

Special Transportation Fund Advisory Committee (STFAC)
Friday, March 18th, 9:00am-12:00pm • ODOT Public Meeting Room, 123 NW Flanders (1st Floor)

AGENDA

TIME	SUBJECT	No.	TOPICS	LEAD
9:00	Welcome	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agenda 	Jan Campbell, <i>STFAC Chair</i>
9:05	Needs Assessment Worksession: Report Back	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key findings & Discussion 	Anais Mathez, <i>Cogan Owens Greene</i>
9:20	2012 CTP: Overview of Historical Context		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historical context of 2012 CTP Key changes and accomplishments since 2012 • Defining and prioritizing 2012 CTP strategies 	Jan Campbell Claudia Robertson, <i>STFAC Vice Chair</i> Teresa Christopherson, <i>Clackamas County</i> Julie Wilcke, <i>Ride Connection</i>
9:30	Draft Chapter 5: Strategic Initiatives	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peer review of innovations in other Coordinated Plans 	Zachary Horowitz, <i>Kittelson and Associates</i>
9:40	The Future of Coordinated Transportation Services: Guest Speakers		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Customer Service and Environment • Coordination • Technology 	Andi Howell, <i>City of Sandy</i> Dion Graham, <i>TriMet</i> Julie Wilcke Bibiana McHugh, <i>TriMet</i>
10:00	Guiding Principles and Priorities for Developing Strategies	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategies Discussion • Process for reviewing and updating strategic initiatives Review 2012 CTP guiding principles • Draft priorities for project evaluation • Draft categories of applications for service expansion or improvement 	Susan Wright, <i>Kittelson and Associates</i>
10:20	<i>Break</i>			
10:30	Discussion Groups		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guiding principles and priorities • Funding application categories 	Table Facilitators
11:30	Report Back		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2-3 minutes per group 	Anais Mathez
11:45	Next Steps		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting timeline • Committee housekeeping 	Hannah Quinsey
12:00	<i>Adjourn</i>			Jan Campbell

TriMet Coordinated Transportation Plan for Elderly and People with Disabilities March 4th 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
- 211 Info

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 or 503-962-4912.

**COORDINATED TRANSPORTATION PLAN (CTP)
FOR ELDERLY AND PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES**

STRATEGIC INITIATIVES FROM THE 2012 CTP

1. ENCOURAGE USE OF FIXED ROUTE TRANSIT

- Implement Trip Screening and Path of Travel Review
- Bus Stop Improvements
- Paratransit Feeder Services
- Route Deviation

2. MANAGE ADA SERVICE DEMAND

- Review LIFT and other providers' service standards
- Develop Comprehensive ADA Paratransit Eligibility Process
- Community-Based Accessible Vans

3. ENHANCE PEDESTRIAN ACCESS/LAND USE IMPROVEMENTS

- Pedestrian-Friendly Environment
- Livable Communities Evaluation
- Pedestrian Master Plan

4. ADDRESS SAFETY AND SECURITY CONCERNS AT TRANSIT FACILITIES AND ON VEHICLES

- Improve lighting
- Improve visibility
- Improve communications with transit security personnel.
- Provide public information on transit safety and security.

5. IMPROVE INFORMATION AND REFERRAL/PROGRAM OUTREACH

- Provider websites review

6. PROVIDE VEHICLE AND DRIVER ALTERNATIVES

- Taxicab Vouchers
- Driver Pools
- Volunteer Driver Programs
- Peer Programs

7. ENHANCE SERVICES FOR PEOPLE WHO STAY AT HOME

8. COORDINATED PLANNING & OPERATIONS

- Opportunities Within the Ride Connection Network

- Intra-Regional Strategies
 - Joint Service Planning
 - Regional ADA Eligibility & Reciprocity
 - Coordination with Private Sector
 - Coordinate Scheduling of Rides
 - Centralize Network Information
 - Coordination with Medical Facilities
 - Coordinated Care Organizations

9. IMPROVE REGIONAL CONNECTIVITY

- Interagency Coordination

COORDINATED TRANSPORTATION PLAN (CTP) FOR ELDERLY AND PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES

DRAFT Updated Chapter 5: Review of Peer CTP Strategic Initiatives

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/

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.

