



WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Wisconsin Human Service Transportation Coordination Model

TECHNICAL MEMO 3 FINAL

July 2008



Table of Contents

	PAGE
Chapter 1. Introduction.....	1-1
Project Summary	1-1
Task Goals	1-2
Task Methodology.....	1-2
Technical Memo Organization	1-5
Chapter 2. The Wisconsin Context	2-1
Coordination Goals and Objectives	2-1
Wisconsin’s Current Coordination Program	2-2
Coordination Obstacles.....	2-2
Chapter 3. Peer Review	3-1
Overview	3-1
Peer Comparisons	3-2
Chapter 4. Coordination Best Practices.....	4-1
Coordination Oversight and Monitoring	4-1
Dedicated State Funding, Incentives, and Required Planning	4-13
Technical Strategies and Assistance	4-28
Regional Infrastructure	4-35
Chapter 5. Conclusions	5-1
Overview	5-1
Coordination Oversight and Monitoring	5-1
Funding.....	5-3
Technical Assistance	5-4

Table of Figures

	PAGE
Figure 1-1: Peer State Screening Matrix (with Selected Peers Highlighted).....	1-4
Figure 3-1 Peer State Coordination Model Comparison.....	3-3

Chapter 1. Introduction

Project Summary

For several years, the state of Wisconsin has been pursuing coordination as a strategy to increase the mobility of Wisconsin residents and enhance transportation service efficiency. These efforts are supported by three recent legislative actions, which are working to increase the prominence of coordination as a key strategy, both at the federal and state levels:

- The revised Federal Transportation Act, SAFETEA-LU, signed into law on August 10, 2005 requires all entities receiving federal program money for three federal funding programs — Capital Assistance Program for Elderly Persons and Persons with Disabilities (Section 5310), Job Access and Reverse Commute Program (Section 5316) and New Freedom Program (Section 5317) — to have a “locally developed coordinated public transit human services transportation plan.”
- In 2005, Governor James Doyle charged a group of individuals from a number of state agencies to form the Interagency Council on Transportation Coordination (ICTC). The ICTC is dedicated to “creating a coordinated, accessible, affordable, dependable, safe, statewide system providing the best transportation services to transportation disadvantaged individuals in Wisconsin”.
- Presidential Executive Order 13330 on the Coordination of Human Service Programs issued by the President on February 24, 2004, created an interdepartmental Federal Interagency Coordinating Council on Access and Mobility (CCAM). The mission of the CCAM is to undertake collective and individual departmental actions to reduce duplication among federally-funded human service transportation services, increase the efficient delivery of such services, and expand transportation access for older individuals, persons with disabilities, persons with low income, children and other disadvantaged populations within their own communities.

In response to these initiatives and the ongoing coordination efforts in the state, the ICTC, in conjunction with the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT), retained the consulting team of Nelson\Nygaard and RLS & Associates (the Nelson\Nygaard team) to develop a Human Service Transportation (HST) Coordination Model for the state of Wisconsin. Key goals for this research are to collect data, assess needs and recommend actions towards a state model of transportation coordination with prioritized implementation strategies. This effort is partially funded with United We Ride (UWR) Implementation Grant Funds and is part of the ICTC work plan. The four major tasks associated with developing a recommended coordination model for the state of Wisconsin are:

1. Task 1: Document state agency programs (State Funding Assessment) — The objective of this task is to identify and document state agency programs that fund human service transportation and the extent to which these funded services are used and coordinated. Results from this task have been documented in Technical Memo 1.
2. Task 2: Identify gaps and barriers (Local Needs Assessment) — There are two key objectives associated with this task: (1) develop, test and finalize an assessment process that can be used throughout the state to gauge and evaluate coordination status; and (2) as the assessment process is tested in the field, evaluate current coordination efforts at the 10 counties and two mini regions that have been selected by the ICTC for inclusion in this study and develop an understanding of coordination perspectives and priorities in these areas. Results from this task have been documented in Technical Memo 2.
3. Task 3: Identify and compare Wisconsin with other states' coordination models — Building on data collection and analysis of both state agency and local level coordination efforts in Wisconsin, we will look externally to consider approaches adopted by other states and associated effectiveness at improving HST coordination.
4. Task 4: Recommend HST coordination models — Our final task will be to recommend a HST coordination model for the state of Wisconsin. This model will be crafted around appropriate and effective strategies that can realistically be implemented based on the socio-demographic characteristics of the state and working within the local political environment.

