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Chapter 1

Executive Summary

In 2019, the Ventura County Transportation Commission (VCTC) selected Moore & Associates, Inc. to prepare Triennial Performance Audits of itself as the RTPA as well as the nine public transit providers to which it allocates TDA funding. As one of the six statutorily designated County Transportation Commissions in the SCAG region, VCTC also functions as the respective county RTPA.

The California Public Utilities Code requires all recipients of Transit Development Act (TDA) Article 4 funding to undergo an independent performance audit on a three-year cycle in order to maintain funding eligibility. As it receives no funding under Article 4, the City of Camarillo is not statutorily required to undergo a Triennial Performance Audit, nor has it traditionally been held to the requirements of the TDA. However, the Ventura County Transportation Commission (VCTC), as the RTPA, requested the City be audited to conduct a comprehensive and objective review providing potential insight into program performance as well as to establish a baseline for future audits. This is the second Triennial Performance Audit of the City of Camarillo.

The Triennial Performance Audit is designed to be an independent and objective evaluation of the City of Camarillo as a public transit operator, providing operator management with information on the economy, efficiency, and effectiveness of its programs across the prior three fiscal years. In addition to assuring legislative and governing bodies (as well as the public) that resources are being economically and efficiently utilized, the Triennial Performance Audit fulfills the requirement of PUC Section 99246(a) that the RTPA designate an entity other than itself to conduct a performance audit of the activities of each operator to whom it allocates funds.

This chapter summarizes key findings and recommendations developed during the Triennial Performance Audit (TPA) of the City of Camarillo’s public transit program for the period:

- Fiscal Year 2016/17,
- Fiscal Year 2017/18, and
- Fiscal Year 2018/19.

The City of Camarillo’s transit program is marketed as Camarillo Area Transit (CAT). The City provides fixed-route service along two routes within Camarillo. One route is a traditional bus route, while the second route is a free trolley service linking retail and dining destinations, as well as regional transit connection points. The fixed-route service operates weekdays from approximately 8:15 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. The trolley operates Sunday through Thursday from 10:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., and Friday and Saturday from 10:00 a.m. until 9:00 p.m.

The City’s Dial-A-Ride is open to the general public. Trips may be scheduled for any purpose except school-related. Service hours are weekdays from 6:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m., Saturday from 8:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m., and Sunday from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.
This performance audit was conducted in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. Those standards require that the audit team plans and performs the audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for its findings and conclusions based on the audit objectives. Moore & Associates believes the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions.

This audit was also conducted in accordance with the processes established by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), as outlined in the Performance Audit Guidebook for Transit Operators and Regional Transportation Planning Entities.

The Triennial Performance Audit includes four elements:

- Compliance requirements,
- Analysis of program data reporting,
- Performance Audit, and
- Functional review.

Test of Compliance
The City of Camarillo met the test of compliance with respect to Transportation Development Act (TDA) regulations.

Status of Prior Recommendations
The prior audit – completed in 2017 by Moore & Associates, Inc./Ma and Associates for the three fiscal years ending June 30, 2016 – prescribed five recommendations for the City of Camarillo.

1. Work with City staff responsible for preparing State Controller Reports to ensure that deadlines are met and that reports and signature pages are filed where they can be easily accessed for the next Triennial Performance Audit.
   **Status:** Implemented.

2. Demonstrate use of the TDA definition of full-time equivalent (FTE) and use that methodology when reporting Employees on the State Controller Report.
   **Status:** Not implemented.

3. Consider and explore strategies for increasing the Farebox Recovery Ratio to 20 percent (as this is an industry standard and accepted metric).
   **Status:** No longer relevant.

4. Develop and utilize a process to ensure data is compiled and reported consistently.
   **Status:** Implemented.

5. Ensure that route guarantees (such as those from Leisure Village and CSUCI) are appropriately reported to the State Controller as Special Transit Fares, not Passenger Fares for Transit Service.
   **Status:** Implemented.
Findings and Recommendations
Based on discussions with City staff, analysis of program performance, and a review of program compliance and function, the audit team submits the no compliance findings for the City of Camarillo.

The audit team has identified one functional finding. While this finding is not a compliance finding, we believe it is significant enough to be addressed within this audit:

1. The use of the TDA definition of full-time equivalent (FTE) for reporting to the State Controller could not be verified.

In completing this Triennial Performance Audit, the auditors submit the following recommendations for the City of Camarillo’s public transit program. They have been divided into two categories: TDA Program compliance recommendations and functional recommendations. TDA program compliance recommendations are intended to assist in bringing the operator into compliance with the requirements and standards of the TDA, while Functional Recommendations address issues identified during the TPA that are not specific to TDA compliance.

Given there are no compliance findings, only functional recommendations are provided.

Exhibit 1.1 Summary of Audit Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Recommendations</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate use of the TDA definition of full-time equivalent (FTE) for the Triennial Performance Audit and use that methodology when reporting Employees on the State Controller Report.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 2

Audit Scope and Methodology

The Triennial Performance Audit (TPA) of the City of Camarillo’s public transit program covers the three-year period ending June 30, 2019. The California Public Utilities Code requires all recipients of Transit Development Act (TDA) funding to complete an independent review on a three-year cycle in order to maintain funding eligibility. While the City does not receive TDA Article 4 funding, VCTC has elected to conduct a triennial performance audit of the City’s transit program.

In 2019, the Ventura County Transportation Commission selected Moore & Associates, Inc. to prepare Triennial Performance Audits of itself as the RTPA, the five transit operators to which it allocates TDA Article 4 funding, and four additional transit operators that do not receive TDA Article 4 funding. Moore & Associates is a general consulting firm specializing in public transportation. Selection of the consultant followed a competitive procurement process.

The Triennial Performance Audit is designed to be an independent and objective evaluation of the City of Camarillo as a public transit operator. Direct benefits of a Triennial Performance Audit include providing operator management with information on the economy, efficiency, and effectiveness of its programs across the prior three years; helpful insight for use in future planning; and assuring legislative and governing bodies (as well as the public) that resources are being economically and efficiently utilized. Finally, the Triennial Performance Audit fulfills the requirement of PUC Section 99246(a) that the RTPA designate an entity other than itself to conduct a performance audit of the activities of each operator to whom it allocates funds.

As it receives no TDA funding for transit, the City of Camarillo is not statutorily required to undergo a Triennial Performance Audit, nor has it traditionally been held to the requirements of the TDA. However, the Ventura County Transportation Commission (VCTC), as the RTPA, requested the City be audited to enable a comprehensive and objective review thereby providing insight into program performance as well as to establish a baseline for future audits.

Given the City is not required to be in compliance with the requirements of the Transportation Development Act, we determined only items which fail to meet other defined guidelines (such as the timely submittal of the State Controller Reports) would be identified as compliance findings. Other items typically identified as compliance findings would be provided as functional findings given the City’s non-use of TDA funds.

