

# Improving Public Transportation Services

through

## Effective Statewide Coordination



Since their initial meeting in 1908 to discuss interstate water problems, the governors have worked through the National Governors Association (NGA) to deal collectively with issues of public policy and governance. The association's ongoing mission is to support the work of the governors by providing a bipartisan forum to help shape and implement national policy and to solve state problems.

The members of NGA are the governors of the fifty states, the territories of American Samoa, Guam, and the Virgin Islands, and the commonwealths of the Northern Mariana Islands and Puerto Rico. The association has a nine-member Executive Committee and three standing committees (on Economic Development and Commerce, Human Resources, and Natural Resources). Through NGA's committees, governors examine and develop policy and address key state and national issues. Special task forces often are created to focus gubernatorial attention on federal legislation or on state-level issues.

The association works closely with the Administration and Congress on state-federal policy issues through its offices in the Hall of the States in Washington, D.C. The association serves as a vehicle for sharing knowledge of innovative programs among the states and provides technical assistance and consultant services to governors on a wide range of management and policy issues.

NGA's Center for Best Practices is a vehicle for sharing knowledge about innovative state activities, exploring the impact of federal initiatives on state government, and providing technical assistance to states. The center works in a number of policy fields, including, economic development and technology, education, natural resources, energy and environment, health, social services, trade, workforce development, and homeland security.

Copyright 2002

**National Governors Association**  
**444 North Capitol Street, Suite 267**  
**Washington, D.C. 20001**  
**[www.nga.org](http://www.nga.org)**

All rights reserved

Design and Layout by HopscotchDesign

Printed in the United States of America

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Acknowledgements</b> . . . . .	4
<b>Executive Summary</b> . . . . .	5
<b>Introduction</b> . . . . .	6
<b>Benefits of Coordinated Transportation</b> . . . . .	7
Increased Transportation Availability and Access to Jobs . . . . .	7
Enhanced System and Service Quality . . . . .	7
Improved Cost Effectiveness . . . . .	8
Elimination of Duplicative Efforts . . . . .	9
<b>The Keys to Successful Coordination</b> . . . . .	9
Leadership . . . . .	9
Participation . . . . .	10
Continuity . . . . .	11
<b>Generating Support for Coordination Activities</b> . . . . .	12
<b>Mechanisms for Creating Coordinating Bodies</b> . . . . .	13
Legislative Mandates . . . . .	13
Executive Orders . . . . .	13
Memorandums of Understanding or Other Informal Agreements . . . . .	13
<b>Challenges to Successful Coordination</b> . . . . .	13
Legal and Regulatory Barriers . . . . .	13
Institutional Barriers . . . . .	14
<b>Conclusion</b> . . . . .	15
<b>Resources</b> . . . . .	17
Federal Resources . . . . .	17
Coordinating Council on Access and Mobility . . . . .	18
<b>Appendix</b> . . . . .	19
<b>Addendum</b> . . . . .	32
<b>Addendum Appendix A</b> . . . . .	39
<b>Addendum Appendix B</b> . . . . .	44

# Acknowledgements

The National Governors Association Center for Best Practices acknowledges the generous support of the U.S. Department of Transportation in the production of this report and its addendum. The following NGA staff authored the report: Thom Rubel, Phil Psilos, Paul Kalomiris, and Jennifer Mueller.

# Executive Summary

Governors can make substantial improvements in the efficiency and effectiveness of transportation services in their states. Current budget constraints are driving states to make better use of separate but extensive transportation networks to achieve multiple goals. Public transportation is often viewed as a solution to congestion, but as a costly and only marginally effective mechanism for serving disadvantaged populations, particularly in meeting their employment needs. Effective state coordination can untangle these transportation webs and provide broader and better transportation access and service without major new transportation investments.

Local and regional public transit agencies maintain substantial systems in many metropolitan regions and in some rural areas. Public and private organizations also provide an extensive range of transportation services to meet other needs. These transportation services are largely supported by public funds, but each tends to take place in its own sphere and toward its own purpose, often with limited impact.

Coordination among providers and agencies that provide transportation services holds the potential to:

- ❖ increase transportation availability and access to jobs;
- ❖ enhance service quality;
- ❖ eliminate duplicative efforts; and
- ❖ substantially improve the cost effectiveness of transportation dollars.

Several states have established comprehensive coordination mechanisms to achieve these goals. Where successful coordination efforts are underway, key factors to success have been identified, including:

- ❖ **leadership**—advocating, generating support, and instituting mechanisms for coordination;
- ❖ **participation**—bringing the right state, regional, and local stakeholders to the table; and
- ❖ **continuity**—ensuring an ongoing forum and executive leadership that stays focused on overall transportation goals and responds to ever-changing needs.

By establishing and supporting formal transportation coordination mechanisms, governors can leverage state, federal, local, and private resources to provide more effective transportation solutions that can lead to reduced congestion, better access to jobs, and more efficient provision of transportation services.

This report identifies the benefits of transportation coordination, the range of programs and potential players, mechanisms that states are using to create effective coordinating bodies, and potential challenges to and available resources for achieving broader state transportation goals.

# Introduction

Federal, state, and local governments spend billions of dollars each year on public transportation through highly visible expenditures on mass transit, including local and regional bus service and commuter rail. Not so visible are the additional billions of dollars spent by agencies that provide specialized transportation services for their clients, such as van services for the aging and Medicaid clients, coordinated job rides, public housing services, and special services for persons with disabilities.

Most public transportation funding comes from the federal government. The U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) spends roughly \$7 billion annually on a variety of federal programs for public transit services, primarily through the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). These programs fund state and local transportation activities delivered primarily by local and regional transportation agencies. Human services transportation is funded through the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), which allocates roughly \$3 billion annually for client transportation services. Other federal agencies, including the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Department of Housing and Urban Development, fund similar activities. Only DOT has transportation as a primary mission, yet other federal agencies devote substantial resources to providing transportation services. In all, nine federal departments provide transportation funding through 41 programs.

Public transit providers maintain substantial systems in many metropolitan regions and in some rural areas. An extensive range of transportation services is provided, as either primary or ancillary service, by public and privately contracted organizations. For example, schools and universities maintain and operate fleets of buses to give students access to their facilities. Health-care providers and senior citizen service agencies provide transportation services for their clients. Employers use a variety of mechanisms, including transportation services or stipends, to ensure that transportation does not become a barrier to employment.

There is an overall lack of coordination for the myriad of transportation activities and funding in each state. This causes fragmented and duplicative transportation services that fail to meet comprehensive transportation needs. In response, states are beginning to employ coordination as a highly effective tool to provide substantially improved transportation services at little or no additional cost.



# Benefits of Coordinated Transportation

## INCREASED TRANSPORTATION AVAILABILITY AND ACCESS TO JOBS

Several studies suggest that many lower-income workers cannot obtain and hold jobs because they lack access to affordable transportation. In 1990, 78 percent of the white working poor and 68 percent of the black working poor commuted from suburb to suburb or reverse commuted from city to suburb.<sup>1</sup> Public transportation systems in many areas of the country are not well-equipped to meet the changing employment patterns in urban and rural America. Most public transportation systems are designed to transport riders from outlying urban and older suburban areas into central business districts. However, the majority of new jobs created in the past decade are located in suburban areas outside the central cities where low-income workers are more likely to reside. This causes what is commonly referred to as spatial mismatch. To exacerbate the problem, employment centers are no longer uniformly located along public transportation corridors, where they are accessible to those without access to private automobiles. This proves to be a barrier for many inner-city working poor, who cannot afford the cost of maintaining personal vehicles.

Recent job access programs have exposed many of the deficiencies in today's public transportation system. Neither the job locations nor the work schedules typical of the 21st century are well-served by public transportation. Decentralized metropolitan development patterns have resulted in fewer job locations being served by public transportation. In addition, an increasing number of businesses are open 24 hours per day, 7 days per week. Workers who staff second and third shifts are finding that public transportation is unavailable during nontraditional working hours. Coordinating transportation services can increase access to employment opportunities for the working poor, while simultaneously helping fill worker shortages in newly developed job centers.

## ENHANCED SYSTEM AND SERVICE QUALITY

From daily commutes to weekend nightlife, a seamless transportation system is an invaluable asset to regions seeking to maintain viable local economies. The ability to attract and retain skilled workers is one of several variables that affect prospects for future economic growth. Community amenities and environmental quality are also important in attracting and keeping talented workers. The quality of a city's or region's transportation infrastructure is an important factor in determining location decisions for workers.

Many of the country's fastest-growing regions are also those with the most severe transportation problems. Traffic congestion has become so severe that it threatens the very prosperity that was responsible for generating it. In high-growth regions, such as metropolitan Atlanta, Southern California, and Northern Virginia, local leaders are struggling to find transportation solutions that will enable their regions to continue to attract talented workers and employment opportunities.

These problems affect diverse sectors of the population: the working poor, who have few transportation choices; and highly skilled workers, who have greater flexibility in both their transportation choices and their location decisions. The common feature of both is that they call for a unified solution: developing a more balanced transportation system that provides workers and employers with more transportation choices.

<sup>1</sup> Margaret Pugh, *Barriers to Work: The Spatial Divide Between Jobs and Welfare Recipients in Metropolitan Areas*, The Brookings Institution, Center on Urban and Metropolitan Policy, September 1998.

Coordination among transportation activities increases the pool of available vehicles, expands existing public transit routes, and improves trip scheduling, increasing the potential range of transportation options available.

## IMPROVED COST EFFECTIVENESS

Policy debates about transportation improvements usually focus on the need for increased resources to fund new initiatives and improve public transit and highway infrastructure. However, a growing number of states are using coordination to increase mobility and create a more seamless transportation system without major new investments.

Greater coordination between public transit and ancillary transportation programs frees up sufficient resources to substantially improve overall public transportation service delivery. In a comparison of the cost and efficiency of transportation services before and after coordination, a study by the Community Transportation Association of America presented case studies from five states that showed average reductions of 50 percent in passenger-trip costs and 28 percent in vehicle-hour costs after coordination activities were implemented.<sup>2</sup>

Interagency coordination can also foster innovative solutions to meeting the demand for transportation services. **South Carolina** is encouraging cross-utilization of the social services agency's fleet by various programs to meet multiple transportation needs. Modified transportation policy guidelines increase the capacity of county social services staffs and allow greater flexibility in meeting customer needs. The southeast **Arkansas** transportation system uses vans from senior centers during off times to provide employment transportation. **Kentucky** has divided into 15 transportation regions. A contracted regional broker coordinates and provides transportation services for each region. The contracts are bid competitively and each provider is responsible for providing all of the transportation themselves or for contracting out necessary services on behalf of the customer. Transportation providers are paid a capitated rate for each welfare recipient in the service area, regardless of whether or not the recipient uses the service.