Task Goals

This technical memorandum reports on Task 3 — identify and compare Wisconsin with other states' coordination models. The objective of this task is to examine the programs and strategies adopted by other states and examine how these models were designed, planned and executed as well as the effectiveness and applicability of the models.

Our approach to the task was to prepare a combined peer comparison and best practices analysis. The peer review component of the task compares and contrasts coordination models and strategies adopted by other states. The best practices overview builds on the peer review by providing more detail on implementation experience and success associated with individual strategies.

Task Methodology

A critical first step to the peer review was reviewing and assessing the “Wisconsin context” for coordination. Accordingly, members of the Nelson\Nygaard team worked together to review results from Task 1 (State Funding Assessment) and Task 2 (Local Needs Assessment) to discuss coordination strengths and challenges facing coordination in Wisconsin. As part of these discussions, the team also evaluated Wisconsin's current coordination program elements and started to draft potential coordination models for Wisconsin. Through this process we developed a preliminary list of potential future

coordination strategies that may work for Wisconsin. From this perspective, we examined peers and best practices.

To identify comparable peer states, we first compiled a long list of potential peer states, comprised of states identified through stakeholder interviews and by members of the study team as either sharing similar characteristics with Wisconsin and/or states with reputations as leaders in statewide coordination programs. Using this long list of potential peer states, we screened for key demographics, political and geographic characteristics and used this analysis to recommend a short list of peer states. Through this process, we selected a short list of six peer states: Florida, North Carolina, Minnesota, Ohio, Washington and Pennsylvania. The screening matrix is shown as Figure 1-1. Key sources for the peer review included conversations with program staff, state websites and published materials on statewide coordination programs.

As we examined and considered the coordination programs adopted by peer states and referenced our original list of preliminary coordination strategies for Wisconsin, the Nelson\Nygaard team prepared a more detailed review of the most relevant strategies and programs and compiled them into a best practices review. The intent of this best practices review is to provide sufficient detail on select programs and strategies to support consideration for inclusion in the Wisconsin coordination model. Key sources for this research include Transit Cooperative Research Program (TCRP) research, various studies performed by Nelson\Nygaard and/or RLS & Associates and follow up calls with contacts at relevant state departments.

Figure 1-1 Peer State Screening Matrix (with Selected Peers Highlighted)

Potential Peer States	Demographics and Basic Statistics				Urbanized areas (#) by population				State funding		Local Governance	
	2006 Population	% Aged 65+	% with Disability	% Low Income	Over 1m	500,000-1 m	200,000-500,000	50,000-200,000	Public Transit	E&D Transportation	Existence of state statute on coordination	Level of local control
Wisconsin	5,556,506	13.0	16.0	10.9	1	1	2	17	Yes	Yes	No (Governor Directive)	High
Florida	18,089,888	16.8	22.2	11.9	4	4	7	11	Yes	Minimal	Yes	County-level
North Carolina	8,856,505	12.1	21.1	13.8	1	2	6	25	Yes	Yes	Executive Order	High
Minnesota	5,167,101	12.1	15.0	8.1	1	0	1	7	Yes	Yes	No	Medium
Ohio	11,478,006	13.3	18.3	11.7	3	3	2	24	Yes	Yes	Funding available	High
Oregon	3,700,758	12.9	18.8	12.9	1	0	2	9	Yes	Yes	Yes	Low
Washington	6,395,798	11.5	18.2	11.6	1	0	6	11	Yes	Yes	Yes (established a support agency)	Multi-level control (ACCT supports)
Pennsylvania	12,440,621	15.2	18.6	11.2	2	3	4	20	Yes	Yes	No	High
Vermont	623,900	13.2	17.1	8.7	0	0	1	4	Yes	Yes	No	Low
Indiana	6,313,520	12.4	19.0	11.1	1	1	4	14	Yes	No	In development	Varies

Source: Population/Demographic Data: US Census

Technical Memo Organization

This memo is organized into four chapters immediately following this introductory section, including:

Chapter 2: The Wisconsin Context — Outlines Wisconsin’s current coordination program and its strengths and weaknesses.

Chapter 3: Peer Review — Presents and discusses coordination models adopted by other states and compares and contrasts the different models.

Chapter 4: Coordination Best Practices — Provides an overview of coordination best practice strategies adopted and implemented by other states.

Chapter 5: Conclusions — Summarizes the overall findings of the peer review and best practices compilation. This section also highlights strategic direction for study next steps.

