

**INTERAGENCY WORKING GROUP
PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COUNCIL
MEETING DOCUMENTATION
May 5, 2009**

PURPOSE & PARTICIPATION

The Public Transportation Advisory Council (PTAC) and the Interagency Working Group (IWG) for Public Transportation services met on Tuesday, May 5, 2009 in the Holiday Inn Vista Conference Center in Boise, Idaho. The meeting objectives were to:

- Generate a shared knowledge of the Coordination Planning and Project Prioritization results;
- Report on IWG agency local, district and state level participation and commitments;
- Review and comment on the state of coordination and conduct a lessons learned to improve in the future
- Review and potentially recommend approval of a mobility association; and
- Generate a shared understanding of the Communications Plan process and status.

Attachments to this meeting summary provide meeting documentation resources and reflect the outcome of meeting discussion. Attachments include:

- Attachment A: List of Meeting Participants
- Attachment B: Flip Chart Notes
- Attachment C: IWG Draft Job Description, revised May 5, 2009
- Attachment D: IWG Recommendations, May 5, 2009

Individuals who made presentations to the group did so using power point presentations. Copies of those presentations are available from the facilitator on request.

Idaho Transportation Department staff made access to the meeting available via conference call and webinar. There were no participants on either.

RESULTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- The IWG endorses a decision-making process and a process for aggregating LMMN plans that maintain LMMN plan autonomy and enables the prioritization of projects collectively rather than distinctly by local, district and state levels.
- The IWG proposes a performance measure process which measures mobility within the context of the new paradigm rather than cost/mile/passenger trip which feeds the old paradigm and limits the measurement. This issue will be studied and addressed in detail at the next meeting - a joint IWG/PTAC meeting.
- The IWG supports ITD's proposed approach to involve the Student Transportation Steering Committee members on the District Coordination Councils.

- The IWG generated inputs to a revised draft job description, noting that what they generated last year holds primarily consistent with what proves to be appropriate now, and that they will add to that the responsibility for generating value propositions which help guide decision-making respective to strategy selection and help facilitate interagency coordination on all levels.
- The IWG approved CTAI's proposal to function as Idaho's mobility association and encouraged ITD to move forward with that arrangement.

DISCUSSION

Coordination Planning and Project Prioritization, 2009 in review

John Krause, ITD, reviewed with the group the process undertaken for coordination planning during 2009 and the current status of that process. The process was monumental, and resulted in the development of 17 Local Mobility Management Network plans, which included prioritized strategies around which entities proposed projects for FTA funding. John pointed out a number of areas where more development was in order, including:

- ▶ Mobility Management
- ▶ Mobility between cities and towns
- ▶ Park n' Ride Lots/Trailheads
- ▶ Drug Court Transportation
- ▶ ADA accessible bus stops
- ▶ Bicycle and Pedestrian
- ▶ Education Transport
- ▶ Voucher systems
- ▶ Traveler Information
- ▶ Traveler Education
- ▶ Taxis and Shuttles
- ▶ Rideshare
- ▶ Vanpools
- ▶ Rail
- ▶ Interagency Coordination

John also described potential developments in the structure, including the evolution of some governance structure for the LMMNs and evolution of DCC membership structure, potentially including a Bicycle/Pedestrian representative at the DCC and potentially at the IWG level.

John specifically asked the IWG to consider two aspects for further discussion and development, and those included the deliberate attempt and development of strategies that feature interagency coordination, as well as a role for the IWG in generating value propositions or policy statements that can guide the selection of strategies. During the course of the discussion, it was observed that 1) some interagency coordination happens just by virtue of information-sharing through the planning process, and 2) that interagency coordination strategies in and of themselves are likely to not rise as a "project" to be funded

by FTA, but rather that they would be a strategy to implement and coordinate at a local level outside the project funding process.

Regarding value propositions, John explained that for a given need or combination of needs there may exist 3-4 strategies for addressing the need. The IWG can provide assistance in the selection of those strategies by creating value propositions that provide distinguishable factors amongst the various strategies.