Fixed-route public transit services may have limited hours of operation or no service available during off-peak hours. In rural areas, the demand for public transit is rarely great enough to support fixed-route services without public subsidy. Specialized human services transportation is delivered through a diverse set of nonprofit agencies contracted by state and local social services agencies to provide transportation to clients with specific needs. In and of itself, this transportation service is insufficient to meet the needs of large numbers of citizens.

By eliminating duplicative services, coordinating transportation services among human services and public transportation agencies results in increased operating efficiencies. This leads to economies of scale and increased ridership. Savings can be redirected to support core missions of the agencies.

<sup>2</sup> CGA Consulting Services, Inc., *An Analysis of Human Services Transportation: America's Other Transit Network*, Community Transportation Association of America, February 1992.

## ELIMINATION OF DUPLICATIVE EFFORTS

The various social services agencies that provide transportation serve different constituencies, though some clients may be served by more than one agency. Many of these constituents have the same transportation needs—getting to a medical appointment, traveling to and from work, and accessing child care—and require travel along the same or adjacent routes. Coordination among providers can eliminate duplicative services and reduce the provider’s cost per trip by increasing the number of passengers per trip.

## The Keys to Successful Coordination

At a roundtable on transportation coordination conducted by the National Governors Association Center for Best Practices, participants from state and local transportation agencies and human services providers who are effectively using coordination identified the keys to the success of their efforts.<sup>3</sup> They include:

- ❖ **leadership**—advocating, generating support, and instituting mechanisms for coordination at the highest level;
- ❖ **participation**—bringing to and keeping at the table the right state, regional, and local stakeholders; and
- ❖ **continuity**—ensuring an ongoing forum and executive leadership that stays focused on overall transportation goals and responds to ever-changing needs.

### LEADERSHIP

Unequivocally, all participants pointed to a governor’s role in driving the success of their coordination efforts. Strong gubernatorial leadership enables participants to overcome many of the barriers commonly faced when implementing coordination efforts. Initiating coordination can be very difficult, because it requires agencies that may have little or no prior working relationship to cooperate and to coordinate and harmonize operations. Because the benefits of coordination are long-term, many participants may not initially see the value of devoting agency time and staff to these efforts. These initial barriers are much easier to overcome when coordination is a priority of the governor.

Leadership by governors was critical to the success of initiatives in several states. In **Oregon**, Governor John A. Kitzhaber, M.D., established clear direction and expectations for the State Agency Coordination Project by providing the following charge to project participants:



<sup>3</sup> Transportation Coordination Roundtable, June 7, 2000, Ft. Lauderdale, Florida.

- ❖ maintain and improve transportation services;
- ❖ eliminate program and administrative duplication;
- ❖ leverage further benefits from established state activities;
- ❖ target services and resources to people at risk;
- ❖ allow for flexibility based on local community strengths and needs;
- ❖ accrue benefits of coordination statewide, not just in pilot or demonstration efforts; and
- ❖ meet the mandates of the Americans with Disabilities Act.

In establishing the **Ohio** Statewide Transportation Coordination Task Force, then Governor George V. Voinovich promoted several goals, which are illustrated through its mission statement:

The Statewide Transportation Coordination Task Force is committed to improving and increasing access to state agency programs and services and enhancing service and program quality, and ultimately the quality of life, for Ohioans through transportation coordination. Methods of coordination include eliminating duplicative programs and services, eliminating conflicting state requirements and regulations; and better use of local, state, and federal resources. The task force will accomplish this mission by:

- ❖ identifying transportation-related programs and services of each agency and opportunities to coordinate service delivery;
- ❖ serving as a clearinghouse for each state agency to ensure consistency in coordinated program and service delivery by reviewing program criteria and guidelines, procedures, and proposed and existing regulations;
- ❖ serving as a clearinghouse for informing the public of available programs and services;
- ❖ developing interagency model projects for coordinated service delivery;
- ❖ identifying strategies and best practices for encouraging cost-effective service delivery;
- ❖ developing interagency cooperative agreements to foster interagency cooperation; and
- ❖ investigating the development of uniform reimbursement requirements, service standards, and reporting requirements.

Interagency working groups have been successful not only in promoting transportation coordination, but also in improving working relationships among the members on other issues as well. The common key to success in this interagency collaboration is direct gubernatorial involvement and leadership.

## **PARTICIPATION**

Having the right people at the table is also a key to empowering change. Since literally dozens of state, regional, and local agencies finance transportation services in one way or another, the most logical step is to bring them all together to discuss the opportunities presented by coordination. Governors have established interagency task forces or working groups whose members are state agencies that provide or finance any transportation services, as well as some less-than-obvious agencies.

For example, the **New Jersey** Intergovernmental Transportation Work Group consists of representatives from:

- ❖ Department of Agriculture
- ❖ Department of Banking and Insurance
- ❖ Department of Corrections
- ❖ Department of Education
- ❖ Department of Environmental Protection
- ❖ Department of Health and Senior Services
- ❖ Department of Human Services
- ❖ Department of Labor
- ❖ Department of Law and Public Safety
- ❖ Department of Personnel
- ❖ Department of Commerce and Economic Development
- ❖ Department of Military and Veteran Affairs
- ❖ Board of Public Utilities
- ❖ New Jersey Transit
- ❖ Department of Transportation
- ❖ Secretary of State
- ❖ Office of Management and Budget
- ❖ Department of Insurance
- ❖ Burlington County Office of Human Services
- ❖ Camden County Improvement Authority
- ❖ Cape May County Planning Department
- ❖ Gloucester County Work First New Jersey
- ❖ Hunterdon County Department of Human Services

The working group is chaired jointly by the Department of Transportation, New Jersey Transit, and the Department of Human Services.

In addition to public-sector representation, many states provide a place at the table for important stakeholders, including local government officials, nonprofit human services agencies, employers, and a representative of the users of transportation services.

Although forming a working group with representatives from all agencies that provide transportation services is desirable, no one model is right for every state. The process of coordination can begin as modestly as two agencies getting together in an attempt to cooperate so they can leverage each other's resources. Once the participants are comfortable with the process, the collaboration can be expanded to additional participants.

## CONTINUITY

One of the primary threats to effective coordination is sustainability. Coordination works because it assumes that there will be continuous change, both in transportation needs and in the resources available to address them. Governors need to ensure that the policy mechanisms they use to implement coordination will create an ongoing forum and executive leadership that stays focused on overall transportation goals and responds to ever-changing needs. Coordination should be reflected as a priority for governors and relevant state agencies through mission statements and in program goals. For example, **Ohio** Governor Bob Taft's ongoing commitment to improve transportation for low-income families is largely responsible for the state's transportation coordination program, which was implemented by his predecessor.

The best way to ensure continuity is through successful efforts that benefit all stakeholders. Performance measures to gauge the overall effectiveness of activities and to serve as barometers for changing transportation needs should be a priority for every coordinating body. States are just beginning to develop these measures.

# Generating Support for Coordination Activities

One of the major challenges confronting efforts to coordinate transportation resources at the state level is that transportation services are provided at the city, county, and regional levels. Statewide transportation coordination requires a close working relationship among diverse public transit and human services providers to demonstrate positive benefits for all participants.

Several states have convened regional transportation coordination summits to garner stakeholder support, including local and regional transit operators, city and county transportation and human services agencies, health care providers, employers, and others. This approach has been successful in a number of states in educating stakeholders on the benefits of coordination and in generating enthusiasm to pursue efforts at the local level.

The **Maryland** Mass Transit Administration, in conjunction with state and regional human services and transportation agencies, held a series of regional transportation summits across the state. Each forum included an introduction to the concept of coordination, an overview of the process, and a facilitated discussion aimed at initiating a local coordination process in each region. Following these meetings, transportation coordination efforts were initiated in several regions and counties. These efforts helped set the stage for securing Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) grant money during the initial rounds of funding from FTA.

## *Florida's Commission Starts as Voluntary Effort Takes on a Life of its Own*

Florida has a long history of coordinated human service transportation. The earliest initiative was a voluntary one between the Departments of Transportation and Health and Rehabilitative Services begun in the mid 1970s.

In 1979, the Florida Legislature mandated coordination of all services for the "transportation disadvantaged," including planning and evaluation efforts. Over the next ten years, statewide planning efforts identified: the transportation disadvantaged population; government expenditures for transportation; and existing coordination strategies. Several counties initiated coordinated programs without state appropriated funds for this purpose.

The state's coordination program was significantly enhanced in 1989, beginning with the establishment of an independent Commission for the Transportation Disadvantaged. The commission was charged with the responsibility of developing and implementing coordinated activities. On the local level, coordinating

boards—including representatives of state and local agencies, coordinators, consumers and citizen advocates—were created to advise the commission on efforts to evaluate the system. Community transportation coordinators were appointed to serve as mobility managers, arranging service delivery from the multiple participating agencies.

The commission is funded through the state's transportation disadvantaged trust fund, initially financed from a 50-cent fee on motor vehicle registrations. The fund now contributes more than \$25 million to the provision of coordinated transportation services.

One of the keys to success in this model is the provision of state funds to help local agencies implement coordinated strategies and overcome their inherent distrust of government mandates. Dedicated funding can provide incentives for local agencies to overcome barriers to collaboration such as turf issues and can help agencies perform the needs assessment critical to implementing a coordinated system.

# Mechanisms for Creating Coordinating Bodies

States are using a variety of mechanisms to create transportation coordinating entities. In some cases, informal agreements have evolved into legislative or statutory mandates that are also embedded in funding requirements.

## LEGISLATIVE MANDATES

States such as **Florida**, **New Jersey**, and **Ohio** have enacted legislative mandates to coordinate human services transportation services. New Jersey and Ohio have mandated that counties develop coordination plans and submit them to the state. In Florida, the legislature created an independent agency charged with overseeing the transportation activities of state and local agencies.

