ALASKA COMMUNITY AND PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY BOARD
MEETING SUMMARY
October 21, 2013

PARTICIPANTS

MEMBERS
- Jennifer Beckmann, Transportation Expert/Low Income
- Susan Bell, Denali Commission
- Patricia Branson, Transportation Expert/Seniors
- Larry Bredeman, Tribal
- Doug Bridges, Nonprofit Organization
- Heidi Frost, Transportation Expert/Disabilities
- Bill Herman, Alaska Mental Health Trust Fund
- Duane Mayes, Department of Human and Social Services
- Glenn Miller, Municipality
- Jeffrey Ottesen, Department of Transportation and Public Facilities
- Sharon Scott, Public At Large
- James Starzec, Public At Large
- Cheryl Walsh, Department of Labor and Workforce Development

OTHERS
- Ezekiel Kaufman, Department of Health and Social Services
- Jon Sherwood, Department of Health and Social Services
- Jamie Action, Municipality of Anchorage
- Jan Tew, Valley Mover
- Debbi Howard, Department of Transportation and Public Facilities
- Eric Taylor, Department of Transportation and Public Facilities

FACILITATOR
Marsha Bracke, Bracke and Associates, Inc.

ATTACHMENTS

The following documents are included as attachments to this meeting summary:

- Attachment A: Flip Chart Transcript
- Attachment B: Transit Conference Inputs
- Attachment C: C&PTAB Strategic Plan

AGENDA

New Members

The C&PTAB conducted a round robin of introductions to share perspectives and interests relative to their role on the C&PTAB, specifically welcoming and getting to know new members Sharon Scott (Public At Large), James Starzec (Public At Large), and Larry Bredeman (Tribal). C&PTAB reviewed resource materials including the CTTF Report, the statute establishing the C&PTAB, the group's Operational Guidelines, and the Strategic Plan, pointing out is significance in the history of the group and its relevance in terms of the group's purpose and this week's activities.

Transit Conference

C&PTAB reviewed the presentation and process for the conference work group discussions scheduled for the next day. Refinements were made to process and handouts; scribes were assigned to C&PTAB facilitators who didn't yet have one; and process supports (flip charts, feedback mechanisms, etc.) were developed to generate greater feedback from meeting participants. Transit conference inputs collected by facilitators and scribes during the October 22 session have been transcribed and are included as Attachment B.

Long Range Transportation Plan

Jeff Ottesen, DOT&PF, reviewed the purpose and schedule of the Long Range Transportation Plan – a document to which the group is required to provide input per statute. The process is just kicking off, and key opportunities exist for the group to provide input at various stages in the process. While it is a high level/long planning term document, opportunities for input include C&PTAB representation on the Transportation Stakeholders Group, input following system analysis (approximately January 2014), comment following scenario development (approximately May 2014) and comment following the release of the draft plan (approximately July 2014). The group made no definitive decision about its preferred involvement options, but did recommend an additional meeting in January 2014 to conduct business face-to-face. The LRTP will be part of that meeting agenda, should the DOT&PF decide to convene the extra meeting.

Strategic Plan

C&PTAB updated their strategic plan per the progress made to date and the realities of implementation. This will be used as a basis for a comprehensive review/update of the strategic plan at the group's next meeting. The update is included as Attachment C.

Tour

C&PTAB toured the Capital Transit Fixed Route and paratransit operations.

Action Items

1. Marsha will produce the meeting summary and distribute to the group to review.
2. DOT&PF will determine whether an additional meeting of the group can be supported.
3. Marsha will issue doodle calendars to identify dates for the next 2-3 meetings of the C&PTAB.
4. C&PTAB members will conduct the transit conference tabletop discussions as outlined/refined at this meeting.

