 C1173058	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	214,808	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	10/26/12	10/26/17
9869	1GB6G5813 C1173332	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	227,094	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	11/8/12	11/8/17
9870	1GB6G5819 C1173187	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	221,240	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	11/12/12	11/12/17
9871	1GB6G5817 C1175262	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	228,504	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	11/14/12	11/14/17
9872	1GB6G5818 C1175223	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	232,799	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	10/25/12	10/25/17
9873	1GB6G5815 C1174952	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	221,104	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	10/25/12	10/25/17
9874	1GB6G5814 C1174909	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	228,880	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	10/30/12	10/30/17
9875	1GB6G5817 C1169445	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	205,187	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	11/12/12	11/12/17
9876	1GB6G5813 C1173606	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	223,376	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	10/25/12	10/25/17
9877	1GB6G5818 C1174637	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	224,275	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	11/13/12	11/13/17
9878	1GB6G5812 C1174701	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	218,978	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	11/13/12	11/13/17
9879	1GB6G5816 C1174989	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	223,474	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	11/14/12	11/14/17
9880	1GB6G5817 C1174998	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	222,279	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	11/15/12	11/15/17
9881	1GB6G5814 C1174926	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	207,914	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	11/15/12	11/15/17
9882	1GB6G5818 C1179045	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	223,258	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	11/16/12	11/16/17
9883	1GB6G5814 C1175106	38	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2012	10	3	Marginal	204,875	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	11/16/12	11/16/17
9901	1GB6G6819 E1163428	39	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 240	2014	12	3	Good	174,197	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	9/29/14	9/29/19
9902	1GB6G681X E1187544	39	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 240	2014	12	3	Good	152,043	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	10/1/14	10/1/19
9903	1GB6G6818 E1187591	39	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 240	2014	12	3	Good	152,103	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	9/29/14	9/29/19
9904	1GB6G6813 E1187661	39	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 240	2014	12	3	Good	157,819	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	9/29/14	9/29/19
9905	1GB6G6812 E1187750	39	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 240	2014	12	3	Good	163,368	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	9/29/14	9/29/19
9906	1GB6G6818 E1187803	39	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 240	2014	12	3	Good	161,232	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	10/1/14	10/1/19
9907	1GB6G681X E1187897	39	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 240	2014	12	3	Good	160,223	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	9/4/14	9/4/19
9908	1GB6G681X E1188032	39	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 240	2014	12	3	Good	178,068	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	9/4/14	9/4/19
9909	1GB6G6815 E1188052	39	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 240	2014	12	3	Good	188,614	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	9/11/14	9/11/19
9910	1GB6G6819 E1188135	39	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 240	2014	12	3	Good	184,892	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	9/29/14	9/29/19
9911	1GB6G6815 E1188245	39	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 240	2014	12	3	Good	175,075	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	9/29/14	9/29/19
9912	1GB6G6819 E1188278	39	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 240	2014	12	3	Good	185,271	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	9/4/14	9/4/19

Table E1: TriMet Vehicle Fleet													
Asset Number	VIN	Fleet #	Asset Make	Asset Model	Year	Seats	Seats ADA	Last Condition	Asset Last Odometer Reading 6/16/20	Status	End of Usable Category	End of Usable Start Date	End of Usable Life End Date
9913	1GB6G6814 E1188365	39	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 240	2014	12	3	Good	179,427	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	9/29/14	9/29/19
9914	1GB6G6813 E1188373	39	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 240	2014	12	3	Good	149,957	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	9/4/14	9/4/19
9915	1GB6G6810 E1188525	39	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 240	2014	12	3	Good	182,276	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	9/4/14	9/4/19
9916	1GB6G6814 E1188642	39	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 240	2014	12	3	Good	187,567	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	9/5/14	9/5/19
9917	1GB6G6819 E1188569	39	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 240	2014	12	3	Good	171,944	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	9/29/14	9/29/19
9918	1GB6G6812 E1188610	39	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 240	2014	12	3	Good	180,513	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	9/4/14	9/4/19
9919	1GB6G6819 E1188720	39	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 240	2014	12	3	Good	173,235	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	10/1/14	10/1/19
9920	1GB6G6817 E1188750	39	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 240	2014	12	3	Good	174,427	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	9/5/14	9/5/19
9921	1GB6G6817 E1188893	39	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 240	2014	12	3	Good	163,011	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	9/16/14	9/16/19
9922	1GB6G6818 E1188918	39	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 240	2014	12	3	Good	168,367	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	9/29/14	9/29/19
9923	1GB6G6818 E1188949	39	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 240	2014	12	3	Good	191,447	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	9/16/14	9/16/19
9924	1GB6G6812 E1188977	39	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 240	2014	12	3	Good	169,066	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	9/9/14	9/9/19
9925	1GB6G6810 E1189058	39	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 240	2014	12	3	Good	167,562	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	9/4/14	9/4/19
9926	1GB6G6815 E1189105	39	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 240	2014	12	3	Good	187,478	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	9/4/14	9/4/19
9927	1GB6G6815 E1189136	39	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 240	2014	12	3	Good	149,196	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	9/5/14	9/5/19
9930	1GB6G6818 F1220865	40	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 240	2015	12	3	Good	138,992	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	12/21/15	12/20/20
9931	1GB6G6818 F1222874	40	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 240	2015	12	3	Good	154,363	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	10/7/15	10/6/20
9932	1GB6G6818 F1223992	40	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 240	2015	12	3	Good	148,681	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	9/30/15	#VALUE!
9933	1GB6G6814 F1235766	40	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 240	2015	12	3	Good	146,657	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	10/19/15	10/18/20
9934	1GB6G6817 F1236622	40	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 240	2015	12	3	Good	144,927	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	10/16/15	10/15/20
9935	1GB6G6812 F1236074	40	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 240	2015	12	3	Good	143,114	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	10/19/15	10/18/20
9936	1GB6G6810 F1238082	40	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 240	2015	12	3	Good	136,329	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	10/19/15	10/18/20
9937	1GB6G6817 F1237740	40	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 240	2015	12	3	Good	159,369	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	10/22/15	10/21/20
9938	1GB6G6811 F1236597	40	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 240	2015	12	3	Good	151,454	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	10/19/15	10/18/20
9939	1GB6G6814 F1238649	40	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 240	2015	12	3	Good	143,270	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	10/13/15	10/12/20
9940	1GB6G6819 F1237593	40	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 240	2015	12	3	Good	133,986	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	11/6/15	11/5/20
9941	1GB6G681X F1236873	40	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 240	2015	12	3	Good	151,092	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	10/23/15	10/22/20
9942	1GB6G6810 F1239247	40	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 240	2015	12	3	Good	128,437	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	11/5/15	11/4/20
9943	1GB6G6812 F1235412	40	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 240	2015	12	3	Good	164,801	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	10/27/15	10/26/20
9944	1GB6G6810 F1238678	40	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 240	2015	12	3	Good	150,896	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	10/27/15	10/26/20
9945	1GB6G6818 F1234989	40	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 240	2015	12	3	Good	156,271	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	10/30/15	10/29/20
9946	1GB6G6813 F1237802	40	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 240	2015	12	3	Good	134,634	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	10/22/15	10/21/20

Asset Number	VIN	Fleet #	Asset Make	Asset Model	Year	Seats	Seats ADA	Last Condition	Asset Last Odometer Reading 6/16/20	Status	End of Usable Category	End of Usable Start Date	End of Usable Life End Date
9947	1GB6G6BL2 F1219422	40	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 240	2015	12	3	Good	149,235	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	10/27/15	10/26/20
9948	1GB6G6BL4 F1284403	40	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 240	2015	12	3	Good	132,251	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	11/13/15	11/12/20
9949	1GB6G6BL0 F1284138	40	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 240	2015	12	3	Good	128,882	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	11/23/15	11/22/20
9950	1GB6G6BL8 F1284386	40	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 240	2015	12	3	Good	127,937	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	11/13/15	11/12/20
9951	1GB6G6BL9 F1283988	40	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 240	2015	12	3	Good	110,102	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	11/17/15	11/16/20
9952	1GB6G6BL2 F1284531	40	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 240	2015	12	3	Good	124,324	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	11/19/15	11/18/20
9953	1GB6G6BL4 F1284689	40	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 240	2015	12	3	Good	106,908	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	11/6/15	11/5/20
9954	1GB6G6BL8 F1285148	40	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 240	2015	12	3	Good	135,015	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	11/17/15	11/16/20
9955	1GB6G6BL0 F1285094	40	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 240	2015	12	3	Good	135,364	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	11/5/15	11/4/20
9956	1GB6G6BL7 F1284444	40	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 240	2015	12	3	Good	131,897	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	11/19/15	11/18/20
9957	1GB6G6BLX F1284647	40	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 240	2015	12	3	Good	114,132	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	11/13/15	11/12/20
9958	1GB6G6BL9 F1286177	40	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 240	2015	12	3	Good	124,423	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	12/2/15	12/1/20
9959	1GB6G6BL7 F1285528	40	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 240	2015	12	3	Good	119,564	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	12/22/15	12/21/20
9960	1GB6G6BL5 F1285348	40	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 240	2015	12	3	Good	125,786	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	11/23/15	11/22/20
9961	1GB6G6BL3 F1286076	40	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 240	2015	12	3	Good	136,106	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	11/23/15	11/22/20
9962	1GB6G6BL7 F1284735	40	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 240	2015	12	3	Good	137,709	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	11/20/15	11/19/20
9963	1GB6G6BL1 F1286173	40	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 240	2015	12	3	Good	137,612	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	12/11/15	12/10/20
9964	1GB6G6BL9 F1285045	40	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 240	2015	12	3	Good	135,960	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	11/19/15	11/18/20
9965	1GB6G6BL9 F1285286	40	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 240	2015	12	3	Good	135,816	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	12/2/15	12/1/20
9966	1GB6G6BL1 F1285380	40	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 240	2015	12	3	Good	140,408	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	12/2/15	12/1/20
9967	1GB6G6BL3 F1284778	40	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 240	2015	12	3	Good	129,264	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	12/9/15	12/8/20
9968	1GB6G6BL8 F1285750	40	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 240	2015	12	3	Good	126,693	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	12/11/15	12/10/20
9969	1GB6G6BL4 F1286054	40	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 240	2015	12	3	Good	136,636	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	12/9/15	12/8/20
9970	1GB6G6BL4 F1284949	40	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 240	2015	12	3	Good	134,467	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	12/22/15	12/21/20
9971	1GB6G6BL7 F1285626	40	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 240	2015	12	3	Good	130,789	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	12/11/15	12/10/20
9972	1GB6G6BL3 F1285803	40	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 240	2015	12	3	Good	132,249	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	12/22/15	12/21/20
9973	1GB6G6BL0 F1285208	40	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 240	2015	12	3	Good	124,458	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	12/11/15	12/10/20
9974	1GB6G6BL7 F1285240	40	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 240	2015	12	3	Good	143,780	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	12/17/15	12/16/20
9975	1GB6G6BL9 F1284509	40	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 240	2015	12	3	Good	123,775	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	12/17/15	12/16/20
9976	1GB6G6BL8 F1285862	40	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 240	2015	12	3	Good	118,866	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	2/1/16	1/31/21
9977	1GB6G6BL6 F1285441	40	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 240	2015	12	3	Good	131,035	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	12/30/15	12/29/20
9978	1GB6G6BLX F1285359	40	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 240	2015	12	3	Good	116,219	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	12/31/15	12/30/20

Table E1: TriMet Vehicle Fleet													
Asset Number	VIN	Fleet #	Asset Make	Asset Model	Year	Seats	Seats ADA	Last Condition	Asset Last Odometer Reading 6/16/20	Status	End of Usable Category	End of Usable Start Date	End of Usable Life End Date
8701	1G86GVBL0G1335410	41	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2016	12	3	Good	95,244	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	12/5/16	12/5/21
8702	1G86GVBL5G1336004	41	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2016	12	3	Good	84,038	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	11/11/16	11/11/21
8703	1G86GVBL0G1335665	41	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2016	12	3	Good	92,620	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	11/1/16	11/1/21
8704	1G86GVBLXG1336810	41	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2016	12	3	Good	91,117	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	11/1/16	11/1/21
8705	1G86GVBL3G1336454	41	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2016	12	3	Good	99,945	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	10/15/16	10/15/21
8706	1G86GVBL4G1339380	41	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2016	12	3	Good	98,356	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	10/15/16	10/15/21
8707	1G86GVBL0G1336217	41	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2016	12	3	Good	102,960	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	11/4/16	11/4/21
8708	1G86GVBL9G1337382	41	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2016	12	3	Good	90,033	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	11/11/16	11/11/21
8709	1G86GVBL5G1337332	41	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2016	12	3	Good	100,695	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	11/18/16	11/18/21
8710	1G86GVBL8G1338572	41	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2016	12	3	Good	99,597	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	11/16/16	11/16/21
8711	1G86GVBL9G1336023	41	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2016	12	3	Good	98,408	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	11/16/16	11/16/21
8712	1G86GVBL2G1336221	41	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2016	12	3	Good	98,313	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	11/14/16	11/14/21
8713	1G86GVBL8G1339026	41	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2016	12	3	Good	83,075	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	11/17/16	11/17/21
8714	1G86GVBL0G1337755	41	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2016	12	3	Good	97,674	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	11/14/16	11/14/21
8715	1G86GVBL7G1335209	41	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2016	12	3	Good	103,955	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	11/4/16	11/4/21
8716	1G86GVBL2G1337143	41	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2016	12	3	Good	95,987	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	12/5/16	12/5/21
8717	1G86GVBL3G1336552	41	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2016	12	3	Good	110,554	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	12/5/16	12/5/21
8718	1G86GVBL7G1339826	41	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2016	12	3	Good	110,057	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	12/7/16	12/7/21
8719	1G86GVBL5G1338853	41	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2016	12	3	Good	109,707	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	12/5/16	12/5/21
8720	1G86GVBLXG1338282	41	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2016	12	3	Good	112,182	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	12/5/16	12/5/21
8721	1G86GVBL2G1339538	41	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2016	12	3	Good	124,823	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	12/13/16	12/13/21
8722	1G86GVBL9G1338080	41	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2016	12	3	Good	113,227	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	12/13/16	12/13/21
8723	1G86GVBLXG1337231	41	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2016	12	3	Good	110,997	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	12/13/16	12/13/21
8724	1G86GVBL3G1337233	41	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2016	12	3	Good	110,527	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	12/20/16	12/20/21
8725	1G86GVBL1G1339059	41	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2016	12	3	Good	110,344	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	12/20/16	12/20/21
8726	1G86GVBL1G1336307	41	Chevrolet	El Dorado Aerotech 220	2016	12	3	Good	110,202	Active	Category D Medium Size Light Duty Bus/ 5yrs/150,000 miles	12/10/16	12/10/21
8801	1FDA2CV8HKB43907	42	Ford	Transit 350	2017	3	1	Excellent	69,691	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	2/4/18	2/4/23
8802	1FDA2CVX HKB43908	42	Ford	Transit 350	2017	3	1	Excellent	66,399	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	2/4/18	2/4/23
8803	1FDA2CV1 HKB43909	42	Ford	Transit 350	2017	3	1	Excellent	66,398	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	2/4/18	2/4/23
8804	1FDA2CV8 HKB43910	42	Ford	Transit 350	2017	3	1	Excellent	63,808	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	3/2/18	3/2/23
8805	1FDA2CVX HKB43911	42	Ford	Transit 350	2017	3	1	Excellent	63,686	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	3/2/18	3/2/23
8806	1FDA2CV1 HKB43912	42	Ford	Transit 350	2017	3	1	Excellent	63,877	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	3/8/18	3/8/23