This performance audit was conducted in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. Those standards require that the audit team plans and performs the audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for its findings and conclusions based on the audit objectives. We believe the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions.
The audit was also conducted in accordance with the processes established by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), as outlined in the *Performance Audit Guidebook for Transit Operators and Regional Transportation Planning Entities*, as well as *Government Audit Standards* published by the U.S. Comptroller General.

**Objectives**

A Triennial Performance Audit has four primary objectives:

1. Assess compliance with TDA regulations;
2. Review improvements subsequently implemented as well as progress toward adopted goals;
3. Evaluate the efficiency and effectiveness of the transit operator; and
4. Provide sound, constructive recommendations for improving the efficiency and functionality of the transit operator.

**Scope**

The TPA is a systematic review of performance evaluating the efficiency, economy, and effectiveness of the transit operator. The audit of the City of Camarillo included five tasks:

1. A review of compliance with TDA requirements and regulations.
2. An assessment of the implementation of recommendations contained in prior performance audits.
3. A verification of the methodology for calculating performance indicators including the following activities:
   - Assessment of internal controls,
   - Test of data collection methods,
   - Calculation of performance indicators, and
   - Evaluation of performance.
4. Examination of the following functions:
   - General management and organization;
   - Service planning;
   - Scheduling, dispatching, and operations;
   - Personnel management and training;
   - Administration;
   - Marketing and public information; and
   - Fleet maintenance.
5. Conclusions and recommendations to address opportunities for improvement based upon analysis of the information collected and the audit of the transit operator’s major functions.

**Methodology**

The methodology for the Triennial Performance Audit of the City of Camarillo included thorough review of documents relevant to the scope of the audit, as well as information contained on the City’s website. The documents reviewed included the following (spanning the full three-year period):
City of Camarillo
Triennial Performance Audit, FY 2017 – FY 2019
Final Report

- Monthly performance reports;
- State Controller Reports;
- Annual budgets;
- TDA fiscal audits;
- Transit marketing collateral;
- Fleet inventory;
- Preventive maintenance schedules and forms;
- California Highway Patrol Terminal Inspection reports;
- National Transit Database reports;
- Accident/road call logs; and
- Organizational chart.

The methodology for this review included a site visit to the City of Camarillo city hall (601 Carmen Drive, Camarillo) on January 27, 2020. The audit team met with Tyler Nestved (Engineering Technician), reviewed materials germane to the triennial audit, and visited the transit operations contractor yard (95 Dawson Drive, Camarillo).

This report is comprised of seven chapters divided into three sections:

1. Executive Summary: A summary of the key findings and recommendations developed during the Triennial Performance Audit process.
2. TPA Scope and Methodology: Methodology of the review and pertinent background information.
3. TPA Results: In-depth discussion of findings surrounding each of the subsequent elements of the audit:
   - Compliance with statutory and regulatory requirements,
   - Progress in implementing prior recommendations,
   - Performance measures and trends,
   - Functional audit, and
   - Findings and recommendations.
This page intentionally blank.
Chapter 3

Program Compliance

This section examines the City of Camarillo’s compliance with the Transportation Development Act as well as relevant sections of the California Code of Regulations. An annual certified fiscal audit confirms TDA funds were apportioned in conformance with applicable laws, rules, and regulations. The Ventura County Transportation Commission considers full use of funds under California Code of Regulations (CCR) 6754(a) as referring to operating funds but not capital funds. The TPA findings and related comments are delineated in Exhibit 3.1.

The City of Camarillo does not use any TDA funding for transit and is not statutorily required to be audited, nor has it traditionally been held to the requirements of the TDA. However, the Ventura County Transportation Commission (VCTC), as the RTPA, requested the City be audited to conduct a comprehensive and objective review providing insight into program performance as well as to establish a baseline for future audits.

The City is not required to be in compliance with the requirements of the Transportation Development Act. Therefore, only one item, which deals with the timely submittal of State Controller Reports, is identified as a compliance finding. Other items typically identified as compliance findings are provided as functional findings given the City’s non-use of TDA funds.

Status of compliance items was determined through discussions with City staff as well as a physical inspection of relevant documents including the fiscal audits for each year of the triennium, State Controller annual filings, California Highway Patrol terminal inspections, year-end performance reports, and other compliance-related documentation.

The City of Camarillo met the test of compliance with respect to Transportation Development Act (TDA) regulations.

Changes Regarding Compliance

Several changes specific to the TDA and TDA funding went into effect beginning July 1, 2016, and were in full effect throughout the audit period. The first was a policy approved by VCTC which mandated funding originally received through the TDA would be classified as TDA funding even after being passed through to another entity. This disallowed the use of TDA funds passed from one claimant to another agency to be used as local support in the calculation of the farebox recovery ratio.

The second change was an amendment to the Public Utilities Code specific to the definition of operating cost and what costs can be excluded. It should be noted that many of the exclusions pertain only to changes in certain costs, either over the prior year or beyond the change in the Consumer Price Index. They do not apply to all costs related to specified exclusion categories.

Senate Bill 508, dated October 9, 2015, amended Section 99268.17 to read as follows:
99268.17 (a) Notwithstanding subdivision (a) of Section 99247, the following costs shall be excluded from the definition of “operating cost” for the purposes of calculating any required ratios of fare revenues to operating cost specified in this article:

(1) The additional operating costs required to provide comparable complementary paratransit service as required by Section 37.121 of Title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations, pursuant to the federal Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. Sec. 120101 et seq.), as identified in the operator’s paratransit plan pursuant to Section 37.139 of Title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations that exceed the operator’s costs required to provide comparable paratransit service in the prior year as adjusted by the Consumer Price Index.

(2) Cost increases beyond the change in the Consumer Price Index for all of the following:

(A) Fuel.
(B) Alternative fuel programs.
(C) Power, including electricity.
(D) Insurance premiums and payments in settlement of claims arising out of the operator’s liability.
(E) State and federal mandates.

(3) Startup costs for new services for a period of not more than two years.

(b) The exclusion of costs from the definition of operating costs in subdivision (a) applies solely for the purpose of this article and does not authorize an operator to report an operating cost other than as defined in subdivision (a) of Section 99247 or a ratio of fare revenue to operating cost other than as that ratio is described elsewhere in this article, to any of the following entities:

(1) The Controller pursuant to Section 99243.
(2) The entity conducting the fiscal audit pursuant to Section 99245.
(3) The entity conducting the performance audit pursuant to Section 99246.

Reporting forms for the State Controller for FY 2016/17 were not updated to reflect these exclusions. Reporting forms were updated and in place for FY 2017/18 and FY 2018/19. However, it is important for agencies to ensure any exclusions from operating cost are clearly itemized within TDA audits or other farebox revenue ratio calculations so that compliance can be clearly assessed.