## EXECUTIVE ORDERS

In **Maryland**, Governor Parris N. Glendening issued an executive order that created the Maryland Coordinating Committee for Human Services Transportation. The committee is composed of representatives of numerous government agencies, including the Department of Transportation, Maryland Mass Transit Administration, the Department of Human Resources, the Department of Health and Mental Hygiene, and the Department of Aging. The committee has focused on creating successful regional networks to facilitate flexible and responsive transportation solutions among service providers.

## MEMORANDUMS OF UNDERSTANDING OR OTHER INFORMAL AGREEMENTS

Some initiatives involve the participation of several different agencies in a task force or working group, but coordination activities can take place when as few as two agencies work together informally. For example, **Wisconsin's** Department of Workforce Development entered into an informal agreement with the Wisconsin Department of Transportation to promote coordinated transportation services for their constituencies. All correspondence regarding their transportation activities is sent out on joint letterhead to reinforce the principle and philosophy of coordination. Wisconsin's efforts have resulted in an innovative state program called the Wisconsin Employment Transportation Assistance Program, and in the successful joint application for an FTA Job Access and Reverse Commute grant.

# Challenges to Successful Coordination

As basic and straightforward as it may seem, coordinating transportation services is not a simple task and presents a number of challenges to policymakers. A substantial impediment is the differences in institutional cultures of transportation and human services departments. The barriers can be broken down into two major categories: legal and regulatory barriers, and institutional barriers.

## LEGAL AND REGULATORY BARRIERS

The nature of congressional appropriations results in funding streams for transportation that flow to state and local governments through "stovepipes." For example, funds for public transit must be used for services that are available to all citizens. Funding for human services transportation typically is targeted for the clients of a particular administrative agency, and federal restrictions prohibit commingling of funds. The typical result is the development of separate transportation systems.

Overcoming these barriers has been made somewhat simpler through program guidance, issued by HHS, outlining how sources of federal funds can be used to support transportation efforts. State coordinating bodies are continuing to work with other federal agencies to facilitate integrated state approaches to transportation solutions.

## INSTITUTIONAL BARRIERS

One of the major barriers to coordination among different state agencies is turf. Participants may mistakenly believe that they are being pushed into this effort because another participant wants to assume their responsibilities or dictate program outcomes. It is important for gubernatorial cabinet agency leaders to reinforce the purpose of these efforts—to make everyone’s job easier and to improve the effectiveness of the state’s transportation investments.

Administrative barriers may inhibit cooperative arrangements between human services agencies and transportation agencies. Reporting requirements for public transportation providers are far more stringent than those imposed on human services agencies that fund transportation as an ancillary service. Transportation providers allocate costs on a per-trip basis, while human services providers often do not. One of the major benefits of a coordination working group is that bringing a diverse group together gives participants an opportunity to learn how each agency operates and to develop trust so barriers can be removed.

Transportation professionals often claim that human services professionals do not understand how to provide transportation services. Human services professionals complain that transportation agencies do not understand their missions. Beyond dissimilar operations and missions, a “language” barrier exists that should not be underestimated. Agencies may not understand each other’s jargon and may misconstrue acronyms used in everyday conversations. Representatives from each agency should take the time to learn the nuances of each other’s operations, frames of reference, and language usage. A vital working relationship that benefits all participants can emerge from this understanding.

Several other barriers to coordination efforts have also been identified, including:

### School Buses can ONLY Transport Students! (Right?)

When it became apparent that existing rules and regulations prevented the use of school buses in coordination projects, the **Ohio** Transportation Coordination task force worked with the Ohio Department of Education to amend their rules to allow school bus usage for transporting “Ohio Works First” clients during the times when the buses were not utilized for transporting students.

In addition, the task force worked with the Department of Insurance and the major insurance carrier for the majority of school bus operations across the state to draft language to ensure appropriate and cost-effective insurance coverage of school buses used in coordination projects.

- ❖ regulatory or legislative restrictions on the use of funds or agency vehicles for providing transportation;
- ❖ perceived incompatibility among diverse passenger groups;
- ❖ negative perceptions of—and lack of support for—transit;
- ❖ need for streamlining of regulatory and reporting processes;
- ❖ difficulty of coordinating with multiple state agencies that administer various federal programs serving similar clients; and
- ❖ competition for scarce funding for additional transportation capacity.

## Conclusion

Transportation coordination holds great potential for addressing multiple needs and goals with limited resources. As basic as it may seem, several dynamics are critical to success, including leadership, participation, and continuity. By establishing and supporting formal transportation coordinating mechanisms, governors can leverage state, federal, local, and private resources to provide more effective transportation solutions that can lead to reduced congestion, better access to jobs, and more efficient provision of transportation services in their states.



# Resources

A number of states and federal agencies have published transportation coordination manuals. These manuals provide step-by-step guides on how to get the process started, take inventory of present transportation resources, and assess current and future transportation needs. Additionally, a guide is available to states through the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) at [www.fta.dot.gov/library/policy/guide/ch1.html](http://www.fta.dot.gov/library/policy/guide/ch1.html); and the Community Transportation Association of America ([www.ctaa.org](http://www.ctaa.org)) has published several guides on transportation resources.

## FEDERAL RESOURCES

Although the coordination of transportation services is likely to produce cost savings through operating efficiencies, additional resources may still be required to fill the gaps in existing transportation services. The FTA and the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) have several programs that provide resources for transportation. Over time, federal guidance has eased some of the restrictions on the use of this funding, so long as services are being provided to the programs' target populations.

The federal government spends nearly \$10 billion on public transportation programs administered through these two agencies. FTA has awarded dozens of grants to states and local transportation agencies under its Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) program. JARC is a national grant program, administered by FTA space, that provides states and communities with funding to expand employment transportation programs and services. The grant requires a 50-percent match.

### Job Access and Reverse Commute

Annual Funding Levels

Fiscal Year	Amount Appropriated	Amount Earmarked
1999	\$75 million	\$0
2000	\$75 million	\$50 million
2001	\$100 million	\$75 million
2002	\$125 million	Approx. \$114 million

Source: Doug Birnie, Federal Transit Administration

In addition, state and local transportation providers can use Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) funds to provide transportation for TANF-eligible and other low-income individuals who are transitioning from welfare into the workforce.

## **COORDINATING COUNCIL ON ACCESS AND MOBILITY**

Recognizing the potential problems created by uncoordinated approaches to specialized and human services transportation, the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) and HHS formally established the Joint HHS-DOT Coordinating Council on Human Services Transportation at [www.fta.dot.gov/CCAM/www/index.html](http://www.fta.dot.gov/CCAM/www/index.html). In 1986 the secretaries of the two departments signed a memorandum of understanding to create a forum where coordination of the departments' transportation programs could be pursued to achieve the basic objective of improving mobility.

Over the years, the council has funded projects to identify, document, and disseminate successful coordination practices to recipients of federal assistance. It also has supported other activities to develop an extensive knowledge base and enhance the capabilities of community transportation operators. In 1998 the council was renamed the Coordinating Council on Access and Mobility to better define its mission and to encourage the full participation of other federal departments in the council's work.

The goals of the joint council, as stated in the original memorandum of understanding, are to:

- ❖ achieve the most cost-effective use of federal, state, and local resources for specialized and human services transportation;
- ❖ encourage state and local governments to take a more active role in the management and coordination of programs supporting specialized and human services transportation;
- ❖ adopt administrative and management practices in the implementation of federal programs that encourage coordination among service providers and increase access to specialized and human services transportation;
- ❖ share technical resources and information with recipients of federal assistance and transportation providers; and
- ❖ encourage the most efficient system of providing service, including consideration of private-sector providers and use of competitive bidding.

Also included in the 1986 Memorandum of Understanding is the following objective: to remove federal barriers that adversely affect the coordination of transportation services among recipients and transportation providers.

# APPENDIX

## Selected State Transportation Coordination Program Descriptions

### Arkansas

Insufficient transportation and the lack of coordination of existing transportation resources have long been recognized as problems in Arkansas. Legislation establishing a state interagency transportation coordination working group to address these issues was signed into law March 3, 1993. The legislation was a result of the Governor's Task Force on Public Transportation Issues and a study the task force commissioned in 1992. The study includes a needs assessment, a demographic analysis, a detailed summary of entities involved in public transportation issues, an inventory of transportation services, public comments, and recommended pilot projects.

The Arkansas Department of Human Services (DHS), which administers public assistance programs, is spearheading the state's welfare reform movement. DHS is one of the largest departments in the state government, serving more than 750,000 people each year and providing services through 83 county sites. The department is coordinated through the DHS Division of County Operations central office in Little Rock.

Transportation will play a key part in moving families from welfare to work under new time-limited welfare reform legislation. The coordinated efforts of agencies, nonprofit organizations, employers, churches, schools, and private citizens will be necessary for welfare reform to succeed.

DHS and the Arkansas Public Transportation Coordinating Council (APTCC) joined together in a coordination demonstration to develop plans for implementing an integrated transportation program for social services programs in the state.

Arkansas is a primarily rural state with few major cities. Therefore, people must commute long distances to seek employment, go to work, make use of child care, and meet other needs. Although welfare reform legislation increases allowable resource limits for people receiving public assistance, enabling them to own more reliable transportation, many people still cannot afford their own vehicles. In addition, Arkansas offers little or no public transportation.

The goal of a coordinated transportation system, as well as the goal of the APTCC, is to improve quality of life by ensuring that everyone has access to transportation for essential purposes, including health, nutrition, education, and employment.

During community meetings across the state, attendees reported medical transportation difficulties, lack of transportation for work, difficulty traveling for food shopping, and the inability to travel from rural areas to the major cities in Arkansas. In addition to community input, transportation providers and the largest businesses in the state were surveyed. Businesses reported that lack of transportation was a problem affecting workforce availability.

Serving the unmet transportation needs of the state will involve making better use of existing transportation resources and developing new transportation programs. Making better use of existing transportation will require coordination of the many sources funding transportation and the many agencies providing transportation services. Most of these agencies have a primary mission other than providing transportation. While numerous agencies and programs provide public transportation, no state agency was directly pursuing the coordination of these services until the establishment of APTCC.