Chapter 2. The Wisconsin Context

As discussed, a critical first step to the peer review involved reviewing previous study tasks and considering the context within which coordination happens in Wisconsin. Accordingly, we commenced this task by reviewing the goals and objectives of our ongoing human service coordination study and from this perspective, considered both Wisconsin's coordination resources and strengths and its coordination obstacles and challenges.

Coordination Goals and Objectives

The stated goal for this project is to create a statewide model for coordination that establishes a state level structure to fund and encourage coordination. We understand that the model should also be designed to encourage the coordination of local services, improve transportation service options and increase the level of transportation service overall in the state of Wisconsin. At the local level, the desired coordinated system will be characterized by the following:

- Local and regional transit, human service and workforce development agencies and advocacy groups and private sector transportation providers will be engaged in ongoing efforts to assess service duplication, gaps and needs, and improve and expand operations and/or implement new services to address those shortcomings.
- A diversity of transportation providers and funding agencies at the county and/or regional transportation services will increasingly be working together in the design and delivery of transportation services to residents. Local and regional transportation services will increasingly carry a diversity of travelers.
- More transportation services will be available to more individuals.
- Individuals seeking information about available transportation services will access information through a single resource. This resource will function as a clearing house for a wide variety of rides, programs and support services. Ideally, scheduling and arranging trips for all riders will also be conducted via a single point of contact.
- Individuals will be placed on the most appropriate level of service given their abilities and needs, allowing for public transportation options where appropriate and maximum levels of ridesharing.
- Especially in rural areas, regularly-scheduled subscription trips will be coordinated with community transportation operators to avoid duplication of services and ensure cost-effective, appropriate service levels.
- To the extent possible, the joint purchasing of operational items such as vehicles, vehicle maintenance, fuel, insurance, and software, and support services such as driver training, drug and alcohol testing, will be facilitated and encouraged.

Wisconsin's Current Coordination Program

The current coordination efforts in Wisconsin include:

- An executive directive to form an Inter-Agency Council on Transportation Coordination (ICTC). The ICTC includes representatives from state agencies that have transportation as one of the program services offered to consumers directly or indirectly through a program funding to local government entities or private profit and non-profit organizations.
- Transportation resources administered by WisDOT that support public and specialized transportation. Specialized transportation funds are administered by WisDOT to county and tribal aging units. There is considerable flexibility on how these funds may be spent and used.
- Supplemental Transportation Rural Assistance Program (STRAP) a federal demonstration project earmarked under SAFETEA-LU designed to assess if a local share reduction will generate more public transportation service, innovation and coordination in rural areas. STRAP funds transportation operating costs in rural areas at 80% of deficit.
- Increased federal grant funding opportunities achieved through coordinated efforts between WisDOT, the Department of Workforce Development (DWD) and the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation (DVR). WisDOT and DWD jointly administer the Wisconsin Employment Transportation Assistance Program (WETAP), which combines multiple federal funds (including JARC) with state resources. Likewise, WisDOT and DVR are working together to administer the New Freedom program with combined federal and state resources.
- Completed county-level coordinated public transit-human service transportation plans. Seventy-one of Wisconsin's 72 counties participated in coordination assessment and planning exercises between May and September 2006. Through this process individual counties prepared coordinated public transit-human services transportation plans. An update to this process is planned for 2008.

Coordination Obstacles

Despite Wisconsin's achievements in coordination, there are a number of obstacles that are working to slow progress towards an increasingly coordinated delivery system. Many of these same obstacles are undermining state and local efforts to expand the overall level of transportation services in the state of Wisconsin.

- Wisconsin transportation funding provides resources to different entities for similar purposes (85.20 and 85.21 plus Medicaid and small pots of human service funding for transportation). This has effectively created (in some areas) multiple systems offering similar services, i.e., service duplication and differentiation has been institutionalized by these funding sources.

- Several of the transportation funding programs do not have strong coordination requirements.
- There is a lack of perceived, real benefit for coordination; including
 - Lack of clear direction for what and how to coordinate
 - No rewards/financial incentives for coordination
 - Few meaningful consequences for not coordinating
 - Lack of good operational model of effective transit-human service coordination
 - Lack of administrative support systems for coordination, such as consistent reporting requirements and streamlined grant applications
- Human service agencies are primarily encouraged to coordinate transportation services as other programs consolidate and because demand is increasing faster than resources. In some cases this has led to an ad hoc to service planning.
- There is a lack of incentives to encourage human service agencies to coordinate with transit agencies, except on ADA-complementary paratransit.
- There is no authority to coordinate human service-oriented programs with medical (Medicaid) and workforce services provided outside of the Aging and Disability Resource Centers (ADRC) or local county/tribal aging units.
- Historically, Regional Planning Commissions have not had a connection to human service transportation programs; at the same time they offer critical resources in terms of data and mapping and play an important role in longer term solutions via their role in regional planning.