ALASKA COMMUNITY AND PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY BOARD
ATTACHMENT A: FLIP CHART TRANSCRIPTS
October 21, 2013

INTRODUCTIONS
- Name
- Affiliation
- Role/Perspective on C&PTAB
- Significance of community and public transportation from your perspective
- What difference can C&PTAB make

BACKGROUND
1. CTTF Report
2. Law
3. Operational Guidelines
4. Strategic Plan

CONFERENCE DISCUSSION SUGGESTIONS
- Mechanism to submit comments after discussion
- Index cards – provide additional comments (indicate topic/number)
- Facilitator hand out cards – ask for more comment
- Next year – end of conference and have teasers throughout
- Thursday – 8:45 – 10:00?
- Easel? One per topic – write comments
- Both
- Scribe post index comment
- Provide e-mail – send to scribe
- All of the above
- Verbal, Index Cards, Easel, Email
- Topic/number in subject line
- Marsha's e-mail

NEXT MEETING

Month	Location	Decision
January	Anchorage	Investigate possibility and consider per updated strategic plan
April/May (late April)	Sitka	Doodle Poll
June/July	Mat-Su Borough	Doodle Poll
Deliverables: LRTP, Alternative Fuels, Annual Funding Review		

Marsha and Eric work

DEFINITION OF COORDINATION
The moderators presented a proposed definition of 'coordination' and asked participants to identify what they did and did not like about the definition and make suggestions for improvements.

GROUP 1
- Good definition
- Covering all bases
- Where would there be pushback? Maybe sharing power
- Hard to analyze, force people to tackle problems
- Lead agency in difficult situation. Who are they? CPTAB?
- Is all this effort (coordination) really worth it? Effort vs. hassle
- Haven't seen an example of where it works
- Takes more than meeting once a year (community coordination groups)
- What is driving force that brings people/agencies to coordination meeting?
- How do we identify what that community need is ... (public meetings)
- When meeting use definition to help agencies determine how it affects them i.e., what power, what is their responsibility
- When you plan together/work together... you will share power, funding, responsibility etc. naturally
- No funding for coordination. Staff time at lead organization
- Huge challenge from small grass roots organization to coordinate all the multi-modal transportation options. Try out mobility manager model.
- Pressure to do more, more, more. Challenge for transit agency.
- Mobility management is misunderstood. Need to define for community.
- Should they be the coordinator to contact all the agencies?
- Can we afford a mobility manager in each community? Region? Statewide coordinator?
- Each agency to contribute money to the coordination effort. Describe benefits – what would come off their plate
- Need better coordination meeting process
- Reporting requirements do not take into account performance measures
- Sharing power – 'way we do business' is really rough – Are they willing to be flexible, change
- Power is a trigger word–need replacement for concept – strong word
- Share community responsibility
- Share a vision rather than power
- Share resources rather than funding
- Planning together means getting together – requires a lead to manage meeting logistics, no planning money, hard to get people to show up – incentives/skin in the game

- Required vs. benefits
- Perception that transit agency is on a power grab if they are the lead planning organization
- What's in it for the community? What's in it for my agency?
- Various definitions of mobility management. Confused with coordination? Can't separate the two. Should they spearhead coordination of agencies.
- Valdez model – one person
- Community dependent – different scale/needs
- Must keep the focus on the creating/greater community mobility
- Share responsibility of the vision

GROUP 2
- Agrees with definition, might be too broad
- Better define: 'increase transportation' because there are different modes, times, etc.
- Perhaps use – increased access
- Are mobility/planning the same as coordination?
- How do we move programs closer together? How will my people be served if I send them to you?
- Fear of losing funding/money. Fear of shared vehicles (insurance/wear and tear of vehicles, etc.)
- If too broad, then will people buy into the concept?
- What does "shared power" mean?
- Can be scary idea for some – use it as 'shared power' means to shared strength
- People need to be assured that things are taken care of/customers are losing by sharing
- WWII analogy – generals had to share ideas, resources plans, etc. to defeat AXIS
- To gain some efficiency – sharing must happen
- Sharing funding – hard to do because some funding streams require entity to pick up specific groups
- Could be that you must pick up specific group AND others
- Plan together/work together is a big part of coordination
- Have to overcome some vulnerability so we can share
- Coordination does not work well without a champion. Someone pushing it
- That could seem like a power grab (if one organizations thinks another organization isn't being champion for right reason)
- Hire outside person to be the champion – very important at the beginning of process
- Could start small – shared training, shared schedules
- How would I explain 'coordination' to my staff?
- Coordination could be 'a moose designed by committee'
- There could be a person trying to derail coordination
- Coordination could help organizations free up time, staff, and resources
- Coordination could be large concepts that gets bogged down by the details