Aggressive coordination of existing providers is needed to provide less-restrictive transportation to more people, and using the same vehicle fleet, by increasing the number of service hours per vehicle. Although the need for transportation service in almost every county is greater than is currently provided, the existing systems have capacity available to serve additional riders. Many vehicles have capacity on at least some trips or are idle some part of the day. These unused seats and vehicles represent an underutilized resource that might, by effective coordination, be applied to serving unmet needs.

Five potential demonstration projects are suggested:

- ❖ intercity transportation in a corridor not presently served combined with coordination with a local rural service provider;
- ❖ coordination of rural and small urban area service in an area having high need but no existing providers;
- ❖ coordination of existing providers in a high-need area;
- ❖ use of entrepreneurial service providers and a user-side subsidy to provide transportation in low-density rural areas; and
- ❖ expansion of the scope of an existing agency to provide general public transportation.

Governor Mike Huckabee has expressed his commitment to the demonstration project. The transportation coordination working group will be chaired by a senior level policy advisor to the Governor. The Arkansas legislation establishing a transportation coordination working group named as chair the director of the Arkansas State Highway and Transportation Department.

The transportation coordination working group includes representatives who have expertise in economic and rural development, workforce development, health services, social services delivery, and transportation planning and coordination.

## Kentucky

The Human Services Transportation Delivery (HSTD) program, developed under the Empower Kentucky Project by Governor Paul E. Patton, provides non-emergency, non-ambulance medical transportation services to eligible Medicaid, vocational rehabilitation, and Department of the Blind recipients.<sup>4</sup> In December 1998, the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services granted Kentucky a 1915(b)(4) waiver. The waiver provides the flexibility for the commonwealth to implement programs and to develop new or different approaches in the delivery of health-care transportation services. The HSTD program combines the resources of public and private transportation providers in an efficient, cost-effective, and easily accessible transportation program throughout the commonwealth.

The Department for Medicaid Services contracted with the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (KYTC) to manage the daily operation of the HSTD program. The Office of Transportation Delivery (OTD) within KYTC answers complaints from recipients, subcontractors, or regional brokers and resolves them in a timely manner.

Under the HSTD program, the commonwealth is divided into 15 transportation regions. A contracted regional broker approved by OTD is responsible for coordinating and providing transportation services for each region. The contracts are bid competitively, and each provider is responsible for providing the transportation or for contracting out necessary services on behalf of the customer. Transportation providers are paid a capitated rate for each welfare recipient in the service area, whether or not the recipient uses the service. Regional brokers provide transportation services to Medicaid recipients within their region.

Recipients needing transportation services contact a regional broker to determine hours of operation and policies for scheduling transportation services. Normal transportation services must be scheduled with the regional broker 72 hours in advance.

For further information, go to: [www.kytc.state.ky.us/empower/otd/Home.htm](http://www.kytc.state.ky.us/empower/otd/Home.htm).

<sup>4</sup> For an overview of the Kentucky HSTD program, see Office of Transportation Delivery, Kentucky Department for Medicaid Services, "Human Service Transportation Delivery Service" available at: [www.kycares.net/needsassessment/tipsheet.asp?tipid=1354](http://www.kycares.net/needsassessment/tipsheet.asp?tipid=1354).

## Michigan

Michigan's welfare reform program, To Strengthen Michigan Families, has been underway since 1992. One component of the state program, Project Zero, is an effort to reduce public assistance households without earned income to zero in pilot areas.

Michigan approached the challenge of Project Zero by building a coalition of state agencies to help welfare recipients gain and retain employment. The Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT), through its Bureau of Urban and Public Transportation (UPTRAN), worked closely with the Family Independence Agency (FIA; formerly the Department of Social Services) and the Michigan Jobs Commission on this initiative. At the outset, a statewide effort to exchange information introduced county and district FIA directors to their local transit agencies, the MichiVan program (statewide vanpooling), and local ridesharing offices.

At the local level, UPTRAN staff arranged meetings with county representatives from FIA, local transit providers, welfare officials, local community action agencies, and other interested parties to overcome the barriers that prevent welfare recipients from accessing employment sites. These coordinated efforts build locally appropriate solutions.

For MDOT, the challenge was to eliminate transportation as a barrier for Project Zero participants. This challenge has been met by:

- ❖ providing more than \$1 million in state money to extend transit service hours and areas of operation;
- ❖ providing transportation service to daycare centers;
- ❖ allowing children on MichiVan vehicles;
- ❖ allowing the lease of MichiVan vehicles for purposes other than conventional vanpools;
- ❖ providing transportation to job interviews; and
- ❖ providing vehicles to an FIA office in counties where there is no general public transportation.

While these service extensions focus on the trip needs of welfare clients, all of the services are open to the general public.

Michigan has approached the challenge posed by welfare-to-work requirements in a coordinated manner, at both the state and local levels. The most critical feature of the program has been to bring all stakeholders (state and local) to the table to discuss client needs and develop services that address those needs. Another critical feature has been to fund these services. While Project Zero was intended to be a one-year, intensive demonstration project focused on selected areas, the mechanisms used to implement the original program have been used in expanded areas.

## New Jersey

The New Jersey Departments of Transportation and Human Services, along with New Jersey Transit, hosted a transportation summit on July 30, 1997, to initiate the New Jersey Coordinated Community Transportation planning process. The purpose was to develop plans for more coordinated and integrated local and regional transportation services in each of the state's 21 counties.<sup>5</sup>

The major objective of the conference was to identify services that can respond to the increased demand for transportation resulting from more people entering the workforce as mandated under the state's welfare reform program, Work First New Jersey (WFNJ). A secondary objective was to provide for improved transportation to meet other employment needs and enhance mobility for all transit-dependent county residents.

On January 29, 1998, the three agency sponsors, along with the National Governors Association, held a second statewide summit to share information about the progress of the counties' planning efforts, noteworthy job access strategies being implemented in New Jersey and elsewhere, and potential funding sources.

Between September 1998 and March 1999, the counties submitted their final transportation plans to the New Jersey Departments of Transportation and Human Services. The county plans also formed the basis for applications to the state's Transportation Innovation Fund and federal job access funding programs (FTA Job Access/Reverse Commute and Welfare-to-Work funds administered by the U.S. Department of Labor).

Transportation services in New Jersey today include:

- ❖ fixed-route buses operated by New Jersey Transit;
- ❖ fixed-route buses operated by private transit operators;
- ❖ other fixed- and flexible-route services operated by counties, municipalities, human services agencies, employers, and private companies, using full-size buses or small vehicles;
- ❖ commuter and light rail service operated by New Jersey Transit;
- ❖ Access Link, paratransit service ("dial-a-ride") for individuals who cannot use fixed-route service, operated by New Jersey Transit;
- ❖ paratransit services provided by county agencies, municipalities, or human services organizations; and
- ❖ ride-sharing services, such as carpool matching and vanpools.

As part of the planning process, local steering committees evaluated the mobility needs not only of WFNJ participants and other entry-level workers, but also of other groups that often depend on public transportation service: seniors, persons with disabilities, and other clients of human services agencies.

To gather information about these groups, the steering committees reviewed prior studies, conducted surveys, interviewed representatives of human services and employment service agencies, held discussions with focus groups, and met with stakeholders.

<sup>5</sup> For additional information on the New Jersey program, see New Jersey Department of Transportation, Workforce & Community Transportation, "NJ Transportation and Coordination Planning" available at: [www.state.nj.us/transportation/workforce/PLANNING.HTM](http://www.state.nj.us/transportation/workforce/PLANNING.HTM).

The mobility needs of these target populations were notably similar across the state. WFNJ participants, many of whom do not have access to automobiles, need transportation to and from:

- ❖ work,
- ❖ job training and job readiness activities,
- ❖ work experience programs,
- ❖ child-care facilities,
- ❖ medical care, and
- ❖ shopping centers.

Since many jobs available to WFNJ participants require work during nontraditional hours, access is needed at night and on weekends, in addition to regular business hours. In many counties, transportation is needed to employment centers in the suburbs, rural areas, or neighboring counties.

Many of the services required by WFNJ participants are also required of the other target populations.

### **Transportation Service Gaps**

Once the steering committees compared existing transportation services to the specific mobility needs of the target populations, a picture of service gaps emerged.

- ❖ Fixed-route bus and rail service is not readily available in suburban and rural areas, where population and trip origins and destinations are widely dispersed.
- ❖ Many residential areas and work-related destinations are located close to public transit services; however, days of operation, hours of service, and frequency of trips may not accommodate the requirements of target populations.
- ❖ Employment centers, medical facilities, and shopping centers serving targeted populations are often not located in areas served by public transportation.
- ❖ Services may not provide necessary connections between counties or between municipalities within a county.
- ❖ Community-based, door-to-door services typically offer limited hours and are usually operating at full capacity.
- ❖ Existing paratransit and existing human services agency paratransit systems are often operating at capacity, and are unable to meet the demand for their services.

Other concerns are the affordability of public transit and the availability of information about transit services.

One key finding from the survey is that gaps in services for WFNJ clients were cited by a large majority of counties, in most categories, and more so than other target populations.

## Recommended Transportation Strategies

Eight strategies were proposed to respond to gaps.

**1. Modify existing bus routes and schedules to increase the frequency of service, add destinations, or provide connections to other services.** Examples include adding service to key job sites during the hours of second and third work shifts and extending New Jersey Transit Service from Passaic County communities to nearby employment centers.

**2. Add new services, operating on fixed or flexible routes and schedules, to link county residents with regional transit services, employers, and other major destinations.** Use shuttle buses—providing fixed and flexible routes and schedules and using small buses—to link Mt. Holly with other Burlington County communities. Provide fixed-route shuttles using small buses to link residents with the Port Authority Transit Corporation (PATCO) rapid transit stations. Provide after-hours, flexible-route van service to link Newark and Irvington residents with PATH service between 1:00 a.m. and 5:00 a.m.

**3. Increase coordination of existing paratransit services, including the establishment of transportation brokers.** Consolidate county paratransit, Medicaid, Access Link, and services provided for human services agency clients within Atlantic and Cape May Counties, with a long-term goal of developing a transportation brokerage to manage services in a combined two-county system. Use a paratransit system to provide Medicaid, non-emergency medical transportation.