Chapter 3. Peer Review

Overview

The purpose of the peer review is to understand the coordination models adopted by peer states and compare and contrast these models with Wisconsin. The objective within this analysis is to identify strategies, programs and practices that could improve coordination in Wisconsin.

As described in Chapter 1, six roughly comparable peer states were selected based on a number of factors including population size and characteristics, the number of small urbanized areas, and reputation for coordination innovation. In some sense, however, we recognize that Wisconsin is unique, shaped by different geography, history, politics, and development patterns. Consequently, unqualified comparisons between state programs are difficult. Instead, comparisons between state programs are indicative only – showing where and how some states have succeeded at furthering coordination in their individual environments. In this peer review, therefore, we have worked to tease out the most meaningful comparisons and identify key strategies for more detailed examination in the best practices review.

Certain factors make Wisconsin unique. These factors are highlighted below and inform the rest of the peer review.

- Wisconsin has a strong county-based service delivery model – As compared with other states, Wisconsin has a very strong county-centric delivery of government services. In most cases, therefore, public services (including public transit and paratransit services) are provided via county-based departments and rarely straddle county boundaries. In addition, not only do county governments in Wisconsin hold a prominent role in service delivery, there are also a lot of counties. Wisconsin currently has 72 individual counties, plus several tribal governments.
- There are ad-hoc local efforts to regionalize some programs and services – Despite a strong county-based delivery model, there is interest and movement towards increasing regionalization in Wisconsin. Interest in regionalization comes from a variety of sources including (1) the complexity involved with administering programs to 72 counties, some of which have populations of less than 20,000 people; (2) a sense that consolidated programs offer potential to save costs and improve services; and (3) consolidation of other non-government services that encompass multiple counties, such as medical facilities, shopping and employment.
- Wisconsin has been and continues to be an innovative leader in the design and delivery of health care and human services. Wisconsin was the first state to form ADRC, a program that is currently expanding across the state. The state is also exploring new medical care delivery models. Not only do these innovative models have implications for transportation, they also imply that some local governments are a strong partner with the state and have been willing to experiment with new delivery models.

Peer Comparisons

Figure 3-1 summarizes coordination models from Wisconsin and six peer states. These states are Florida, North Carolina, Minnesota, Ohio, Washington and Pennsylvania. Comparing and contrasting the coordination model structures of these states led to the following observations:

- Several states (Florida, Minnesota, Washington and Pennsylvania) have legislative orders that support and encourage coordination efforts. Legislative orders demonstrate broader program support and offer longevity as compared with executive office terms. In most cases, states with legislative orders also have clearer guidance on coordination, focused funding and stronger oversight with established monitoring programs.
- Actively involving and incorporating Medicaid into coordination programs is a challenge for most states. The peer review shows two examples, Florida and North Carolina, which have achieved some success involving Medicaid in state discussions and including Medicaid services with local level coordination efforts.
- State level coordination councils in some states (Florida and Washington) are actively involved in the administration, oversight and/or monitoring of local progress towards coordinated transportation.
- Several states combine public and specialized transportation funds into a single funding source. North Carolina, for example, consolidates all transportation funding into a Community Transportation Program. Funds are administered with considerable state-level technical support. Counties/regions receive the combined funding and jointly determine how to provide services.
- Florida and North Carolina directly fund local level coordination staff. In Florida, the state mandates a county-level Local Coordinating Boards (LCB) that is staffed by a Community Transportation Coordinator (CTC). The CTC administers local transportation services; this position is directly funded by the state of Florida.
- Many state level coordinating councils play an active role in the monitoring and oversight of local coordination efforts.

