

**INTERAGENCY WORKING GROUP
PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COUNCIL
MEETING DOCUMENTATION
January 13, 2009**

PURPOSE

The Public Transportation Advisory Council (PTAC) and the Interagency Working Group (IWG) for Public Transportation services met on Tuesday, January 13, 2009 in the ITD East Annex Conference Room in Boise, Idaho. The meeting objectives were to:

- Generate a shared understanding of the status and processes underway regarding IMAP, and to
- Generate inputs and recommendations respective to IMAP-associated issues

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

A series of handouts were made available to inform the meeting discussion. Most were sent out electronically to participants the day prior to the meeting. Handouts included:

1. The meeting agenda
1. A summary IMAP update
2. Mobility Planning Schedule
3. LMMN Coordination Planning Workshops
4. DCC Membership Matrix
5. DCC Meetings Summary
6. DCC Feedback: Questions and Themes
7. AG Response to IMAP Questions
8. PT Response Letter to IMAP Questions
9. Summary of DCC inputs to Charter and Operational Guidelines
10. DCC Charter – Revised Draft
11. DCC Operational Guidelines – Working Draft
12. DCC Membership Applications
13. PTAC Job Description
14. DCC Chair (PTAC) Job Description
15. Bike/Pedestrian Work Plan
16. LMMN Power Point Presentation provided at Coordination Planning Workshops
17. LMMN 1A Preliminary Draft Coordination Plan
18. IWG Agency “Horse blanket”
19. FTA Grant Application Guidance

ACTION ITEMS

Action items resulting from the meeting discussion include:

1. Marsha Bracke will prepare and distribute meeting summary documentation to the group.
2. Brian Shea will work to ensure that the Department of Labor data is incorporated to the draft LMMN Coordination Plans as soon as possible.
3. Brian Shea will investigate the content and potential use of Compass data for 2008 for statewide application in the LMMN Coordination Plans.
4. The Division of Public Transportation staff will prepare talking points so that the IWG, PTAC and DCCs are representing this process consistently.
5. The Division of Public Transportation staff will have a follow-up conversation with Veteran's Services to discuss feedback received from that set of stakeholders in the LMMN meetings.
6. Joe Herring and Marsha Bracke will follow up with Karen Cornwell and Jim Deffenbaugh respective to their participation comments to the PTAC and DCCs.
7. Marilyn Sword will convene a meeting with Randy Kyrias, Kelly Buckland and Kim Steinberg to discuss how to help support AmeriCorps objectives in the context of IMAP.
8. John Krause, Kelli Fairless and Marsha Bracke will generate a proposal for the most effective communications about IMAP amongst stakeholder groups.
9. Marsha Bracke will inform DCC applicants that their applications will be forwarded to their respective DCCs for consideration and approval.
10. Brian Shea will conduct the research with the agencies required to complete the Horse Blanket on a state level and work with them to break it down to the district level.
11. Sharon Duncan will secure the AG letter respective to school bus transportation and send it to Marsha Bracke to distribute to the group.
12. Marsha Bracke will incorporate group inputs to the revision of the DCC Charter and Operational Guidelines and provide the results to the DCCs who will ratify their own final Operational Guidelines.
13. Marsha Bracke will work with John Krause to develop a draft Charter and Operational Guidelines for the LMMNS, giving them the capacity, like the DCCs to have subcommittees and, if necessary, executive sessions to discuss issues where confidentiality will be appropriate.
14. The Division of Public Transportation staff will provide each PTAC member with a list of LMMN participants.

RESULTS

Welcome

PTAC Chair Joe Herring welcomed the group and congratulated all on the commitments to and progress made to make IMAP a reality.

IMAP Status

Randy Kyrias and John Krause provided a brief overview of IMAP status and schedule and some of the new initiatives associated with its implementation. Handouts provided informed this discussion. Summarily:

- The Coordination Planning contractor is on board and conducting LMMN meetings to identify local needs and strategies.
- The Communications contractor is on board and preparing to initiate work.
- The Bicycle and Pedestrian programs have been integrated to the division and a survey underway to establish that inventory of resources and needs. Over 1000 individuals have already responded to that survey.
- There is an increasing amount of media interest in IMAP activities.
- A focused effort to engage the private sector will be initiated within the next month.