- Airlines are independent agencies but share schedules so customers are served
- When money is scarce, coordination happens more freely
- Is it the funders' responsibility to demand coordination? So we only give money if coordination actually happens?
- By coordinating are we surrendering power, equipment?
- Where does it say in the grant/contract that you can't pick up people who aren't part of your special group? It doesn't, usually
- The goal is to provide MORE before funding gets so tight that originations merge (then are coordinating)
- Change: A way to increase … to ACROSS communities – (instead of their communities)
- Word efficiency is missing
- Barriers: contracts say you can't. That's why buses sit vacant. People, background checks, etc., make it harder to coordinate but not impossible
- Repurpose the vehicles by allowing vehicles to be used when the agencies aren't using them (weekends, night)
- Have to have rules in place to make coordination happen
- How does it fit our definition? Do we need to add something about vehicles in our definition of coordination?

GROUP 3
- Do we have performance measurements to check to see if we are coordinating, our performance is better, benchmarks?
- How do we determine what is shared?
- Instead of 'sharing power' should it be 'sharing decision-making'
- Power is a strong word. It scares people away because it leans toward 'what power is taken from me?"
- Change to 'coordinated process with a shared vision'
- What about sharing resources instead of share funding – resources means more than just money. It's time, people, vehicles, maintenance, facilities, etc.
- Likes first and last statement a lot
- Likes committed partners (not just partners)
- We need to have one agency responsible for the coordination – schedule meetings, ask other agencies to share, coordinate the Team approach
- Should there be an agency that is separate from the transit agencies who does the coordination (has no dog in the fight)?
- Must have shared vision before coordination can happen
- There must be an incentive to coordinating
- What's in it for me? More services to my customers
- Do the smaller agencies have a maintenance bay? Could they benefit from sharing that way? What is the benefit to the agency? Training? Background checks/ Schedules? Funding?
- To work, coordination MUST start at the top
- Can work on small scale between different agencies
- Must be an ongoing effort (not starts and spurts)

- Will fall apart if all responsibility falls on one person or one agency
- Mobility Manager works with consumer
- Coordination takes place between groups
- Sometimes mobility manager is also the coordinator
- By saying 'most need it in the community' are we excluding those who just need it? Trying to see we prioritize the folks who need it most
- Add 'scaleable' because some villages/towns/city have different scale of need
- You could start small (just 2 agencies coordinating) – who that it works and then add more agencies into process
- Shared responsibility is a big item. How do you ensure everyone is sharing the responsibility and one agency isn't doing it all?
- We all have to share the responsibility of the Vision
- An ongoing strategy to use shrinking resources

Submitted in drop box
- Things you should not do while driving: anything else. Driving time is down time
- Things you can do while riding a bus: text, read, knit/crochet, write a book, compose music, ???? . Riding time can be productive time

REWRITES

Coordination is: Committed partners who
- Plan together, work together, and support the broader community
- Share responsibility
- Share power
- Share funding and resources
- Increase benefits

In order to build a sustainable, efficient transit system that works for the community as a whole

Coordination is:
- An ongoing strategy to better manage scarce resources
- Committed partners who
  - Share power (new work or delete)
  - Share resources
  - Share responsibility for the vision
  - Share benefits
  - Plan together, work together, and support the broader community
- A way to increase transportation options for those who most need it in their communities

Submitted in drop box:

Coordination

Coordination is the successful ACTION of planning and management of transportation challenges due to the uniqueness of our state and transportation needs. Coordination includes partners being able to
- Share in both the responsibility of planning and management of planning process and equally share in the decision-making process
- Share and pool resources and funding to mitigate the scarceness and limited availability of resources

Coordination will benefit both providers and users of transportation by
- Reducing distance barriers
- Increasing availability of transportation
- Improving the quality of life for providers and users

INTERAGENCY (STATE) COORDINATION
The work group shared a their proposal for an Interagency Working Group and asked participants to identify challenges and proposed solutions to the interagency coordination effort.