Table E1: TriMet Vehicle Fleet													
Asset Number	VIN	Fleet #	Asset Make	Asset Model	Year	Seats	Seats ADA	Last Condition	Asset Last Odometer Reading 6/16/20	Status	End of Usable Category	End of Usable Start Date	End of Usable Life End Date
8807	1FDAX2CV3 HKB43913	42	Ford	Transit 350	2017	3	1	Excellent	65,250	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	3/23/18	3/23/23
8808	1FDAX2CV5 HKB43914	42	Ford	Transit 350	2017	3	1	Excellent	69,018	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	3/27/18	3/27/23
8809	1FDAX2CV7 HKB43915	42	Ford	Transit 350	2017	3	1	Excellent	66,900	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	3/27/18	3/27/23
8810	1FDAX2CV9 HKB43916	42	Ford	Transit 350	2017	3	1	Excellent	68,546	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	3/28/18	3/28/23
8811	1FDAX2CV0 HKB43917	42	Ford	Transit 350	2017	3	1	Excellent	62,290	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	4/6/18	4/6/23
8812	1FDAX2CV2 HKB43918	42	Ford	Transit 350	2017	3	1	Excellent	66,457	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	3/8/18	3/8/23
8813	1FDAX2CV4 HKB43919	42	Ford	Transit 350	2017	3	1	Excellent	66,680	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	3/10/18	3/10/23
8814	1FDAX2CV0 HKB43920	42	Ford	Transit 350	2017	3	1	Excellent	62,915	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	3/20/18	3/20/23
8815	1FDAX2CV2 HKB43921	42	Ford	Transit 350	2017	3	1	Excellent	66,244	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	3/16/18	3/16/23
8930	1FDVU4XV 0JK811863	43	Ford	Transit 350XL	2018	5	1	Excellent	24,734	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	3/19/19	3/18/24
8931	1FDVU4XV 2JK811864	43	Ford	Transit 350XL	2018	5	1	Excellent	24,391	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	2/27/19	2/27/24
8932	1FDVU4XV 5JK826052	43	Ford	Transit 350XL	2018	5	1	Excellent	27,531	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	1/31/19	1/31/24
8933	1FDVU4XV 7JK826053	43	Ford	Transit 350XL	2018	5	1	Excellent	31,595	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	2/21/19	2/21/24
8934	1FDVU4XV 9JK826054	43	Ford	Transit 350XL	2018	5	1	Excellent	25,060	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	2/27/19	2/27/24
8935	1FDVU4XV 0JK826055	43	Ford	Transit 350XL	2018	5	1	Excellent	26,045	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	1/31/19	1/31/24
8936	1FDVU4XV 2JK826056	43	Ford	Transit 350XL	2018	5	1	Excellent	23,867	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	7/16/19	7/15/24
8937	1FDVU4XV 4JK826057	43	Ford	Transit 350XL	2018	5	1	Excellent	34,212	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	3/22/19	3/21/24
8938	1FDVU4XV 6JK826058	43	Ford	Transit 350XL	2018	5	1	Excellent	31,703	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	3/22/19	3/21/24
8939	1FDVU4XV 8JK826059	43	Ford	Transit 350XL	2018	5	1	Excellent	25,328	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	3/19/19	3/18/24
8940	1FDVU4XV 4JK826060	43	Ford	Transit 350XL	2018	5	1	Excellent	27,213	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	5/1/19	4/30/24
8941	1FDVU4XV 6JK826061	43	Ford	Transit 350XL	2018	5	1	Excellent	26,448	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	3/27/19	3/26/24
8942	1FDVU4XV 8JK826062	43	Ford	Transit 350XL	2018	5	1	Excellent	28,126	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	3/7/19	3/6/24
8943	1FDVU4XV 0JK826063	43	Ford	Transit 350XL	2018	5	1	Excellent	28,078	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	2/27/19	2/27/24
8944	1FDVU4XV 1JK826064	43	Ford	Transit 350XL	2018	5	1	Excellent	25,565	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	3/19/19	3/18/24
8945	1FDVU4XV 3JK826065	43	Ford	Transit 350XL	2018	5	1	Excellent	25,038	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	4/9/19	4/8/24
8946	1FDVU4XV 5JK826066	43	Ford	Transit 350XL	2018	5	1	Excellent	26,107	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	5/1/19	4/30/24
8947	1FDVU4XV 7JK826067	43	Ford	Transit 350XL	2018	5	1	Excellent	22,968	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	4/9/19	4/8/24
8948	1FDVU4XV 9JK826068	43	Ford	Transit 350XL	2018	5	1	Excellent	24,261	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	3/22/19	3/21/24
8949	1FDVU4XV 0JK826069	43	Ford	Transit 350XL	2018	5	1	Excellent	24,621	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	5/1/19	4/30/24
8950	1FDVU4XV 7JK826070	43	Ford	Transit 350XL	2018	5	1	Excellent	22,462	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	5/6/19	5/5/24
8951	1FDVU4XV 9JK826071	43	Ford	Transit 350XL	2018	5	1	Excellent	19,514	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	6/3/19	6/2/24
8952	1FDVU4XV 0JK826072	43	Ford	Transit 350XL	2018	5	1	Excellent	25,639	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	5/1/19	4/30/24

Table E1: TriMet Vehicle Fleet													
Asset Number	VIN	Fleet #	Asset Make	Asset Model	Year	Seats	Seats ADA	Last Condition	Asset Last Odometer Reading 6/16/20	Status	End of Usable Category	End of Usable Start Date	End of Usable Life End Date
8953	1FDVU4XV2K826073	43	Ford	Transit 350XL	2018	5	1	Excellent	24,791	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	5/9/19	5/8/24
8954	1FDVU4XV4K826074	43	Ford	Transit 350XL	2018	5	1	Excellent	22,890	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	5/1/19	4/30/24
8955	1FDVU4XV6K826075	43	Ford	Transit 350XL	2018	5	1	Excellent	22,756	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	5/9/19	5/8/24
8956	1FDVU4XV8K826076	43	Ford	Transit 350XL	2018	5	1	Excellent	19,110	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	6/3/19	6/2/24
8957	1FDVU4XVJK826077	43	Ford	Transit 350XL	2018	5	1	Excellent	18,613	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	7/16/19	7/15/24
8958	1FDVU4XV1K826078	43	Ford	Transit 350XL	2018	5	1	Excellent	18,553	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	7/16/19	7/15/24
8959	1FDVU4XV3K826079	43	Ford	Transit 350XL	2018	5	1	Excellent	21,233	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	5/1/19	4/30/24
8001	1FDVU4XV0K836408	44	Ford	Transit 350XL	2019	5	1	Excellent	6,282	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	1/16/20	1/15/25
8002	1FDVU4XV2K836409	44	Ford	Transit 350XL	2019	5	1	Excellent	6,246	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	1/16/20	1/15/25
8003	1FDVU4XV9K836410	44	Ford	Transit 350XL	2019	5	1	Excellent	6,070	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	1/16/20	1/15/25
8004	1FDVU4XV0K836411	44	Ford	Transit 350XL	2019	5	1	Excellent	8,629	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	1/21/20	1/20/25
8005	1FDVU4XV2K836412	44	Ford	Transit 350XL	2019	5	1	Excellent	6,236	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	1/30/20	1/29/25
8006	1FDVU4XV4K836413	44	Ford	Transit 350XL	2019	5	1	Excellent	6,074	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	1/30/20	1/29/25
8007	1FDVU4XV6K836414	44	Ford	Transit 350XL	2019	5	1	Excellent	6,273	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	2/7/20	2/6/25
8008	1FDVU4XV8K836415	44	Ford	Transit 350XL	2019	5	1	Excellent	5,286	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	2/12/20	2/11/25
8009	1FDVU4XVJK836416	44	Ford	Transit 350XL	2019	5	1	Excellent	8,301	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	2/12/20	2/11/25
8010	1FDVU4XV1K836417	44	Ford	Transit 350XL	2019	5	1	Excellent	437	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	2/13/20	2/12/25
8011	1FDVU4XV3K836418	44	Ford	Transit 350XL	2019	5	1	Excellent	2,684	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	2/25/20	2/24/25
8012	1FDVU4XV5K836419	44	Ford	Transit 350XL	2019	5	1	Excellent	2,384	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	3/2/20	3/2/25
8013	1FDVU4XV7K836420	44	Ford	Transit 350XL	2019	5	1	Excellent	3,982	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	2/26/20	2/25/25
8014	1FDVU4XV9K836421	44	Ford	Transit 350XL	2019	5	1	Excellent	1,533	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	3/6/20	3/6/25
8015	1FDVU4XVJK836422	44	Ford	Transit 350XL	2019	5	1	Excellent	502	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	3/11/20	3/11/25
8016	1FDVU4XV2K848587	44	Ford	Transit 350XL	2019	5	1	Excellent	992	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	3/30/20	3/30/25
8017	1FDVU4XV4K848588	44	Ford	Transit 350XL	2019	5	1	Excellent	1,645	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	3/20/20	3/20/25
8018	1FDVU4XV6K848589	44	Ford	Transit 350XL	2019	5	1	Excellent	1,581	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	3/20/20	3/20/25
8019	1FDVU4XV8K848590	44	Ford	Transit 350XL	2019	5	1	Excellent	1,732	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	3/11/20	3/11/25
8020	1FDVU4XVJK848591	44	Ford	Transit 350XL	2019	5	1	Excellent	1,465	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	3/13/20	3/13/25
8021	1FDVU4XV2K848592	44	Ford	Transit 350XL	2019	5	1	Excellent	1,561	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	4/7/20	4/7/25
8022	1FDVU4XV4K848593	44	Ford	Transit 350XL	2019	5	1	Excellent	898	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	4/7/20	4/7/25
8023	1FDVU4XV6K848594	44	Ford	Transit 350XL	2019	5	1	Excellent	3,992	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	2/10/20	2/9/25
8024	1FDVU4XV8K848595	44	Ford	Transit 350XL	2019	5	1	Excellent	978	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	3/25/20	3/25/25
8025	1FDVU4XVJK848596	44	Ford	Transit 350XL	2019	5	1	Excellent	753	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	3/26/20	3/26/25

Table E1: TriMet Vehicle Fleet													
Asset Number	VIN	Fleet #	Asset Make	Asset Model	Year	Seats	Seats ADA	Last Condition	Asset Last Odometer Reading 6/16/20	Status	End of Usable Category	End of Usable Start Date	End of Usable Life End Date
8026	1FDVU4XV1KK348597	44	Ford	Transit 350XL	2019	5	1	Excellent	1,047	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	5/7/20	5/7/25
8027	1FDVU4XV3KK348598	44	Ford	Transit 350XL	2019	5	1	Excellent	1,447	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	4/1/20	4/1/25
8028	1FDVU4XV5KK348599	44	Ford	Transit 350XL	2019	5	1	Excellent	4,900	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	4/6/20	4/6/25
8029	1FDVU4XV8KK348600	44	Ford	Transit 350XL	2019	5	1	Excellent	0	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles		
8030	1FDVU4XVXXX348601	44	Ford	Transit 350XL	2019	5	1	Excellent	5,160	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	4/14/20	4/14/25
8031	1FDVU4XV1KK348602	44	Ford	Transit 350XL	2019	5	1	Excellent	3,486	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	5/7/20	5/7/25
8032	1FDVU4XVXXX349084	44	Ford	Transit 350XL	2019	5	1	Excellent	3,198	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	5/7/20	5/7/25
8033	1FDVU4XV1KK349085	44	Ford	Transit 350XL	2019	5	1	Excellent	2,512	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	5/12/20	5/12/25
8034	1FDVU4XV3KK349086	44	Ford	Transit 350XL	2019	5	1	Excellent	758	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	6/4/20	6/4/25
8035	1FDVU4XV5KK349087	44	Ford	Transit 350XL	2019	5	1	Excellent	2,424	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	5/12/20	5/12/25
8036	1FDVU4XV7KK349088	44	Ford	Transit 350XL	2019	5	1	Excellent	352	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	5/29/20	5/29/25
8037	1FDVU4XV9KK349089	44	Ford	Transit 350XL	2019	5	1	Excellent	607	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	5/29/20	5/29/25
8038	1FDVU4XV5KK349090	44	Ford	Transit 350XL	2019	5	1	Excellent	2,322	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	5/12/20	5/12/25
8039	1FDVU4XV7KK349091	44	Ford	Transit 350XL	2019	5	1	Excellent	615	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	6/4/20	6/4/25
8040	1FDVU4XV9KK349092	44	Ford	Transit 350XL	2019	5	1	Excellent	280	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	6/4/20	6/4/25
8041	1FDVU4XV0KK349093	44	Ford	Transit 350XL	2019	5	1	Excellent	0	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles		
8042	1FDVU4XV2KK349094	44	Ford	Transit 350XL	2019	5	1	Excellent	530	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	5/29/20	5/29/25
8043	1FDVU4XV4KK349095	44	Ford	Transit 350XL	2019	5	1	Excellent	480	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	5/29/20	5/29/25
8044	1FDVU4XV6KK349096	44	Ford	Transit 350XL	2019	5	1	Excellent	0	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles		
8045	1FDVU4XV8KK349097	44	Ford	Transit 350XL	2019	5	1	Excellent	0	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles		
8046	1FDVU4XVXXX349098	44	Ford	Transit 350XL	2019	5	1	Excellent	0	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles	5/29/20	5/29/25
8047	1FDVU4XV1KK349099	44	Ford	Transit 350XL	2019	5	1	Excellent	42	Active	Category E Small, Light Duty Bus 4 yrs/100,000 miles		

<b>TABLE E2 SANDY AREA METRO VEHICLE INVENTORY</b>									
FLEE	YEAR	MAKE	VIN	PLATE #	BODY	ADA	CAPACIT	FUEL	SERVICE
1	2017	HOMETOWN TROLLEY	1FC4E4KS4GD C48358	E274121	TROLLEY	2	18	DSL	DEVIATED
2	2020	TROLLEY			TROLLEY	2	18	DSL	DEVIATED
15	2006	FORD ESCAPE	1FMCU96H86K B49381	E234848	HYBRID	0	4	UNL	N/A
20	2011	LF GILLIG	15GGB271XB1 178555	E254534	TRANSIT 35	2	28	DSL	FIXED
21	2013	FRTL - DEFENDER II	1FVACWDU2D HFD786	E259054	TRANSIT 35	2	26	DSL	DEVIATED
23	2020	MV1	57WMD2A67E M101486	E264803	MINI VAN	1	4	UNL	NEMT
25	2016	MV1	57WMD2C64G M100392	E264839	MINI VAN	1	4	UNL	NEMT
26	2017	LF GILLIG	15GGB2710H1 186916	E274102	TRANSIT 35	2	28	DSL	FIXED
27	2019	FORD 450 CHAMPION	1FDFE4FS1KD C39641	E283536	CUTAWAY	2	16	UNL	DAR
28	2019	FORD E450 CHAMPION	1FDFE4FS1KD C39642	E283537	CUTAWAY	2	16	UNL	DAR
30	2020	LF GILLIG	15GGB2718L31	E284452	TRANSIT 35	2	31	DSL	FIXED
31	2020	LF GILLIG	15GGB271XL3	E284451	TRANSIT 35	2	31	DSL	FIXED



<b>Table E3 South Metro Area Regional Transit (SMART) Fleet Inventory</b>								
<b>Unit#</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Make</b>	<b>Model</b>	<b>Fuel</b>	<b>VIN</b>	<b>Current mileage</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Eligible to replace</b>
2010	2010	Ford/Braun	E350	G	1FTSS3EL4ADA95339	157,335	Relief vehicle	10/22/2015
2405	2005	Eldorado	EZ Rider 30	D	1N9FLACL65CO84246	375,856	Active	N/A
2500	2000	Gillig	Phantom 35	D	15GCA1812Y1089833	485,858	Training	N/A
2600	2000	Gillig	Phantom 35	D	15GCA1816Y1089866	577,255	Active/Spare	N/A
3005	2005	Ford/Champion	Challenger 25	D	1FDXE45P85HA59900	331,015	Active/Spare	2/22/2012
3119	2019	Proterra	Catalyst E2	E	7JZTG11J4KL000026	18,207	Active	6/27/2031
3219	2019	Proterra	Catalyst E2	E	7JZTG11J6KL000027	11,739	Active	6/27/2031
3516	2016	Gillig	LF 35	D	15GGB2714G1185590	86,838	Active	11/18/2028
3616	2016	Gillig	LF 35	D	15GGB2714G1185591	79,162	Active	11/18/2028
3707	2007	Blue Bird	CSRE 40	D	1BDJNBKA67F255277	93,537	Active/Spare	12/31/2017
4113	2013	Gillig	LF 40	D	15GGD2714D1182078	192,347	Active	11/6/2025
4212	2012	Gillig	LF 40	D	15GGD2715C1180354	227,534	Active	10/16/2024
4314	2014	Gillig	LF 40	H	15GGD3016E1184514	207,779	Active	2/1/2027
4414	2014	Gillig	LF 40	H	15GGD3018E1184515	204,759	Active	2/1/2027
5104	2004	Ford/Eldorado	Aerotech 240	D	1FDXE45F13HB85164	326,290	Retired	1/21/2011
5210	2010	Ford/Eldorado	Aerotech 240	D	1FDFE4FP4ADA20975	273,351	Active/Spare	3/12/2017
5310	2010	Ford/Eldorado	Aerotech 240	D	1FDFE4FP6ADA20976	285,491	Retired	3/12/2017
5411	2011	Ford/Eldorado	Aerotech 240	C	1FDFE4FS68DB00462	177,802	Active	12/5/2018
5511	2011	Ford/Eldorado	Aerotech 240	C	1FDFE4FS88DB00463	217,559	Active	12/5/2018
5612	2012	Ford/Eldorado	Aerotech 240	G	1FDFE4FSXCDA82453	273,330	Active	7/9/2019
5713	2013	Ford/Eldorado	Aerotech 240	G	1FDFE4FS3DDDB16086	232,015	Active	9/20/2020
5813	2013	Ford/Eldorado	Aerotech 240	G	1FDFE4FS5DDDB16087	241,994	Active	9/20/2020
5913	2013	Ford/Eldorado	Aerotech 240	G	1FDFE4FS1DDDB16085	281,625	Active	9/20/2020
6013	2013	Ford/Eldorado	Aerotech 240	G	1FDFE4FS1DDDB19312	265,988	Active	9/20/2020
6116	2016	Ford/Eldorado	Aerotech 240	G	1FDFE4FS1GDC21875	178,352	Active	1/25/2023
6217	2017	Ford/Starcraft	Allstar 22	G	1FDFE4FS0HDC06785	77,666	Active	3/8/2022
6318	2018	Ford/Starcraft	Allstar 24	G	1FDFE4FSXJDC07688	22,074	Active	8/9/2023
6515	2015	Ford/Eldorado	Aerolite 200	C	1FDFE4FS3FDA15827	139,616	Active	6/20/2022
6615	2015	Ford/Eldorado	Aerolite 200	C	1FDFE4FS5FDA15828	104,998	Active	6/20/2022
6719	2019	Ford/Eldorado	Aerotech 240	C	1FDFE4FS6KDC25994	5,855	Active	2/10/2026
6819	2019	Ford/Eldorado	Aerotech 240	C	1FDFE4FSXKDC25996	4,690	Active	2/10/2026
6919	2019	Ford/Eldorado	Aerotech 240	C	1FDFE4FS8KDC25996	6,285	Active	2/10/2026
8110	2010	Dodge/Braun	Caravan	G	2D4RN4DE4AR120626	113,750	Relief vehicle	1/15/2014
8210	2010	Dodge/Braun	Caravan	G	2D4RN4DE4AR120625	77,983	Supervisor	1/15/2014
15048	2001	Classic	Trolley	D	4UZZAAUBV21C115048	51,042	Special events	3/20/2011