**4. Expand paratransit systems to offer service to new user groups or during additional hours.** Use paratransit service to provide work trips in the evening and on weekends. Extend days and hours to provide second and third shift employment trips. Add WFNJ clients to the list of eligible users of county paratransit service, with the long-term goal of opening service to the general public. Provide dial-a-ride service to the general public in northern New Jersey and “safety-net” service for work trips throughout Camden county.

**5. Develop programs to assist low-income individuals with the purchase and operation of their own cars.** Initiate auto purchase, insurance, or repair loan programs; or a combination of two or more of those programs.

**6. Provide employer shuttles.** Operate shuttle services between points served by fixed-route and local shuttle services, residential areas, or both, and areas of significant employment in several communities. Improve access to the Pureland Industrial Complex with shuttle service between New Jersey Transit bus routes and the complex.

**7. Increase distribution of public transportation information to users, including trip-planning services.** Establish a transportation information clearinghouse or brokers to provide transportation information to all county residents; help WFNJ clients identify and arrange for suitable work-related transportation; and manage contracts with transportation operators. Use trip planning software similar to that developed by Bergen County. Develop and update county transit maps.

**8. Implement New Jersey Transit's WorkPass program and other incentives for the use of transit passes.** Expand the TransitChek program, through which employers distribute vouchers that employees use to purchase tickets, tokens, or passes from transportation providers. Open additional transit pass outlet centers and make PATCO tickets available by mail.

For further information, go to: [www.state.nj.us/transportation/workforce/PLANNING.HTM](http://www.state.nj.us/transportation/workforce/PLANNING.HTM).

## Ohio

In 1996 representatives from the Ohio Departments of Transportation, Aging, Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities, and Human Services attended a regional transportation coordination conference sponsored by the Federal Transit Administration and the Department of Health and Human Services. At the conference, the state representatives developed a plan that consisted of several action steps, including forming a state agency task force to develop interagency agreements and address interagency barriers, holding a state transportation coordination conference, and developing a demonstration project to address locally the issues of state agency barriers to coordination.<sup>6</sup>

Over the next several years, the task force expanded its membership to include most of the other state agencies that sponsor transportation activities, conducted two statewide conferences on the issue to generate support for coordination at the local level, and selected a county demonstration site to address state regulations and policies that were barriers to local coordination. Information was shared among the member agencies concerning regulatory-free zones and waiver processes, reporting requirements, and funding distribution. Experts in various fields were invited to address the task force. These included representatives from other states and private insurers, who provided input on insurance and liability issues faced by coordination projects. In addition, the task force published transportation coordination briefs that described the activities of the task force, addressed issues of importance, and shared best practices information. The task force continues to meet quarterly to discuss ongoing issues and to develop plans to expand coordination efforts throughout the state.

In 1995 the Ohio Department of Transportation formally set aside funds from its operating budget to establish the Ohio Transportation Coordination Program. Funding for the current year is \$1.3 million. The project's goals are:

- ❖ to improve and expand transportation services in those Ohio counties that do not have a public transportation system;
- ❖ to increase efficiency and effectiveness of transportation service delivery; and
- ❖ to develop coordination models that are applicable to other communities.

The goal of the transportation coordination project, to the extent feasible, is to develop projects that coordinate with and support the transportation plan requirements of Ohio Works First, the state's welfare reform program. Projects are also expected to collaborate with the Workforce Investment Act networks in their areas. All projects must demonstrate some level of interagency coordination in their

<sup>6</sup> For an overview of the Ohio coordination program, see Ohio Department of Transportation, "Transportation Coordination Overview," available at: [www.dot.state.oh.us/ptrans/Funding\\_Programs/trans\\_coord.htm](http://www.dot.state.oh.us/ptrans/Funding_Programs/trans_coord.htm).

local area to be eligible for funding. All projects must designate a lead agency and transportation coordinator to administer day-to-day operations, execute memorandums of understanding with participating agencies, and commence the project within 90 days of contract awards.

For further information, go to: [www.dot.state.oh.us/ptrans/Coordination\\_Links/state\\_coord.htm](http://www.dot.state.oh.us/ptrans/Coordination_Links/state_coord.htm).

## Oregon

In Oregon, responsibility for transporting agency clients, students, and the general public is scattered among a dozen state agencies and 22 separate programs. Collectively, these agencies spend almost \$175 million a year on vehicles and a variety of transportation services. However, there was very little conscious coordination of transportation services among state agencies, which resulted in gaps in coverage, fragmentation and duplication of services, and inefficient use of public resources.

### The Plan

To address these needs, participants in the State Agency Transportation Coordination Project crafted a vision statement to help guide the formation of a coordination plan:

“To maximize independence and productivity, people in Oregon will have universal access to coordinated transportation services.”<sup>7</sup>

Key goals of the plan include:

- ❖ doing more with limited public resources;
- ❖ utilizing state transportation investments more efficiently;
- ❖ enhancing the mobility of the most needy Oregonians; and
- ❖ preserving individual independence and enhancing the overall quality of life.

### Barriers and Outcomes are Identified

To achieve these specific outcomes, state agencies and their local partners are challenged to overcome numerous barriers to coordination, including turf issues, conflicting federal and state mandates and rules, and differing perceptions of need and practical solutions. Administrative functions clearly need to be better integrated, and state agencies need to cooperate more in planning how their funds will be allocated and services delivered. A common language throughout state government is also clearly needed to measure mobility needs and performance, report on accomplishments, and plan for the future. These steps are essential to achieve the following outcomes:

- ❖ Increase the number of people served and the number of rides provided with existing resources.
- ❖ Increase options for travel within and between Oregon communities.
- ❖ Improve access to education opportunities, medical services, social supports, and jobs.

<sup>7</sup> State Agency Transportation Coordination Project, *Final Project Report: The Coordination Challenge* (Salem, Ore.: Oregon Department of Transportation, June 2000), 7; available at: [www.odot.state.or.us/pubtrans/documents/CoordBook.pdf](http://www.odot.state.or.us/pubtrans/documents/CoordBook.pdf). Also see “State Agency Transportation Coordination Project,” available at: [www.odot.state.or.us/pubtrans/coordination.html](http://www.odot.state.or.us/pubtrans/coordination.html)[0].

- ❖ Reduce duplication and fragmentation in administration, planning, funding, and delivery of transportation services.
- ❖ Increase and sustain the safety of state-supported transportation services.
- ❖ Increase local efforts that maximize the use of existing resources.

## Recommended Implementation Strategies

The plan recommended a series of actions to create the institutional framework to achieve this vision. They fall into three categories: initial actions, state activities, and monitoring and reporting.

**Initial Actions the Governor Needs to Take.** The governor should meet with key state agency heads, announce a coordination policy initiative, and outline expected outcomes. The governor should charge the agencies with implementing the coordination initiative and hold them accountable for achieving results. The governor should also encourage state agencies to seek the maximum involvement of local communities and stakeholders in the transportation coordination process, including the creation of local structures for coordinating state-supported transportation services.

**State Activities Needed to Achieve Outcomes.** An ongoing system needs to be implemented that can: identify new coordination barriers and obstacles as they emerge; identify gaps in the current delivery system and opportunities to improve the coordination of services; integrate administration of major agency programs; provide policy solutions and technical support; collect and disseminate common information about activities and outcomes; design and implement innovative projects and initiatives; and provide financial incentives to support coordination.

Several priority coordination activities were identified by the working group.

1. Efficiency increases are possible from mixing clients served by special transportation programs and volunteer drivers. Unfortunately, mixing client loads may increase insurance costs. To make this strategy effective, steps will be taken to:

- ❖ *Create a mechanism to reduce the risks associated with mixing clients in transportation, such as an insurance risk pool.*

2. To eliminate barriers to the development of shared-use, interagency or intergovernmental agreements, leverage resources; improve safety; and minimize concerns related to equipment, providers, and people using systems:

- ❖ *Develop consistent standards for transportation services and planning among the Oregon Department of Human Services (DHS), the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT), Oregon Department of Education (ODE), the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA), and others.*

- ❖ *Develop uniform operating, safety, and vehicle standards and specifications (such as child restraints and special licensing), and training.*

3. To simplify and clarify local transportation services, to provide a mechanism for evaluating billings, and to update information on the “state of public transit” in Oregon:

- ❖ *Condense existing rules where practical and develop a consistent set of state agency policies, administrative rules, and standards to govern eligibility.*
- ❖ *Coordinate transportation programs of ODOT, DHS, ODE, VA, and other agencies involved in transportation services.*

4. Because passengers of transportation services have multiple problems and needs, and coordination has proven to be an effective means of increasing the amount of service that may be obtained from a given resource level:

- ❖ *Make available a brokerage or other locally appropriate transportation coordinate mechanism in each county or region.*
- ❖ *Create incentives that encourage local jurisdictions to integrate transportation services.*
- ❖ *Establish a method to reinvest coordination savings into the community to increase transportation service and improve quality.*
- ❖ *Assist communities in identifying and overcoming barriers to coordinated transportation services.*

5. Fragmented systems foster opportunities for gaps to exist and assumptions to be based on misinformation. To streamline transportation planning and grants to local communities and to encourage strategies that serve a variety of needs:

- ❖ *Coordinate transportation funding and planning (both generalized and specialized) among ODOT, DHS, ODE, VA, and their local partners.*
- ❖ *Develop consistent transportation billing and tracking systems among state agencies.*
- ❖ *Where appropriate, consolidate fragmented funding and transportation reimbursements from all state agencies, including ODOT, DHS, VA, and ODE into a single transportation coordination grant to local communities.*

6. For transportation providers to focus on services and to provide best practice examples, technical assistance and peer-to-peer resources throughout the state:

- ❖ *Develop and maintain a consolidated inventory of transportation funding resources, providers, and coordinated services within Oregon.*
- ❖ *Establish a single point of contact for local communities to call for assistance and “barrier busting.”*

7. Because both the purchase and maintenance of rolling stock consumes a large amount of available resources for special needs transportation:

- ❖ *Maximize the use of existing vehicles in community programs through shared-use programs.*
- ❖ *Establish a capital asset management plan that identifies when vehicles need to be replaced, maximizes vehicle utilization, and avoids redundancy.*

8. To make transportation services more easily accessible and user friendly:

- ❖ *Create and offer funding for local jurisdictions to integrate transportation services and consolidate funding.*

9. To create closer links among education, social support, and workforce outcomes:

- ❖ *Create incentives in the school transportation allocation for school districts to participate in coordinated transportation services (e.g., allow districts to keep savings in state allocation from coordinating services).*

10. To ensure that desired coordination improvement outcomes are being met:

- ❖ *Develop a performance monitoring and tracking system to assess the effectiveness of agencies in implementing these directives and in achieving desired outcomes.*
- ❖ *Develop a uniform tool to evaluate local transportation coordination efforts, including quality attributes, such as avoided health-care costs.*

**Monitoring and Reporting.** State agencies should measure and report progress in improving coordination. Quarterly reports should be made to the governor’s office on goals, objectives, and accomplishments. Implementation assistance should be provided to state and local agencies to accomplish coordination goals. Support should be provided by technical and financial assistance.