Figure 3-1 Peer State Coordination Model Comparison

	Wisconsin	Florida	North Carolina	Minnesota
Coordination Organizational Structure				
State Directive	Yes – from Executive office	Yes - Legislation	Yes - Executive Order	Yes – Legislation (from early 80s); currently discussing beefing it up
State Level Council on Coordination	Yes – Inter-Agency Council on Transportation Coordination (ICTC)	Yes – Florida Commission for the Transportation Disadvantaged (CTD) plus subcommittees	Yes – Human Service Transportation Council (HSTC)	Yes – Interagency Committee on Transit Coordination
Meeting Schedule	Quarterly	Quarterly (historically met monthly)	Quarterly	Monthly
Interagency Agreements	None	Yes	Yes – Between DHHS and DOT	No – but looking to create
Medicaid Participation	Participate in ICTC	Participates in CTD; Also special sub-committee within CTD; Agreement between Agency for Health Care Administration and CTD transferred administration and management of Medicaid Non-Emergency Transportation (NET) to CTD	Participates in HSTC and county/regional Technical Advisory Boards (TABs)	Participates on ICTC; Medicaid pilot “brokerage” set up in 7-county Twin Cities metro region
Key Responsibilities	Defining	Administers coordination program and appoints county coordinating board	Establish coordination policy and address coordination barriers/issues	Education; Implement Policy Revisions; Report to Governor
Outreach Activities	Statewide Conference; Ongoing Stakeholder Committee	Statewide Conference, State funds mandate Local County Coordinating Boards (LCB)	Statewide Conference; NCDOT staff are assigned by region to support coordination	Statewide Conference; website; Board of Aging, MnDOT and MTC are currently investigating pilot projects
State Funding for Coordination				
State Funding for Public Transportation	Est. \$103M state and federal money for public transportation. Includes independent funds for public transit (\$102M) and elderly & disabled transportation (\$13.2M).	Transportation Disadvantaged Trust Fund	Transportation funding consolidated into Community Transportation Program; includes Human Service Transportation Management; E&DTAP, Work First, and General Public funding	\$120M to Met Council for Twin Cities metro area; \$57M to MnDOT for Greater Minnesota; Approx 50% comes from State
Funding Source	Highway Funds	Highway Funds	Highway Funds	N/A
Use of State Funds for Coordination	Permissible use of state funds – no state requirements	State funds LCBs; LCBs oversee Community Transportation Coordinator (CTC), who administers local transportation services	HSTM funds coordinators, matching funds	None currently dedicated to coordination, but ICTC is working on it

	Wisconsin	Florida	North Carolina	Minnesota
Other Funding	Partnerships between DOT and other agencies combine transportation funds from multiple agencies to foster coordination, increase funding levels and reduce local match		Counties/regions receive either Section 5310 or 5311 but not both (requires agencies with vehicles to be coordinated or all agencies buy transportation from single broker)	Recently completed effort details funding levels and sources for all agencies involved with community transportation
Requirements, Monitoring and Reporting				
Coordination Requirements	Per SAFETEA-LU	Trust Fund services mandates all federal and state funds must be coordinated through LCB; To receive transportation or funds, agencies must participate in coordination	Planning, Local TABs, MOUs	Legislation mandates coordination among state agencies, and establishes operating and vehicle safety standards
Monitoring and Reporting	Defining	CTD conducts annual review of CTCs and audits billings; LCBs responsible for daily oversight of CTC (LCB report to CTD)	DOT staff monitoring of local systems, stringent reporting requirements	ICTC is working on this
Programs, Policies and Procedures to Foster Innovation				
State programs that foster innovation	Joint funding of WETAP and New Freedom programs; encourages partnerships and coordination and reduces local match	CTD prepared 5-year plans to review progress and set short-term goals	Cycle of review and evaluation encourages program improvement, NCDOT also provides technical assistance for new ideas	Innovations are actively encouraged for JARC and New Freedom project applications