GROUP 3A

Challenges
- Assignment of ride could be done by another means or agency
- Lack of funding for implementing lead agency requirements or sustaining
- Insufficient cash on hand – advance cash from state
- Shipping equipment to rural communities limited by conditions increases cost
- Agency service outside of population centers is more difficult and transportation is less efficient
- Medicaid waiver billing requirements for ride too expensive and inflexible to implement

Solutions
- All state agencies should require participation in local coordination group as a funding condition
- State level Mobility Manger
- Standard for ADA eligibility
- Providers must be tied in to interagency working group
- Inventory of community services

Handwritten Notes

Challenges and Frustrations, Solutions

- Para transit to group here to pick up client and there's a state purchased care on group with providers – why city pick up bill
- The cost and procedures for providers hurt them and they need better procedures for state and providers to use – more in terms of advance cash flows to providers
- Many organizations are responsible for planning to coordinate, but there's no funding – *More funding for an agency to actually implement coordination would help; need start up funds and funds to be sustainable at state and local level*
- Shipping challenges – have to wait for ice to flow out so barges to get in village. The weather screws up resources on barges to get to village. Gas is high
- *ADA eligibility standard that that's the same across all agencies*
- *Include transportation providers in the IAWG*
- *Have a map listing communities and population and then which services are available there. An overlay of this. That way, we could know what's there and have target intervention*
- DOT - there may be some of that at the community level, and they are easily outdated because not updating maps/population moves

GROUP 3B

Challenges
- Lack of local government ownership and funding support
- Local agency advocating use of data to support message
- Waiver rules change
- Coordination of planning carrying through to project implementation
- Coordination between Mat-SU and Anchorage
- Lack of shared participation in implementation cost from funders and coordination partners

Solutions
- Common reporting system
- Limit scattered funding; target funding to fewer service providers
- DOT&PF staff support (area planners)

Handwritten Notes
- Matsu Area – cities and municipalities aren't responsible or don't contribute money for transportation
- *Diversify funding sources and funding streams*
- Providers don't get enough money to incentivize programs. Either initial money or money to sustain programs or for clients to use services
- State agencies don't know the communities – *go to communities*
- *Decrease burden of reporting or at least provide data system infrastructure for providers to use. Common reporting system; clearly demonstrate importance of data*

GROUP 4A
- Senior and disabilities – NTS grants
- Local governments
- Medicaid waiver
- FTA Children in transition
- AMHT – data collection
- DOL
- Medicaid
- Vocational Rehabilitation
- ADA
- Coordinate reporting
- Efficiencies decreased to reporting base
- Definitions inconsistent (especially MV)

Challenges
- Coordinate power comes from funders
- Pooled insurance, incentive from coordination to join
- Require repurposing when not in use
- Obtainable result within given time to spend energy in coordinating group
- Interpretation/perception of blending of funds, internal and external
- Pool all vehicles – transportation services
- AnchoRides -smaller initiative – model
- Private sector model – shared cars/bikes, efficiency – potential for non-profits
- Public – segmentation of services perceived
- State agencies – better understanding needed across agencies
- e.g. replace shelter – DOTPF – shelter ROW/AMHS property
- FTA grant requirements – driving services – impeded
- Matsu example
- Grant restrictive on uses, e.g., only for school use/reconsider
- TANF/DOTPF/Senior Services – funding agencies NOT coordinated
- Limits services/creates administrative work
- Grant clarifications up front
- Matsu – good example of exploring options to help coordination
- "if don't displace' primary users, then other users allowed
- Balance – appropriate vs. misappropriation

Solutions
- Program audits
- Promote using coordinated transit
- Separate transit from day habilitation and group home
- Brokerage between state and local, more communication , less barriers
- SDS alert model
- Urban vs. rural for trip definition