The third change, also contained within Senate Bill 508, related to the type of funds that can be used to supplement farebox revenue. Prior to this bill, “local funds” was defined as “revenues derived from taxed imposed by the operator or by a county transportation commission.” S.B. 508 amended Section 99268.19 to read:

99268.19 If fare revenues are insufficient to meet the applicable ratio of fare revenues to operating cost required by this article, an operator may satisfy that requirement by
supplementing its fare revenues with local funds. As used in this section, “local funds” means any nonfederal or nonstate grant funds or other revenues generated by, earned by, or distributed to an operator.

This expanded definition opened up new revenue sources that can be used to offset farebox shortfalls. Applicable revenues include funds received through advertising, interest income, sale of surplus vehicles, and other such sources. While these funds are no longer limited to those generated by local taxes, they cannot be state or federal funds.

The Future of the Transportation Development Act

In the nearly 50 years since the introduction of the Transportation Development Act, there have been many changes to public transportation in California. Many operators face significant challenges in meeting the farebox recovery ratio requirement, and it calls into question whether that remains the best measure for TDA compliance. In 2018, the chairs of California’s state legislative transportation committees requested the California Transit Association spearhead a policy task force to examine the TDA.

Numerous meetings were conducted with the TDA task force across a full year. Other efforts included input from state-level stakeholders as well as transit agencies. It also reviewed the results of two research projects requested by legislative leaders and conducted by the UCLA Institute of Transportation Studies. Two particularly important conclusions were:

- The state’s goals for transit have changed and broadened considerably since 1971 when the TDA became law and 1978 when the farebox recovery requirement was added; and
- A survey of California transit and regional agency professionals reveals the current TDA requirements appear to influence agency management decisions in ways that do not align with the state’s current goals for transit.

The task force then set forth a draft framework for TDA reform that maintained the farebox recovery requirement but significantly changed how it would be applied. The draft framework:

1. Retains TDA’s current farebox recovery requirements as an important data set for policymakers at all levels. The ratios would be targets that all transit agencies should try to hit.
2. Removes financial penalties associated with missing farebox recovery requirements for all agencies.
3. Requires agencies that miss their required farebox recovery for three years in a row be given the option in year four to either 1) develop and submit an action plan to the RTPA that details the steps it will take to meet its farebox recovery requirement; or 2) develop new targets, in collaboration with the RTPA, that monitor the transit agency’s contribution to local, community, regional, or statewide goals.

---

1 Letter from Rick Ramacier, State Legislative Committee Chair, California Transit Association, and Joshua W. Shaw, Executive Director, California Transit Association to California Transit Association members, RTPAs, and other public transit systems. Subject: Transportation Development Act Reform – A Draft Framework (inclusive of Attachment 1, Draft Framework). Dated January 8, 2020.
4. Adjusts some aspects of the farebox recovery ratio definitions for the numerator and denominator, and lower the basic targets, to better reflect current goals and objectives for public transit, and to more realistically accommodate today’s most pressing transit challenges and unfunded mandates.

While these proposed changes to the TDA legislation have yet to be finalized and enacted, it is very likely the TDA will undergo significant revisions during the next audit period. As a result, the test of compliance may look quite different in subsequent triennial performance audits.
### Exhibit 3.1 Transit Development Act Compliance Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compliance Element</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Compliance</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal and compliance audits submitted within 180 days following the end of the fiscal year (or with up to 90-day extension).</td>
<td>PUC 99245</td>
<td>In compliance</td>
<td>FY 2016/17: November 17, 2017 FY 2017/18: November 1, 2018 FY 2018/19: November 5, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The City does not receive TDA 4 or 8(c) funds. Dates represent submittal dates for TDA 3 and TDA 8(a) audits.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operator’s terminal rated as satisfactory by CHP within the 13 months prior to each TDA claim.</td>
<td>PUC 99251 B</td>
<td>Confirm accuracy: August 20, 2015 March 14, 2018 March 27, 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operator’s claim for TDA funds submitted in compliance with rules and regulations adopted by the RTPA.</td>
<td>PUC 99261</td>
<td>In compliance</td>
<td>The City only submits claims for Article 3 and Article 8(a) funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If operator serves urbanized and non-urbanized areas, it has maintained a ratio of fare revenues to operating costs at least equal to the ratio determined by the rules and regulations adopted by the RTPA.</td>
<td>PUC 99270.1</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An operator receiving allocations under Article 8(c) may be subject to regional, countywide, or subarea performance criteria, local match requirements, or fare recovery ratios adopted by resolution of the RTPA.</td>
<td>PUC 99405</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>The City does not receive funding under Article 8(c).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The operator’s operating budget has not increased by more than 15% over the preceding year, nor is there a substantial increase or decrease in the scope of operations or capital budget provisions for major new fixed facilities unless the operator has reasonably supported and substantiated the change(s).</td>
<td>PUC 99266</td>
<td>In compliance</td>
<td>FY 2016/17: +0.81% FY 2017/18: -1.49% FY 2018/19: +5.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The operator’s definitions of performance measures are consistent with the Public Utilities Code Section 99247.</td>
<td>PUC 99247</td>
<td>In compliance*</td>
<td>The City did not provide its calculation methodology with respect to full-time equivalents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the operator serves an urbanized area, it has maintained a ratio of fare revenues to operating cost at least equal to one-fifth (20 percent).</td>
<td>PUC 99268.2, 99268.4, 99268.1</td>
<td>In compliance</td>
<td>Unsupplemented/with qualifying revenues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Given the City does not receive TDA funds, this is considered a functional finding rather than a compliance finding.*
### Compliance Element

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compliance Element</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Compliance</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If the operator serves a rural area, it has maintained a ratio of fare revenues to</td>
<td>PUC 99268.2, 99268.4, 99268.5</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>operating cost at least equal to one-tenth (10 percent).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For a claimant that provides only services to elderly and handicapped persons, the</td>
<td>PUC 99268.5, CCR 6633.5</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ratio of fare revenues to operating cost shall be at least 10 percent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The current cost of the operator’s retirement system is fully funded with respect to</td>
<td>PUC 99271</td>
<td>In compliance</td>
<td>City employees are eligible for CalPERS retirement benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the officers and employees of its public transportation system, or the operator is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implementing a plan approved by the RTPA, which will fully fund the retirement system for 40 years.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the operator receives State Transit Assistance funds, the operator makes full use of funds available to it under the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 before TDA claims are granted.</td>
<td>CCR 6754 (a) (3)</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>The City does not receive STA funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In order to use State Transit Assistance funds for operating assistance, the operator’s total operating cost per revenue hour does not exceed the sum of the preceding year’s total plus an amount equal to the product of the percentage change in the CPI for the same period multiplied by the preceding year’s total operating cost per revenue hour. An operator may qualify based on the preceding year’s operating cost per revenue hour or the average of the three prior years. If an operator does not meet these qualifying tests, the operator may only use STA funds for operating purposes on a sliding scale.</td>
<td>PUC 99314.6</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>The City does not receive STA funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A transit claimant is precluded from receiving monies from the Local Transportation Fund and the State Transit Assistance Fund in an amount which exceeds the claimant’s capital and operating costs less the actual amount of fares received, the amount of local support required to meet the fare ratio, the amount of federal operating assistance, and the amount received during the year from a city or county to which the operator has provided services beyond its boundaries.</td>
<td>CCR 6634</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>The City does not receive LTF or STA funds.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 4

Prior Recommendations

This section reviews and evaluates the implementation of prior Triennial Performance Audit recommendations. This objective assessment provides assurance the City of Camarillo has made quantifiable progress toward improving both the efficiency and effectiveness of its public transit program.