Randy also made a point of acknowledging that some of the process deadlines cannot change due to funding cycle requirements, and that concerns about the pace of the process can be addressed through the subsequent year processes which will further enrich and inform the planning efforts.

Coordination Planning: LMMNs

John Krause described the schedule, process and participation of the LMMN Coordination Meetings to date, referencing a number of handouts to inform that discussion. Participants were specifically asked to review a preliminary draft LMMN Coordination Plan and provide feedback respective to how it 1) supports clients needs at the local level and 2) is able to capture the roles and responsibilities the agencies play in meeting their client needs.

That feedback was recorded on flip chart notes and has been transcribed verbatim in Attachment B, Flip Chart Notes, page 5. Summarily, that feedback advised the group that:

- In some cases, needs are being articulated by providers and advocates and not users. The outreach effort needs to include a conscientious attempt to reach users, potentially involving having and/or carrying meetings over into the evening as well as during the day. One proposal was to have a day session, the results of which were presented to participants in the evening. Another proposal responded to the challenge for some folks to get out in the evening, and suggested webinars as an additional means of incorporating broader participation into the coordination planning process.
- A number of data sources are available that need to be included in the planning at the local level. One important source is the workforce/commuter data available at the Department of Labor which will very specifically inform activities at the local level. Another is 2008 data that Compass has which is said to have statewide applicability. Brian will obtain this data and ensure it is incorporated to the Coordination Plans.

- Some suggestions relative to the document itself included the acknowledgement that all have the same format, vision and introduction, but the local data will differ. The version this group reviewed still had no local input provided, and the group underscored the need to make sure the plans feature input from users and are focused on local needs. The group also suggested that the text be evaluated so that the language is applicable to all agencies, and that the context acknowledges the value of coordination as its own value.
- Regarding coordination, the group discussed the significance of completing the IWG horse blanket and making it applicable at the district and local level. Participants need to know what these programs are and how the money is being spent in order to maximize and coordinate their use. With that information and the identification of barriers associated with coordinating them, the IWG is better poised to address coordination barriers. Brian Shea will work with the CCAM and the agencies to complete that document and to work the process of drilling it down to at least district-level applicability and to integrate this information with the local coordination planning efforts.
- Some additions and clarifications proposed included incorporating the Medicaid Broker into this process; pointing out that ICOA is a state level entity and the Area Agencies on Aging are best referenced as the local stakeholders; that AmeriCorps is involved at different levels and supporting their efforts in a meaningful way is an important priority; to ensure that every provider is listed; and to be deliberate about needs, strategies and barriers so that the IWG is poised to address those barriers.
- LMMN Charters and Operational Guidelines are increasingly considered meaningful given the need to form evaluation committees and to organization communications.

Coordination Planning: DCCs

John Krause provided an overview of the first series of DCC meetings, reviewing participation and membership. Handouts available to the group documented participants, meeting results, inputs received, and questions for IWG/PTAC consideration and guidance.

Several questions posed at the DCC level were about liability and conflict of interest. Randy forwarded those questions to the Attorney General's office prior to this meeting and the Attorney General's response was distributed. Also distributed was a draft letter from Randy to the IMAP distribution list providing that clarification. Essentially, the material confirmed that the structure frees individual participants from liability, and that operating via a subcommittee process to evaluate applications, combined with having participants sign a conflict of interest statement, will address the conflict of interest questions. The group advised Randy to distribute that communication.