Handwritten Notes
- ▪ Make a list of all agencies that support transportation, including the different divisions within departments. We receive NTS grants, Medicaid waiver, local contract for paratransit, Title 1-children in transition, MHTA. Federal, state, local. MTHA causes a lot of extra work because of the data they request.
- ▪ Data requirements should match management. Founding sources should care about whether they are efficient.
- ▪ Coordinate reporting; there is always something unique about each funder's reporting requirements. E.g., Medicaid waiver providers must have performance improvement plan, NTS grant uses logic model that addresses improving services. Everyone wants their own reports; the formatting is different. It takes resources away from services.
- ▪ Reporting makes mixing trips difficult, ease of use is impaired. Clients have difficulties understanding different rules; many are cognitively impaired.
- ▪ DVR is a funding source.
- ▪ Regular Medicaid transportation is a whole different service from Medicaid waiver transportation.
- ▪ Local government reporting plus national transit database.
- ▪ Different definitions used: e.g., NTS defines a trip around disembarking, Medicaid waiver defines a round trip as to and from home.
- ▪ Different programs have different auditors, different audit requirements.
- ▪ Solutions:
  - o Opportunity for providers to give feedback to funders on data requirements and how they impact operations before the requirements are implemented.
  - o Promote coordination: separate transportation from other services (e.g., Medicaid waiver requires transportation as part of day habilitation).
  - o Oregon is a good model; its Medicaid program contracts with local agencies to serve Medicaid clients. The broker is a local transit system or some other local government entity.
  - o Communication with providers is important, before changes are made.
  - o Agencies need to know the difference between rural and urban, really different settings, and sometimes different rules.
  - o Iowa and Wisconsin have been doing coordination for quite a while.
- ▪ Power for coordination really lies with the funders. When money is tight, people naturally get together at the local level, but the power is with the funders to foster coordination. For example, there are thousands of vehicles in the Anchorage area that could pool insurance, which would help permit vehicles to be repurposed when they are not being used for their provider's programs. Some agencies need vehicles for evenings and weekends while others are parking their vehicles on evenings and weekends.
- ▪ One piece that is needed is dispatching software to track vehicles.
- ▪ Different service definitions, not usually a problem, but sometimes are.
- ▪ Local groups all need champions. And if there isn't something tangible they can do quickly (i.e., within six months), they will lose interest.

- In Mat-Su area, the community perception is that the vehicles are dedicated purposes, seniors, tribal, etc. Introduction of technology will help change perception.
- All of the perception issues are at the local level, the challenge is what state agencies can do to help change perceptions.
- In one Florida community, all of the nonprofits gave up vans. One entity staffed and maintained all of the vans. Some sharing occurs here, but not real strong. Anchor Rides does not own all of the vehicles it operates. Some are owned by other entities.
- What are the incentives to pool vehicles? Is the funding an incentive? How do we clarify what we can do better.
- Zip Cars are an example of initiative to share vehicles.
- Urban vs. rural, what you can and can't do.
- People/provider agencies hide behind their own interpretations of the rules.
- Different agencies don't know what other agencies are doing. Example of trying to get a bus shelter replaced on Marine Highway property, working with Marine Highway, and DOT right of way. But they couldn't get a decision from DOT as to which was the permitting entity.
- Other agencies don't understand FTA reporting requirements.
- Unequal treatment of programs: Government buses don't have to stop at weigh stations; nonprofit buses do.
- Funding agencies put limitations on vehicle use. We need a process to apply for reconsideration (exemption?) for mixed use.
- All funding could be run through one source.
- Data reporting – One trip might have 4 different funding sources, 4 different reporting requirements.
- Example of problem: paraplegic woman in Haines returns from medical travel by ferry. Van can take her twenty miles home but isn't supposed to take her family. It makes no sense when the van is empty and has capacity.
- Pooling: what is appropriate vs. misappropriation?
- If you can come up with clear rules for coordination, you will see more rides.
- Example of speed limits: people obey them better if they know someone is enforcing them. For appropriate coordination,, we need a sense that people are watching the provider behavior so that people don't abuse the system.

COMMUNICATING BENEFITS
This work group asked participants what coordination looks like to them and what kinds of messages communicate the value of coordination. After that, participants were asked to evaluate the effectiveness of proposed C&PTAB messages.