The prior audit – completed in 2017 by Moore & Associates, Inc./Ma and Associates for the three fiscal years ending June 30, 2016 – prescribed five recommendations for the City of Camarillo:

1. Work with City staff responsible for preparing State Controller Reports to ensure that deadlines are met and that reports and signature pages are filed where they can be easily accessed for the next Triennial Performance Audit.
   
   **Discussion:** Public Utilities Code Section 99243 requires transit operators in receipt of TDA Article 4 funds to submit annual reports to the State Controller within 90 days following the end of the fiscal year (110 days if filing electronically). During preparation of the prior audit, the submittal and signature page for the FY 2013/14 State Controller Report could not be located. As such, no submittal date could be verified for that fiscal year. The submittal date for the FY 2015/16 report was outside the timeframe specified by the State Controller’s Office. The submittal date was October 21, 2016, when the deadline for submittal was October 18, 2016 (110 days following the end of the fiscal year).

   **Progress:** All State Controller Reports were submitted prior to the established deadline, and all documentation could be easily accessed.

   **Status:** Implemented.

2. Demonstrate use of the TDA definition of full-time equivalent (FTE) and use that methodology when reporting Employees on the State Controller Report.
   
   **Discussion:** Public Utilities Code Section 99247(j) defines the vehicle service hours per employee metric as “the number of vehicle service hours divided by the number of employees employed in connection with the public transit system” based on person-hours of work. The item goes on to state, “The count of employees shall also include those individuals employed by the operator, which provide services to the agency of the operator responsible for the operation of the public transportation system even though not employed in that agency.” As part of the prior audit, the City did not provide any documentation outlining the methodology it uses in calculating FTE. Employees as reported to the State Controller varied widely from year to year. In FY 2013/14 and FY 2014/15, the number of employees was the same for both fixed-route and demand-response, which was interpreted as the City reporting the total number of employees system-wide as the number of employees for each mode. In FY 2015/16, the number of employees reported appeared
to be much more appropriate for each mode. However, it was unclear how the City was calculating the number of employees or FTE it is reporting.

**Progress:** The City noted its Finance department is supposed to be using the proper definition, but did not provide its calculation methodology in conjunction with the current audit.

**Status:** Not implemented.

3. **Consider and explore strategies for increasing the Farebox Recovery Ratio to 20 percent (as this is an industry standard and accepted metric).**

**Discussion:** PUC Section 99268 establishes a 20 percent farebox recovery minimum for urbanized transit systems in order to remain compliant with TDA. While other locally generated funds may be used to subsidize farebox recovery, the standard is also used as a measure of efficiency and productivity. During the prior audit period, the City’s farebox recovery ratio ranged between 8.5 percent and 13.0 percent during the audit period. Given the City does not use TDA funds to operate its system, its internal goal for farebox recovery has been 10 percent, and compliance with the 20 percent goal has not been required.

The prior audit recommended the City consider and explore strategies that can be used to increase its farebox recovery ratio to 20 percent. These strategies could include additional marketing, increased contributions from existing partners or new route guarantees from other partners, a fare increase, or a reassessment of service delivery to focus on more fixed-route service and less demand-response service.

**Progress:** The City discussed options for increasing its farebox recovery ratio by increasing fares, but has no interest in doing so. However, when other qualifying revenues already being used for transit are applied to the farebox recovery ratio, the City meets the 20 percent threshold. Therefore, the City would be in compliance even if it received TDA funding.

**Status:** No longer relevant.

4. **Develop and utilize a process to ensure data is compiled and reported consistently.**

**Discussion:** Operators report performance data using multiple formats (State Controller and NTD reports, as well as internal reports and audits). While data may be prepared at different times and using slightly different definitions, it should be able to be tracked consistently across multiple formats. During the preparation of the prior audit, it was difficult to determine, based on the documents provided, accurate performance measures and cost figures for the City’s transit program. While the underlying methodology appeared sound, the manner of reporting the data on the documents provided was inconsistent.

**Progress:** During the current audit period, data reported to the State Controller and in NTD reports was much more consistent.

**Status:** Implemented.
5. Ensure that route guarantees (such as those from Leisure Village and CSUCI) are appropriately reported to the State Controller as Special Transit Fares, not Passenger Fares for Transit Service.

Discussion: The State Controller’s Uniform System of Accounts for Public Transit Operators considers revenue received as a route guarantee as separated from passenger fare revenue. Passenger Fares for Transit Service (Account 401.000) includes revenue earned through passenger fares and park and ride parking lot revenues. Special Transit Fares (Account 402.000) includes “revenues earned for rides given in regular transit service, but paid for by some organization rather than by the rider, and for rides given along special routes for which revenues may be guaranteed by a beneficiary of the service.” The prior auditor noted revenue data reported via the transit State Controller Report should break revenues out into the appropriate categories. The City did not segregate its passenger fare revenue from its route guarantee in reporting to the State Controller.

Progress: Since the prior audit report was prepared, the State Controller’s Office has revised its reporting form. Route guarantees were reported appropriately during the audit period.

Status: Implemented.
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Chapter 5
Performance Analysis

Performance indicators are typically employed to quantify and assess the efficiency of a transit operator’s activities. Such indicators provide insight into current operations as well as trend analysis of operator performance. Through a review of indicators, relative performance as well as possible inter-relationships between major functions is revealed.

The Transportation Development Act (TDA) requires recipients of TDA funding to track and report five performance indicators:

- Operating Cost/Passenger,
- Operating Cost/Vehicle Service Hour,
- Passengers/Vehicle Service Hour,
- Passengers/Vehicle Service Mile, and
- Vehicle Service Hours/Employee.

To assess the validity and use of performance indicators, the audit team performed the following activities:

- Assessed internal controls in place for the collection of performance-related information,
- Validated collection methods of key data,
- Calculated performance indicators, and
- Evaluated performance indicators.