Marsha took the group through a deliberate process of addressing other DCC questions, the results of which will be incorporated in a revised Charter – one for the entire set of DCCs – and Operational Guidelines – which can differ by District. Conclusions of that discussion include:

- Regarding the need for the DCCS to have the ability to provide input and feedback to the LMMNs, via the LMMN representative or otherwise, the group affirmed that this mechanism needs to be provided.
- Regarding logistics and note-taking, ITD will provide logistics and notification support; it is anticipated that CTAI, once it has redefined and reorganized itself as the state's mobility association, will carry on the coordinator role and may provide for note taking services. Notes need to capture what has occurred and will be disseminated. Neither effort, logistics or note-taking, will be the Chair's responsibility.
- About providing the chair the ability to address attendance and demeanor issues with a DCC participant, the group confirmed that the chair would 1) have a conversation with the participant to seek understanding of the lack of participation or animosity, and then 2) call the agency who appointed the individual and seek another with more commitment to the schedule and the process. The group also proposed formalizing the DCC appointments with signed agreements that outlines the skills and expectations (outlined in 2C of the Operational Guidelines) as an indicator of this commitment.
- Regarding the need to have someone lead the DCC in case of the Chair's absence, the group agreed that providing the DCC Chair the opportunity to appoint a designee for a given meeting would be appropriate. A Vice Chair is not necessary.
- The group proposed changing the documents to indicate that 2-4 meetings or as needed will address the meeting requirement.
- The IWG and PTAC agreed that the DCCs should have the ability to select their own applicants for the following reasons: to ensure DCC composition is representative of District-specific needs; in acknowledgement of the reality that this group is less knowledgeable about the Districts than are the DCCs themselves; consistent with IMAP's mission to support local leadership and ownership of mobility planning; and in response to the direct request of one of the DCCS for the same reasons. Marsha will send a message to the five applicants under consideration today to let them know about this decision and that their applications will be forwarded to the DCCs.
- A local representative from the Medicaid Brokerage, and not another DHW staff, would be a logical addition to the DCCs to represent Medicaid operations. The Charter and Operational Guidelines can maintain a placeholder for this individual.
- MPOs are confirmed to be integral to a LMMN and work at the LMMN level. DCC participants must conscientiously and deliberately bring to the group a district-wide perspective.

PTAC Commitments

As IMAP has evolved, some of the PTAC members have understandably expressed concern about increased responsibilities and time commitments, given their new responsibility for chairing the DCCs and increased involvement in the coordination planning and mobility funding processes. Knowing that PTAC members' full commitment and participation is essential to making this process effective, Marsha asked the PTAC members present to share their intent respective to their involvement.

- Kathleen Simko indicated that she remains concerned about the scope of what this might entail, but is committed to full participation until she can't fully participate and informs the group of that reality of that time.
- Steve Hadley indicated that he would like to stay but is too busy to take this on. He asked to be replaced on the PTAC.
- Joe Herring said he is committed and he will stay and assume the responsibilities.
- Jan Vassar said that she will stay and is committed unless it gets too big or complicated for her.

Joe and Marsha will have follow-up discussions about the same with Karen Cornwell and Jim Deffenbaugh.

Mobility Funding Process

Rinda Mitchell, ITD PT Grants Administration Team Program Manager, provided the group with an overview of the funding process and schedule, and provided them with a copy of the grant application materials. Central to that presentation was a discussion about what materials different entities would and would not review and how evaluations of grant applications would be conducted.

Rinda explained that LMMNs would have evaluation committees to evaluate projects at the LMMN level; DCCs would have evaluation committees to evaluate projects that cross LMMNs; and the IWG would have an evaluation committee to evaluate projects that cross Districts. The PTAC's role is to apply funding and make the final recommendation to ITD.

While the group acknowledged that priorities will be established in the Coordination Plans themselves, the group agreed that the DCCs, in order to make informed decisions, need to be cognizant of applications submitted and recommended at the LMMN levels. Similarly, the IWG will need to be cognizant of applications at the LMMN and DCC levels in order to make informed recommendations at their level. To expedite that process, the group agreed that photocopies of original applications are an efficient way to communicate those other activities. The group affirmed that no local priorities will be changed, but that the body of information considered together will make for more meaningful recommendations.