GROUP 5&6A

- Use stories, experiences, and first-hand to share needs/benefits
- Facts and data useful, but overwhelming not as effective to convey messages
- Simple messages, powerful points, accurate information

- Make needs clear (vs. wants)
- Encourage participation of additional groups, knowledge sharing
- Focus on local coordination before reaching out to big government
- Share successes and concrete examples of what works (locally) – uses of current funding
- What have we accomplished with what we've already been given
- Common voice – group effort
- Outreach to leadership by USERS (spokespeople)
- Think in terms of daily needs – groceries, medical, employment cannot operate without transit
- Poor accessibility effects more than just one person – it affects the family/groups
- One –on-one discussions/outreach – useful as well as groups
- Combining resources without fear of losing financial support from grants/organizations

GROUP5&6B

- Better use of resources
- Variety of messages/outreach – understanding needs
- Consistent outreach
- More ideas, perspectives, involvement
- More effective communication of benefits
- Simpler system, combining resources, information dissemination
- System unity
- Less waste of time/money coordinating transportation
- Safer
- Coordination – efficiency – prevent wasted resource
- Cost saving to end users – eases cost associated with transit/facilitates employment
- Coordination requirements performance measures
- Helping people get to work has a trickle-down affect
- Encourages community/discourages segregation
- Promotes creative solutions
- Encourages standardization which promotes safety
- Fuel and time savings
- Brings funding sources together

Submitted in drop box:
- Helps identify what the common needs of service providers are
- Efficiency of operations
- How do we communicate these benefits? Use united voice – one speaker backed up by show of users at meeting

Evaluation of C&PTAB messages:

On a scale of 1-5, 5 being high and 1 being low, how effectively does this statement communicate the value of coordinated transportation?

1, 4, 4, 3, 3, 4, 1, 3, 5, 3, 1, 3, 5, 2, 3, 5, 3, 3, 3, 4, 3, 5, 5, 3 (3.3)
Coordination can reduce the burden of meeting federal reporting requirements and processing paperwork.

3, 4, 3, 4, 3, 4, 5, 4, 5, 2, 5, 5, 5, 5, 4, 5, 5, 3, 4, 1, 3, 3, 4, 4 (3.9)
Coordinated transportation enables home and community-based services; the more local the care is provided, the less its total cost.

5, 5, 4, 3, 2, 3, 5, 3, 5, 1, 3, 3, 5, 5, 5, 5, 2, 3, 5, 4, 5, 4, 4, 3 (3.9)
Coordination can help limited and decreasing funding across agencies and programs sustain or increase support.

5, 5, 2, 4, 4, 4, 5, 4, 5, 5, 4, 2, 5, 3, 4, 5, 5, 4, 2, 5, 5, 5, 4, 4 (4.2)
Alaska has the fastest growing senior population in the nation - one in five seniors do not drive. Therefore, the need for human service and public transportation options is rising rapidly.

5, 4, 2, 3, 1, 3, 1, 2, 5, 4, 5, 3, 5, 3, 5, 5, 3, 3, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 2 (3.7)
There is not enough transportation available at an affordable cost in Alaska to meet the need - at least one out of nine Alaskans has special needs or circumstances.

5, 5, 3, 5, 3, 4, 5, 4, 5, 5, 4, 4, 5, 5, 3, 5, 5, 5, 1, 5, 4, 5, 5, 3 (4.3)
Human service and public transportation promote economic development.

Edits and Additions:
- Coordination can maximize current investments and better serve the entire community.
- These thoughts are great – tie coordination into the statement (add coordination language to 5 specifically)
- We need more training in the small village to help them get public transit in their small village
- Coordinated public transportation allows those who cannot afford private vehicles a means to get to work, therefore lowering the cost to government of otherwise providing/supporting them on public assistance (welfare).

MEASURING IMPACTS
This work group asked participants to respond to this specific question: How can we most meaningfully measure the IMCPACT of coordinated public and human service transportation on users, stakeholders, the economy, and the environment?