The procedures used to calculate TDA-required performance measures for the current triennium were verified and compared with indicators included in similar reports to external entities (i.e., State Controller and Federal Transit Administration).

Operating Cost
The Transportation Development Act requires an operator to track and report transit-related costs reflective of the Uniform System of Accounts and Records developed by the State Controller and the California Department of Transportation. The most common method for ensuring this occurs is through a compliance audit report prepared by an independent auditor in accordance with California Code of Regulations Section 6667. The annual independent financial audit should confirm the use of the Uniform System of Accounts and Records. *Operating cost* – as defined by PUC Section 99247(a) – excludes the following:

---

2 CCR Section 6667 outlines the minimum tasks which must be performed by an independent auditor in conducting the annual fiscal and compliance audit of the transit operator.
- Cost in the depreciation and amortization expense object class adopted by the State Controller pursuant to PUC Section 99243,
- Subsidies for commuter rail services operated under the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission,
- Direct costs of providing charter service, and
- Vehicle lease costs.

Vehicle Service Hours and Miles
*Vehicle Service Hours* (VSH) and *Miles* (VSM) are defined as the time/distance during which a revenue vehicle is available to carry fare-paying passengers, and which includes only those times/miles between the time or scheduled time of the first passenger pickup and the time or scheduled time of the last passenger drop-off during a period of the vehicle's continuous availability.³ For example, demand-response service hours include those hours when a vehicle has dropped off a passenger and is traveling to pick up another passenger, but not those hours when the vehicle is unavailable for service due to driver breaks or lunch. For both demand-response and fixed-route services, service hours will exclude hours of "deadhead" travel to the first scheduled pick-up, and will also exclude hours of "deadhead" travel from the last scheduled drop-off back to the terminal. For fixed-route service, a vehicle is in service from first scheduled stop to last scheduled stop, whether or not passengers board or exit at those points (i.e., subtracting driver lunch and breaks but including scheduled layovers).

Passenger Counts
According to the Transportation Development Act, *total passengers* is equal to the total number of unlinked trips (i.e., those trips that are made by a passenger that involve a single boarding and departure), whether revenue-producing or not.

Employees
*Employee hours* is defined as the total number of hours (regular or overtime) which all employees have worked, and for which they have been paid a wage or salary. The hours must include transportation system-related hours worked by persons employed in connection with the system (whether or not the person is employed directly by the operator). *Full-Time Equivalent (FTE)* is calculated by dividing the number of person-hours by 2,000.

Fare Revenue
*Fare revenue* is defined by California Code of Regulations Section 6611.2 as revenue collected from the farebox plus sales of fare media.

TDA Required Indicators
To calculate the TDA indicators for the City of Camarillo, the following sources were employed:

- Operating Cost was not independently calculated as part of this audit. Operating Cost data were obtained via State Controller Reports for each fiscal year covered by this audit.

³ A vehicle is considered to be in revenue service despite a no-show or late cancellation if the vehicle remains available for passenger use.
Operating Cost from the reports was compared against that reported in the City’s audited financial reports and was determined to be consistent with TDA guidelines and accurately reflects the costs for the City’s transit services. In accordance with PUC Section 99247(a), the reported costs excluded depreciation and other allowable expenses.

- Fare Revenue was not independently calculated as part of this audit. Fare Revenue data were obtained via State Controller Reports for each fiscal year covered by this audit. Fare subsidies/route guarantees provided by Leisure Village, CSUCI, and the Chamber of Commerce appear to be counted as fare revenue. This is consistent with TDA guidelines as well as the uniform system of accounts.

- Vehicle Service Hours (VSH) data were obtained via NTD reports submitted to the FTA for each fiscal year covered by this audit. Data from these reports were then compared with information included within the City’s monthly performance data summary reports and State Controller Reports. The City calculates VSH using schedule hours reconciled with driver trip sheets. The City’s calculation methodology is consistent with PUC guidelines.

- Vehicle Service Miles (VSM) data were obtained via NTD reports submitted to the FTA for each fiscal year covered by this audit. Data from these reports were then compared with information included within the City’s monthly performance data summary reports and State Controller Reports. The City calculates VSM by subtracting deadhead and out-of-service miles subtracted from total vehicle mileage (as noted on each vehicle’s odometer). This methodology is consistent with PUC guidelines.

- Unlinked trip data were obtained from State Controller Reports for each fiscal year covered by this review. Data from these reports was then compared with information included within the City’s monthly performance data summary reports. The City’s calculation methodology is consistent with PUC guidelines.

- Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) data were obtained from State Controller Reports for each fiscal year covered by this review. Use of the TDA definition regarding FTE calculation could not be verified.

System Performance Trends
System operating costs increased 43.5 percent across the six-year period, though only 11.3 percent during the current audit period. The greatest change took place in FY 2016/17. Fare revenue saw a net 10 percent increase between FY 2013/14 and FY 2018/19, but a 3.1 percent decrease during the audit period.

Vehicle service hours (VSH) experienced a net increase of 38.1 percent across the six-year period, including a 25.7 percent increase during the audit period. Vehicle service miles (VSM) increased 18.7 percent during the audit period, following a significant (16.8 percent) decrease in FY 2016/17. System ridership steadily increased across the six-year period, counter to nationwide trends. This resulted in ridership growth of 62.9 percent during that period, and a 4.2 percent increase during the audit period.

Cost-related performance indicators were mixed during the audit period. Operating cost/VSH and operating cost/VSM both experienced a net decrease, while operating cost/passenger increased. Decreases to these indicators signify improvements to cost-effectiveness, while increases signify declines. Passenger-related metrics decreased during the audit period, indicating a decline in productivity. The unsupplemented farebox recovery ratio declined each year of the audit period.
### Exhibit 5.1 System Performance Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating Cost (Actual $)</td>
<td>$1,644,531</td>
<td>$1,776,162</td>
<td>$1,909,081</td>
<td>$2,119,705</td>
<td>$2,295,197</td>
<td>$2,359,867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Change</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fare Revenue (Actual $)</td>
<td>$139,804</td>
<td>$230,146</td>
<td>$183,159</td>
<td>$158,695</td>
<td>$153,934</td>
<td>$153,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Change</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
<td>-20.4%</td>
<td>-13.4%</td>
<td>-3.0%</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Service Hours (VSH)</td>
<td>24,341</td>
<td>28,672</td>
<td>25,041</td>
<td>26,734</td>
<td>32,849</td>
<td>33,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Change</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>-12.7%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Service Miles (VSM)</td>
<td>330,425</td>
<td>392,944</td>
<td>392,944</td>
<td>326,783</td>
<td>357,685</td>
<td>387,852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Change</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-16.8%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passengers</td>
<td>107,150</td>
<td>165,439</td>
<td>166,215</td>
<td>167,519</td>
<td>172,192</td>
<td>174,558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Change</td>
<td>54.4%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Change</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>-29.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Performance Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>System-wide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating Cost/VSH (Actual $)</td>
<td>$67.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Change</td>
<td>-8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Cost/Passenger (Actual)</td>
<td>$15.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Change</td>
<td>-30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passengers/VSH</td>
<td>4.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Change</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passengers/VSM</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Change</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farebox Recovery</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Change</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours/Employee</td>
<td>760.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Change</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### TDA Non-Required Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>System-wide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating Cost/VSM</td>
<td>$4.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Change</td>
<td>-9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSM/VSH</td>
<td>13.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Change</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fare/Passenger</td>
<td>$1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Change</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: State Controller Reports.
Exhibit 5.10 System Farebox Recovery