## Wisconsin

The Wisconsin Employment Transportation Assistance Program (WETAP) is jointly administered by the Wisconsin Departments of Workforce Development and Transportation. The program integrates several state and federal funding sources into one coordinated process. It encourages local areas to work together in a collaborative process to assess and address their transportation needs.<sup>8</sup>

WETAP draws on federal employment transportation programs such as FTA’s JARC program, the TANF program, and the DOT Demand Management (TDM) Program. TANF rules and regulations allow some portion of grants to be used for low-income populations to access work or employment-related activities such as child care and training. TDM funds are available from DOT to develop alternatives to single-occupancy vehicle usage. WETAP then provides state dollars that are used to meet the match requirements of these programs.

WETAP provides “seed” dollars for demonstration projects with the objective of long-term sustainability. The program can cover up to 80 percent of the match requirements of JARC, with the localities providing the other 20 percent. The local contribution is required to ensure long-term sustainability and commitment from local providers.

<sup>8</sup> For additional information on Wisconsin’s transportation coordination program, see Wisconsin Department of Workforce Development, “The Mobility Pages: Bridging the Gap in Employment Transportation,” available at: [www.dwd.state.wi.us/dwepfe/mobility.htm](http://www.dwd.state.wi.us/dwepfe/mobility.htm).

The objectives of WETAP are to:

- ❖ help low-income, unemployed, and at-risk people access jobs, retain jobs, or advance to higher paying jobs by alleviating transportation-related barriers;
- ❖ enhance the low-income population’s mobility options, increase their access to employment, and help them meet job-related needs;
- ❖ increase the number and variety of transportation options available to low-income workers. Projects receive consideration based on the following priorities:
  - o expansion of the public transportation system’s capacity, with the intention of sustaining the route for the long-term;
  - o ridesharing options, including vanpools and carpools; and
  - o innovative individual solutions, such as car repair programs, vehicle donation programs, automobile lease or loan programs, training, or education.
- ❖ encourage the creation of a local planning process that involves all local stakeholders, including low-income individuals and the private sector (e.g., employers, chambers of commerce).

To ensure all projects are locally or regionally coordinated, only one application per county is accepted.

For further information, go to: [www.dwd.state.wi.us/dwepfe/mobility.htm](http://www.dwd.state.wi.us/dwepfe/mobility.htm).

## **ADDITIONAL STATE RESOURCES**

Massachusetts

[www.state.ma.us/hst/HSTagenc.htm](http://www.state.ma.us/hst/HSTagenc.htm)

Minnesota

[www.dot.state.mn.us/transit/5310/App/Info.pdf](http://www.dot.state.mn.us/transit/5310/App/Info.pdf)

Texas

[www.dhs.state.tx.us/programs/transportation/index/html](http://www.dhs.state.tx.us/programs/transportation/index/html)

Washington

[www.wsdot.wa.gov/acct/default.htm](http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/acct/default.htm)

# Addendum: Measuring Performance in Statewide Transportation Coordination Efforts

As described in this report, transportation coordination can yield numerous benefits. The challenge remains to measure coordination initiatives in a way that illustrates the benefits achieved while allowing for continuous improvement and accountability.

This addendum describes some key issues in establishing a performance measurement system for transportation coordination. It presents the logic of measuring performance, basic and advanced performance measures, and case studies of how several states are building performance measurement systems to capture better information on transportation coordination. Guidelines for statewide performance measurement are also outlined.

## WHAT NGA DID

In order to understand the current practices of transportation coordination performance measurement, the NGA Center for Best Practices took the following steps:

- ❖ Convened a group of high-level state transportation coordination officials at the CTAAs annual conference in Austin, Texas, in May 2002;
- ❖ Reviewed the literature on performance measurement published by states, federal agencies and nonprofit organizations; and
- ❖ Conducted interviews with transportation coordination leaders in 10 states to gain an in-depth view of how performance is measured.

## A Performance Management Framework for Transportation Coordination

Performance measurement is a tool for accountability that provides a means of judging policies and programs by measuring their outcomes or results against agreed-upon standards. A performance measurement system organizes information about processes and outcomes so that it can be used effectively by political leaders and program managers.<sup>1</sup>

The ideal performance measurement system includes measures of *program* effectiveness and measures of *policy* effectiveness. **Measures of program effectiveness** provide information about how well individual programs perform. These measures may include cost effectiveness, cost efficiency, service effectiveness and sometimes quality of service. Program measures do not answer questions of whether human services transportation is working in a coordinated fashion.

**Measures of policy effectiveness** focus on whether transportation coordination achieves the state’s broader goals and objectives. These goals include eliminating duplicate services, using transportation capacity fully and improving quality of life. Measuring these outcomes requires the use of data that capture the success of the system in operating as a single enterprise rather than as a collection of programs.

States are working to shape their systems toward robust measures of policy accountability, since these measures shed light on how well the state can work together as an enterprise to achieve policy goals. The following section outlines performance measures that can be used to develop this system.

## Basic Measures of Program Effectiveness

Of the states measuring the performance of their transportation coordination initiatives—**Kentucky, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Jersey, Ohio and Oregon**—the four most common groups of data being collected are:

1. *Cost efficiency* data can be used to measure the relationship between resource inputs and service outputs.<sup>2</sup> Ideally, coordination will improve the ratios of cost efficiency. Measures in this area include:
  - ❖ Total operating cost per hour that vehicles are in service;
  - ❖ Total operating cost per mile that vehicles are in service;
  - ❖ Costs of paying drivers per hour that vehicles are in service;
  - ❖ Ratios of the hours vehicles are in service to the hours that drivers are paid;
  - ❖ Maintenance cost per hour that vehicles are in service;
  - ❖ Administrative cost per hour that vehicles are in service;
  - ❖ Average cost per hour that vehicles are in service; and
  - ❖ Labor cost per hour that vehicles are in service.
2. *Cost effectiveness* data can be used to measure the relationship between consumption of public transportation services and the resources expended.<sup>3</sup> The fewer resources expended in relation to the service consumed, or the greater the consumption revenue received in relation to dollars spent, the more cost effective the service.

Measures of cost effectiveness include:

- ❖ Total cost of operating the service per passenger;
  - ❖ Passenger revenue as a percent of total operating cost; and
  - ❖ Passengers served for each dollar of operating costs.
3. *Service effectiveness* data can be used to measure the consumption of public transportation service in relation to the amount of service available.<sup>4</sup> Data in this category go beyond basic transit measures and look at measures such as the number of shared trips provided or the percentage of vehicle capacity used. These begin to shed light on whether coordination actually is occurring. Other reliable measures of service effectiveness include:

### MANDATING PERFORMANCE MEASURE

In **Ohio**, the state-run coordination program mandates that communities collect performance data and demonstrate improvements in coordination in order to get continued state funding.\*

The law mandating coordinated special-needs transportation in **Washington State** calls for performance goals and an evaluation process that leads to continuous system improvement.†

**Oregon** also has recognized the role that performance monitoring plays in determining whether the intended results of transportation coordination are being achieved.§ However, a set of performance measures has yet to be agreed upon.

\* Ohio Coordination Program: Criteria and Application Instructions” (Columbus, OH: Ohio Department of Transportation), 5.

† Coordinating Special Needs Transportation (Chapter 47.06B RCW),” Washington State law available online at: [www.wsdot.wa.gov/acct/library/1999legislation.htm](http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/acct/library/1999legislation.htm).

§ Mark Steranka and David Raphael, “The Coordination Challenge” (Salem, OR: Oregon Department of Transportation, November 2000), 19.

- ❖ Passengers served per hour that vehicles are in service;
- ❖ Passengers served per mile that vehicles are in service;
- ❖ Passenger revenue per hour that vehicles are in service;
- ❖ Passenger revenue per mile of vehicle service;
- ❖ Average passenger trips per month; and
- ❖ Average passengers per hour of vehicle operation.

4. *Service quality* data are frequently collected through ridership surveys that ask clients about such things as on-time service, the safety and appearance of drivers, and the ease of scheduling ride appointments. Most of these are only applicable in demand-based systems and are much harder to measure in the case of fixed-route transit services such as buses and rail.

## Advanced Measures of Policy Effectiveness

A few states, most notably **Massachusetts** and **Ohio**, have gone a step further by using higher-level performance measurement that captures both program and policy effectiveness. These higher-level measures illustrate progress toward the core of transportation coordination *policy* goals. They show how transportation coordination as a policy is functioning to achieve community-wide outcomes at a given level of program efficiency and effectiveness.

States, via key policy staff and program managers, can develop higher-level performance measures by asking questions such as:

- ❖ Is quality of life improving for human services clients?
- ❖ Are more seniors and/or disabled residents living independently as a result of greater access to transportation?
- ❖ Are fewer transportation-dependent residents missing medical appointments?
- ❖ Are coordinated transportation systems providing greater access to jobs, leading to an increase in residents with earned income and a decrease in those relying on public assistance?

## State Examples of Higher-Level Performance Measurement Systems

**Ohio** uses performance measures to determine both the success of coordination and of agencies implementing coordination at the county and regional levels. The Ohio Coordination Program provides grants of up to \$75,000 to counties and regional transit authorities to coordinate transportation delivery. The program goals are to improve and/or expand transportation services in a given area, and/or eliminate duplication of transportation resources. First-year applicants are required to provide baseline data with their funding requests. Required data include: number of individuals served, passenger trips, vehicle miles, vehicle hours, operating costs and other transportation-related expenses for each agency in the service area that either provides or purchases transportation services.