<b>TABLE E-4 Canby Area Transit (CAT) Vehicle Inventory</b>								
<b>VEHICLE</b>	<b>YEAR</b>	<b>MAKE</b>	<b>VIN #</b>	<b>LENGTH</b>	<b>FUE</b>	<b>BODY</b>	<b>CAPACITY</b>	<b>Mode Use</b>
Bus 17	2009	CHEV SENATOR	1GBE4V1999F4 07205	26 ( 312" )	DIESE L	CUT-AWAY	21 Ambulatory w/o w/c 16 Ambulatory/1 in w/c 14 Ambulatory/2 in w/c	Fixed Route
Bus 18	2010	CHEV	1GB9G5A68A11 21989	22 ( 264" )	DIESE L	CUT-AWAY	17 Ambulatory w/o w/c 4 w/c stations	DAR
Bus 19	2010	CHEV	1GB9G5A65A11 22100	22 ( 264" )	DIESE L	CUT-AWAY	17 Ambulatory w/o w/c 4 w/c stations	DAR
Bus 26	2011	ARBOC	1GB6G5BG6B11 86044	26 (312")	GAS	CUT-AWAY low-floor	20 Ambulatory w/o w/c 18 Ambulatory/1 in w/c 16 Ambulatory/2 in w/c	Fixed Route DAR Backup
BUS 27	2011	ARBOC	1GB6G5BG7B11 90622	26 (312")	GAS	CUT-AWAY low-floor	20 Ambulatory w/o w/c 18 Ambulatory/1 in w/c 16 Ambulatory/2 in w/c	Fixed Route DAR Backup
BUS 28	2013	GILLIG	15GGB2719D11 82065	35 ( 420" )	DIESE L	COACH low-floor	33 Ambulatory w/o w/c 30 Ambulatory w/1 in 27 Ambulatory w/2 in	Fixed Route
BUS 29	2013	GILLIG	15GGB2710D11 82066	35 ( 420" )	DIESE L	COACH low-floor	33 Ambulatory w/o w/c 30 Ambulatory w/1 in 27 Ambulatory w/2 in	Fixed Route
MV-30	2013	DODGE CARAVAN	2C4RDGCG8ER 187479	19' (228")	GAS	MINI-VAN	3 Ambulatory 1 Ambulatory/1 in w/c	DAR
Bus 31	2016	ARBOC	1GB6G5BG8F12 45245	23' (276")	GAS	CUT-AWAY low-floor	16 Ambulatory 12 ambulatory w/ 1 w/c 10 ambulatory w/ 2 w/c 6 ambulatory w/ 3 w/c 2 ambulatory w/ 4 w/c	DAR Fixed Backup
Bus 32	2016	ARBOC	1GB6G5BGXF12 45781	26' (312")	GAS	CUT-AWAY low-floor	20 Ambulatory w/o w/c 18 ambulatory w/1 w/c 12 ambulatory w/2 w/c	DAR Fixed Backup
Bus 33	2016	ARBOC	1GB6G5BG0F12 48530	26' (312")	GAS	CUT-AWAY low-floor	20 Ambulatory w/o w/c 18 ambulatory w/1 w/c 12 ambulatory w/2 w/c	DAR Fixed Backup
Bus 35	2018	ARBOC	1HA6GUBB1JN0 08040	28' (336")	GAS	CUT-AWAY low-floor	20 ambulatory w/o w/c 16 ambulatory w/ 1w/c 12 ambulatory w/2 w/c 8 ambulatory w/3 w/c	Fixed Route DAR Backup
Bus 36	2018	ARBOC	1HA6GUBB0JN0 08000	23' (276")	GAS	CUT-AWAY low-floor	16 ambulatory 12 ambulatory w/1 w/c 10 ambulatory w/2 w/c 6 ambulatory w/3 w/c 2 ambulatory w/4 w/c	DAR Fixed Backup
Bus 37	2018	ARBOC	1HA6GUBB6JN 008082	23' (276")	GAS	CUT-AWAY low-floor	16 ambulatory 12 ambulatory w/1 w/c 10 ambulatory w/2 w/c 6 ambulatory w/3 w/c 2 ambulatory w/4 w/c	DAR Fixed Backup

<b>TABLE E5 South Clackamas Transit District (SCTD) Fleet Inventory</b>													
<b>OPTIS</b>		<b>Asset</b>	<b>Asset</b>		<b># of</b>	<b>Seat</b>	<b>Last</b>	<b>Asset</b>		<b>EUL</b>	<b>Useful</b>	<b>EUL</b>	
<b>Asset #</b>	<b>VIN#</b>	<b>Make</b>	<b>Model</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Seat</b>	<b>ADA</b>	<b>Condition</b>	<b>Last</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Life</b>	<b>Date</b>	
								<b>Odomete</b>			<b>start</b>		
V00147 4	1GB6FG5B L3E11 67212	Chevrolet	Van	2014	16	2	Poor	294,413	Active	7 yrs/ 200,000 miles (medium, med- duty)	2014	6/9/2021	
V00164 9	1FDGF5GT XGEA 86002	Ford	Starcraft Allstar XL	2016	20	2	Adequate	181,585	Active	7 yrs/ 200,000 miles (medium, med- duty)	2016	3/7/2023	
V00178 6	5WEASC8 M7JH2 31694	International	Starcraft Allstar XL	2018	20	2	Adequate	187,740	Active	7 yrs/ 200,000 miles (medium, med- duty)	2018		
V00188 7	5WEASC8 M9JH2 31695	International	Starcraft Allstar XL	2018	20	2	Good	175,612	Active	7 yrs/ 200,000 miles (medium, med- duty)	2018	1/3/2025	
V00188 8	5WEASC8 M0JH2 31696	International	Starcraft Allstar XL	2018	20	2	Good	180,673	Active	7 yrs/ 200,000 miles (medium, med- duty)	2018	1/15/2025	
	5WEEZC8 P3LH1 02832	International	Starcraft Allstar XL	2020	20	2	Good	25,622	Active	7 yrs/ 200,000 miles (medium, med- duty)	2020	3/7/2023	

<b>TABLE E6 Ride Connection Fleet Inventory</b>									
Serial Number	Vehicle Category	Make	Model	Year	Odometer 05/31/2020	In Service Date	Seating Capacity	Condition Assessment	Date Purchased
2D4RN4DEXAR16 4517	Cat E 3: Modified Minivan	Dodge	Braun Entervan	2010	57,738	4/1/2010	Seats 05 - ADA 1	Adequate	4/1/2010
2D4RN4DE0AR16 5417	Cat E 3: Modified Minivan	Dodge	Braun Entervan	2010	104,090	4/1/2010	Seats 05 - ADA 1	Adequate	4/1/2010
2D4RN4DE4AR28 2501	Cat E 3: Modified Minivan	Dodge	Braun Entervan	2010	104,176	7/19/2010	Seats 05 - ADA 1	Marginal	7/19/2010
1FDFE455X9DA92 863	Cat D: Medium-Size, Light-Duty Bus & Van Chassis	Ford StarTrans	Senator	2010	84,292	8/1/2010	Seats 12 - ADA 2	Adequate	8/1/2010
1FDFE45519DA92 864	Cat D: Medium-Size, Light-Duty Bus & Van Chassis	Ford StarTrans	Senator	2010	81,326	7/19/2010	Seats 14 - ADA 2	Adequate	7/19/2010
2D4RN4DE7AR28 2492	Cat E 3: Modified Minivan	Dodge	Braun Entervan	2010	104,624	7/1/2010	Seats 05 - ADA 1	Adequate	7/1/2010
2D4RN4DE9AR28 2557	Cat E 3: Modified Minivan	Dodge	Braun Entervan	2010	103,883	7/1/2010	Seats 05 - ADA 1	Adequate	7/1/2010
2D4RN4DE4AR28 2515	Cat E 3: Modified Minivan	Dodge	Braun Entervan	2010	122,294	8/1/2010	Seats 05 - ADA 1	Marginal	8/1/2010
2D4RN4DE3AR28 8595	Cat E 3: Modified Minivan	Dodge	Braun Entervan	2010	59,105	9/24/2010	Seats 05 - ADA 1	Adequate	9/24/2010
1FDFE4F56ADA58 678	Cat D: Medium-Size, Light-Duty Bus & Van Chassis	Ford StarTrans	Senator	2010	96,948	9/24/2010	Seats 14 - ADA 2	Adequate	9/24/2010
1FDFE4F56ADA79 207	Cat D: Medium-Size, Light-Duty Bus & Van Chassis	Ford StarTrans	Senator	2010	103,866	10/1/2010	Seats 14 - ADA 2	Adequate	10/1/2010
1FDFE4F50BDA29 954	Cat D: Medium-Size, Light-Duty Bus & Van Chassis	Ford StarTrans	Senator	2011	83,799	7/1/2011	Seats 14 - ADA 2	Adequate	7/1/2011
1FDFE4F53BDA39 412	Cat D: Medium-Size, Light-Duty Bus & Van Chassis	Ford StarTrans	Senator	2011	108,864	7/1/2011	Seats 14 - ADA 2	Marginal	7/1/2011
1FDFE4F52BDA39 224	Cat D: Medium-Size, Light-Duty Bus & Van Chassis	Ford Champion	Challenger	2011	67,841	2/21/2011	Seats 13 - ADA 2	Adequate	2/21/2011
2C4RDG8G0CR22 5818	Cat E 3: Modified Minivan	Dodge	Braun Entervan	2012	174,301	5/8/2012	Seats 05 - ADA 1	Marginal	5/8/2012
2C4RDGCG7CR39 9268	Cat E 3: Modified Minivan	Dodge	Braun Entervan	2012	70,554	9/28/2012	Seats 05 - ADA 1	Adequate	9/27/2012
1FDFE4F56CDB38 243	Cat D: Medium-Size, Light-Duty Bus & Van Chassis	Ford Elkhart	EC II	2013	66,341	1/18/2013	Seats 14 - ADA 2	Adequate	1/18/2013
2C4RDG8G6CR39 8467	Cat E 3: Modified Minivan	Dodge	Braun Entervan	2012	99,100	1/18/2013	Seats 06 - ADA 2	Marginal	1/18/2013
2C4RDGCGXDR54 3669	Cat E 3: Modified Minivan	Dodge	Braun Entervan	2013	126,928	1/18/2013	Seats 07 - ADA 2	Adequate	1/18/2013
2C4RDG8G0CR39 8481	Cat E 3: Modified Minivan	Dodge	Braun Entervan	2012	96,540	1/18/2013	Seats 06 - ADA 2	Marginal	1/18/2013
1FDFE4F58DDA50 893	Cat D: Medium-Size, Light-Duty Bus & Van Chassis	Ford Elkhart	EC II	2013	53,962	6/30/2013	Seats 14 - ADA 2	Adequate	6/30/2013
1FDFE4F52DDA64 191	Cat D: Medium-Size, Light-Duty Bus & Van Chassis	Ford Elkhart	EC II	2013	80,556	6/30/2013	Seats 14 - ADA 2	Adequate	6/30/2013
1FDFE4F56DDA89 174	Cat D: Medium-Size, Light-Duty Bus & Van Chassis	Ford Elkhart	EC II	2013	135,177	6/30/2013	Seats 14 - ADA 2	Adequate	6/30/2013
1FDFE4F50DDA93 107	Cat D: Medium-Size, Light-Duty Bus & Van Chassis	Ford Elkhart	EC II	2013	85,900	6/30/2013	Seats 14 - ADA 2	Adequate	6/30/2013

TABLE E6 Ride Connection Fleet Inventory									
Serial Number	Vehicle Category	Make	Model	Model Year	Odometer 05/31/2020	In Service Date	Seating Capacity	Condition Assessment	Date Purchased
1FDEE4FL4EDA05701	Cat D: Medium-Size, Light-Duty Bus & Van Chassis	Ford Elkhart	EC II	2014	53,257	1/30/2014	Seats 14 - ADA 2	Adequate	1/30/2014
1FDEE3FL1EDA23762	Cat D: Medium-Size, Light-Duty Bus & Van Chassis	Ford Goshen	GC-II	2014	31,406	1/23/2014	Seats 10 - ADA 2	Good	1/23/2014
2C7WDGBG6ER380141	Cat E 3: Modified Minivan	Dodge	Braun Entervan	2014	60,508	8/21/2014	Seats 07 - ADA 2	Adequate	8/21/2014
2C7WDGBG8ER380139	Cat E 3: Modified Minivan	Dodge	Braun Entervan	2014	63,944	8/21/2014	Seats 07 - ADA 2	Adequate	8/21/2014
2C7WDGBG4ER380137	Cat E 3: Modified Minivan	Dodge	Braun Entervan	2014	50,359	8/21/2014	Seats 07 - ADA 2	Adequate	8/21/2014
2C7WDGBG6ER380091	Cat E 3: Modified Minivan	Dodge	Braun Entervan	2014	86,625	8/14/2014	Seats 05 - ADA 1	Adequate	8/14/2014
2C7WDGBG6ER380107	Cat E 3: Modified Minivan	Dodge	Braun Entervan	2014	52,515	8/21/2014	Seats 07 - ADA 2	Adequate	8/21/2014
2C7WDGBG1ER380080	Cat E 3: Modified Minivan	Dodge	Braun Entervan	2014	57,786	8/14/2014	Seats 05 - ADA 1	Adequate	8/14/2014
1FDFE4F57EDA04523	Cat D: Medium-Size, Light-Duty Bus & Van Chassis	Ford Champion	Challenger	2014	113,849	12/31/2014	Seats 14 - ADA 2	Adequate	12/31/2014
1FDFE4F54EDA04530	Cat D: Medium-Size, Light-Duty Bus & Van Chassis	Ford Champion	Challenger	2015	43,904	10/23/2014	Seats 14 - ADA 2	Adequate	10/23/2014
1FDFE4F59EDA04538	Cat D: Medium-Size, Light-Duty Bus & Van Chassis	Ford Champion	Challenger	2014	56,812	12/31/2014	Seats 14 - ADA 2	Adequate	12/31/2014
1FDFE4F50EDA04511	Cat D: Medium-Size, Light-Duty Bus & Van Chassis	Ford Champion	Challenger	2014	60,050	12/31/2014	Seats 14 - ADA 2	Adequate	12/31/2014
1FDFE4F52EDA04526	Cat D: Medium-Size, Light-Duty Bus & Van Chassis	Ford Champion	Challenger	2014	97,568	12/31/2014	Seats 14 - ADA 2	Adequate	12/31/2014
1FDFE4F5XEDA04533	Cat D: Medium-Size, Light-Duty Bus & Van Chassis	Ford Champion	Challenger	2014	63,661	12/31/2014	Seats 14 - ADA 2	Adequate	12/31/2014
1FDFE4F58EDA04496	Cat D: Medium-Size, Light-Duty Bus & Van Chassis	Ford Champion	Challenger	2014	101,456	12/31/2014	Seats 14 - ADA 2	Adequate	12/31/2014
1FDFE4F50EDA04525	Cat D: Medium-Size, Light-Duty Bus & Van Chassis	Ford Champion	Challenger	2014	30,825	12/31/2014	Seats 14 - ADA 2	Good	12/31/2014
1FDFE4F53EDA04535	Cat D: Medium-Size, Light-Duty Bus & Van Chassis	Ford Champion	Challenger	2015	63,843	10/23/2014	Seats 14 - ADA 2	Adequate	10/23/2014
1FDFE4F50EDA04492	Cat D: Medium-Size, Light-Duty Bus & Van Chassis	Ford Champion	Challenger	2014	59,829	12/31/2014	Seats 14 - ADA 2	Adequate	12/31/2014
1FDFE4F5XEDA04502	Cat D: Medium-Size, Light-Duty Bus & Van Chassis	Ford Champion	Challenger	2014	76,857	12/31/2014	Seats 14 - ADA 2	Adequate	12/31/2014
JT2BF22K6X0167189	Cat E 7: Sedan	Toyota	Camry	1999	172,308	11/7/2014	Seats 05 - ADA 0	Marginal	11/7/2014
KMHEC4A47DA084304	Cat E 7: Sedan	Hyundai	Sonata Hybrid	2013	67,406	1/30/2015	Seats 05 - ADA 0	Adequate	1/30/2015
KMHEC4A46DA089820	Cat E 7: Sedan	Hyundai	Sonata Hybrid	2013	96,460	1/30/2015	Seats 05 - ADA 0	Adequate	1/30/2015
KMHEC4A48DA089821	Cat E 7: Sedan	Hyundai	Sonata Hybrid	2013	74,143	1/30/2015	Seats 04 - ADA 0	Adequate	1/30/2015
1FDFE4F50FDA15851	Cat D: Medium-Size, Light-Duty Bus & Van Chassis	Ford Elkhart	EC II	2015	44,735	3/4/2015	Seats 20 - ADA 2	Good	3/4/2015