GROUP 7A&B
- Statewide programs review data

- KTN cabs do not take vouchers or C Cards
- Less traffic using transit
- Consistent one stop
- Brochure – information on impacts
- Studies already done
- White papers
- Standard data collection
- Don't reinvent the wheel – look at plans, compare, and coordinate
- Providers, funding systems
- Information collected is vital
- How important is this service
- Community Transportation Association – how do they report? Economy? Don't reinvent wheel
- Consumers, providers meet
- Statewide overlay of services
- Incentives to serve outlying communities not already being served
- Household income
- Category tracking
- Type of trips – work, doctors, store, etc.
- Size of community vs. serve area – average trip? Length (miles?)
- Time on bus
- Shared rides
- Efficiency in trips
- Coordination with vets
- More work for providers collecting measurable data
- Phone surveys – follow-up
- Valdez – purchase services survey – users, count rides
- @ sign up – category – elders, low-income, disability – mental health DD, Wheelchair
- Three – complete riders surveys sent into quarterly reports
- Providers' surveys
- Fairbanks NSB
- Fixed routes are limiting
- Through coordination reach out to users over ¾ miles
- $ per agency – how it's used – pool funds?
- Stay involved
- "Quality f Life" measure
- FRA Provider – small % - use public transportation
- Internal survey
- REACH – Para transit – 30%public
- # of transit employees
- Vendor impacts –doctors, stores, centers =, trips made by users
- # trips, #users, personal miles per gallon / emissions, fuel, efficient, length
- Fixed paved roads – al being served in communicate s(service area vs. need)
- Network with communities increase services and funds sharing (POW Tribal Transit)

- Encourage private sector to engage with transit, parking, stops, cost savings, reduce infrastructure needs, more help to develop plans
- $ as a motivator
- Social services – share information with providers
- Transportation vs. measuring transportation – how to apply ? funds to prepare plans – funds to implement
- Lack of coordination
- Get to basics – apply it
- Cost effective, streamline

GROUP 8A&B

- Telling the personal human story (impact)
- The number – the 'story' – reference AMC
- Instead of describing trip numbers describe "rides to "– trip purpose
- We plan for what we measure
- User groups – trip purpose = more engaging
- Use of statistics towards "learning mode"
- Just because someone else isn't measuring does not mean other data not important or useful
- Numbers don't always tell whole or 'best story
- Don't add more data to measure but work at interpreting current data differently
- Number of rides/trip purpose (most important measurable)
- Boarding and alighting locations
- How many people have access not just currently using geographically and 'temporary " – time arranging
- Reliability – on time performance
- Not just for need but choice
- Add a bullet ' public health'
- Measure environmental/transit use – health and economic impact
- Quantify fiscal impact
- What is asked for 'data wise' sometimes too onerous (time effort bureaucracy) to seek funding
- How to measure impact on economy?
- How many people use transit to access work
- Comparison of personal finances relating to 'transit lifestyle' vs. personal vehicle
- What is important to measure impact
- Tell the personal store of how transit helps people's lives
- Measure level of coordination (measure similar routes, duplication)
- Mobility manager could improve coordination and better data collect
- Measure how much time to get ride (example: case manager wants ride for client how long between that and actual ride)
- On-line survey to determine why using confidentiality

- Measure how much fuel saved by using transportation (high gas prices in rural AK) – check to see if local purchases go up with fuel savings
- Measure 'down time' associated with transit user "needing transit due to temporarily illness disability"
- How many people use transit to get to work
- Measure inventory of transit assets
- Measure 'user groups,' revenue sources associated with
- Measure use 'before' coordination and 'after"
- Trips per hour
- Number of service hours reduced by coordination (multiple agencies serving same hours and areas0
- Number of vehicles on road/congestion (environment)
- Measure potential users
- Measure number of drivers who have unsafe vehicles or are 'driving when they should not ' – legal situations
- Number of unduplicated passengers (measure with pass stces)
- Annoying data collection:
- Trip purpose where rider is going
- Economic profiles/data of riders
- One way of less bothersome method of economic data collection is to look at other assistance programs that users access
- Don't like to 'type people' example mental health trust
- Desire one reporting standard for all revenue sources
- Too much time spent in data collection and reports and not enough to hands on management o program
- Hate DBI reports
- Tell us what you want data for (user getting asked for data wants to know what you are looking for) – the system is really intrusive
- Funders should include fundees in the dialogue of why data collected and seek our advice
- Transit not just for poor people. Some people elect to use for other reasons. Funders can fall into trap that creates stigma of transit. Data can be influenced by this 'mind set"

Submitted in drop box:
- Have state funders use same definitions and reporting to minimize costs and maximize efficiency
- We're fighting too many battles on taxicab issues. In no society do we allow a cab driver decide he/she doesn't pick up black people or native people, so why do we allow them to decide not to pick up someone in a wheelchair or has a service animal. Consider a state law that anyone licensed locally to provide taxi or limousine service shall not discriminate against PWDs or provide way to punish those who do. And, anyone who operates a dispatch company shall follow through on calls by PDS to assure they get picked up on. Anyone who ones or operates more than three permits shall ensure one of them meets federal ADA standards.