Applicants also must explain what resources are to be shared among the participating local agencies. Applicants must present coordination milestones and a timetable for achieving their goals. Grantees seeking second- and third-year funding must demonstrate progress toward meeting their milestones, such as measurable increases in the number of project participants and the number of coordinated complemen-

tary services. Demonstrated success, based on the performance measures outlined by the state, weighs heavily for determining continued funding to the grantees.

In July 2002, the **Massachusetts** Human Service Transportation Coordination Initiative installed an advanced set of performance measurement data points. Prior to that time, the state only knew how much money it was spending to coordinate human services transportation. Given the fiscal imperative for states to get the most for their money, the coordination oversight office developed a 12-point performance measurement matrix that the 9 regional transportation brokers must report on monthly (this matrix appears in Appendix II). The measures go beyond the basic program measures and ask providers for data such as: the number of shared and non-shared trips provided, the cost for providing shared and non-shared trips, the number of transportation providers used for trips, and the number of no-shows and canceled trips. The state expects these data will provide a much more thorough measure of their coordination success.

Sustained data collection and analysis are planned to yield long-term systemic improvements. For example, concurrent increases in expenses and no-shows/cancellations could illustrate the cost impact that no-shows and cancellations have on the transportation provider. Once that is understood, the state could step back and consider services and approaches to reduce no-shows and cancellations. In addition, measuring the number and cost of shared trips (those with more than one rider) may indicate whether multiple agencies are effectively coordinating services for maximum efficiency.

Examples of higher-level performance measurement also are evident in communities that receive federal transportation funding for job access transportation coordination. A U.S. General Accounting Office study found that the grantees went beyond simply collecting data on the number of job sites served and were reporting a variety of higher-level measures including:<sup>5</sup>

- ❖ Number of employers made available to low-income people through a job access service;
- ❖ Number of jobs served by job access transportation service; and
- ❖ Number of Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) clients who were able to obtain and keep employment as a result of job access service.

Once enough high-level performance measurement data have accumulated, state policymakers and program managers can spot trends that will lead to a complete evaluation of the system and ultimately conclude whether the program or policy is succeeding. Further, performance measures can focus attention on the relationship between program operations and outcomes.<sup>6</sup>

## Guidelines in Establishing Effective Performance Measurement Systems

Governors should consider following four performance measurement guidelines in their statewide transportation coordination efforts.

### **1. At a minimum, Governors should direct state agencies involved in transportation coordination to implement a performance measurement system.**

Governors are the only actors with responsibility for the various program areas participating in coordination, and therefore must ensure accountability in transportation coordination efforts. As described above, meaningful performance measurement systems can track progress toward policy and program goals as well as provide an instrument for making continuous improvements.

States involved in transportation coordination are at different stages of mandating the collection and analysis of performance measures. Some states interviewed for this report have not established performance measures. Those states that do require performance measures differ in the level of complexity of that data, even to the point that few truly are measuring the added value that transportation coordination can bring to the state human services mission.

### **2. Performance measurement should be linked to transportation coordination goals.**

The most commonly identified goals of state transportation coordination initiatives are:

- ❖ Cost savings;
- ❖ Expansion of services;
- ❖ Greater operational efficiency; and
- ❖ Elimination of duplication.

Measures that focus on only a single program—and less comprehensive measures in general—fall short of giving policymakers the information they need to make informed decisions about transportation coordination. Basic transit measures such as rider counts and measures of cost efficiency fail to provide a complete understanding of performance. Most states have established a foundation for higher-level performance measurement by looking at basic transit measures. The next step for these states is to move up to a higher performance measurement level.

Once a statewide reporting system is in place, states can define new measures—as **Massachusetts** has done—to identify progress towards coordination goals. For example, Massachusetts has incorporated measurement of how many trips are shared by multiple passengers. Without basic cost data in place, this higher-level measure would be meaningless. Similarly, measuring service expansion without basic data in place would neglect the cost dimension. Measures, such as sharing of trips among agency clients, total operating costs at a given level of service, and total services provided at a given cost can be added to a program performance measurement system.

### **3. States should standardize regional providers' reporting requirements to enable consistent, regular measurement of performance and improvement.**

States should develop and adhere to a standard set of data points upon which coordination partners from around the state must report. The data points must be able to be collected and reported consistently

across regions. States should require regular reporting of data, such as monthly or quarterly reports. Among the states interviewed for this report, such reporting is evident in **Kentucky, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Jersey, Ohio and Oregon.**

Data should be reported to a single state entity, wherever the state determines the performance measure aspect is best housed. That state office would “own” the data and be responsible for collecting it and reporting its analyses of the data to the governor; the legislature; and the cross-agency, state-level transportation coordination council (established as a policy and program discussion group for state departments involved). State-level analyses will provide an overall assessment and yield trends that should lead to further research on why some regions succeed while others struggle, particularly if the first task of the state office is standardization of regional data to establish a reliable baseline.<sup>7</sup>

#### **4. Establish Consensus among Participating Agencies on Performance Measurement Guidelines.**

By definition, transportation coordination entails bringing many interests to the table. At the state level, this usually means representatives of the departments of transportation, health and human services, labor, and education. Gubernatorial policy staff and legislators also are interested third parties. Although different partners have different priorities, agreement must be reached on performance measurement guidelines.

Several states, including **Massachusetts, North Carolina, Ohio and Washington,** have established cross-agency councils or task forces to provide guidance for the state-run transportation coordination effort. In some cases, this has led to the creation of performance measures. In other cases, the mechanism for doing so is in place for when the state decides to move forward with performance measurement.

# Conclusion

Governors can ensure improvement in state transportation coordination efforts and pave the way for future enterprisewide government initiatives by improving policy accountability through state-of-the-art performance measurement. While implementation of such a system is neither instantaneous nor easy, the current era of budgetary challenges necessitates action in this direction for improved government performance and efficiency.

Moving to a higher level of performance measurement requires interagency consensus, standard data reporting, and significant coordination among regional and local actors, such as transportation brokers, human service agencies, and transit systems and providers. Hence, governors should designate administrative responsibility for measurement at the state level and provide the necessary authority to the designated individual or office, and they should ensure that the goal of systemwide measurement is pursued.

---

<sup>1</sup> Brizius and Campbell, 11.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid.

<sup>5</sup> U.S. General Accounting Office, "Welfare Reform: Job Access Program Improves Local Service Coordination, but Evaluation Should be Completed" (GAO-03-204) (Washington, D.C.: U.S. General Accounting Office, December 2002), 10.

<sup>6</sup> Brizius and Campbell, 25.

<sup>7</sup> "Human Services Transportation Coordination: Determining Before and After Costs" (Transportation Coordination Brief No. 7) (Columbus, Ohio: Ohio Statewide Transportation Coordination Task Force, August 1998).

<sup>8</sup> "Ohio Coordination Program: Criteria and Application Instructions" (Columbus, Ohio: Ohio Department of Transportation), 9.

<sup>9</sup> Karen Horsch, "Indicators: Definition and Use in a Results-Based Accountability System" (Harvard Family Research Project) available online at [www.gse.harvard.edu/~hfrp/pubs/onlinepubs/indicators.html](http://www.gse.harvard.edu/~hfrp/pubs/onlinepubs/indicators.html).

# Addendum Appendix A: Selected State Program Summaries

Summary of Transportation Coordination Efforts	Performance Measures and Program Contacts
<p><b>KENTUCKY</b></p> <p>The Human Service Transportation Delivery (HSTD) program primarily provides non-emergency medical transportation services to eligible Medicaid recipients. To a lesser extent, it transports persons in the TANF program to job interviews, job training, employment and child-care facilities. The program also provides services to persons eligible for programs through the state Department for the Blind &amp; Vocational Rehabilitation. The Office of Transportation Delivery, within the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet, oversees the HSTD program.</p>	<p>The state computes cost-per-trip rates based on ridership and expense data reported monthly by transportation brokers. Cost-per-mile rates are not measured because of the largely rural composition of the state. Riders also are surveyed to determine customer satisfaction with the service.</p> <p>Marc Clark Executive Director Office of Quality Kentucky Transportation Cabinet 502/564-4072 <a href="mailto:marc.clark@mail.state.ky.us">marc.clark@mail.state.ky.us</a></p> <p>Kentucky Office of Transportation Delivery HSTD Branch <a href="http://www.kytc.state.ky.us/empower/otd/">http://www.kytc.state.ky.us/empower/otd/</a></p> <p>Enabling Legislation for HSTD Program <a href="http://www.lrc.state.ky.us/kar/603/007/080.htm">www.lrc.state.ky.us/kar/603/007/080.htm</a></p>

<p><b>MASSACHUSETTS</b></p> <p>The Massachusetts Human Service Transportation (HST) Coordination Initiative serves human and elder service agency consumers who participate in state-funded programs such as MassHealth (i.e., Medicaid), Early Intervention, and community-based residential and social services. In addition, state agencies help with transportation for eligible consumers returning to work and for access to child care. The initiative is overseen by the Human Service Transportation Office, which is under the Executive Office of Health &amp; Human Services and is staffed with transportation managers from the major participating agencies, including the state departments of mental health, mental retardation, public health and transitional assistance.</p>	<p>In July 2002, the state implemented a 12-point performance measurement report that looks at a range of ridership, cost and transportation data. Among the data points are: customers served, shared trips, non-shared trips, cost of shared and non-shared trips, and providers used. This new system standardizes the reporting requirements for the nine transportation brokers statewide. The new system is proposed to better monitor resource utilization and give a truer picture of coordination success.</p> <p>Catherine Mick Director Human Service Transportation Office 617/626-5151 <a href="mailto:catherine.mick@state.ma.us">catherine.mick@state.ma.us</a></p> <p>HST Coordination Initiative <a href="http://www.masscares.org/transportation/">http://www.masscares.org/transportation/</a></p> <p>Operational Framework for HST Initiative <a href="http://www.masscares.org/transportation/framework.pdf">http://www.masscares.org/transportation/framework.pdf</a></p>
--	---

**Summary of Transportation Coordination Efforts**

**Performance Measures and Program Contacts**

**MICHIGAN**

Michigan operates two programs involving coordinated transportation. Under Project Zero, the state’s welfare-to-work initiative, transportation is provided for access to jobs, job training and child-care. Funding is provided by the Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT), Family Independence Agency and Department of Career Development. The Specialized Service Program serves the elderly and disabled. MDOT makes grants to public transit agencies or other transportation providers to serve these residents. Grantees must establish local coordination committees to determine how best to meet their needs.