Rinda pointed out that district-wide meetings amongst LMMN and DCC participants will be conducted the week of February 16 to establish coordinated local and district priorities. Those meetings will be important to understanding the mobility picture for each LMMN and each District. Subsequent to that, the groups will want to be forming their evaluation teams in order to prepare for the application process.

The point was emphasized throughout the meeting that individual needs and interests are most appropriately and meaningfully input at the LMMN level.

Parking Lot

A series of items were held in the parking lot to address at the meetings end. These issues and those conclusions are already represented in the action items above, and include:

- Conducting a meeting between Randy, Kelly, Kim and Marilyn about how to best coordinate with the AmeriCorps efforts and IMAP;
- Establishing a known communication process for connecting with stakeholders at all levels as IMAP evolves;
- Completing and using the IWG Horse blanket so that programs and funding are known, understood, and coordinated at the local level;
- Exploring creative opportunities for reaching out in the local networks, including using a day and evening format where potentially day results are presented for feedback in the evening sessions and web opportunities are provided for increased participations;
- Involving the school districts at a more deliberate level, and reviewing the AG letter regarding school district transport of other clients to the entire group for their review.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment at this meeting.

NEXT MEETING

The PTAC/ IWG meeting schedule has been rescheduled for:

- April 28, 2009
- July 28, 2009
- October 27, 2009

All meetings are scheduled for 8:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. unless otherwise noticed. All meetings are scheduled with the understanding that all dates, and particularly the April and October dates, are subject to change given the mobility funding process requirements of the PTAC and IWG in April and the mobility conference being planned for the fall.

Fiscal Year 2009

Name	IWG	PTAC	Ex Officio	STAFF	OBSERVER	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	Brad Jensen						
Holly Player	P						
Marilyn Sword	P						
Kelli Fairless	P						
Dwight Johnson	P						
Pat Maderieta			P				
Joe Herring			P				
Leonard Herr			P			373-0457	leonard.herr@deq.idaho.gov
Steve Hadley		P					
Jim Deffenbaugh		A				772-0584	jimd@pacni.org
Joe Herring		P					
Kathleen Simko		P				322.7033	ksimko@sageidaho.com
Karen Cornwell		A					
Jan Vassar		P					
Rinda Mitchell				P		334-8848	Rinda.mitchell@itd.idaho.gov
Butch Ragsdale				P		334-8383	Burtch.ragsdale@itd.idaho.gov
Kevin Bittner				P		332-7876	Kevin.bittner@itd.idaho.gov
Steve O'Neal				P		334-8286	Steve.oneal@itd.idaho.gov
Brian Shea				P			
John Krause				P		334-8292	John.krause@itd.idaho.gov
Gloria Parkvold					P	846-8547 x 4218	
Barb Singleton					P		
Marsha Bracke				P		442-1760	mbracke@earthlink.net

**INTERAGENCY WORKING GROUP
FLIP CHART NOTES
JANUARY 13, 2009**

COORDINATION PLANS

- Needs coming from providers/advocates – not necessarily users
- √ Incorporate Labor data – Brian
- √ Updated Compass 2008 data – state packet – Briand investigate
- Take draft out in evening format
- Need to understand the need
- State of transition - will take a couple years
- Hard to generalize across meetings / different mix in each – Ours did three hours of needs
- Focus our energy on barriers emerging from local needs
- Current data
- Input from users?
- √ Make sure we're all representing process the same (this group DCCs) –talking points
- Same format / vision / introduction - different data
- Consistent language applicable to all agencies
- Emphasis on coordination as its own value
- Comment on state dollars being spent – how to maximize and coordinate
- Reflect horse blanket – use as locally applicable
- Section to barriers to achieving strategies – so we can address those barriers
- Barriers – knowing where clients are
- Two state agencies couldn't carpool in state car
- Looking forward to local LMMNs touch / ownership
- Incorporate Medicaid broker
- Ensure every provider is listed
- ICOA vis a vis AAA
- Needs for each LMMN identified, strategies described
- Is local option on the table? Describes today and leverages what we have – next step is a long term strategy – the funding options
- Guiding principles – environment – need to determine, assess if it is compatible – statement about how plan fits in
- Not well connected with AmeriCorps – help?
- Plans include measures of success
- Labor assist with data
- Listing of assets – include school buses – need to be part
- Plan language
- Audience –LMMN, DCC, All...
- Have to evaluate at state level policy
- “Efficient and “effective” transit services- not necessarily more