Alaska Community and Public Transportation Advisory Board: Strategic Plan - October 21, 2013

STRATEGIC DIRECTION	Nov-13	Dec-13	Jan-14	Feb-14	Mar-14	Apr-14	May-14	Jun-15	Jul-14	Aug-14	Sep-14	Resources	TEAM MEMBERS
1. Developing common definitions/criteria/terminology													Jennifer B Glenn M
a Finalize definition and articulate next steps			15-Jan										
2. Establishing grant/RFP conditions for funding awards													Interagency Working Group
a Research action included in 4.e. below		1-Dec											
b Report on analysis								1-Jun					
3. Exploring solutions used by other states and municipalities (including Medicaid medical trasnportation and creating templates and for state and locals use)												Teleconference line 12 hours of meetings 288 hours of research 24 hours of writing report Printing costs Online place to store reports	
Medical Transportation													
a Continue to communicate with other states on best practices for NEMT													
b Determine the areas of interest to highlight (e.g., services covered, brokerage model, etc.)													Doug Bridges Heidi Frost Cheryl Walsh David Levy
c Review SOA agencies and if they could participate (perhaps goes to group 4)													
d Write report on medical transportation practices available to Alaska													
Accessible Taxi													
e Continue to review ordinances, enforcement, trainings, vehicle standards													
f Write draft ordinance													
g Write report on accessible taxis													
4. Establishing interagency (state) working group												Paula Pawlowski	Duane Mayes Robbie Graham / Susan Bell Jon Sherwood Ezekiel Kaufman
a Finalize Charter	15-Nov												
b Gain Commissioner-level support/Designation	15-Nov												
c Convene first meeting of interagency working group		1-Dec											
d Meet every two months		1-Dec		1-Feb		1-Apr		1-Jun		1-Aug			
e Incorporate the following activites into work plan per C&PTAB inquiry: Check out service categories of state agencies related to transpotation (DOL, HSS), Research definitions related to transportation; Collect/inventory existing RFP requirement; report on analysis of defintions and RFP requirements		1-Dec											
5. Educating audiences about transportation options, relevance, benefits and role of coordination as appropriate												Time: Pat Branson and Jeff Ottesen DOT web/graphics staff Funding for marketing consultant $100K	Pat Branson Jeff Ottesen DOT graphic/ web staff DOT transit staff
a Invite state agencies to attend state transit conference (incentivize as appropriate)										1-Aug			
b Get on Alaska Municipal League fall conference meeting agenda	15-Nov												
c Present benefits of coordination to state agency audience at transit conference													
d Present benefits of coordination to Alaska Municipal League attendees	15-Nov												
e Generate RFP to select marketing consultant to develop communication plan		15-Dec											
f Complete marketing outline, launch coordinated transportation website (with loco)							15-May						
6. Preparing performance measures for tracking results (C&PTAB, transit community, unmet needs)												Time C&PTAB members	Bill Herman Sharon Scott Glenn Miller Larry Bredeman James Starzec
a Collect multiyear data currently being collected by DOT&PF, State, Federal, Tribes, Municipalities			15-Jan										
b Develop "idealized" measures we want to collect (data development agenda)						15-Apr							
c From "definition of coordination" group, establish a scale of coordination and apply to coordination systems around the state							15-May						
7. Establishing a transportation ombudsmen													
8. Inventorying regulations and funding streams													
C&PTAB DELIVERABLES		Deliver Strategic Plan & Recmdtsn's			Review and comment on Alternative Fuels Findings	Review and comment on DOT&PF LRTP							Chair, Board, Staff