TABLE E6 Ride Connection Fleet Inventory									
Serial Number	Vehicle Category	Make	Model	Model Year	Odometer 05/31/2020	In Service Date	Seating Capacity	Condition Assessment	Date Purchased
1FDFF4F52FDA25488	Cat D: Medium-Size, Light-Duty Bus & Van Chassis	Ford Elkhart	EC II	2015	68,736	5/11/2015	Seats 12 - ADA 4	Good	5/11/2015
1FDFF4F54FDA25489	Cat D: Medium-Size, Light-Duty Bus & Van Chassis	Ford Elkhart	EC II	2015	57,495	5/11/2015	Seats 12 - ADA 4	Good	5/11/2015
1FDFF4F50FDA25490	Cat D: Medium-Size, Light-Duty Bus & Van Chassis	Ford Elkhart	EC II	2015	68,730	5/11/2015	Seats 12 - ADA 4	Adequate	5/11/2015
1FDFF4F52FDA25491	Cat D: Medium-Size, Light-Duty Bus & Van Chassis	Ford Elkhart	EC II	2015	68,972	5/11/2015	Seats 12 - ADA 4	Good	5/11/2015
1GB6G5B8XF1130596	Cat D: Medium-Size, Light-Duty Bus & Van Chassis	Chevrolet Glaval	Titan II	2015	103,655	6/19/2015	Seats 14 - ADA 2	Good	6/19/2015
2C7WDG8G8FR703509	Cat E 3: Modified Minivan	Dodge Eldorado	Amerivan	2015	45,920	6/26/2015	Seats 07 - ADA 2	Adequate	6/26/2015
1FDXE4550YHC01195	Cat D: Medium-Size, Light-Duty Bus & Van Chassis	Ford Eldorado	Aerotech 220	2001	217,493	10/19/2001	Seats 08 - ADA 3	Marginal	10/19/2001
1FDXE45531HA74142	Cat D: Medium-Size, Light-Duty Bus & Van Chassis	Ford Eldorado	Aerotech 240	2001	213,133	10/19/2001	Seats 12 - ADA 4	Marginal	10/19/2001
1FDXE4551YHB99098	Cat D: Medium-Size, Light-Duty Bus & Van Chassis	Ford Eldorado	Aerotech 220	2000	60,474	10/19/2001	Seats 14 - ADA 2	Adequate	10/19/2001
1FDXE4553YHB99099	Cat D: Medium-Size, Light-Duty Bus & Van Chassis	Ford Eldorado	Aerotech 220	2000	56,771	9/28/2001	Seats 14 - ADA 2	Marginal	9/28/2001
1FDXE4554YHB99158	Cat D: Medium-Size, Light-Duty Bus & Van Chassis	Ford Eldorado	Aerotech 220	2000	74,255	9/28/2001	Seats 14 - ADA 2	Marginal	9/28/2001
1FDXE45573HB28321	Cat D: Medium-Size, Light-Duty Bus & Van Chassis	Ford Eldorado	Aerotech 240	2003	191,738	7/24/2003	Seats 14 - ADA 4	Marginal	7/24/2003
1FDXE45534HB52357	Cat D: Medium-Size, Light-Duty Bus & Van Chassis	Ford Eldorado	Aerotech 220	2004	219,620	12/15/2004	Seats 14 - ADA 4	Marginal	12/15/2004
1FDXE45546HA53534	Cat D: Medium-Size, Light-Duty Bus & Van Chassis	Ford Eldorado	Aerotech 220	2006	154,897	10/14/2005	Seats 14 - ADA 2	Adequate	10/14/2005
1FDXE45547DB21176	Cat D: Medium-Size, Light-Duty Bus & Van Chassis	Ford Eldorado	Aerotech 220	2007	160,739	9/14/2007	Seats 14 - ADA 2	Marginal	9/14/2007
1FDXE45567DB21177	Cat D: Medium-Size, Light-Duty Bus & Van Chassis	Ford Eldorado	Aerotech 220	2007	115,914	9/14/2007	Seats 14 - ADA 2	Adequate	9/14/2007
1FDXE45527DB21175	Cat D: Medium-Size, Light-Duty Bus & Van Chassis	Ford Eldorado	Aerotech 220	2007	81,216	9/14/2007	Seats 14 - ADA 2	Adequate	9/14/2007
1FD4E45528DA59569	Cat D: Medium-Size, Light-Duty Bus & Van Chassis	Ford Eldorado	Aerotech 240	2008	130,670	3/1/2008	Seats 10 - ADA 4	Marginal	3/1/2008
1FDFF4F54ADA78976	Cat D: Medium-Size, Light-Duty Bus & Van Chassis	Ford Eldorado	Aerotech 220	2010	123,557	9/23/2010	Seats 14 - ADA 2	Adequate	9/23/2010
1FDFF4F5XADA78934	Cat D: Medium-Size, Light-Duty Bus & Van Chassis	Ford Eldorado	Aerotech 240	2010	124,097	8/1/2010	Seats 10 - ADA 4	Adequate	8/1/2010
1FDFF4F51ADA78935	Cat D: Medium-Size, Light-Duty Bus & Van Chassis	Ford Eldorado	Aerotech 240	2010	130,924	8/1/2010	Seats 10 - ADA 4	Adequate	8/1/2010

<b>TABLE E6 Ride Connection Fleet Inventory</b>									
<b>Serial Number</b>	<b>Vehicle Category</b>	<b>Make</b>	<b>Model</b>	<b>Model Year</b>	<b>Odometer 05/31/2020</b>	<b>In Service Date</b>	<b>Seating Capacity</b>	<b>Condition Assessment</b>	<b>Date Purchased</b>
1FDDE4F538DA63189	Cat D: Medium-Size, Light-Duty Bus & Van Chassis	Ford Eldorado	Aerotech 220	2011	76,152	6/1/2011	Seats 14 - ADA 2	Marginal	6/1/2011
1FDDE4F598DA80322	Cat D: Medium-Size, Light-Duty Bus & Van Chassis	Ford Eldorado	Aerotech 220	2011	132,075	9/1/2011	Seats 14 - ADA 2	Marginal	9/1/2011
1FDDE4F508DA63151	Cat D: Medium-Size, Light-Duty Bus & Van Chassis	Ford Eldorado	Aerotech 240	2011	134,047	6/1/2011	Seats 10 - ADA 4	Adequate	6/1/2011
1FDDE4F598DA63150	Cat D: Medium-Size, Light-Duty Bus & Van Chassis	Ford Eldorado	Aerotech 240	2011	117,265	6/1/2011	Seats 10 - ADA 4	Adequate	6/1/2011
1FDDE4F508DA80323	Cat D: Medium-Size, Light-Duty Bus & Van Chassis	Ford Eldorado	Aerotech 220	2011	56,363	9/1/2011	Seats 14 - ADA 2	Adequate	9/1/2011
1FDDE4F500DA07360	Cat D: Medium-Size, Light-Duty Bus & Van Chassis	Ford Champion	Challenger	2013	79,161	6/30/2013	Seats 10 - ADA 4	Adequate	6/30/2013
1FDDE4F540DA07362	Cat D: Medium-Size, Light-Duty Bus & Van Chassis	Ford Champion	Challenger	2013	83,872	6/30/2013	Seats 10 - ADA 4	Adequate	6/30/2013
1FDDE4F520DA07361	Cat D: Medium-Size, Light-Duty Bus & Van Chassis	Ford Champion	Challenger	2013	87,910	6/30/2013	Seats 10 - ADA 4	Adequate	6/30/2013
5NPE24AFXGH318280	Cat E 7: Sedan	Hyundai	Sonata SE	2016	19,644	4/11/2016	Seats 04 - ADA 0	Good	3/11/2016
2C7WDGBGXFR705617	Cat E 3: Modified Minivan	Dodge Eldorado	Amerivan	2015	58,460	7/26/2016	Seats 06 - ADA 2	Good	6/15/2016
2C7WDGBG1FR705618	Cat E 3: Modified Minivan	Dodge Eldorado	Amerivan	2015	37,339	9/23/2016	Seats 06 - ADA 2	Good	6/15/2016
2C7WDGBG3FR705619	Cat E 3: Modified Minivan	Dodge Eldorado	Amerivan	2015	51,374	9/12/2016	Seats 06 - ADA 2	Good	6/15/2016
2C7WDGBGXFR705620	Cat E 3: Modified Minivan	Dodge Eldorado	Amerivan	2015	45,209	7/26/2016	Seats 06 - ADA 2	Good	6/15/2016
2C7WDGBG1FR705621	Cat E 3: Modified Minivan	Dodge Eldorado	Amerivan	2015	47,352	9/12/2016	Seats 06 - ADA 2	Good	6/15/2016
2C7WDGBG2HR831117	Cat E 3: Modified Minivan	Dodge	Braun Entervan	2017	23,665	10/4/2017	Seats 05 - ADA 2	Good	9/22/2017
57WMD2C60GM100101	Cat E 3: Modified Minivan	Mobility Ventures LLC	MV - MV1	2016	17,787	11/1/2016	Seats 03 - ADA 2	Good	10/25/2016
2C7WDGBG8FR705616	Cat E 3: Modified Minivan	Dodge Eldorado	Amerivan	2015	12,964	6/15/2016	Seats 06 - ADA 2	Good	6/15/2016
1FDEE3F56HDC29364	Cat D: Medium-Size, Light-Duty Bus & Van Chassis	Ford Starcraft	Allstar	2017	24,702	3/9/2017	Seats 14 - ADA 2	Good	3/7/2017
1FDEE3F53HDC29354	Cat D: Medium-Size, Light-Duty Bus & Van Chassis	Ford Starcraft	Allstar	2017	31,736	4/21/2017	Seats 14 - ADA 2	Good	4/18/2017
1FDEE3F5XHDC30100	Cat D: Medium-Size, Light-Duty Bus & Van Chassis	Ford Starcraft	Allstar	2017	14,795	4/13/2017	Seats 14 - ADA 2	Good	3/7/2017
1FDEE3F55HDC29338	Cat D: Medium-Size, Light-Duty Bus & Van Chassis	Ford Starcraft	Allstar	2017	59,216	3/28/2017	Seats 14 - ADA 2	Good	3/7/2017
1FDEE3F59HDC29343	Cat D: Medium-Size, Light-Duty Bus & Van Chassis	Ford Starcraft	Allstar	2017	29,463	4/19/2017	Seats 14 - ADA 2	Good	3/7/2017
1FDEE3F52HDC23528	Cat D: Medium-Size, Light-Duty Bus & Van Chassis	Ford Starcraft	Allstar	2017	28,719	2/10/2017	Seats 14 - ADA 2	Good	1/10/2017

<b>TABLE E6 Ride Connection Fleet Inventory</b>									
<b>Serial Number</b>	<b>Vehicle Category</b>	<b>Make</b>	<b>Model</b>	<b>Model Year</b>	<b>Odometer 05/31/2020</b>	<b>In Service Date</b>	<b>Seating Capacity</b>	<b>Condition Assessment</b>	<b>Date Purchased</b>
1FDEE3F57HDC29342	Cat D: Medium-Size, Light-Duty Bus & Van Chassis	Ford Starcraft	Allstar	2017	20,197	3/23/2017	Seats 14 - ADA 2	Good	3/7/2017
1FDEE3F53HDC29337	Cat D: Medium-Size, Light-Duty Bus & Van Chassis	Ford Starcraft	Allstar	2017	32,774	4/19/2017	Seats 14 - ADA 2	Good	3/7/2017
1FDFE4F50HDC07466	Cat D: Medium-Size, Light-Duty Bus & Van Chassis	Ford Starcraft	Allstar	2017	33,063	3/8/2017	Seats 16 - ADA 2	Good	3/7/2017
1FDEE3F55HDC29372	Cat D: Medium-Size, Light-Duty Bus & Van Chassis	Ford Starcraft	Allstar	2017	36,947	4/6/2017	Seats 14 - ADA 2	Good	3/24/2017
1FDEE3F56HDC30062	Cat D: Medium-Size, Light-Duty Bus & Van Chassis	Ford Starcraft	Allstar	2017	53,212	4/19/2017	Seats 14 - ADA 2	Good	3/24/2017
1FDEE3F54HDC29346	Cat D: Medium-Size, Light-Duty Bus & Van Chassis	Ford Starcraft	Allstar	2017	95,530	4/19/2017	Seats 14 - ADA 2	Good	3/24/2017
1FDEE3F59HDC30170	Cat D: Medium-Size, Light-Duty Bus & Van Chassis	Ford Starcraft	Allstar	2017	40,800	4/3/2017	Seats 14 - ADA 2	Good	3/24/2017
1FDEE3F53HDC29340	Cat D: Medium-Size, Light-Duty Bus & Van Chassis	Ford Starcraft	Allstar	2017	96,810	4/19/2017	Seats 14 - ADA 2	Good	3/24/2017
1FDEE3F5X0HDC29335	Cat D: Medium-Size, Light-Duty Bus & Van Chassis	Ford Starcraft	Allstar	2017	78,691	4/19/2017	Seats 14 - ADA 2	Good	4/18/2017
1FDEE3F52HDC29359	Cat D: Medium-Size, Light-Duty Bus & Van Chassis	Ford Starcraft	Allstar	2017	39,403	4/20/2017	Seats 14 - ADA 2	Good	4/18/2017
1FDEE3F58HDC29365	Cat D: Medium-Size, Light-Duty Bus & Van Chassis	Ford Starcraft	Allstar	2017	28,900	4/19/2017	Seats 14 - ADA 2	Good	4/18/2017
1FDFE4F5JDC42830	Cat D: Medium-Size, Light-Duty Bus & Van Chassis	Ford Eldorado	Aerotech 240	2018	28,709	11/27/2018	Seats 10 - ADA 4	Excellent	11/6/2018
1FDFE4F5XDC42831	Cat D: Medium-Size, Light-Duty Bus & Van Chassis	Ford Eldorado	Aerotech 240	2018	17,409	11/21/2018	Seats 10 - ADA 4	Excellent	11/6/2018
1FDFE4F5JDC42832	Cat D: Medium-Size, Light-Duty Bus & Van Chassis	Ford Eldorado	Aerotech 240	2018	21,182	11/21/2018	Seats 10 - ADA 4	Excellent	11/6/2018
2C7WDGBG4HR831118	Cat E 3: Modified Minivan	Dodge	Braun Entervan	2017	25,475	9/26/2017	Seats 05 - ADA 2	Good	9/22/2017
2C7WDGBGXHR838817	Cat E 3: Modified Minivan	Dodge	Braun Entervan	2017	33,881	11/8/2017	Seats 05 - ADA 2	Good	11/7/2017
2C7WDGBG1HR838818	Cat E 3: Modified Minivan	Dodge	Braun Entervan	2017	27,869	12/1/2017	Seats 05 - ADA 2	Good	11/7/2017
2C7WDGBG9HR831115	Cat E 3: Modified Minivan	Dodge	Braun Entervan	2017	31,612	10/2/2017	Seats 05 - ADA 2	Good	9/22/2017
2C7WDGBG0HR831116	Cat E 3: Modified Minivan	Dodge	Braun Entervan	2017	28,857	10/15/2017	Seats 05 - ADA 2	Good	9/22/2017
1FDFE4F5JDC42833	Cat D: Medium-Size, Light-Duty Bus & Van Chassis	Ford Eldorado	Aerotech 240	2018	34,644	11/15/2018	Seats 10 - ADA 4	Excellent	11/6/2018
2C7WDGBG1KR521399	Cat E 3: Modified Minivan	Dodge Eldorado	Amerivan	2019	10,603	4/30/2019	Seats 05 - ADA 2	Excellent	4/4/2019
2C7WDGBG4KR521400	Cat E 3: Modified Minivan	Dodge Eldorado	Amerivan	2019	12,309	4/16/2019	Seats 05 - ADA 2	Excellent	4/4/2019
2C7WDGBG6KR521401	Cat E 3: Modified Minivan	Dodge Eldorado	Amerivan	2019	12,953	4/16/2019	Seats 05 - ADA 2	Excellent	4/4/2019



<b>TABLE E6 Ride Connection Fleet Inventory</b>									
<b>Serial Number</b>	<b>Vehicle Category</b>	<b>Make</b>	<b>Model</b>	<b>Model Year</b>	<b>Odometer 05/31/2020</b>	<b>In Service Date</b>	<b>Seating Capacity</b>	<b>Condition Assessment</b>	<b>Date Purchased</b>
2C7WDGBG8KR521402	Cat E 3: Modified Minivan	Dodge ElDorado	Amerivan	2019	8,370	4/29/2019	Seats 05 - ADA 2	Excellent	4/4/2019
2C7WDGBG8KR521403	Cat E 3: Modified Minivan	Dodge ElDorado	Amerivan	2019	6,557	4/24/2019	Seats 05 - ADA 2	Excellent	4/4/2019
2C7WDGBG1KR521404	Cat E 3: Modified Minivan	Dodge ElDorado	Amerivan	2019	18,764	4/30/2019	Seats 05 - ADA 2	Excellent	4/4/2019
1FDFE4F54KDC43717	Cat D: Medium-Size, Light-Duty Bus & Van Chassis	Ford ElDorado	Aerotech 220	2019	17,184	10/15/2019	Seats 14 - ADA 2	Excellent	8/28/2019

**TABLE E7 Clackamas County Fleet Inventory**

MHX VEHICLES												
County Unit #	License	VIN	Sandy Unit #	Make	Model	Type	Year	Mileage	Condition	EUL Category	EUL Start Date	EUL End Date
	E265795	1FDFE4F55GD C11446	929	FORD	STARCRAFT	Category D	2016	193,511	Poor	5 yrs / 150,000	2016	2021
	E248081	1FDFE45559D A42243	902	FORD	SENATOR	Category D	2009	303,506	Marginal	5 yrs / 150,000	2009	2014
168919	E258888	1FVACWDT4G HHL5392	919	FREIGHTLINER	DEFENDER	Category B	2016	250,092	Marginal	10 yrs / 350,000	2016	2026
158925	E262290	1FVACWDT2F HGG3294	925	FREIGHTLINER	DEFENDER	Category B	2015	354,586	Poor	10 yrs / 350,000	2015	2025
158926	E262292	1FVACWDT0F HGG3293	926	FREIGHTLINER	DEFENDER	Category B	2015	344,037	Marginal	10 yrs / 350,000	2015	2025
208962	E281532	4UZADRFC0LC LX1608	964	FREIGHTLINER	DEFENDER	Category B	2020	16,450	Good	10 yrs / 350,000	2020	2030
208963	E281531	4UZADRFC2LC LX1609	962	FREIGHTLINER	DEFENDER	Category B	2020	20,413	Good	10 yrs / 350,000	2020	2030
208964	E281533	4UZADRFC9LC LX1610	963	FREIGHTLINER	DEFENDER	Category B	2020	19,720	Good	10 yrs / 350,000	2020	2030

TRP VEHICLES												
County Unit #	License	VIN	TRP Vehicle #	Make	Model	Type	Year	Mileage	Condition	EUL Category	EUL Start Date	EUL End Date
148916	E262267	1FDFE4F53ED A26731	2	FORD	AEROTECH	Category D	2014	137,853	Poor	5 yrs / 150,000	2014	2019
108910	E251205	1FDFE45599D A90652	1	FORD	AEROTECH	Category D	2010	178,093	Poor	5 yrs / 150,000	2010	2015

## Attachment F Ride Connection Partner Network

## RIDE CONNECTION PARTNER NETWORK

### **Clackamas County**

The **Clackamas County Transportation Consortium**: Clackamas County Social Services Division serves as the lead organization in partnership with community-based Senior/Community centers around the County. One service offered through this partnership is door to door transportation for seniors and persons with disabilities. The centers contract with Clackamas County to provide a host of services funded by the Older Americans Act, STF and other State and local resources. Some of the supportive services provided by the Centers are nutrition (congregate and home delivered meals), health and wellness activities (fitness/fall prevention classes and health screenings), case management, information & assistance, and reassurance.