Both responsibilities the group ultimately decided to fold into their revised job description as an IWG role.

The IWG asked about the look and purpose of a state plan in the context of wanting to keep LMMN plans in tact, which generated a discussion about what the state plan might look like. John pointed out that that product doesn't have a look yet, and anticipates that it will evolve as this process unfolds. The prevalent thinking is that the seventeen plans will aggregate to district plans - where district-specific inputs are generated as an addendum to their collection of LMMN plans, and similarly so the state-specific inputs are generated as an addendum to the collection of in tact LMMN plans and district comments.

Rinda Mitchell presented to the group the process and results of the project prioritization process, describing nuances of prioritization preferences and challenges associated with prioritizing local, district and state-level projects. The IWG discussed the need to ensure that LMMN plans remain intact throughout the process, that there be a way to prioritize projects without having local, district and state level projects compete as three separate series of projects, but rather having local, district and state level projects compete in the entire pool together.

Finally, Brian Shea presented to the group a proposed performance measure tool which consisted of measuring passenger trips and costs per trip. While Brian pointed out that this was just one of potentially several measurement tools, the IWG took great exception to the methodology as being contrary to the paradigm IMAP was intended to create. The focus on cost per trip and miles is an old paradigm structure which by its very nature eliminates the value associated with access, quality of life, responding to special needs and more. The proposed performance measures feed current legislative thinking that it is the bottom line cost figure that creates value (least cost per passenger per trip), rather than a balance between effectiveness and efficiency. The approach is acknowledged to be a tool helpful in managing a service but doesn't tell anything about mobility; it doesn't show what IMAP is really trying to establish.

Finding a way to measure mobility that includes access, quality of life and other values is much preferred by IWG. It was pointed out that TRCP has done some work in this area, as has United We Ride. Exploring some of those measurement tools was proposed and the discussion about measuring mobility was identified as a priority agenda topic at the next IWG meeting, which will be a joint meeting with PTAC who will be an important participant in that discussion.

IWG Involvement, Local and District Feedback

IWG members reported on the level of their agency involvement on the local and district level, and provided feedback from those entities respective to their experience with the planning process.

Summarily, feedback from the agency representatives on local and district levels were predominantly positive, with specific notes that they like the process of identify needs and planning with a coordination emphasis, they appreciate ITD's presence in the local areas, strong support for the emphasis on and autonomy for the LMMNs and the aggregation of that emphasis to a state-level view, emphasis on PTAC involvement, ability to leverage local resources, increased advocate involvement at the local level, facilitation of local meetings, the deliberate convening of stakeholders and agencies in the process at the local and district levels, and the ability to plan at a "functional" level rather than just traditional regional or district lines.

In reflecting on how the process was implemented this year, there was recognition that this was the first time through and the process evolved as it proceeded and that that required some flexibility from participants; that for some participants and stakeholders who aren't typically involved in these processes there is a sometimes significant learning curve in understanding the shared goal, relevance of the process, and process requirements that must be achieved in order to maximize involvement; and the application process was short and confusing due to changes implemented this year; and the process of prioritizing projects proved to be much more time consuming than anticipated. A shared glossary of terms and the true integration of bicycle/pedestrian interests was also suggested.

Regarding agency involvement:

- The Area Agencies on Aging are involved at the LMMN and DCC level in all areas, some even taking on coordination roles and others assigning staff to involve senior centers and others in the local planning process.
- The Department of Health and Welfare has assigned Regional Directors to all of the DCCs and has Navigators working on the LMMN level.
- The Community Transportation Association of Idaho is supporting the process through the development of a proposed Mobility Association Business Plan and has members actively involved in the LMMNs and as applicants to support proposed LMMN priorities and strategies.
- Vocational Rehabilitation has Regional Managers involved in most of the DCCs and some vocational rehabilitation counselors are involved in the LMMNs.
- Medicaid's process support comes through the Regional Directors, as there are no separate Medicaid representatives.
- Disability representatives around the state are involved at various levels and with specific positions retained for development disability representatives on the DCCs. The Idaho Council on Development Disabilities also works closely with the State Independent Living Council AmeriCORPS staff, which provides eleven individuals who are involved on the LMMN level.
- The Department of Environmental Quality has individuals involved on most of the DCC's and in some of the LMMNs.
- Department of Labor personnel are actively involved in four DCCs.