	Ohio	Washington	Pennsylvania
Coordination Organizational Structure			
State Directive	No – Governor backs but no directive	Yes - Legislation	Yes – Legislation requiring coordination specifically for seniors and broadly for other programs
State Level Council on Coordination	Yes –Statewide Transportation Coordination Task Force	Yes – Agency Council on Coordinated Transportation (ACCT) plus Program for Agency Coordination Transit Forum (PACT); PACT supports ACCT on policy reform	Yes - State Transportation Coordination Committee
Meeting Schedule	Quarterly	Bi-monthly	N/A
Interagency Agreements	Yes	Seven state agencies are charged to work together under ACCT	State Transportation Coordination Committee brings together nine state agencies to encourage coordination of all state services
Medicaid Participation	Not in Task Force but Medicaid participates locally if part of grant application	Not part of ACCT, but ACCT is looking at ways to more effectively use Medicaid brokers in community transportation, including by sponsoring demonstration projects	Not well integrated with DOT programs – has separate Medical Assistance Transportation Program (MATP)
Key Responsibilities	Refining Coordination Action Plan (ongoing)	Promote coordination, framework for discussing issues and initiating change, report to legislature, recommend legislative remedies, and established coordination policies. Also developed criteria for monitoring and reporting, provides technical assistance and works on policy reform (via PACT).	Encourage state-level coordination through interagency communication
Outreach Activities	Annual Statewide Conference; Developed coordination handbook; Guidelines on agency information sharing	Local community forums held as condition of receiving state funds, Completed studies to further coordination, statewide conference	
State Funding for Coordination			
State Funding Programs	Rural Transit System Program - combines federal and state operating funds for transit agencies	PACT receives federal funding and state funds from state general fund and property taxes totaling \$4.3M	Free Transit and Shared-Ride Programs funded with state lottery funds; demand-responsive service for seniors administered by state DOT
State Funds for Coordination	Ohio Coordination Program (demonstration projects to initiate public transportation services)	PACT funds are distributed to lead transportation agencies through ACCT	Rural Public Transportation Operating Assistance Program requires local coordination

	Ohio	Washington	Pennsylvania
Requirements, Monitoring and Reporting			
Coordination Requirements	State funding programs require local transportation coordinator and coordination must be demonstrated	Local coordinators, coordination plans, uniform standards for all systems	County coordinators must submit coordination plan to state DOT
Monitoring and Reporting	Projects must document collaborative efforts with area agencies	ACCT develops criteria for monitoring and reporting requirements of local systems	None
Other	Significant ODOT technical assistance		State DOT appoints program coordinators in each county
Programs, Policies and Procedures to Foster Innovation			
State programs that foster innovation	State provides considerable technical assistance and awards grant via competitive process	Prioritizes coordination activities and goals; sponsors demonstration programs that meet these goals	Innovation encouraged/rewarded through funding

Chapter 4. Coordination Best Practices

The purpose of the peer review was to compare coordination efforts in Wisconsin with coordination strategies adopted by other states. The peer review provides a broad perspective on state programs, which led to a number of observations suggesting lessons and potential strategic direction for Wisconsin. The Nelson\Nygaard team also prepared a more detailed review of the most relevant strategies and programs and compiled them into a best practices review. The intent of this best practices review is to provide sufficient detail on select programs and strategies to support consideration for inclusion in the Wisconsin coordination model. We grouped the best practices into four categories:

- Coordination oversight and monitoring
- Dedicated State Funding, Incentives, and Required Planning
- Technical strategies and assistance
- Regional Infrastructure

Coordination Oversight and Monitoring

Best practice examples in state oversight (1) serve a leadership role in the coordination effort and facilitate cooperation among participating agencies; (2) address and remove barriers, both real and perceived, to further the coordination effort; (3) directly or indirectly help to plan and implement coordination efforts on the local/regional levels; and (4) monitor these efforts to ensure good stewardship of funding.

Most states with successful coordination programs provide oversight at the state and county/regional level. This bi-level oversight structure provides a body to oversee a state-level framework of coordination and establish common policies and procedures that mandate or foster coordination at the county/regional level. Responsibility for implementation rests with the local entity, allowing flexibility to establish an appropriate local system. Several states have also created a bi-level oversight structure that is flexible enough to strengthen existing coordination efforts and remove obstacles. In this synergistic relationship, it is up to the local coordination organizations to implement coordination programs and provide feedback to the state level group as to which policies/strategies are working and which are not. Coordination is continually a work-in-progress.

- State of Florida: Commission for the Transportation Disadvantaged, Local Coordinating Boards, and Community Transportation Coordinators
- State of Iowa: Statewide Transportation Coordination Task Force
- State of Minnesota: Transportation Coordination Advisory Council
- State of North Carolina: Human Service Transportation Council
- State of Ohio: State Transportation Coordination Task Force
- State of Pennsylvania: State Transportation Coordination Committee
- State of Washington: Program for Agency Coordinated Transportation

Best Practice: Bi-Level Coordination Oversight and Monitoring

Case Study: State of Florida: Commission for the Transportation Disadvantaged, Local Coordinating Boards, and Community Transportation Coordinators.