Rides for the purpose of coming to the community center for exercise, nutrition, supportive services, or to partake in the center's monthly/bimonthly grocery shopping trip are scheduled as group rides on the mini bus. Rides to medical appointments, and/or personal business or shopping that is not part of a monthly/bimonthly group trips, are scheduled with volunteer drivers operating their own vehicles. TRP dispatch staff schedule rides primarily for medical and life-sustaining medical purposes as well as limited use shopping, personal business and nutrition (trips to local food banks).

This network includes:

- Canby Adult Center
- Friends of Estacada Community Center
- Gladstone Senior Center
- Hoodland Senior Center
- Lake Oswego Adult Community Center
- Milwaukie Center
- Molalla Adult Community Center
- Pioneer Community Center (Oregon City)
- Sandy Senior and Community Center
- Transportation Reaching People (TRP)

The City of West Linn though their community center provides limited recreational rides outside of the Consortium services.

## **Multnomah County**

**Asian Health and Services Center** offers culturally-specific transportation to Asian and Asian-American seniors in Multnomah County. This includes rides to their clinic and center in SE Portland for medical appointments, meals, and other activities.

**David's Harp** offers transportation to adults with severe and persistent mental illness. The program provides a shuttle to and from Gateway MAX for the day. Vans are also used to support member integration in the community. This component allows members to discover and access social, educational and health related resources that assist in their psychiatric stabilization.

**Ride Connection East County U-Ride**-This service provides local area door to door transportation services to seniors and people with disabilities, a daily shuttle to meal sites, and group trips to shopping destinations. East County U-ride also serves the rural areas of East County including Corbett.

**Ride Connection Mid-County U-Ride**- Door to door service for seniors and people with disabilities in areas west of 82<sup>nd</sup> Ave and east of 162<sup>nd</sup> Ave. Mid-County provides daily shuttles to meal sites, community centers and shopping destinations.

**Ride Connection Northwest Portland**- Door to door services for seniors and people with disabilities residing in areas of Downtown and Northwest Portland. Ride Connection also operates the Downtown Rideabout, a weekly shopping shuttle that transports people from downtown Portland to shopping destinations.

**Ride Connection Veterans Transportation**- A service in which veteran volunteers transport veterans in Multnomah and Washington Counties.

**Project Linkage** is a program of **Metropolitan Family Service** that has several parts to it. Transportation is the largest part of the program. They also provide have a Community Visitor Program and a Minor Home Repair Program. The transportation program is a door through door service that serves older adults and people with disabilities. Project Linkage operates 21 shopping shuttles during the week from different parts of North, Northeast Portland and Mid-county to take people to grocery stores and food banks. They also collaborate with the service center at Ride Connection to take people to medical appointments, dialysis, cancer treatments and any other requests that clients might have.

**Neighborhood House** provides door-to-door transportation to adults 60 and over and adults with disabilities residing in SW Portland. Trips are provided by paid and volunteer drivers in fleet vehicles and volunteers' personal vehicles. Services include pre-scheduled shopping shuttles in SW and downtown Portland, and recreational group trips for the Neighborhood House Senior Center.

**Impact NW** provides escorted door-through-door transportation services to seniors over the age of 60 and adults of any age with disabilities residing in SE Portland or accessing services at the Multi-cultural Senior Center on SE Belmont. Impact NW has vehicles that are lift equipped for individuals who have wheelchairs or scooters.

**Providence Elderplace** is a Program of All Inclusive Care for the Elderly. Along with coordinated care solutions, we provide transportation for program participants from home, to and from medical appointments, the social center and ElderPlace coordinated events and outings. We also collaborate with area programs to provide trips for shopping, nutrition, and recreational opportunities. The

**Urban League** provides door to door services to seniors living in the North/Northeast communities. The service includes but is not limited to, Medical appointments, Medication pickups/Personal Business/Supportive services/Shopping/Recreation/Daily visits to meal sites for nutritional needs.

## **Washington County**

### **Edwards Center (client-based services only)**

### **LifeWorks Northwest\Michael's Place (client-based services only)**

**Ride Connection Community Connectors-** Ride Connection operates four deviated fixed-route shuttles that are open to the general public. These include (1) Grovelink, providing transportation within the City of Forest Grove; (2) North Hillsboro Link, an employment shuttle serving employment areas in Hillsboro north and south of US 26; (3) Tualatin Shuttle, an employment shuttle serving Tualatin east and west of I-5; and (4) Westlink, which connects Forest Grove and Hillsboro to the rural communities of North Plains and Banks.

**Ride Connection Veterans Transportation-** A service in which veteran volunteers transport veterans in Multnomah and Washington Counties.

**Ride Connection Washington County General Public-** Door to door service for all Washington county residents residing in areas outside the TriMet service district

and within the city limits of Banks, North Plains, and Gaston. Riders are transported to destinations in Forest Grove, Cornelius or Hillsboro where they can access public transportation.

**Ride Connection Washington County U-Ride-** Door to door service for seniors and people with disabilities serving the urban areas of Washington County.

**Providence Elderplace** is a Program of All Inclusive Care for the Elderly. Along with coordinated care solutions, we provide transportation for program participants from home, to and from medical appointments, the social center and ElderPlace coordinated events and outings. Providence Elderplace also collaborates with area programs to provide trips for shopping, nutrition, and recreational opportunities.





## Attachment G Performance Measures and Reporting

## Attachment G: Performance Measures and reporting

Performance measures have a variety of different uses. The funding applications that the STFAC evaluates include a variety of performance measures related to the projects and programs seeking funding. The STFAC also receives monthly reports that include data and performance measures from each of the transit providers within the tri-County area. The STFAC desires to update the monthly reports to provide data that is:

- more directly related to the performance measures reported in the funding applications;
- provides information that helps the STFAC understand how well they are serving seniors and persons with disabilities, how many people they are serving, and what progress is being made on implementing the CTP; and,
- aides the STFAC in their decision making; and,
- is succinct and not overly burdensome on the providers to prepare.

The types of performance measures that may be useful to the STFAC include measures that do the following:

- Assess compliance with federal regulations such as the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)
- Evaluating the merits of funding applications with the TDP Guiding Principles
- Evaluate the performance of providers
- Evaluate the performance of a specific program or project funded by the STFAC
- Identify unmet needs per the TDP Service Guidelines
- Identify program or project benefits to customers and the community
- Identify how many additional people are being served or helped by a program funded by the STFAC
- Document customer satisfaction

Characteristics of effective performance measurement that should be considered when selecting performance measures include:

- Stakeholder acceptance
- Linkage to goals

- Clarity
- Reliability and credibility
- Variety of measures
- Number of measures
- Level of detail
- Flexibility
- Realism of goals and targets
- Timeliness
- Integration into agency decision-making

The following provides a list of performance measures relevant to paratransit, dial-a-ride, and small fixed route systems which may be applicable to the types of programs and projects that the STFAC evaluates. The CTP Guiding Principles that the measure could help evaluate are identified.

It is recommended that the smallest number of measures that address priority policy issues be used. Too many measures tend to obscure the most important needs and can hinder effective management.

Additional information on each of these measures can be found in the Transit Cooperative Research Program (TCRP) Report 88: A Guidebook for Developing a Transit Performance-Measurement System.

[http://onlinepubs.trb.org/onlinepubs/tcrp/tcrp\\_report\\_88/Guidebook.pdf](http://onlinepubs.trb.org/onlinepubs/tcrp/tcrp_report_88/Guidebook.pdf)

**Table 1 Potential Performance Measures**

	Relationship to CTP Priorities							
	How many people are being served?	What or how much area is being served?	Is capacity adequate?	Is the service accessible?	Are the vehicles adequate or in good repair?	How cost-effective is the service?	Is the distribution of service equitable?	How is the rider experience?
Revenue hours	x		x					
Stop accessibility	x			x				x
Passengers per mile	x					x		
Passengers per hour	x					x		
Passenger trips per employee	x					x		
Percentage of no-shows	x						x	x
Service Hours	x							x
Total annual ridership	x							
Passenger miles traveled	x							
Trips per vehicle	x							
No shows and late cancelations	x							
Service coverage area		x						
Hours of service		x						
Capital resource utilization Peak-to-Base Ratio			x			x		
Demand to Capacity Ratio			x			x		
Percentage of missed phone calls			x					x
Percentage of calls held excessively long			x					x
Response time			x					x
Passenger capacity			x					
Service denials			x					
Percentage of stops with shelters and benches				x				x
Equipment reliability				x				x
Maintenance work orders per bus model vs. total fleet				x				
Fleet composition					x	x		x
Miles between safety incidents					x			x
Average age of fleet					x			x

	Relationship to CTP Priorities							
	How many people are being served?	What or how much area is being served?	Is capacity adequate?	Is the service accessible?	Are the vehicles adequate or in good repair?	How cost-effective is the service?	Is the distribution of service equitable?	How is the rider experience?
Van miles per trouble call					X			X
Injuries per 100,000 passenger boardings					X			X
Equipment reliability					X			X
Road calls					X			X
Preventative maintenance inspections completed					X			
Percentage of vehicles placed into service					X			
Mean vehicle age					X			
Subsidy per passenger						X	X	
Cost per vehicle hour						X		
Cost per vehicle mile						X		
Cost per trip						X		
Operating expense						X		
Service Equity							X	
Local Index of Transit Availability							X	
Passenger Complaints								X
Passenger commendations								X
Vehicle accidents								X
Late trips								X
On-time Performance (demand-responsive)								X
Customer satisfaction								X



## Attachment H Demographic Data

**Table H1. Tri-County Population Profile**

	2010 Population	2018 Population	2040 Population Forecast	Annual Population Growth	Land Area (sq mi)	Population Density (pers / sq mi)
<b>Clackamas County</b>	<b>375,992</b>	<b>405,788</b>	<b>541,943</b>	<b>0.96%</b>	<b>1864.01</b>	<b>218</b>
Barlow	135	119		-1.56%	0.05	2,380
Canby	15,829	17,527		1.28%	4.37	4,011
Damascus	10,539	12,024		1.66%	15.23	789
Estacada	2,695	3,270		2.45%	2.22	1,473
Gladstone	11,497	12,045		0.58%	2.37	5,082
Happy Valley	13,903	19,471		4.30%	9.42	2,067
Johnson City	566	500		-1.54%	0.06	8,333
Lake Oswego	36,619	38,705		0.69%	10.76	3,597
Milwaukie	20,291	20,955		0.40%	4.93	4,251
Molalla	8,108	9,082		1.43%	2.31	3,932
Oregon City	31,859	36,040		1.55%	9.64	3,739
Rivergrove	289	509		7.33%	0.18	2,828
Sandy	9,570	10,834		1.56%	3.35	3,234
Tualatin	26,054	27,338		0.60%	8.11	3,371
West Linn	25,109	26,511		0.68%	7.53	3,521
Wilsonville	19,509	23,418		2.31%	7.29	3,212
<i>Unincorporated</i>	<i>143,555</i>	<i>147,440</i>		<i>0.33%</i>	<i>1776.23</i>	<i>83</i>
<b>Multnomah County</b>	<b>735,334</b>	<b>798,647</b>	<b>980,567</b>	<b>1.04%</b>	<b>433.58</b>	<b>1,842</b>
Fairview	8,920	9,303		0.53%	3.15	2,953
Gresham	105,594	110,770		0.60%	23.41	4,732
Maywood Park	752	998		3.60%	0.17	5,871
Portland	583,776	639,387		1.14%	134.36	4,759
Troutdale	15,962	16,559		0.46%	5.92	2,797
Wood Village	3,878	4,036		0.50%	0.95	4,248
<i>Unincorporated</i>	<i>16,452</i>	<i>17,594</i>		<i>0.84%</i>	<i>265.6</i>	<i>66</i>
<b>Washington County</b>	<b>529,710</b>	<b>581,821</b>	<b>810,303</b>	<b>1.18%</b>	<b>723.24</b>	<b>804</b>
Banks	1,777	1,811		0.24%	0.67	2,703
Beaverton	89,803	97,012		0.97%	19.6	4,950
Cornelius	11,869	12,575		0.72%	2.02	6,225
Durham	1,351	1,724		3.09%	0.41	4,205
Forest Grove	21,083	23,923		1.59%	5.86	4,082
Gaston	637	546		-1.91%	0.34	1,606
Hillsboro	91,611	104,730		1.69%	24.64	4,250
King City	3,111	3,807		2.56%	0.7	5,439
North Plains	1,947	2,427		2.79%	0.91	2,667
Sherwood	18,194	19,337		0.76%	4.33	4,466
Tigard	48,035	52,368		1.09%	12.68	4,130
<i>Unincorporated</i>	<i>240,292</i>	<i>261,561</i>		<i>1.07%</i>	<i>651.07</i>	<i>402</i>

Source: 2010 Population, US Census Table P1; 2018 Population, American Community Survey Table B01003; 2040 Population Forecast, Portland State University (2019).



**Table H2. Largest Employment Nodes**

Primary Employer / Site	County	City	Jobs
Oregon Health & Science University	Multnomah	Portland	19,439
Nike, Inc. – Main Campus	Washington	Unincorporated	8,462
Providence Health and Services – Headquarters	Multnomah	Portland	7,993
Intel Corporation – Main Campus	Washington	Hillsboro	7,691
Portland State University	Multnomah	Portland	6,331
Intel Corporation – Jones Farm Campus	Washington	Hillsboro	5,608
Kaiser Permanente – Sunnyside Medical Center	Clackamas	Unincorporated	5,205
Portland International Airport	Multnomah	Portland	5,007
Washington Square	Washington	Tigard	4,921
Lloyd Center	Multnomah	Portland	4,610
Providence St. Vincent Medical Center	Washington	Unincorporated	4,572
Commercial Zone – I-5 / OR 217 Jct. Northwest	Washington	Tigard	4,522
Providence Portland Medical Center	Multnomah	Portland	3,938
Shipyards Commerce Center – Swan Island	Multnomah	Portland	3,273
Boeing Company	Multnomah	Gresham	3,151
Legacy Emmanuel Medical Center	Multnomah	Portland	3,022
US Bankcorp Tower	Multnomah	Portland	2,987
Portland Community College – Sylvania	Multnomah	Portland	2,828
Murray Business Center / Providence Health	Washington	Beaverton	2,775
Clackamas Town Center	Clackamas	Unincorporated	2,691
Kaiser Permanente – 500 Multnomah Street	Multnomah	Portland	2,312
Commercial Zone – OR 217 / OR 99W Jct. South	Washington	Tigard	2,232
Commercial Zone – Sandy Boulevard / NE 181 <sup>st</sup> Avenue Southwest	Multnomah	Gresham	2,231
Industrial Zone – OR 99W / SW 124 <sup>th</sup> Avenue Southwest	Washington	Tualatin	2,223
Commercial Zone – OR 217 / SW Hall Boulevard Southwest	Washington	Beaverton	2,149
World Trade Center – Portland	Multnomah	Portland	2,134
Commercial Zone - Centerpointe Drive	Clackamas	Lake Oswego	2,133
Clackamas County Administration	Clackamas	Oregon City	2,054
Adventist Medical Center	Multnomah	Portland	2,045
Commercial Zone - Merlo Road	Washington	Beaverton	2,025
Moda Tower	Multnomah	Portland	2,000

Source: Longitudinal Employment &amp; Housing Dynamic - 2014.