- Schools were originally intended to be participating on the local level, given the number of independent school districts and the fact that they are independent. A few have been somewhat involved, including Burley, Soda Springs, Montpelier, Lemhi, and Freemont. John pointed out that since that structure was generated, he became aware of a Student Transportation Steering Committee that features regional representatives which might be an appropriate fit for DCC involvement. John will investigate this opportunity.

Mobility Association Proposal

Cecilia Hockett, Chair, Community Transportation Association of Idaho Board of Directors, presented to the IWG CTAI's proposal for being Idaho's mobility association in response to the requirements proposed by ITD at the IWG's last meeting. The entire CTAI Board of Directors was present and brought to the discussion responses to specific questions generated in a CTAI webinar and in anticipation of other questions the group may ask.

The IWG endorsed the proposal, and recommended for ITD to proceed with establishing that structure. One point of concern expressed by the IWG was regarding CTAI's ability to pursue earmarks and an opinion that CTAI, by virtue of its collective representation, would by its very nature preclude other entities to pursue earmarks as well. Cecilia reminded the group that the association's work would be driven by membership, and only if membership determined a specific earmark was one they wanted the organization to pursue, would they in fact do so.

Another primary recommendation to CTAI was to fully articulate the association's value proposition and program for the bicycle/pedestrian community in order to begin the process of integrating that interest.

Randy Kyrias said that a meeting between CTAI and ITD will occur on Friday at which they will pursue generating a memorandum of understanding so that CTAI can proceed immediately with pursuing the hiring of an Executive Director. Subsequent meetings to discuss the coordination and integration of communications and technological efforts will also occur in the near future.

Communications Plan Presentation

Robin Rausch, Red Sky Publishing, provided a presentation on the process and status of the IMAP communications planning effort.

Other

Heather Wheeler announced the elimination of three Regional Director positions within the Department as well as her own. She will be working with the Department on establishing who will replace her on the IWG, and three Regional Directors will remain who will be

supporting 2 and 3 regions each. That may have some impact on the DCC membership roster, on which ITD will want to follow-up.

The IWG expressed their appreciation for Heather, who, they said, brought critical thinking and conscientious follow-through on IWG and IMAP initiatives and priorities.

ACTION ITEMS

Action items resulting from the meeting discussion include:

1. Marsha Bracke will prepare and distribute meeting summary documentation to the group.
2. John will share with the group the conclusion to the question about what a state-level plan looks like in the context of keeping all 17 LMMN plans in tact.
3. Randy and CTAI will follow-up with an agreement to begin the immediate formation of the new mobility association structure and service.
4. Randy will follow-up with efforts to discuss and pursue coordination and integration opportunities regarding ongoing efforts given the new mobility association structure.
5. ITD will investigate options for measuring mobility that feed the mobility paradigm and not the previous paradigm, which was based on passenger trips per mile and cost.
6. IWG representatives will review and comment on the revised IWG Job Description and provide their comments to Marsha for a final iteration of the document at the next meeting.
7. Marsha will generate an agenda for the July 28, 2009 meeting that features a joint discussion with IWG and PTAC regarding mobility management performance measures.

NEXT MEETING

The PTAC/ IWG meeting schedule has been rescheduled for:

- July 28, 2009
- October 13, 2009
- January 12, 2010
- April 27, 2010

All meetings are scheduled for 8:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. unless otherwise noticed.