- Difficulty of “consumer” speaking at District level
- Products – one week early
- Needs and strategies start at LMMN level
- Provide PTAC with list of LMMN participants

DISTRICT COORDINATION COUNCILS

- A. DCC has to provide feedback / LMMN reps on DCCs
- B. Most capture what occurred; must disseminated; not chair.; logistics, notification PT can provider; notes – who takes?
- CTAI – opportunity for paid staff in each District to support local and district process – communications and documentation – carry on coordinator role
- Need to make commitment to support local level and to sustain it
- It’s a locally owned process
- Input needs to happen at local level
- Comment at DCC level re District-level issues – also state
- Public places for comment – different mechanisms
- Chair:
 - 1. Ask participant – seek to understand reason for lack of participation or animosity/unwillingness to collaborate
 - 2. Call person who appointment – ask to consider new with positive working perspective
- Values statement / agreement
- Formalize Appointment – reference skills
- Agreement that folks sign – principles and expectations (outlined in 2c)
- Vice Chair – designee from DCC
- f. Meetings – 2-4 or as needed
- G. DCC does their own
- H. Regional Director and potentially brokerage – not DHW
- MPO a part of a LMMN – work at LMMN level – can provide LMMN technical support – IACs
- J.√ Critical issues on Veteran’s side – articulate issues and follow-up with vets
- Applications: DCCs will decide – DCC Chairs lead discussion

PTAC COMMITMENTS

- Kathleen – not sure – watch evolution- what does this entail – Commit to stay 100 percent until I can’t
- Steve – replace Steve – would like to stay but too busy
- Joe – committed
- Jan – committed until too big or complicated
- √ Marsha and Joe follow-up with Karen and Jim

PLANNING PROCESS

- Features district-wide workshop to calibrate priorities

FUNDING PROCESS

- Known funding amounts at District level
- Features submittal of applications grounded in response to priorities and evaluated at the level at which they apply
- DCCs to be provided actual copies of LMMN projects but evaluate DCC level
- IWG provided copies of all projects but evaluate state level
- PTAC applies funding

DCC Chairs

- Participate in workshops of LMMNs and DCC representatives the week of the 16th
- Evaluation committees operating in April

PARKING LOT

1. AmeriCorps
2. Communication mechanisms – PT – LMMN – DCC
3. Horse blanket
4. Workshop schedule
5. Meeting Dates

PARKING LOT RESPONSE

AmeriCorps

- They're forming
- Timing
- Application made in different context
- Conversations with Randy, Kelly, Kim, Marilyn about how to address
- Marilyn to convene
- Need to fit in and make workable

Communication mechanism

- Connect with LMMNs, how to share info- via group chairs? Once networks up, they can manage...?
- Formalize communication process
- Central contact in each district?
- LMMN Charters, guidelines, roles, delegate to DCC, chair, evaluation team communications
- ✓ John, Kelli, Marsha work
- Proposal for communications

Horse blanket

- Helpful to see funding opportunities and programs
- Drill down and provide summary
- In kind – add
- Funding/match – clarify
- Indicate what can be used as match for FTA

- √Individual – reach out to agencies/agencies break down at least by district – identify commonalities; federal CCAM can provide federal dollars – Brian
- Should help identify linkages for coordination -what can it be used for and how can it be used to coordinate
- Kind of money more important than amount
- Amount important in local network
- Is money identifiable?
- Inquire of other states

Workshop Schedule

- Accommodate users/consumers with night/web opportunities to participate
- Produce “day” results and present in 2nd session

School Buses

- AG letter – distribute – Sharon

April - brokerage