**Table H3. Income, Employment, and English Proficiency**

	Median Income	Mean Travel Time to Work (minutes)	Unemployment Rate	Non-English Speaking Population
<b>Clackamas County</b>	<b>\$80,691</b>	26.2	<b>4.7%</b>	<b>4.1%</b>
Barlow	\$50,000	36.9	5.0%	11.8%
Canby	\$70,638	24.9	2.6%	8.8%
Damascus	\$87,808	30.5	4.4%	4.0%
Estacada	\$65,320	32.2	1.0%	0.3%
Gladstone	\$64,983	23.9	4.5%	3.6%
Happy Valley	\$119,135	27.6	1.9%	7.7%
Johnson City	\$56,964	22.6	2.2%	1.5%
Lake Oswego	\$111,141	21.2	2.0%	3.0%
Milwaukie	\$72,887	24.4	3.0%	1.7%
Molalla	\$56,875	33.4	3.1%	6.4%
Oregon City	\$72,210	27.8	3.3%	2.9%
Rivergrove	\$93,958	23.2	3.1%	4.7%
Sandy	\$62,321	29.3	2.0%	2.9%
Tualatin	\$95,405	20.7	3.3%	5.9%
West Linn	\$99,738	24.9	2.8%	3.1%
Wilsonville	\$77,260	24.0	2.6%	3.8%
<i>Unincorporated</i>		27.6		
<b>Multnomah County</b>	<b>\$73,426</b>	24.8	<b>5.6%</b>	<b>8.4%</b>
Fairview	\$78,235	25.8	2.2%	5.5%
Gresham	\$56,326	28.2	4.4%	11.2%
Maywood Park	\$90,417	25.6	3.3%	1.2%
Portland	\$77,111	23.7	3.8%	8.1%
Troutdale	\$65,938	27.0	4.7%	6.2%
Wood Village	\$57,031	23.4	1.5%	29.9%
<i>Unincorporated</i>		44.3		
<b>Washington County</b>	<b>\$82,110</b>	24.6	<b>5.0%</b>	<b>9.1%</b>
Banks	\$80,000	23.4	2.6%	0.4%
Beaverton	\$76,674	23.0	3.8%	11.2%
Cornelius	\$47,450	24.1	3.4%	21.0%
Durham	\$96,328	22.0	3.1%	6.4%
Forest Grove	\$48,365	24.6	4.7%	8.0%
Gaston	\$78,250	33.4	2.1%	1.3%
Hillsboro	\$79,725	22.4	3.6%	11.1%
King City	\$61,513	21.3	1.3%	2.8%
North Plains	\$79,643	23.6	1.8%	2.3%
Sherwood	\$98,646	25.9	2.1%	3.0%
Tigard	\$85,223	22.8	3.5%	7.2%
<i>Unincorporated</i>		25.8		

Source: Median Income, American Community Survey Table S1903 (2014-2018 5 Year Estimate); Mean Travel Time to Work, American Community Survey Table B08135 (2014-2018 5 Year Estimate); Unemployment Rate, American Community Survey Table DP03 (2014-2018 5 Year Estimate); Non-English Speaking Population, American Community Survey Table DP02 (2014-2018 5 Year Estimate).

**Table H4. Population of Seniors and Persons with Disabilities**

	2010 Population	65 and Over Population	% Over 65	Population with Disabilities	% with Disabilities
<b>Clackamas County</b>	<b>375,992</b>	<b>51,231</b>	<b>13.6%</b>	<b>47,447</b>	<b>11.7%</b>
Barlow	135	17	12.6%	9	7.6%
Canby	15,829	2,247	14.2%	2,318	13.3%
Damascus	10,539	1,406	13.3%	1,451	12.1%
Estacada	2,695	347	12.9%	383	11.7%
Gladstone	11,497	1,581	13.8%	1,772	14.8%
Happy Valley	13,903	1,138	8.2%	1,380	7.1%
Johnson City	566	105	18.6%	99	20.0%
Lake Oswego	36,619	5,918	16.2%	3,036	7.9%
Milwaukie	20,291	2,767	13.6%	2,741	13.1%
Molalla	8,108	797	9.8%	972	10.8%
Oregon City	31,859	3,555	11.2%	4,467	12.6%
Rivergrove	289	53	18.3%	58	11.4%
Sandy	9,570	977	10.2%	1,452	13.4%
Tualatin	26,054	1,819	7.0%	2,466	9.0%
West Linn	25,109	2,785	11.1%	2,381	9.0%
Wilsonville	19,509	2,597	13.3%	1,937	8.8%
<i>Unincorporated</i>	<i>143,555</i>	<i>23,139</i>	<i>16.1%</i>	<i>20,525</i>	
<b>Multnomah County</b>	<b>735,334</b>	<b>77,423</b>	<b>10.5%</b>	<b>101,426</b>	<b>12.8%</b>
Fairview	8,920	890	10.0%	1,582	17.0%
Gresham	105,594	11,321	10.7%	16,273	14.8%
Maywood Park	752	118	15.7%	125	12.5%
Portland	583,776	60,789	10.4%	78,880	12.4%
Troutdale	15,962	1,215	7.6%	1,906	11.5%
Wood Village	3,878	291	7.5%	452	11.2%
<i>Unincorporated</i>	<i>16,452</i>	<i>2,799</i>	<i>17.0%</i>	<i>2,208</i>	
<b>Washington County</b>	<b>529,710</b>	<b>53,109</b>	<b>10.0%</b>	<b>57,740</b>	<b>10.0%</b>
Banks	1,777	70	3.9%	148	8.2%
Beaverton	89,803	9,374	10.4%	10381	10.8%
Cornelius	11,869	744	6.3%	1289	10.3%
Durham	1,351	139	10.3%	143	8.3%
Forest Grove	21,083	2,599	12.3%	3179	13.4%
Gaston	637	38	6.0%	108	19.8%
Hillsboro	91,611	7,155	7.8%	9930	9.6%
King City	3,111	1,494	48.0%	776	20.8%
North Plains	1,947	180	9.2%	258	10.8%
Sherwood	18,194	1,240	6.8%	1189	6.1%
Tigard	48,035	5,413	11.3%	5759	11.0%
<i>Unincorporated</i>	<i>240,292</i>	<i>24,663</i>	<i>10.3%</i>	<i>24,580</i>	

Source: Population Over 65, US Census Table DP-1(2010); Population with Disabilities, American Community Survey Table DP03 (2014-2018 5 Year Estimate).



# Attachment I      Summary of Stakeholder Workshop

## TriMet Coordinated Transportation Plan for Elderly and People with Disabilities

### March 4<sup>th</sup> 2016 Stakeholder Worksession Summary

Thank you for your engagement in the Needs Assessment worksession for TriMet's Coordinated Transportation Plan for Elderly and People with Disabilities (CTP). Your participation in the small group discussions and in sharing your comments helped make the Special Transportation Fund Advisory Committee (STFAC) worksession a great success. Together, we discussed the transportation needs, challenges and gaps for seniors and people with physical and/or cognitive disabilities. We identified the geographic, regulatory and structural barriers to addressing these needs, and shared ideas and strategies. The following provides some highlights from the worksession conversations and comments. A complete inventory of comments will be included in an appendix to the updated Plan.

**Over 50 people provided feedback, either through the worksession or online. Among you were seniors, persons with physical and/or cognitive disabilities and users of the transportation system, representing sixteen social service agencies and eight transit service providers across the tri-county area that include:**

- Albertina Kerr
- Canby Area Transit (CAT)
- Cascadia Behavioral Health
- Centerstone
- City of Forest Grove
- Clackamas Community College
- Clackamas County Disability Services Advisory Council (DSAC)
- Clackamas County Social Services
- Clackamas County Transportation Consortium
- Committee on Accessible Transportation
- Community Partners for Affordable Housing
- Community Vision
- Edwards Senior Center, Inc.
- Hollywood Senior Center
- Lifeworks NW
- Metro
- Multnomah Aging, Disability and Veterans Services Division (ADVS)
- National Alliance on Mental Illness, Clackamas County
- Ride Connection
- Sandy Area Metro (SAM)
- South Metro Area Regional Transit (SMART)
- Special Transportation Funds Advisory Committee (STFAC)
- TriMet
- Vocational Rehabilitation
- Washington County Disability, Aging and Veteran Services (DAVS)
- Western Psychological

## Key Themes

### General Trends

- Shifting demographics and displacement.** Rapid growth and rising housing costs have shifted the region's aging and transit-dependent populations to outlying areas that are not well served by fixed-route service, and consequently not well served by paratransit.
- Infrastructure improvements near key destinations.** Paved roads, complete sidewalks and curb cuts greatly affects an individual's ability to access public transportation when they have a disability. While basic infrastructure still lacks in more rural areas, improvements should focus around destinations that accommodate a higher traffic of individuals with physical and/or cognitive disabilities, such as senior centers and medical offices. For example, corridors such as the Tualatin Valley Highway and facilities such as the Edwards Senior Center lack sidewalks to connect its users to the transportation system.
- Funding gaps.** Overall, participants agreed that there is a desire to see more funding from predictable sources for transportation services that meet the needs of seniors and people with physical and/or cognitive disabilities.

*"As good as our system is, it is far from perfect. Many seniors and people with disabilities live in areas where land and housing is available. This puts them in areas where fixed route may be available, but not necessarily accessible. Last mile service, evening and weekend service, local service are all lacking in these outlying areas."*

### Customer Service and Environment

- Driver training for people with cognitive and/or mental health challenges.** Participants expressed a need for more comprehensive driver training in order to better serve individuals with cognitive or mental health challenges. In addition, providing support personnel or audio/visual distraction for riders may help improve driver safety.
- First-mile and last-mile trips.** Transportation access is often limited by an inability to reach a fixed or deviated-route transit stop due to distance or terrain. Participants noted that strategies should focus on public-private partnerships to help an individual complete the first or last mile of their trip. Otherwise, the effectiveness of system improvements may be compromised.



- **Circulator transit service.** Transit users and providers alike emphasized that local transit routes can help individuals better access services within their own community. Whereas most major transportation corridors link outlying areas to downtown Portland, more circulator service can alleviate the demand for community-based transit providers such as Ride Connection to access local destinations. Participants mentioned GroveLink as an example of a successful, small-scale circulator service for the Forest Grove community.
- **Transit stop amenities and design.** Improving transit stops with shelters, benches, lighting, curbs/curb-cuts and designated pedestrian crossings improve safety and accessibility. Participants suggested that poorly designed or nonexistent facilities may be what prevents an individual from using fixed-route services instead of LIFT services.

*“Infrastructure provides safety, comfort and dignity.”*

### **Coordination and Organization**

- **Coordination of transportation service with medical facilities.** Participants expressed the need for better coordination between transportation services, hospitals and medical clinics in order to ensure patients arrive to their appointments on time and are well supported when discharged.
- **Information dissemination.** While several discussion groups agreed that there is a wealth of transportation services provided through various agencies, organizations and communities, the information lacks centralization. Suggestions for improving access to information included clearinghouse of all available services by type of need (similar to 211 Info), “transportation ambassadors” for social service organizations and a standardized menu of services and contact information on all transit fleets.
- **Plan implementation through a governing body.** Participants called for reinstating a governing body, like the former Regional Transportation Coordinating Council, to better support the implementation of the CTP’s strategies and initiatives.

### **Technology**

- **Real time information and location services.** Several discussion groups supported the use of mobile apps and web platforms to request and track rides, plan trips and pay for fares. Of note, some rural areas lack adequate cellular service.
- **Human service in the age of technology.** While there was strong support for greater technological capabilities for transit service providers, several participants expressed concern that the digital divide could further isolate individuals who are unable or uncomfortable using technology. They emphasized that human personnel services, whether manual payment of bus fare or a person-to-person phone call, is crucial.



- **Integration of public-private transportation services.** Participants expressed interest in transportation network companies (TNC) such as Uber and Lyft to help address first-mile/last-mile issues, as well as the use of TNC software for seamless integration between different services and trip legs.

### *Ideas and Strategies*

- **Provide greater mental health training for drivers and support staff.** For example, transit drivers in Eugene, OR know to call CAHOOTS, a mobile crisis intervention team, in case additional support is needed for individuals with cognitive and/or mental health challenges.
- **Utilize and update existing ridesharing platforms.** Drive Less Connect, an online ridesharing platform operated by ODOT and promoted by Metro, could be upgraded and expanded to help connect rides among individuals who have accessibility challenges.
- **Explore partnerships with Uber and Lyft.** Public-private partnerships can expand the number of transportation providers, encourage software integration and improve customer experience through first-mile/last-mile transportation. This is currently being done in Kansas City, Kansas and Dallas, Texas



*"I have faith in the providers in our region. I have never questioned their commitment, dedication, or ability to dig deep and find ways to do what they can to find ways to provide more and/or better options for our seniors and people with disabilities."*



#### **FOR MORE INFORMATION:**

If you have questions or ideas about TriMet's next steps to support accessible transportation through the 2016 CTP Update, please don't hesitate to contact TriMet CTP project manager, Hannah R. Quinsey at [RitchieH@TriMet.org](mailto:RitchieH@TriMet.org) or 503-962-4912.



Attachment J      Peer Review on Strategies

## Peer Review On Strategies

*The draft text below reflects strategies identified through a review of peer agency Coordinated Plans, literature from the Transit Cooperative Research Program (TCRP), and stakeholder input from the STFAC worksession on March 4, 2016. The next step is to gather further input from the STFAC at the March 18, 2016 meeting.*

*The information on strategies is organized along three main tracks developed through stakeholder input on unmet needs and cover provider and social service agency coordination, strategies to improve customer service, opportunities to increase the use of technology to meet the transportation needs of seniors and people with disabilities, and a set of categorized strategies for funding.*

### **Coordination Strategies**

- Institutional strategies
  - Agency-wide governance strategy.
  - Regional coordination council, which could include committees that focus on specific aspects of coordination (service delivery, maintenance, technology issues).
  - Hire a regional mobility manager.
  - Continue to hold coordination meetings with seniors, people with disabilities, and people in poverty and associated representatives.
  - Consideration of a “no one size fits all” philosophy that aims to provide tailored approaches to coordination of transportation service for different groups of people.
  - Region- or system-wide shared paratransit eligibility
  - Review legal and insurance barriers to shared transportation.
  - Manage risk.
- Operational strategies
  - Creation of a “concept of operations” document describing the options and needs of seniors and people with disabilities.
  - Vehicle/cost-sharing agreement between providers.

- Centralized demand-response dispatching with on-line options (text, web, mobile).
- Centralized transportation brokerage to integrate various transportation resources
- Development of seamless transportation technology to allow for easier cross-system use.
- Performance/mobility strategies
  - Performance measurement
  - Cost/benefit analyses
  - Track success, promote and market, and duplicate successful projects from within and from outside of the region.
  - Explore public-private partnerships
  - Continued to promote and market public transit usage
  - Continued to promote regional accessibility and livability

### **Customer Service and Environment Strategies**

- Increase driver sensitivity training for all types of drivers (volunteer, fixed route, paratransit)
- Reduce transfer times.
- Reduce total trip times.
- Increase the availability of real-time information across multiple platforms (this is also a technology strategy).
- Increase availability of travel training programs.
- Determine which infrastructure improvements (e.g. bus stops improvement, completing sidewalk gaps, ADA upgrades) would have the ability to increase customer experience the most.
- Provide same day paratransit service.
- Adapted and assign vehicles to meet the needs of target rider groups.
- Create and/or enhance a centralized customer care center (Salt Lake City has a particularly good example) or something similar to the Veterans Transportation Community Living Initiative.

- Provide additional service to “lifestyle” activities such as recreational sites (e.g. movie theaters, hiking, cultural activities).

## Technology Strategies

- Develop software for a regional one-click/one-call center to connect seniors, people with disabilities, and those in poverty to mobility options. Software would allow for connections to related systems throughout the service area (or regionally). An integrated software package could include the following specific applications:
  - Rideshare matching software
  - On-line scheduling/dispatching systems (Salt Lake City has a good example)
  - Develop database of users in multiple agency directories – opportunity to build on and expand functionality of the current regional 211 database.
- Electronic fare systems incorporating technologies such as e-fare cards, multiple fare products, multiple point-of-sale locations/systems, and centralized data collection for system-wide analyses.
- Incorporate end-user training on technology products into travel training efforts.
- Use of open-source software and database tools
- Mobile application development including:
  - Bridj, which provide data that can be used to increase efficiency in demand-response transportation. See: <http://www.metro-magazine.com/bus/news/710635/bridj-kcata-ford-partner-for-urban-mobility-pilot-project>
  - Tiramisu: Bus location app (Pittsburgh)
  - Let’s Go: transit information via phone (Pittsburgh)
  - Dynamic scheduling app (Pittsburgh)
- Systems integration with Uber/Lyft services for first- and last-mile service enhancements that improve mobility: See:
  - <http://www.thetransitwire.com/2016/02/24/psta-teams-with-uber-and-taxi-company-to-improve-mobility/>

- [www.thetransitwire.com/2016/01/13/lyft-tests-senior-transportation-service/](http://www.thetransitwire.com/2016/01/13/lyft-tests-senior-transportation-service/)

## **Funding**

- Review of existing programs and identify all recipients of monies from 5310, STF, and other programs.
- Create a schematic map of funding sources and identify funding sources by jurisdictions at the federal, state, and local levels. (Denver)
- For each strategy included in the final CTP, identify what unmet need(s) it would address, what potential projects would be completed, and what would be the potential funding source.
- Include map or link to a list of fiscally-constrained transit improvement projects.
- Funding application processes
  - Review Pittsburgh application selection process (plan begins on page 56 of the document).
  - Project selection criteria could include: ability to meet coordination needs, project benefits, level of innovation, opportunities to increase organizational capabilities, and budget.
  - Allow scoring methodology to assign different weights to each category.
- Focus on financial sustainability and program efficiency such as: reduce costs, selecting cost-effective strategies, technology solutions that would reduce costs, and opportunities to coordinate the maintenance of vehicles, equipment, and other resources
- Pooled funding for specific programs
- Provide free/reduced cost transit passes, taxi vouchers, and create affordable fare programs.
- Advocacy white paper for legislators/statewide advocacy effort to increase funding sources.