How it Works: Through legislation, the state of Florida established the Commission for the Transportation Disadvantaged (CTD) to oversee and set statewide policies for coordination. The same legislation also provides for the establishment of Local Coordinating Boards (LCBs), primarily at the county level, to set local policies, oversee county-based coordination activities, and select and monitor the activities of a Community Transportation Coordinator (CTC).

Florida CTD — By statute, the Florida CTD must perform 27 tasks. These include: acting as an information clearinghouse, developing coordination policies and procedures, determining performance standards and liability insurance requirements, coordinating with local governments, designing and developing training programs, preparing a statewide five-year transportation disadvantaged plan, and making annual reports to the governor and the Legislature. The Florida CTD also oversees the Transportation Disadvantaged Trust Fund, a state fund dedicated to sponsoring the transportation of persons requiring specialized transportation that is not already sponsored or subsidized.

Local Coordinating Boards (LCBs) — The state Statute also establishes local coordinating boards in each county to facilitate local coordination. The local coordinating boards are staffed by a member of the local planning agency, either the MPO or another designated official planning agency. Each board then is responsible for selecting a Community Transportation Coordinator (CTC).

Community Transportation Coordinators (CTCs) — The CTCs have full authority for the delivery of services to the transportation-disadvantaged, either by direct operation of service or indirectly by way of subcontracts (as with a broker) or both. In some more rural regions, counties have combined into a region, with one CTC serving the region. The CTCs are the focal point for coordinating Medicaid NEMT, senior transportation, and other agency-sponsored transportation (and sometimes ADA paratransit) in each county. While not mandated to do so, most county-level agencies purchase transportation through the CTC. Additionally, FTA funding for Section 5310 and 5311, administered by the Florida DOT, flows through the CTCs in each county. The CTCs include transit agencies, counties, human-service agency operators, and for-profit transit management/operations companies. Trips are coordinated and purchased from several modes, including taxis, paratransit and lift-equipped vehicles, school buses, volunteers, and public transit systems. Currently, there are 51 coordinators for Florida's 67 counties. Of Florida's 23 transit systems, 13 are CTCs. Many of the CTCs are Area Agencies on Aging or other organizations that focus on the provision of transportation and

Best Practice:	Bi-Level Coordination Oversight and Monitoring
	<p>other service to older adults.</p>
Tricks:	<p>The Florida CTD uses a Quality Assurance team to address contract compliance issues that may affect the safety of Floridians that receive transportation services under the Transportation Disadvantaged Program. The program evaluation activities include the collection and evaluation of the contractors' operating data, as well as other finance related activities. The CTD sets a high standard for quality control with clearly defined standards across the board, thorough reporting, and extensive monitoring of the projects. With private operators providing over 43 million trips annually through contracts, the Quality Assurance Program is critical to the overall success of the program.</p> <p>The Florida CTD conducts annual performance reviews of local CTCs that may result in changes to policies and standards.</p> <p>The Florida CTD administers an ombudsman program that provides a repository for customer complaints and a forum for grievance procedures.</p> <p>The Florida CTD also contracts with an accounting firm to monitor nonpayment issues and to conduct audits of rates and units of service billed to the CTD and to conduct financial reviews of the CTD.</p>
Traps:	<p>One perceived shortcoming of the Florida CTD system is its composition, and the extent to which a number of private for-profit providers serve on the Commission. This has resulted in a “fox in the henhouse” situation in which these providers can benefit financially from the state policies they help to adopt.</p> <p>Another shortcoming of this system is that certain state agencies, notably Medicaid, have not increased their sponsorship rates to keep up with the cost of providing the transportation even through a coordinated system. Consequently, some of the county systems have dropped Medicaid as a sponsor.</p>
Wisconsin Application:	<p>Florida’s legislation that created a bi-level oversight structure would appear to be ideally suited for Wisconsin. There are some striking parallels between the ICTC and the FCTD, especially if the ICTC’s responsibilities are expanded to include responsibility for a State Coordination Fund. Like Florida, Wisconsin’s counties are very strong and constitute the base building blocks from which coordination strategies should be conceived and implemented, except where counties decide that multi-county efforts might make more sense. Here too, this is in concert with the vision for Wisconsin. Lastly, Florida’s LCBs and CTCs form a template for how locally coordinated services could be overseen and delivered.</p>