Exhibit 5.11 System Fare/Passenger
Fixed-ROUTE Performance

Given the State Controller Report does not split out cost by mode, an analysis of cost-related performance indicators by mode is not provided.

Vehicle service hours (VSH) experienced a net increase of 153.9 percent across the six-year period (primarily due to a significant increase in FY 2014/15), but saw a 1.4 percent decrease during the audit period. Vehicle service miles (VSM) increased a net 78.9 percent between FY 2013/14 and FY 2018/19, with a 4.2 percent net increase during the audit period (primarily due to a significant increase in FY 2014/15). Fixed-route ridership fluctuated during the six-year period, resulting in a net increase of 458.5 percent. Ridership saw a net 6.8 percent during the audit period. Passenger-related metrics decreased during the audit period, indicating a decline in service productivity.

Exhibit 5.12 Fixed-Route Data Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Service Hours (VSH)</td>
<td>2,097</td>
<td>4,542</td>
<td>5,389</td>
<td>5,401</td>
<td>5,385</td>
<td>5,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Change</td>
<td>116.6%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
<td>-1.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Service Miles (VSM)</td>
<td>31,593</td>
<td>54,578</td>
<td>54,578</td>
<td>54,274</td>
<td>54,607</td>
<td>56,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Change</td>
<td>72.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-0.6%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passengers</td>
<td>13,793</td>
<td>53,633</td>
<td>84,876</td>
<td>82,447</td>
<td>77,752</td>
<td>77,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Change</td>
<td>288.8%</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>-2.9%</td>
<td>-5.7%</td>
<td>-0.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Change</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>-77.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Performance Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passengers/VSH</td>
<td>6.58</td>
<td>11.81</td>
<td>15.75</td>
<td>15.27</td>
<td>14.44</td>
<td>14.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Change</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
<td>-3.1%</td>
<td>-5.4%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passengers/VSM</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Change</td>
<td>125.1%</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>-2.3%</td>
<td>-6.3%</td>
<td>-4.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours/Employee</td>
<td>131.1</td>
<td>252.3</td>
<td>1,347.3</td>
<td>1,350.3</td>
<td>1,346.3</td>
<td>1,331.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Change</td>
<td>92.5%</td>
<td>433.9%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
<td>-1.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TDA Non-Required Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VSM/VSH</td>
<td>15.07</td>
<td>12.02</td>
<td>10.13</td>
<td>10.05</td>
<td>10.14</td>
<td>10.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Change</td>
<td>-20.2%</td>
<td>-15.7%</td>
<td>-0.8%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: State Controller Reports.
Exhibit 5.13 Fixed-Route Ridership

Exhibit 5.14 Fixed-Route VSM/VSH

Exhibit 5.15 Fixed-Route Passengers/VSH

Exhibit 5.16 Fixed-Route Passengers/VSM
Exhibit 5.17 Fixed-Route VSH/FTE
Demand-Response Performance

Given the State Controller Report does not segregate cost by mode, an analysis of cost-related performance indicators by mode is not provided.

Vehicle service hours (VSH) experienced a net increase of 27.1 percent across the six-year period, but saw a 32.6 percent increase during the audit period. Vehicle service miles (VSM) increased a net 10.9 percent between FY 2013/14 and FY 2018/19, with a 21.6 percent net increase during the audit period. Demand-response ridership fluctuated during the six-year period, resulting in a net increase of 43.8 percent. Ridership saw a 14.6 percent during the audit period. Passenger-related metrics decreased during the audit period, indicating a decline in productivity.

Exhibit 5.18 Demand-Response Data Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Service Hours (VSH)</td>
<td>22,244</td>
<td>24,130</td>
<td>19,652</td>
<td>21,333</td>
<td>27,464</td>
<td>28,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Change</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>-18.6%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Service Miles (VSM)</td>
<td>298,832</td>
<td>338,366</td>
<td>338,366</td>
<td>272,509</td>
<td>303,078</td>
<td>313,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Change</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-19.5%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passengers</td>
<td>93,357</td>
<td>111,806</td>
<td>81,339</td>
<td>85,072</td>
<td>94,440</td>
<td>97,529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Change</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>-27.2%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Change</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: State Controller Reports.
Exhibit 5.19  Demand-Response Ridership

Exhibit 5.20  Demand-Response VSM/VSH

Exhibit 5.21  Demand-Response Passengers/VSH

Exhibit 5.22  Demand-Response Passengers/VSM
Exhibit 5.23 Demand-Response VSH/FTE
Chapter 6
Functional Review

A functional review of the City of Camarillo’s public transit program is intended to assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the operator. Following a general summary of the City’s transit services, this chapter addresses seven functional areas. The list, taken from Section III of the Performance Audit Guidebook published by Caltrans, reflects those transit services provided by the City of Camarillo through its transit program:

- General management and organization;
- Service planning;
- Scheduling, dispatch, and operations;
- Personnel management and training;
- Administration;
- Marketing and public information; and
- Fleet maintenance.

Service Overview
The City of Camarillo’s transit program is marketed as Camarillo Area Transit (CAT). The City provides fixed-route service on two routes within Camarillo. One route is a traditional bus route, while the second is a free trolley service linking retail and dining destinations, as well as regional transit connection points. The fixed-route service operates weekdays from approximately 8:15 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. The trolley operates Sunday through Thursday from 10:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., and Friday and Saturday from 10:00 a.m. until 9:00 p.m.