Fiscal Year 2009

Name	IWG	PTAC	Ex Officio	STAFF	GUEST	PHONE	E-MAIL
Tammy Perkins	A						
Randy Kyrias	P						randy.kyrias@itd.idaho.gov
Darrell Quist	P						
Stan Burton	A						
Heather Wheeler	P						
Sharon Duncan	P						
Ray Merial	A						
Holly Player	P						
Marilyn Sword	P						
Kelli Fairless	P						
Dwight Johnson	A						
Pat Maderieta			A				
Joe Herring			P				
David Luft			P			373-0457	leonard.herr@deq.idaho.gov
Rinda Mitchell				P		334-8848	rinda.mitchell@itd.idaho.gov
Brian Shea				P			
John Krause				P		334-8292	john.krause@itd.idaho.gov
Mark McNeese				P			mark.mcneese@itd.idaho.gov
Robin Rausch					P		robin.rausch@redskypr.com
Fred Kitchener					P		fmkitch@mindspring.com
Charles Trainor					P		ctrainor@compassidaho.org
Denise Myler					P		dmyler@ida.net
Terri Lindenberg					P		terri@treasurevalleytransit.com
Tom La Pointe					P		rpt@lewiston.com
Cecilia Hockett					P		chockett@achd.ada.id.us
Jason Miller					P		jason@mountainrides.org
Gloria Chigbrow					P	846-8547 x 4218	gchigbrow@valleyregionaltransit.org
Barb Singleton					P		
Marsha Bracke				P		442-1760	mbracke@earthlink.net

**INTERAGENCY WORKING GROUP
FLIP CHART NOTES
MAY 5, 2009**

IWG INPUTS REQUESTED

- Value Proposition
- Interagency Coordination as a strategy
- This year basics
- Education long-term vision for interagency coordination
- Strategies prioritized by taking priorities into account
- On-the street perspective
- Intent - utilize inventory to coordinate
- Evolution / iterative

AGENCY FEEDBACK

AGING

- AAAs - Transportation monies cut
- Area 1 - LMMN Coordinator/DCC member
- Area 2 - LMMN and DCC
- Area 3 - Meetings, outreach, PTAC survey - will evaluate needs, LMMN
- Area 4 - Assigned staff to LMMNs and reach out to Senior Centers - DCC member
- Area 5 - DCC
- Area 6 - DCC and planning meetings

Feedback: all positive, appreciate ITD presence in area, like needs/coordination process

DHW

- Regional Directors on DCCs
- Navigators - LMMN level
- Shaky start - now get it
- Really like LMMNs and local level involvement
- Cycle provides opportunity to leverage local funding
- Challenge to create true understanding of value
- Evolving process
- Application review - time consuming

CTAI

- Mobility Association Business Plan
- LMMN involvement
- Application process
- Staying connected
- Meeting at public hearings
- Like:

- 17 local plans leading to one
- More direct PTAC involvement
- Local evolution to state plan
- Having a process to distribute funds
- Engaging agencies and sharing information
- More local advocates
- Improve
 - Schedules and timing (crunch)
 - Confusing application process
 - Refine mobility management / glossary
 - Strength Bike/Ped
 - Transportation time to meetings

VOC REHAB

- Regional Managers on DCCs
- Counselors in LMMNs
- Particularly like LMMN process
- Liked functionality of how areas were divided
- Still on learning curve to maximize involvement

MEDICAID

- Supportive through Regional Directors - no separate Medicaid representatives
- Removed non-emergent benefit / CMS denied / reinstated for basic
- RFP award delayed until that issue resolved

DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES

- Disability representatives around state involved at various levels
- Support for AmeriCORPS -- eleven members at LMMN level
- For first timers on grant application process, missed meeting or deadline to notice
- LMMN facilitator helpful
- Prioritizing process confusing (do at meeting for more consensus rather than take individual inputs and produce later)
- Goal - get to know process and potential

DEQ

- Involvement on DCCs and in LMMNs

LABOR

- Involved in four

SCHOOLS

- Really no school Districts
- Burley
- Soda Springs
- Montpelier
- Lemhi

- Freemont
- County Disaster Management (Salmon)
- Opportunity for DCCs: Student Transportation Steering Committee