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

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

Charlotte, North Carolina:
<http://charmack.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

Long Island, New York:

http://nymtc.org/files/RTP_PLAN_2040_docs/Public%20Review%20Drafts/Appendix6.pdf

COORDINATED TRANSPORTATION PLAN (CTP) FOR ELDERLY AND PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES

Guiding Principles and Priorities Discussion Guide

This document provides background and discussion questions to help update the Coordinated Transportation Plan (CTP). The Draft Guiding Principles for the 2016 CTP and potential priorities are intended for use in developing and prioritizing strategies in the CTP and in prioritizing STF/5310 funding when it becomes available during the years the updated CTP is in effect.

Guiding Principals

The 2012 CTP included the following Guiding Principles:

“The development of these strategies is based on the following guiding principles:”

- (a) *“The highest priority for service providers is to preserve existing services and to avoid further service reductions”*
- (b) *“Adequate capital replacements must be accounted for”*
- (c) *“Transportation providers intend to maintain their process to ensure strategic and equitable distribution of available funding”*
- (d) *“Additional funding is needed to support operations and capital investments”*
- (e) *“Given escalating demand, efforts should be taken to increase capacity of existing programs”*

Note: the 2012 CTP did not explicitly order these principles or use letters to organize them, but instead used bullet points. They are arbitrarily assigned letters here so they can be referred to in the following discussion.

These principles provided guidance for developing strategies in the 2012 CTP. They also helped inform how proposals for funding were ranked and prioritized in 2015 and 2016.

The 2016 CTP can provide more guidance to staff and to future STFAC deliberations with a more fully developed list of priorities.

1. Potential Priorities – Initial List for Discussion and Response

The following table presents Draft Guiding Principles for the 2016 CTP for discussion and feedback from the STFAC. This list includes the previous principles established by the 2012 CTP update and builds on them to include new priorities to help aid STFAC deliberation and evaluation of projects. This discussion draft is listed in a potential order of priority, but the STFAC may choose to change the order, only assign specific priorities to some items, or not rank the priorities at all.

Discussion questions:

1. Is the list of Draft 2016 CTP Guiding Principles generally adequate?
2. Is there anything missing?
3. Should the 2016 CTP Guiding Principles be prioritized or just listed? If prioritized, what is the right order of priority?
4. If the 2016 CTP Guiding Principles are prioritized, how should this be considered in the funding application process?

The 2012 CTP did not explicitly order the guiding principles. The STFAC may elect to prioritize the guiding principles in the 2016 CTP. This could be useful in prioritizing strategies, making funding recommendations and prioritizing applications.

Guiding Principles (2012 CTP)
<i>The highest priority for service providers is to preserve existing services and to avoid further service reductions</i>
<i>Adequate capital replacements must be accounted for</i>
<i>Transportation providers intend to maintain their process to ensure strategic and equitable distribution of available funding</i>
<i>Additional funding is needed to support operations and capital investments</i>
<i>Given escalating demand, efforts should be taken to increase capacity of existing programs</i>

	Draft Guiding Principles (2016 CTP)
1	Preserve existing services and avoid service reductions.
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. <i>*Note: In practice, during application ranking, this has led to the approach of funding scaled-back requests rather than original, full requests in order to provide at least some funding to as many services in as many locations as possible.</i>
4	Help mitigate shortfalls in funding from other sources of grant funds. <i>*Note: This would indicate that utilizing STF and 5310 funds to fill funding gaps left by reductions and elimination of funds, such as BETC and JARC, would be a priority.</i>
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).
6	Consider cost-effectiveness in making funding decisions (such as \$ per ride, % match)
7	Expand service in new areas, restore service where previously cut, or implement new initiatives related to technology and coordination.

2. Categories of funding applications

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

1. Maintain Existing Service
 - a. Operational funding to maintain existing service levels
 - b. Shortfall funding to maintain existing service levels (help mitigate shortfalls in funding due to reductions and loss of funding such as BETC and JARC).

2. Improve service quality – this category would provide improvements to the safety, efficiency, comfort, cost-effectiveness or coordination of existing service. Examples could include better dispatch systems, new transit shelters, or new higher-capacity buses.

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

4. New initiatives – this category would include other new efforts which could include projects such as introducing new technologies and new ways to coordinate services.



Discussion questions:

1. Do you think that categorizing the different types of funding applications would be useful when reviewing applications? Are there any categories missing? Or, how could they be improved?
2. What kinds of information would be useful for providers to share with you when you are evaluating these different types of funding applications?