The City’s Dial-A-Ride is open to the general public. Trips may be scheduled for any purpose except school-related. Service hours are weekdays from 6:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m., Saturday from 8:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m., and Sunday from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

The only service changes occurring during the audit period were the expansion of Dial-A-Ride service by one hour and reductions in Trolley service hours. However, in January 2020, the City’s Dial-A-Ride service began offering more direct connections to medical facilities in Oxnard. Rather than requiring riders to transfer to Gold Coast ACCESS to complete their trip, Camarillo Dial-A-Ride now offers service all the way to St. John’s Regional Medical Center in Oxnard, with the hospital acting as a transfer point to GC ACCESS. This more direct service is expected to reduce transfer incidence for 40 percent of out-of-area riders.
Fares for the City’s fixed-route service have remained stable during the audit period. The City offers fare-free rides to residents of Leisure Village, a retirement community for persons age 55 and above. Free rides are also provided on the City’s trolley service. Exhibit 6.1 illustrates the City’s fare structure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fare Category</th>
<th>Fare</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fixed-route</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults and students (one-way)</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors (55+) and Disabled</td>
<td>$0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure Village residents</td>
<td>Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College students (VCTC College Ride program)</td>
<td>Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trolley</td>
<td>Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All riders</td>
<td>Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dial-A-Ride</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults and students (one-way)</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors (55+) and Disabled</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children under 6 (with paid adult)</td>
<td>Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College students (VCTC College Ride program)</td>
<td>Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors (55+) and Disabled to East Ventura County cities</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General Management and Organization
The City of Camarillo’s public transit program is administered within the City’s Public Works Department. The Camarillo city council is the governing body overseeing the transit program. City council meetings occur on the second and fourth Wednesday of each month at 5:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers located at city hall (601 Carmen Drive, Camarillo). All meetings are ADA-accessible, and transit service is available via Camarillo Dial-A-Ride.

There have been several new city councilmembers in the past year. Staff has discussed the transit program with new members to enhance their understanding of the program. They appear to be receptive to learning how it works, and are receptive to changes and new ideas. So far the City has only implemented minor changes, but may look at more changes next fiscal year to help boost farebox revenue.

The City contracts with Roadrunner Shuttle (now owned by RATP Dev) to provide vehicle operations and maintenance for fixed-route and Dial-A-Ride services for more than eight years. In January 2020, the City went out to bid for a new operations contract given receipt of a notice of termination with a 180-day timeline from Roadrunner. The alternative was a 36 percent rate increase, which the City felt it could not agree to absent a competitive bid process. It is likely the purchase of Roadrunner by RATP Dev, combined with the elimination of Roadrunner’s airport service (also based in Camarillo), as well as a need for increased wages, contributed to the contractor’s ultimatum. Staff believes it is
possible the City will face a significant cost increase as a result of the bid process. Fuel has traditionally been a significant variable within the City’s budget.

The City has maintained a good relationship with the operations contractor, and generally has good communication. The City’s management team monitors program performance via monthly invoices – including ridership and performance statistics – as well as monthly contractor meetings.

The City indicated its internal staffing levels were appropriate, though the Engineering Technician noted a request for an intern was denied. Everything eventually gets done with current staff. The City’s organizational chart is provided in Exhibit 6.2.

Service Planning
The City includes goals and objectives for its transit program in each biennial budget, as well as accomplishments from the previous two years. Goals are revised every two years. For example, goals in the 2018-2020 budget include:

- Monitor and evaluate local transit services to ensure compliance with required performance measures, and
- Explore possibility of direct transit service provided by City from Camarillo to West County for seniors and persons with disabilities.

The City also includes goals and objectives for public transportation within the Circulation element of its General Plan. The goal listed in the 2014 plan is to “maintain a safe and efficient public transportation
network that provides mobility to all city residents and persons employed there as an alternative to automobile travel.”

The City evaluates developments for potential service expansion. As part of its planning process, transit needs such as new stops or bus cut-outs are identified. The City’s internal goal for Dial-A-Ride trips within the City is four passengers/VSH.

The City works with the Camarillo Council on Aging as a citizens advisory board. Other public participation efforts include participation in the Camarillo Seniors Expo. Service changes are publicized via internet and brochures. The City participates in the Camarillo Council on Aging Board meetings on an as needed basis, as well as provides travel training at Leisure Village. A public hearing was held prior to the changes regarding service to the West County, but only one person attended, and no comments were received.

The City has not conducted recent rider or community surveys. Avenues to provide feedback are customer service and dispatch lines as well as an open-door policy. Roadrunner, the operations contractor, also maintained a complaint log. The City is interested in conducting origin and destination studies to determine where riders are going and where demand may be.

**Scheduling, Dispatch, and Operations**

The City utilizes one fixed-route driver. Dial-A-Ride shifts are assigned based on seniority. The workforce is not represented. Peak vehicle pull-out is 19 vehicles.

Time off is accrued based on hours worked. Policies are communicated via employee handbook. The City employs standby drivers to cover absences/vacations.

The City utilizes Roadsoft software for scheduling of Dial-A-Ride trips. Reservations can be made via phone or online. Reservations can be made from two hours to two weeks in advance. Subscription trips comprise no more than 20 percent of trips. Pick-up windows are ten minutes before and ten minutes after the scheduled time. The driver will wait five minutes before leaving. The City now auto-calls customers, which has reduced no-shows. Customers who do not cancel within two hours of a trip twice in one month can have privileges restricted the following month. Passengers who fail to cancel reserved rides more than three times will no longer be able to reserve rides until a $5.00 penalty fee is paid to the City.

Collected revenue is brought into the contractor’s facility in money bags. The contractor utilizes two-person counting. Onboard cameras also provide a layer of security. Fares collected onboard are deposited by Roadrunner and deducted from their invoice. The City also sells fare media at city hall.

**Personnel Management and Training**

Countywide, securing drivers has been a big challenge. Most operators have a sufficient number of drivers, but can be short due to turnover. Open positions are advertised on online job boards. Drivers must possess a minimum of three years’ professional driving experience and pass a background screening and driving test. Training includes one week of classroom and behind-the-wheel training.
Drivers are monitored by road supervisors and via DriveCam videos which are reviewed by the contractor’s safety department, which includes two local safety managers and a safety director.

Drivers are recognized for good performance via a “Driver of the Month” award and gift certificates. Customer letters of appreciation are passed along to drivers.

Driver turnover is approximately 15 percent to 25 percent, based on a variety of factors including poor performance, violation of employment terms, or simply finding new jobs.

Contractor employees are eligible for benefits including medical insurance, vacation time, paid time off, sick leave, and 401(k) savings accounts.

**Administration**

Budgeting is conducted every two years, with regular review of expectations versus actual cost/revenue. In recent budgets, expenditures have outpaced revenue, but the City has taken steps to rectify this by fine-tuning its forecasts. Fuel cost is one of the largest variables with respect to the budget. The budget is adjusted for anticipated changes or known factors, including vehicle purchases.

The city council has approval authority over significant contracts. The Engineering Technician is responsible for contract management, including regular monitoring of the operations contract. The operations/maintenance contract relationship began in 2012; the agreement was for three years plus up to seven option years. As discussed earlier, the City has an operations procurement in progress in response to a notice of termination from Roadrunner. Procurement follows guidelines set by the City, FTA, and VCTC. VCTC reviews the City’s transit RFPs to ensure all federal requirements are addressed. The City follows CalACT guidelines for rolling stock procurement.