## Relevant Research

### TCRP 101 – Toolkit for Rural Community Coordinated Transportation Services

*Westat, Nelson Development, Ltd., and Nelson\Nygaard Consulting Associates, Inc. Transportation Research Board, Washington, D.C., 2004.*

This report summarizes strategies and lessons learned about the successful provision of coordinated transportation services in rural areas. It also provides information about basic concepts, it identifies the entities that may be involved in the provision of coordinated transportation services, and it describes the benefits of coordinated transportation services. Identified challenges to coordination include actual or perceived regulatory barriers, actual or perceived agency mission incompatibilities, challenges of accountability and reporting, inability to provide the local match for federal funding, and lack of knowledge about how coordination works.

Chapter 3 of the report discusses establishing a new coordinated transportation service program. Chapter 4 contains answers to "frequently asked questions" about coordination. Chapter 5 describes strategies for improving existing coordinated services. These strategies include the following:

- Finding and using new funding sources and sources not currently utilized
- Decreasing direct costs
- Improving productivity and utilization
- Taking advantage of economies of scale
- Providing service where service currently does not exist
- Taking advantage of opportunities created by multiple providers and modes
- Providing trips on fixed routes where possible
- Providing ADA services via private nonprofits instead of public transit agencies, to take advantage of the lower cost structures of the former
- Using volunteer drivers and/or volunteer staff
- Providing incentives to paratransit users to use fixed-route transit
- Consolidating the services provided by individual human service agencies



- Implementing a coordinated dispatching system

The report identifies strategies to avoid as well. These include duplicating dispatch and administrative functions, duplicating services, and serving only one type of client or trip.

Identified factors for success include the following:

- Effective stakeholder leadership and participation (in depth and from the outset)
- Clear identification of stakeholder needs and concerns
- Sound planning (with goals, objectives, a strategic plan, an operational plan, an implementation plan, and commitments)
- Sound technical support (including reporting, sharing of technical resources, and use of information technologies)
- Demonstrated benefits
- Modified services and financial participation arrangements

Chapter 6 suggests approaches to addressing specific coordinated transportation issues. Chapter 7 contains examples of and model processes for state-level involvement in coordinated transportation. Chapter 8 describes lessons learned from case studies of successful coordinated transportation services.

#### TCRP 105 – Strategies to Increase Coordination of Transportation Services for the Transportation Disadvantaged

*TranSystems Corporation, Center for Urban Transportation Research, Institute for Transportation Research and Education, and Planners Collaborative. Transportation Research Board, Washington, D.C., 2004.*

This report summarizes the development of strategies for improving coordinated transportation services that support travel by the transportation-disadvantaged. The report includes an inventory of funding sources, service types/models, and planning and decision-making processes; case studies; technology discussion; and analysis. The case studies were intended to support the identification of successful and innovated coordinated transportation strategies.

Indicators of success identified in the report include the following:

- Building a coalition that comprises transportation providers and other stakeholders (e.g., businesses and institutions)
- Developing strong leadership at the state and local levels (including champions among elected officials)
- Leveraging federal programs and requirements to build infrastructure
- Taking advantage of state programs that support coordination
- Getting all stakeholders involved in the transportation planning process
- Evaluating the program
- Exploring non-traditional funding sources
- Coordinating at the regional level
- Using technology to provide information, coordinate operations, and improve customer service
- Being flexible with respect to changes in funding and changes in regulations
- Building trust among stakeholders (e.g., by involving all of them from the beginning and by tailoring service to meet each stakeholder's needs)
- Partnering with agencies that are amenable to changing the status quo
- Using a phased approach to program implementation
- Investing time upfront to develop resources, support, a framework, and clear goals and objectives
- Developing commitment to coordinated transportation at all levels of the stakeholder organizations
- Focusing on improvements that will benefit many people rather than few people
- Testing concepts before broader implementation
- Developing and using high-quality cost information
- Recognizing that benefits might not appear immediately

## Peer agency review

The review of peer agencies similar to TriMet included the following transit agencies. A link to each agency's most recent version of their Coordinated Transportation follows the name of the city.

**Atlanta, Georgia:** [http://documents.atlantaregional.com/tcc/HST/2012-2013\\_HST\\_Plan\\_Limited\\_Update\\_FINAL.pdf](http://documents.atlantaregional.com/tcc/HST/2012-2013_HST_Plan_Limited_Update_FINAL.pdf)

**Baltimore, Maryland:** <http://www.baltometro.org/reports/2010-Human-Services-Transportation-Plan-final.pdf>

**Charlotte, North Carolina:**  
<http://charmeck.org/city/charlotte/cats/bus/ridingcats/documents/coordinated%20hs%20transportation%20plan%20rev%201.pdf>

**Salt Lake City, Utah:** <http://wasatchmobilityplan.weebly.com/>

**Las Vegas, Nevada:** <http://www.rtcnv.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/06/Coordinated-Transportation-Plan-FINAL-031215.pdf>

**Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minnesota:**  
<http://metro council.org/Transportation/Publications-And-Resources/Public-Transit-and-Human-Services-Transportation-C.aspx>

**Seattle, Washington:** <http://www.psrc.org/assets/11596/CoordinatedPlan2015-2018.pdf>

**Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania:**  
<http://www.spcregion.org/pdf/atwichs/FullFinalHSReport.pdf>

**Denver, Colorado:** <https://drcog.org/sites/drcog/files/resources/C1-DRAFT%20Transit%20Coord%20Plan-TAC%20Jan%202016.pdf>

**Tampa Bay, Florida:** [http://www.planhillsborough.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/Regional-Mobility-Needs-Chapter\\_2.27.14.pdf](http://www.planhillsborough.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/Regional-Mobility-Needs-Chapter_2.27.14.pdf)

**Long Island, New York:**  
[http://nymtc.org/files/RTP\\_PLAN\\_2040\\_docs/Public%20Review%20Drafts/Appen dix6.pdf](http://nymtc.org/files/RTP_PLAN_2040_docs/Public%20Review%20Drafts/Appen dix6.pdf)



## Attachment K      Summary of STFAC Workshop on Priorities and Strategies

**STFAC Meeting 5: WORKSHOP SUMMARY (RAW NOTES)**  
*Table Facilitator Notes, Comment Form Responses, Flipchart Notes*

March 18, 2016

---

**Draft Guiding Principles and Priorities**

**1. New categories:**

**a. Funding**

- i. Include language regarding cost, funding, money spent outside STF Funds, etc...
- ii. Equitable funding (funding per capita?)
- iii. Include “Consider cost-effectiveness with needed level of service in mind, in making funding decisions” in all guiding principles
- iv. Budget tracking and expenses
- v. Reallocate poorly utilized service to new service
- vi. Overview of providers prior to actual funding process
- vii. Make new initiatives clearer
- viii. Add needing additional funding

**b. Partnerships, collaboration**

- i. Add evaluation of collaboration.
- ii. Collaborate with schools and school buses.

**c. Customer focus**

- i. Identify the population that is being served (seniors, people with disabilities, low income, etc.)
  - (a) *Improvements should be based on increasing accessibility for NOT ridership*
  - (b) *Should relate to user*
- ii. Focus on under-served communities
- iii. Introduce all applicants to an overview of providers

**d. Sustainability**

**e. Accessibility**

- i. Expand service
- ii. Level of service
- iii. Ride quality
- f. Land use and siting (geography and design)**
- g. New innovations – Localized solutions**
- h. Equity and reliability**
- i. Evaluation of performance/efficiency measurement**

**2. To include in each category:**

**a. Cost effectiveness**

- i. Consider cost-effectiveness for each principle not on its own.

**b. Capital**

**3. Prioritization:**

**a. Do not prioritize 2016 CTP Guiding Principles. They should be simply listed.**

**b. If prioritized, they should be ranked on:**

i. Cost Effectiveness

*(a) Include multi-year cost*

*(b) Consider future cost*

ii. Service: preserve and expand services

iii. Review each funding cycle (multi-year cost estimates)

*(a) Discussion of priorities needs to happen at each funding cycle (to address lower tier applications). Funding of cycle should be prioritized in order for each funding cycle to be equitable. Need to reserve some money for lowest priority.*

iv. Need – what needs to be funded and why

**Funding Application Categories**

**1. Missing categories:**

**a. Collaboration and partnerships**

**b. Capital expenditures**

i. Vehicle replacement and maintenance

ii. Facilities and stop improvements

## 2. Improvements needed:

- a. Clarify new initiatives
  - i. I.e. does improving service quality refers to infrastructure or vehicles?
- b. The first question in application should be whether the baseline service is mentioned. Maintain existing service/baseline services.
- c. Match application categories with guiding principles and priorities more clearly
- d. Multiple application types
- e. Ask about number of customer, cost per mile cost effectiveness

## 3. Information that would be useful for project evaluation:

- a. **Breakdown of full project costs** - Need cost breakdown for requests and provider budgets.
  - i. STF money
  - ii. Budget
  - iii. Operational funding
  - iv. Number of FTE
  - v. Shortfall funding (?)
  - vi. Data operating worksheets are helpful.
  - vii. Breakout how much of service serves E&D.
- b. **Discuss priorities at each funding cycle** – shift money accordingly
  - i. Project solicitation – meet before to establish priority.
- c. **Improvements to service** (partnerships, extended service area, etc.)
  - i. Breakout service level for seniors vs. young people with disabilities
  - ii. Use data operating worksheets to evaluate performance
  - iii. Include demand data in applications.
- d. **Timeline for applications is too short**
  - i. Begin process in November
  - ii. Advocate for more time to write, review and rank applications
- e. **Have applicants present their applications**
- f. **Ideas for consolidating information in application forms.**
  - i. Application process should coordinate with ODOT



- ii. Keep them brief
- iii. Reduce narrative or move to appendix

**g. Technology pilot programs**

**h. Other things to consider**

- i. Administrative cost to administer grants
- ii. Additional funding sources
- iii. B/C analysis
- iv. Consolidate application narrative
- v. Application process can be overwhelming for participants
- vi. Coordinate ODOT app with STFAC needs
- vii. Repetition among applications
- viii. Time consuming

**Issues Specific to Draft 2016 CTP Guiding Principles**

***#1 – Preserve existing services and avoid service reductions.***

- Language related too closely to the recession? (might be able to eliminate)
- Is there a need to account for increasing budgets?
- Consider that funding comes from two sources for ops and capital.

**Expand to include**

- Maintain baseline service (combine with #3)
- Maintain vehicles

***#2 – Provide for adequate capital replacements and maintenance of vehicles and other fundamental requirements to provide service.***

***#3 – Strive for strategic and equitable distribution of funding to address the needs of the region’s seniors and people with disabilities.***

***#4 – Help mitigate shortfalls in funding from other sources of grant funds.***

- **Concern:**
  - Old plan = new funding
  - New plan = short falls

**#5** – Increase capacity and improve service quality of existing services (such as providing additional or larger buses or other capital equipment, increasing frequency, span of service, or staff time).

**Expand to include**

- Access to infrastructure

**#6** – Consider cost-effectiveness in making funding decisions (such as \$ per ride, % match)

- Hard to compare with different types

**Keep and expand to include**

- Evaluation and performance (budget tracking and expenses)
- Cost effectiveness measures
- Show cost and money spent outside of STF funds
- Add statement about new sources, new language

**#7** – Expand service in new areas, restore service where previously cut, or implement new initiatives related to technology and coordination.

**Keep and expand to include**

- New collaborative partnerships
- Research, peer review, new technologies
- Add statement about new sources, new language
- Include more focus on underserved communities, individuals.

**Strategies**

- Collaboration and Coordination – for implementation (social service transit providers).
- Infrastructure improvements, physical barriers at stops.
- Partners (school buses, shuttles, circulator service). *See first bullet point.*
- Eliminate jurisdictional and political “issues”. *See first bullet point.*
- Peer review of other plans.
- No one size fits all! Population served.
- Advocacy white paper.
- Customer-centric projects.

- “Safe route to schools” – similar program?
- Collect RC donations through application?
- Crowd sourcing data and funding for new and innovative programs.



Attachment L      Summary of STFAC Workshop on  
Funding Process and Application  
Criteria

# STFAC Meeting 6: WORKSHOP SUMMARY (RAW NOTES)

April 15th, 2016

**Funding Process.** The proposed application review process for reviewing funding applications identifies a seven step process that includes 3 STFAC meetings instead of 2, and identifies actions that will occur by TriMet staff and STFAC members between meetings and between funding cycles.

## 1. What questions or comments do you have on the proposed funding process? Would you amend the proposed process in any way?

- Pre-evaluations – yes or no? Mixed.
  - Pre-evaluation helps prepare questions.
  - Don't want to submit right away
    - Need 1 – 2 days
    - Some may need a week
    - Friday to Tuesday maybe okay
- Seems strange that applicants vote.
- Concerned about past processes where providers discuss alone and make a decision that has more weight than STFAC.

\*\*\*\*\*

- When would notification/when would providers get information?
  - As early as possible.
- Clarification.
- The process is too short.
- Start early on as possible.
- Check the legalities of the process.
  - Have to wait for notice from ODOT to start the public process, accepting application.
- Not submit the application but fill it out.
- TM Board approves in March/OR in April/contracts in May.
- Multi-layer.
- Like have meeting #1 before the notice, have discussions ahead of time.

\*\*\*\*\*

- Empowering bureaucrats, not the community.
- Minimize/cut-out bureaucracy.
- Stay on top of ODOT.

- Get ODOT’s information ahead of time. Need to know.
- Do everything possible for streamlining.
- Timeline.
- Identify ODOT staff to get information out.
- Develop strategy.

\*\*\*\*\*

- More time for ranking/feedback
- First meeting could have been scheduled 2 months earlier.
- Any TriMet staff function that evaluates programs the STFAC should be in charge of. Maybe a subcommittee?

## 2. Do you have any suggestions on how to discuss priorities at STFAC Meeting #1?

- Review unmet needs → review 3-2
- Discuss any new demographic changes/issues → discuss specific gaps.

\*\*\*\*\*

- What projects are eligible and the priorities?
- Behind the scenes knowledge – What ODOT is thinking.
- Have ODOT give a presentation-perspective.
  - Can guide us early.
- Ability to revisit priorities.
- Clarity on when funds will be available.

\*\*\*\*\*

- Identify during pre-meeting – current priorities as we know the targeted funding.
- Restore art books (?) if that – perennial priority.
- Identify list of cuts.
- Look for available technology if available for solutions.
- Develop consistency across apps by comparing to benchmarks. Easier to...
  - Score apps.
  - See excluded criteria.
  - More objectivity.
- Elaine Wells wants to follow up.

\*\*\*\*\*

- Depends on the type of funding
- Go back to Guiding Principles. Identify priorities there.
- Providers need to be at the first meeting
- Review needs/geographic statistics by county.

**Funding Application Categories.** The proposed funding application categories were updated based on input received at the last meeting to more clearly separate capital from operations. The categories now include capital projects and operations projects under “Maintaining Existing Service” and “Service Expansion” projects. There is also a category for “New Initiatives”.

**3. Do you have any additional comments on the updated Funding Application Categories? Is there any type of funding request that you believe may still be missing?**

- Put categories right at top of applications – front and center.

\*\*\*\*\*

Operations – 5310 is considered a capital expense – more match, STF is more flexible, less match.

- Bring in 5310 categories and make compatible.
- Operations (includes 5310 purchase service)
- Why differ between capital and operations?
- Is the capital a one-time expense?
- Like the 3 major categories – simple.
- Technology (upgrades)/ITS in service (new) expansion, new initiative and maintain service (replace).
- Accessibility and mobility
  - Lighting at stop (service expansion)
- Public safety.
- Service expansion or enhancement
- One or two sentences to describe the categories.
- Things in Maintain
  - Is thing critical to keep those services running?

\*\*\*\*\*

- Zero-emission vehicles.
  - Increase cost.
  - Timeline concerns.
- Right-sizing vehicles – where does it fit?
- Earlier comments chart – misleading.
  - (d) new initiates.
- Better, cheaper examples.
- More to advocacy category.

\*\*\*\*\*



**Evaluation Criteria.** The proposed evaluation criteria identify criteria that relate to the Guiding Principles. The criteria each include a series of questions to help describe how different types of applications may address the criteria. Applicants will be asked specifically to address these criteria and the STFAC members will evaluate each application how well they address the criteria.

**4. Do you want to evaluate each project on a 1 through 5 scale for how well they address each criteria (as you have done in the past), or would you prefer to rank all projects in order of preference based on how well you believe the project meets all the Guiding Principles?**

- Ranking → 4 votes
- Unsure/Not rank → 1 vote → Like it but seems challenging
- Score – 0 or 1 vote
- Is there something in the middle?