DISCUSSION:

- Incentive - what does this process offer you?
- Do folks on LMMN/DCC see this as their own? their thing?
- Need to institutionalize - how close are we?
- Who is missing? Reach out?
- Goal: Stakeholder owned and driven
- Some LMMNs taking ownership
- Let locals define it

IWG JOB DESCRIPTION

- A lot in first paragraph still accurate - refine and update
- Looking at key strategies
- Look at whole plan and confirm it is meeting coordination goals
- Value proposition
- Relay on locally driven focus to generate state plan
- PTAC, DCC, LMMN -0 all independent of state
- Statewide strategies included in local for their own prioritization
- Compile LMMNs to District to State - not compete against each other
- IWG explore how to coordinate at state and national level to facilitate what locals want to do
- Locally owned - separate from the state
- Flows up and down
- Balance of needs and interests and coordination
- Three different funding levels - or do they compete?

CTAI DISCUSSION

- Roles and responsibilities vis a vis other players - collective voice, member driven
- CTAI performance measures - memberships and partnerships
- Bike/Ped concern - want state level voice
- What cost? What benefit?
- Membership structure/dues
- Evolution - embrace mobility/IMAP - broaden - first time
- Infrastructure helps integrate bike/ped
- Bike/ped community needs to see something specific to them
- ITD has Bike/Ped information
- Earmark applications
- Changes to Board - 6 District and 3 at large
- RTAP
- Collaborative partners in wide variety of areas
- Financial sustainability - memberships/partnership

- Transition
- Concerns: Entities who want earmarks and don't want to go through CTAI and get squeezed out

ACTION ITEMS

- How to measure mobility on next agenda - explore mobility measurements
- Marsha - write meeting notes
- Proceed with CTAI
- Marsha - update IWG Job Description

INTERAGENCY WORKING GROUP for PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS
DRAFT JOB DESCRIPTION
MAY 5, 2009

The Interagency Working Group is comprised of a group of state agencies and consumer advocacy group representatives with a responsibility for or interest in making transportation services available to their customers or for which mobility is essential to serving customers needs.

The IWG

- Provides leadership by stimulating and practicing coordination amongst their agencies;
- Works to ensure that their counterparts on the local and district level are involved in the IMAP process and coordinating resources to best serve local and district needs;
- Generates policy statements and value propositions which stimulate coordination and provide guidance for project prioritization and decision-making;
- Generates and prioritizes broad statewide strategies for coordination at the state level in consideration of local coordination needs;
- Addresses barriers to coordination amongst agencies and at the state and federal level;
- Reviews the state plan to ensure opportunities for interagency coordination are maximized, including opportunities not associated with FTA funds and programs
- Generates an annual State of Mobility report.

**INTERAGENCY WORKING GROUP for PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM
RECOMMENDATIONS
MAY 5, 2009**

LMMN PLAN AUTONOMY

- The IWG endorses a decision-making process and a process for aggregating LMMN plans that maintain LMMN plan autonomy and enables the prioritization of projects collectively rather than distinctly by local, district and state levels.

PERFORMANCE MEASURES

- The IWG proposes a performance measure process which measures mobility within the context of the new paradigm rather than cost/mile/passenger trip which feeds the old paradigm and limits the measurement. This issue will be studied and addressed in detail at the next meeting - a joint IWG/PTAC meeting.

DCC COMPOSITION

- The IWG supports ITD's proposed approach to involve the Student Transportation Steering Committee members on the District Coordination Councils.

IWG JOB DESCRIPTION

- The IWG generated inputs to a revised draft job description, noting that what they generated last year holds primarily consistent with what proves to be appropriate now, and that they will add to that the responsibility for generating value propositions which help guide decision-making respective to strategy selection and help facilitate interagency coordination on all levels.

MOBILITY ASSOCIATION

- The IWG approved CTAI's proposal to function as Idaho's mobility association and encouraged ITD to move forward with that arrangement.