The City is self-insured, part of a state insurance pool. The operations contractor also provides its own insurance. The City does not have a formal disaster preparedness plan, but utilizes transit for emergencies as needed. VCTC is currently preparing a countywide emergency preparedness plan.

The City has an internal audit process, which is conducted on an annual basis.

**Marketing and Public Information**

The fixed-route brochure was last updated in 2015. The Dial-A-Ride user guide was updated in 2016. The Trolley brochure was updated in 2019. The City’s website also includes service-related information, including maps, schedules, fare information, and more.

Customer calls are handled by Roadrunner and complaints are logged. Complaints are addressed by Roadrunner and the City’s Engineering Technician. The City receives frequent input from a handful of residents, but overall does not receive a lot of complaints. Overall, the public is largely appreciative of the transit service. In fact, one resident sent the City a donation of $500 at Christmas as a token of thanks.

**Maintenance**

City personnel are responsible for cleaning and inspecting bus shelter and stop infrastructure. Inspections occur every two weeks, with cleaning as needed. Infrastructure used to be pressure-washed
routinely, but this practice was suspended during California’s drought. Pressure washing now occurs only for health and safety reasons.

The City’s was cited for its preventive maintenance plan in its most recent FTA triennial review for being too restrictive. The current preventive maintenance schedule conforms to manufacturers’ recommended schedules, which are more lenient than Roadrunner’s prior plan. Several vehicles in the City’s fleet are under warranty and can be sent to the manufacturer if repairs are needed. Preventive maintenance is conducted after service hours so as not to conflict with vehicle usage. Vehicles undergo pre-trip safety inspections to ensure unsafe vehicles are not used for service.

The operations contractor’s maintenance facility is dedicated to the City’s fleet and is sufficient for that purpose. It includes two maintenance bays and three lifts. Parts inventory is also sufficient to minimize downtown. Dispatchers notify maintenance immediately if a vehicle breaks down. The City’s fleet vehicle status is shared on Google Drive so multiple departments have access to it. Dispatchers are also notified when a repaired vehicle is once again eligible for service. Wheelchair lifts are sent out for repair. The City feels Roadrunner does a good job with maintenance.

The City fleet includes one vehicle used for fixed-route service, one trolley, and the remainder is comprised of cutaways and vans used for Dial-A-Ride service. The average age of the vehicles is approximately 4.5 years, and vehicles typically exceed their useful life benchmark. Exhibit 6.3 details the City’s public transit fleet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Make</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Fuel type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fixed-Route</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Chevy</td>
<td>Arboc</td>
<td>Gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trolley</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Chevy</td>
<td>Hometown</td>
<td>Gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAR</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Braun</td>
<td>EnterVan</td>
<td>Gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAR</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>Glaval Entourage</td>
<td>Gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAR</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Braun</td>
<td>EnterVan</td>
<td>Gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAR</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>ElDorado National</td>
<td>Diesel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAR</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Chevy</td>
<td>Glaval Titan II</td>
<td>Gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAR</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Dodge</td>
<td>EnterVan</td>
<td>Gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAR</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Chevy</td>
<td>Glaval Titan</td>
<td>Gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAR</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>Challenger</td>
<td>Gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAR</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>Transit 350</td>
<td>Gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAR</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Chevy</td>
<td>Glaval Titan</td>
<td>Gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAR</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Dodge</td>
<td>EnterVan</td>
<td>Gas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exhibit 6.3 City of Camarillo Transit Fleet
Chapter 7

Findings and Recommendations

Conclusions
The City of Camarillo does not receive any TDA funds for transit and is not required to be in compliance with the requirements of the Transportation Development Act. Any items typically identified as compliance findings are provided as functional findings given the City’s non-use of TDA funds. Recommendations intended to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the operator are detailed below.

Findings
Based on discussions with City staff, analysis of program performance, and an audit of program compliance and function, the audit team presents no compliance findings.

The audit team has identified one functional finding. While this finding is not a compliance finding, the auditors believe it is significant enough to be addressed within this audit:

1. The use of the TDA definition of full-time equivalent (FTE) for reporting to the State Controller could not be verified.

Program Recommendations
In completing this Triennial Performance Audit, the auditors submit the following recommendations for the City of Camarillo’s public transit program. They are divided into two categories: TDA Program Compliance Recommendations and Functional Recommendations. TDA Program Compliance Recommendations are intended to assist in bringing the operator into compliance with the requirements and standards of the TDA, while Functional Recommendations address issues identified during the audit that are not specific to TDA compliance.

Given there are no compliance findings, only functional findings are presented.

Functional Finding 1: The use of the TDA definition of full-time equivalent (FTE) for reporting to the State Controller could not be verified.

Criteria: Public Utilities Code Section 99247(j) defines the vehicle service hours per employee metric as “the number of vehicle service hours divided by the number of employees employed in connection with the public transit system” based on person-hours of work. The item goes on to state, “The count of employees shall also include those individuals employed by the operator, which provide services to the agency of the operator responsible for the operation of the public transportation system even though not employed in that agency.”

Condition: As part of this review, the City did not provide any documentation outlining the methodology it uses in calculating FTE. While the number of employees reported appeared to be
appropriate for each mode, it is unclear how the City is calculating the number of employees or FTE it is reporting. This finding is carried forward from the prior audit as it remains relevant and has not been resolved.

**Cause:** There may be a lack of understanding of the TDA definition of full-time equivalent on behalf of the transit operations contractor or the City’s Finance department, which results in use of either a person-count or FTE calculated using the federal definition of full-time (which is 2,080 hours).

**Effect:** When FTE reported to the State Controller cannot be verified by internal calculation methodology, or when that calculation methodology is incorrect, it is a TDA compliance issue.

**Recommendation:** Demonstrate use of the TDA definition of full-time equivalent (FTE) for the Triennial Performance Audit and use that methodology when reporting Employees on the State Controller Report.

**Recommended Action(s):** City staff responsible for preparing the State Controller Report and transit management staff should become familiar with the TDA definition for full-time equivalent (FTE) as well as how it should be reported on the State Controller Report. In completing the State Controller Report, all staff and contractor hours worked for the full fiscal year should be added together, then divided by 2,000 to get the total FTE. Rather than accepting FTE figures from the contractor, we recommend the City request actual hours worked from the contractor, add City staff hours, then calculate FTE for the State Controller Report.

**Timeline:** Ongoing.

**Anticipated Cost:** None.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Recommendations</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate use of the TDA definition of full-time equivalent (FTE) for the Triennial Performance Audit and use that methodology when reporting Employees on the State Controller Report.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exhibit 7.1 Summary of Audit Recommendations