\*\*\*\*\*

- Priorities and rankings.
  - Systematic approach – same level of standard.
- Formal ranking based on priorities, transparent, procurement process, in good faith.
- Presentations can help with those who aren't good at grant writing.
- Point system.
- We should consider whether our application is ODOT's application (that's how they are going to prioritize applications).
- Maybe a few questions that address STFAC priorities?
- What about 5310 funds? Urban area.
- Consensus around the table:
  - Form 1: Keep
  - Form 2 (Main): ODOT
  - Form 3: Question specific to addressing CTP-project specific

\*\*\*\*\*

- Consistent and objective process.
- Considering a different scoring method.
- Provide some evaluation points for rural areas – need to meet needs of rural areas.

\*\*\*\*\*

- Ranking works well if the guiding principles are in front of you. Scoring can still be done individually, but you turn in a ranking by category.

**If ranking is preferable, would you rather rank projects within each category or provide an overall ranking?**

- Interest → Yes

- Consider ranking applications for capital vs. operations.
- When applicants have multiple applications, asking them to rank their own applications is not fair and the STFAC seeing something is an applicant's 2<sup>nd</sup> priority out of 6 applications is not comparable to another applicants 2<sup>nd</sup> priority out of 2. Don't want to create incentive for submitting multiple applications.

\*\*\*\*\*

- Limited by funding, so categories don't matter.
- What accessibility and equity? Geographical equity. Something in the ranking.
- Keep description clear and concise.
  - Those end up ranking higher.

\*\*\*\*\*

- Not answered on third form.

\*\*\*\*\*

- By category; if that's possible with the money we have.

**5. Do you feel that the proposed criteria adequately reflect the Guiding Principles and do they reflect the STFAC's desired outcomes? What comments do you have on the proposed criteria?**

- Customer surveys would be helpful.
- Question #1 – Concerned about cost/ride.
- Vehicle age and mileage – should be provided in the application if required vehicle.
- Can we tailor further to address people?
  - How many different people are we serving?
  - New people that will be served?
  - Add to Question #2.

\*\*\*\*\*

- Don't know if this meets the ODOT criteria.
- Ranking should follow ODOT rankings.
  - ODOT criteria 1-4
  - 5<sup>th</sup> should be how well does the project meet the STFAC goals/guiding principles.
  - Distill the local criteria into one or two.
  - This is too much.
  - Asking the question too many times – double the work.
  - Questions are the same but tweaked differently.
- Use the ODOT criteria as it pertains to our guiding principles.
- Transparent – What you submit to STFAC is same as what is submitted to ODOT.
- ODOT criteria is the core – additional clarifying or questions to address the local goals (one-pager)(STFAC guiding principles).

\*\*\*\*\*

- Add cultural/language barriers.
- Is the project “fair” to remote or rural area?
  - Consider a separate question.
- Consider ODOT’s criteria in order to reduce duplication.

\*\*\*\*\*

- Sub bullets should be reviewed to make sure they align with the criteria questions
- Add **Project** to describe the type of application in Question 1 and 4
- Add question about number of people served, number of new people served, number of 60+/PWD to Question 1
- Add “cost per house” to “cost per ride” under Bullet 2, Question 1.
- Add bullet question under Question 1: Any new ways of strategizing for making things more cost-effective?
- Add to Question4: Does the project include new partnerships or collaborations between more than one agency or service provider and how does it reduce duplication of service or increase number of people served or enhance service quality?
- Add to Question 6: How does this project increase access or opportunity to people of color, those with language or cultural barriers and low income populations?
- Add to Question 7: Does it build on previous efforts and work towards a whole? (Generally unclear)

**Funding Applications.** The proposed updated funding applications have two forms. The first form provides information about the applicant's organization and they will complete this only once, regardless of how many different project applications they submit. The second form will get filled out for each project application submitted by an applicant.

**6. Do you have any questions or comments on the two-form approach?**

- Like it!
- Seems more organized.

\*\*\*\*\*

- Like the two form approach.
- Do any of these need 900 words? Can it be captured in 500 words (or less)?
  - As concise as possible.
- Evaluation of performance of funded projects – Like that.

\*\*\*\*\*

- Need to match up with ODOT.
- Good idea for 2 forms.
- Add days/hours of operation to both forms.

\*\*\*\*\*

- It's good!
- Add Email and Website for organization contact info

**7. The proposed applications include project goals and measurable (page 27). Is there anything the STFAC would specifically like to request in these sections or is the proposed table sufficient?**

- Needs to be only for operating projects
  - Doesn't fit some applications like a computer server.
  - Different table for capital vs. operations applications?
- This info could still be good for capital to know how many people the program serves.
- Additional metrics for capital:
  - # of vehicles.
  - # of miles.
- Should this table be provided for each component of the application (maintain, expand, innovate)?
- How do we handle existing measurables vs. projected measurables for expansion?

\*\*\*\*\*

- How are riders and number of riders served?
- Equitable?
  - Geographic and demographic.
- % of E&D population covered/served?

\*\*\*\*\*

- Travel training/mobility management.
  - Need to provide this information.
  - Include on application form #1, organizational.
- Include economic development
  - Always keeping them as active consumers.
  - Consider opportunities.
- Number of individuals in remote rural area.
  - Time of day.
- Add “Type of Vehicle” – lifecycle.

\*\*\*\*\*

- On Pg 27, add question after Table 1.3: How would you measure your success?
- Describe fleet and type of vehicle (fleet info will help discern/measure these project goals by type of fleet).

**8. Do the proposed application forms include all of the information the STFAC would like to see the applicants provide?**

- Website.
- Organization contact info.
- Project contact vs. organization contact.

\*\*\*\*\*

- Not answered on second form.

\*\*\*\*\*

- Sensitivity training.
- Passenger safety.
  - Improvements.
  - Opportunity.
- Driver training.
- Mental Health.
- Coordination with other organizations that provide these types of drivers.
- Costs:
  - Education/training for different populations.

\*\*\*\*\*

- **Form 1:**
  - **Pg 19:** change Table 3,4,5 to transportation-specific, i.e. Table 3: Transportation Service Days and Hours of Operation, Table 4 to: Annual Transportation Budget and Table 5 to: Transportation Operating Data
  - Move Table 2.1-2.3 (section 2 of Form 2) to Form 1

- **Form 2:**

- Add at the top under Section 1: Project Overview:  
Indicate the type of funding request:
  - Maintain Existing Service
    - Operating funds for services
    - Equipment, vehicles or infrastructure investments
  - New Service or Service Expansion
    - Operating funds for services
    - Equipment, vehicles or infrastructure investments
  - New initiatives (not currently funded)
    - Operating funds for new services
    - Technology or infrastructure investments
- Add “transportation” program to describe program and project
- Pg 12 change #4 to say “Project Design” or “Project Description”.  
Under this ask:
  - Who will you serve?
  - What level of service will be provided to customers?
  - Describe if volunteers are utilized to provide service and how will this occur (is the volunteer program supported with STF or other funds? Will you provide mileage reimbursement to volunteers using their own vehicles?)
  - How will the service be marketed?
- Pg 13, under describe need for this project, add: Attach your data or study.
- Pg 13 under question “How do you measure cost-effectiveness and what are your measurable goals?” Add “*how many people will be served?*”
- Pg 14: Under meeting project needs for PWD, add question: How will the project improve customer satisfaction, increase ride matching and reduce wait times?
- Pg 14: Under increasing accessibility, add:
  - Are you expanding service hours? *By what specific amount?*
  - Are you increasing the capacity of an existing service? *How?*
  - Are you addressing a service gap per the Service Guidelines and Standards listed in the Coordinated Transportation Plan? *Which ones?*
- Pg 15: Add under equity: How does this project increase access or opportunity to people of color, *those with language or cultural barriers and low income populations?*
- Pg 25, under customer service: Add question about how they measure customer satisfaction and eliminate last bullet (i.e. how many people would be affected)
- Pg 27: Add number of turn downs to Table 1.3
- Move Table 2.1-2.3 (section 2 of Form 2) to Form 1

### 9. What other comments do you have?

- Not answered on first form.

\*\*\*\*\*

- Not answered on second form.

\*\*\*\*\*

- Art funding for lights at bus stops.

\*\*\*\*\*

Summarizing key points:

### Was there a central issue and opportunity from your group about:

- **Funding Process**

- Pre-evaluations before meeting #2 are good
  - Need few days (Friday-Tuesday) to submit.
- Questions on applicants reviewing their own applications
  - Is this conflict? ½ of committee so seems necessary but is there a conflict?
- When discussing priorities
  - Want to revisit/review needs/services gaps.

\*\*\*\*\*

- Start as early as possible.
- At first meeting:
  - Preliminary thinking – What is ODOT thinking?
  - Have ODOT give a presentation.

\*\*\*\*\*

- Build advocacy into funding process.
- Private funding.
- Coordination, advance notice, transparency, reduce bureaucratic barriers, increase creative solutions.

\*\*\*\*\*

- **Funding application categories**

- Good.
- Want them front and center at top of application with description.
- Like the 3 major categories.
- Would like to see “Enhancement” added to service expansion.
  - This could include technology/ITS, which could also be added to new initiatives.

\*\*\*\*\*

- Zero-emission vehicles.
- Rural services.
- Right-sized vehicles.

\*\*\*\*\*

- **Evaluation Criteria**

- Majority agreed ranking would be better, encourage individual scoring to develop individual ranking.
- Ranking in categories seemed interesting
  - Interested in seeing straw proposal using categories and pre-agreed priorities.
- Make sure we are focusing on people served.
- Make sure adequately address capital.

\*\*\*\*\*

- The criteria should follow ODOT's criteria.
- Additional criteria to address how project meets the STFAC guiding principles/goals.

\*\*\*\*\*

- Have objective guidelines to evaluate.
  - To be consistently applied.
  - Cultural/language.
  - Include ODOT's criteria.

- Specifics.

\*\*\*\*\*

● **Funding Applications**

- Like 2 worksheet format.
- Measures on p.22 may need to be more tailored for capital, consider separate.
- How do we answer for program with expansion component?

\*\*\*\*\*

- Like Form 1.
- Criteria – ODOT.
- One-pager for STFAC.
- Keep scores.

\*\*\*\*\*

- Include mobility management/training – can turn into projects.
- Advocacy.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Other Comments?**

- Include website and project contact rather than organization contact on applications.



Attachment M      Proposed Funding Process

## INTERIM STATE GUIDANCE COMBINING STF AND STIF FUNDING PROGRAMS

In 2019, the Oregon State Legislature directed the transfer of \$10.1 million from the STIF to STF. The transfer is designed to distribute funds to transit entities to support public transportation services benefiting seniors and persons with disabilities.

The Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) 2019-2021 Legislatively Adopted Budget (House Bill 5039) directed ODOT to merge STF and STIF into one public transit program.

In November, the Oregon Transportation Commission endorsed the ODOT Rail and Public Transit Division's STF/STIF Consolidation Report and Plan. ODOT updated the Formula Allocation Comparison in December of 2019 to include the most recent STIF revenue forecast.

It is expected that ODOT and its partners will bring forward the recommendation for statutory change to the 2020 legislative session. The Oregon Legislature may consider implementing the recommended concepts in late 2020. As the Qualified Entity (QE) of both the STF and STIF funds within the three county area, TriMet will likely amend the 2020 CTP and other plans to administer funding programs consistent with new statutory guidelines emanating from the 2020 legislative session.

### PROPOSED FUNDING PROCESS

1. **STFAC Meeting #1** - STFAC meets to discuss upcoming funding opportunities and priorities and discuss the following:
  - a. Which funding sources will be available and approximately how much will be available?
  - b. What projects are eligible under each funding opportunity?
  - c. What are the STFAC's priorities for each of the funding opportunities?
  - d. How well are existing programs meeting the STFAC's goals? *(This will inform applicants on how to improve their applications or project scope before drafting an application.)*

## 2. TriMet Staff Actions

- a. Inform applicants of upcoming funding opportunities and the STFAC's priorities for each fund this funding cycle.
  - b. Solicit applications (Impress on ODOT the need for increased time for the project solicitation process and STFAC review evaluation and deliberation).
  - c. Review applications for completeness of information and ask applicants for any necessary application updates.
  - d. Distribute complete applications to STFAC for review and preliminary evaluation.
- 3. STFAC Action** – STFAC members review and complete preliminary evaluation of applications.
- 4. STFAC Meeting #2** - STFAC meeting for applicants to present their applications and for the STFAC to ask questions. STFAC members complete their application evaluations and submit them to TriMet staff at the end of the meeting.
- 5. TriMet Staff Action** - TriMet summarizes STFAC evaluations and creates a funding straw proposal for discussion (includes ranking by application type and combined).
- 6. STFAC Meeting #3** - STFAC meets to discuss the funding straw proposal and make a recommendation to the TriMet Board.
- 7. TriMet Staff Action** – Upon TriMet Board approval, TriMet staff submits applications for funding to the State and Federal agencies. In agreement with ODOT and the FTA, TriMet administers pass-through and sub-recipient agreements for grant funds to service providers in the region.
- 8. Between funding cycles:**

**a. TriMet Staff Action**

- i. TriMet staff provides regular updates on the status of future funding, including grants beyond STF/STIF and §5310 – what’s happening at the federal and state level?
- ii. TriMet staff provides a history of the previous funding cycle and review of previous recipients of funding.

**b. Transit Providers** provide a status report on how previously funded programs are meeting specified goals and if not meeting these goals, describe why.

**c. STFAC** or a subcommittee meets to discuss opportunities to enhance effectiveness of the funded programs in the next funding cycle.

**PROPOSED FUNDING APPLICATION CATEGORIES**

Applications for STF/STIF and §5310 funding can generally be placed into the following general categories:

**○ Maintain Existing Service**

- a. Capital
  - i. Dispatch or computer system
  - ii. Replacement vehicles
  - iii. Vehicle Preventative Maintenance
  - iv. Capital Equipment Replacement
- b. Operations
  - i. Operational funding to maintain existing transit service levels
  - ii. Operational funding to maintain existing coordination service
  - iii. Operational funding to maintain existing mobility management service

**○ Service Expansion**

- a. Capital
  - i. Dispatch or computer system
  - ii. Purchase additional vehicles or right-sizing vehicles
  - iii. New equipment or Stop/Transit Center amenities
- b. Operations

- i. Increase amount of service - this provides more transportation service than currently provided, such as adding weekend service or having more frequent service.
- ii. Restore service area – this restores transit service to an area that has received service in the past.
- iii. New service area – this expands transit service to an area that has never received service before

○ **New initiatives** – this category would include other new efforts which could include projects such as introducing new technologies and new ways to coordinate or collaborate on services.

- a. New technology project
- b. New ways to coordinate or collaborate on services
- c. New type of Mobility Management
- d. Accessibility Improvement (e.g. sidewalks, curb ramps, crossings, etc.)

## PROPOSED APPLICATION REVIEW CRITERIA

STFAC members may provide project rankings or evaluation scores for each project. An evaluation scoring process is described below to assist STFAC members with developing their rankings if that is their preferred approach. Either ranking or scores will be useful to TriMet in compiling the evaluations.

The evaluation criteria and questions provided are intended to help articulate how a project addresses the priorities identified during the CTP Update process. These evaluation criteria will be addressed in the application forms completed by the applications and will be useful to the STFAC members responding during their evaluations.

Review each project and evaluate each project on the degree to which they implement the Priorities of the CTP. Rate each project on a scale of 1 to 5 point value for each criterion to reflect how well the proposed project satisfies each of the four ODOT public transportation goals.

Greatest    5    4    3    2    1    Least

1. How cost-effective is the application?
  - a. Is it leveraging other funds? What %?
  - b. What is the cost per ride or potential maintenance savings?

- c. Will it improve the cost-effectiveness of all service (such as through improved dispatch, ride matching, technology, etc.)?
2. Does the project provide accessibility that is otherwise not available for seniors and persons with disabilities?
  - a. What percentage of the rides will be for seniors and persons with disabilities?
  - b. Is this the only available service for seniors and persons with disabilities?
  - c. Does it address the needs of an underserved population?
  - d. Does it address a service gap per the Service Guidelines and Standards?
3. Does the project increase accessibility of existing services?
  - a. Does it expand the service hours?
  - b. Does it increase the capacity of an existing service?
  - c. Does it improve physical access to transit (more accessible vehicles, sidewalks, transit stop/station amenities)?
  - d. Does it address a service gap per the Service Guidelines and Standards?
4. Does the application include a new or innovative approach to coordinate and collaborate?
  - a. Does the project implement new technology to enhance service or improve cost-effectiveness?
  - b. Does the project include new partnerships or collaboration between more than one agency or service provider?
5. Would the project improve customer service?
  - a. Does the project improve ease of scheduling, or on-time performance, or communication between rider and driver?
  - b. Does the project improve the customer on-board experience?
  - c. Does the project improve their wait time at a stop or station?
  - d. How many people would be affected?

6. Does the project improve equity?
  - a. How is the project geographical/demographically/financial equitable?
  - b. How does this project increase access or opportunity to people of color and low income populations?
  - c. Does it address the needs of an underserved population?
  
7. Is the project sustainable?
  - a. Does it complete a one-time gap or need funds every year?
  - b. Does it build on previous efforts and work towards a whole?
  - c. Would “seed money” create a long-term funding source?
  - d. Does the project leverage other infrastructure