For Project Zero, local transportation providers report costs, revenues, passengers served, and hours and miles of service provided. Beginning in 2003, MDOT only is asking Specialized Service Program grantees for non-financial data, such as passengers served and miles and hours of service provided. Previously for the program, MDOT asked for financial information but has since stopped because the data were not being used for comparative purposes or to determine program performance. The latest MDOT long-range plan urges the development of a performance measurement system for programs throughout the department. It is thought that performance measures will not be incorporated into the transportation coordination programs, whose total state funding is \$8 million, until they are applied to larger state transportation initiatives.

Kim Johnson  
Manager  
Transportation Services Section  
Office of Passenger Transportation Division  
Multimodal Services Bureau  
Michigan Department of Transportation  
517/373-8796  
[johnsonki@michigan.gov](mailto:johnsonki@michigan.gov)

MDOT Transportation Services Section  
[http://www.michigan.gov/mdot/0,1607,7-151-9623\\_10693\\_15160-32754--,00.html](http://www.michigan.gov/mdot/0,1607,7-151-9623_10693_15160-32754--,00.html)

**NEW JERSEY**

Transportation coordination is overseen by partnership of the New Jersey Departments of Transportation, Human Services and Labor, Transit, and the New Jersey State Employment & Training Commission. Each of the state’s 21 counties established an interagency transportation steering committee to identify local strategies for meeting transportation needs for this population. The process brought together human services, transportation, planning, and employment services agencies; as well as nonprofit organizations and other community stakeholders. Local

*(continued)*

Reliable data have been difficult to produce since the majority of the target population served use existing fixed-route bus service to get to and from jobs and job training. No tool has been developed to identify those people who use the existing service for this express purpose. Such data can only be gathered in small and rural areas where nonprofit agencies and private transit operators run demand-based services. In cases where specific jobs-access transportation routes have been established, the state has just begun asking for New Jersey Transit—the primary transit provider in the state—to report ridership numbers. The Department of Human Services is developing a monthly form for transit

*(continued)*

**Summary of Transportation Coordination Efforts**

**Performance Measures and Program Contacts**

strategies developed include: expansions of existing transit service, expansions of paratransit service, implementation of feeder services that connect rural and suburban areas to existing transit service, and establishment of transportation brokerages.

providers to report ridership and cost data for clients served who are TANF-eligible or whose TANF eligibility recently expired.

Terri Hirschhorn  
Program Analyst  
Office of Policy & Planning  
New Jersey Department of Human Services  
609/292-9265  
[tehirschho@dhs.state.nj.us](mailto:tehirschho@dhs.state.nj.us)

Bob Koska  
New Jersey Transit  
973/491-7376  
[ccafrpk@njtransit.com](mailto:ccafrpk@njtransit.com)

Workforce & Community Transportation  
New Jersey Department of Transportation  
[http://www.state.nj.us/transportation/workforce/IN  
DEX.HTM](http://www.state.nj.us/transportation/workforce/INDEX.HTM)

***NORTH CAROLINA***

The Human Service Transportation Council oversees statewide coordination. Its goal is to determine how much funding from federal, state, and other sources support human services transportation and then develop approaches that would blend funds to efficiently serve the largest number of residents. An April 2002 executive order from Governor Michael Easley directed state agencies that provide transportation to coordinate their efforts. The North Carolina Department of Transportation administers the Human Service Transportation Grant Program, which pays up to 75 percent (not exceeding \$18,750 annually) of the salary of a transportation coordinator for a county’s lead transportation agency. The coordinator is charged with planning how best to merge the different transportation resources with the various human services client needs.

At this stage, there are no performance measures in place.

Kathy McGehee  
Chair  
Human Service Transportation Council  
919/733-4534  
[Kathy.mcgehee@ncmail.net](mailto:Kathy.mcgehee@ncmail.net)

Charles Glover  
Assistant Director  
Community Transportation Branch  
Public Transportation Division  
North Carolina Department of Transportation  
919/733-4713, ext. 277

Human Service Transportation Management Grant Program  
[http://www.ncdot.org/transit/transitnet/PublicInfo/  
TransitFinance/Grants/HSTM.html](http://www.ncdot.org/transit/transitnet/PublicInfo/TransitFinance/Grants/HSTM.html)

Summary of Transportation Coordination Efforts	Performance Measures and Program Contacts
<p><b>OHIO</b></p> <p>The Ohio Coordination Program awards grants to municipalities and regional transit authorities to coordinate human services transportation. Grantees can receive up to \$75,000 a year for three years to provide coordinated transportation. Funding preference is given to areas without public transportation systems in place.</p>	<p>Program guidelines require grant applicants to explain what resources are proposed to be shared among participating local agencies. Applicants must present coordination milestones and a timetable for achieving their goals. Grantees seeking second- and third-year funding must demonstrate progress toward their milestones, such as measurable increases in the number of project participants and the number of complementary, coordinated services.</p> <p>Lynn Rathke Rural Transit Assistant Program Coordinator Office of Transit Ohio Department of Transportation 614/644-7362 <a href="mailto:lynn.rathke@dot.state.oh.us">lynn.rathke@dot.state.oh.us</a></p> <p>Ohio Coordination Program <a href="http://www.dot.state.oh.us/ptrans/Funding_Programs/trans_coord.htm">http://www.dot.state.oh.us/ptrans/Funding_Programs/trans_coord.htm</a></p>

<p><b>OREGON</b></p> <p>The Oregon State Agency Transportation Coordination Project involves eight state-level departments and the Governor's Office. Among its accomplishments is the establishment of brokerages providing non-emergency medical transportation for Medicaid patients.</p>	<p>A June 2000 Oregon Department of Transportation report recommended developing a performance monitoring and tracing system to assess the effectiveness of agencies in implementing the transportation coordination directives, and in achieving desired outcomes. Parameters are still being developed.</p> <p>Jean Palmateer Public Transit Division Oregon Department of Transportation 503/986-3472 <a href="mailto:jean.m.palmateer@odot.state.or.us">jean.m.palmateer@odot.state.or.us</a></p> <p>Oregon Transportation Coordination Initiative <a href="http://www.odot.state.or.us/pubtrans/coordination.html">http://www.odot.state.or.us/pubtrans/coordination.html</a></p>
--	--

Summary of Transportation Coordination Efforts	Performance Measures and Program Contacts
<p><b>RHODE ISLAND</b></p> <p>The Rhode Island Public Transit Authority (RIPTA), a quasi-state agency, has a state mandate to oversee transportation coordination. The authority plans how best to serve the paratransit and job access client base, provides most of the transportation services directly and brokers the rest of the services to other providers.</p>	<p>RIPTA collects and reports standard transit data, but has not yet developed a performance measurement system to illustrate the progress of the ongoing transportation coordination effort.</p> <p>Mark Therrien  Assistant General Manager  Transit System Development/Planning/Grants  Rhode Island Public Transit Authority  401/784-9500, ext. 152  <a href="mailto:mtherrien@ripta.com">mtherrien@ripta.com</a></p> <p>Rhode Island Public Transit Authority  <a href="http://www.ripta.com">www.ripta.com</a></p>
<p><b>WASHINGTON</b></p> <p>The Washington State Agency Council on Coordinated Transportation (ACCT) oversees the state initiative. Coordination is managed locally with the state acting as a facilitator. The program primarily serves the disabled, low-income, and elderly populations.</p>	<p>The 1999 law establishing the state-level council mandated the development of performance goals and an evaluation process that leads to continuous improvement of the system. To date, a performance measurement system has not been implemented.</p> <p>Jeanne Ward  Administrator  Washington State ACCT  360/705-7917  <a href="mailto:wardje@wsdot.wa.gov">wardje@wsdot.wa.gov</a></p> <p>Washington State ACCT  <a href="http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/acct/default.htm">http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/acct/default.htm</a></p>

# Addendum Appendix B: Massachusetts Performance Measurement Matrix: Human Services Transportation Brokers

<i>HST</i>	Consumers	One-way trips			Revenue/Expenditure (month of service not date of receipt or date paid out)				Other	Rev/ data			
<i>01</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>E</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>G</i>	<i>H</i>	<i>I</i>	<i>J</i>	<i>K</i>	<i>L</i>	
<i>DMR</i>	Total consumers added	Active consumers	Consumer shared	Consumer non-shared	Monitor	Consumer shared trip expenditures	Consumer non-shared trip expenditures	Monitor trip expenditures	Revenue direct services	Revenue mgt. Fee	Number providers used	No-show & cancelled trips	yes no *
Jul-02	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
Aug-02	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
Sep-02	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
Oct-02	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
Jun-03	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●

*A* Represents the number of new consumers added and provided at least one trip for the month

*B* Represents the number of consumers receiving service during the month — column A would be included in this number (count only if a consumer took at least 1 trip)

*C* Represents the number of shared consumer trips for the month (shared trip is a trip with more than one authorized consumer on board the vehicle, ● That is, 5 consumers on the vehicle = 5 shared trips; 3 consumers = 3 shared trips, etc.

*D* Represents the number of non-shared consumer trips for the month (1 consumer in the vehicle) — if there is more than 1 consumer in the vehicle that would be recorded under shared trips (column C)  
**{The sum of columns C & D should equal total consumer trips for the month}**

*E* Represents the number of monitor trips for the month

*F* Represents the expenditures to providers for shared trips

*G* Represents the expenditures to providers for non-shared trips

*H* Represents the expenditures to providers for monitor trips  
**{The sum of columns F, G & H should equal total expenditures to providers for the month}**

*I* Represents the revenue received from the agency for direct services only

*J* Represents the revenue received from the agency for approved management costs only (ready or recurring payment)

*K* Represents the number of providers used that month to transport agency consumers

*L* Represents the number of no-show and canceled trips for the month (trips scheduled and not used for either reason)

*Rev/data* Indicate yes or no if the data submitted include a revision of a previous month's data (if yes, indicate in the asterisk column which month is revised)