Best Practice:	State-Level Coordination Oversight & Monitoring; Funding Clearinghouse; Coordinated Sponsorship
Case Study:	State of Iowa: Departments of Transportation, Human Services and Elder Affairs, State Level Transportation Coordinating Council.
How it Works:	<p>The state of Iowa enacted legislation to mandate the coordination and/or consolidation of transportation services for the elderly and disabled.</p> <p>As part of this legislation, the Iowa legislature established the State Level Transportation Coordinating Council, which is responsible for setting coordination policies and allocating demonstration funding. This council includes representatives from the Departments of Transportation, Human Services, Education, Elder Affairs, Public Health, as well as Iowa Workforce Development, the Iowa Association of Counties and League of Cities with the DOT as chair.</p> <p>Also in the legislation are requirements that state agencies and other organizations apply for funding through a clearing house, and that they consolidate funding and services with regional transit systems. The Department of Human Services and the Department of Elder Affairs are specifically required to coordinate with DOT in the provision of transportation services.</p> <p>The legislation assigns different responsibilities to the Iowa Department of Transportation and other state agencies. For example, the DOT is required to compile and coordinate information about program funding, and to include information about transportation coordination in its annual report to the state legislature. The legislation also compels the DOT to analyze human service transportation programs and recommend methods to avoid duplication and increase the efficiency of services.</p>
Tricks:	<p>As a result of the legislation, coordination in Iowa is built around the transit agencies, which serve as the regional coordinators. As such, the transit agencies must coordinate planning for transportation services at the urban and regional level by all agencies or organizations that receive public funds and that purchase or provide transportation services.</p> <p>In addition, state agencies and other organizations are required to apply for funding through a clearinghouse and to coordinate and consolidate funding and services with regional transit systems.</p>

Best Practice:	State-Level Coordination Oversight & Monitoring; Funding Clearinghouse; Coordinated Sponsorship
Traps:	None apparent, although the legislation that provides for membership in the State Level Transportation Coordinating Council is not as inclusive as it perhaps could be. Noticeable omissions are representatives from private non-profit agencies who actively provide or fund community transportation services and representatives from advocacy organizations representing customers who rely on community transportation services.
Wisconsin Application:	For Wisconsin, the Iowa model has several redeeming elements. First, it exemplifies how state legislation can foster, if not institutionalize, coordination. Second, it establishes a multi-agency state-level oversight with the responsibility to not only set coordination policies but to also allocate state coordination demonstration funding. Third, it provides for specific entities ¹ to become the focus of the regional coordination of community transportation (in effect expanding upon their previous more limited mission). Fourth, the state legislation compels state agencies (and other organizations) to coordinate funding applications through one source, and to coordinate/consolidate their respective community transportation programs through this network of regional coordinators.

¹ In Iowa's case, the legislation prescribes that these regional transportation coordinators be transit agencies, although for Wisconsin, it could be whatever agency in the region makes the most sense to lead the coordination effort.

<p>Best Practice: State-Level Coordination Oversight and Monitoring</p>
<p>Case Study: State of Minnesota: Transportation Coordination Advisory Council</p>
<p>How it Works: By statute, the state of Minnesota in 1991 established a Transportation Coordination Advisory Council to coordinate transportation services for the transportation disadvantaged. This council was composed of staff from the Department of Transportation, the Department of Human Services, community representatives and advocates, and transit providers. However, nothing of permanence materialized from this council.</p> <p>In 2005, the state of Minnesota decided to re-address its coordination efforts and recommit to improving transportation services. This led to the governor establishing the Interagency Committee on Transit Coordination (ICTC).</p> <p>The committee is made up of high-level representatives from various state departments that recognize transportation as an essential component of their service delivery system and whose direct or indirect spending comprises a large portion of the transportation funding within the state. Its mission is to further the coordination of health and human service programs and Minnesota's public transportation systems across the state.</p>
<p>Tricks: The original statute also established operating standards for providers as well as standards for vehicle and equipment safety.</p> <p>Following recommendations provided by a statewide coordination study commissioned in 2006 by MnDOT on behalf of the ICTC, MnDOT has “bridged” the Section 5310 and 5311 programs so that they are more in synch, and is pursuing a design for Greater Minnesota (beyond the Twin Cities metro area) that focuses on (1) transit agencies serving as regional community transportation coordinators in the urban areas, and (2) the existing Regional Development Commissions (RDCs) serving as the lead planning agency for coordination in non-urban areas.</p>
<p>Traps: The original statute and the lack of resulting coordination activities illustrate how the best of intentions can falter unless there is an active champion.</p> <p>In the 2006 study, a special plan was designed for the Twin Cities metro region. While coordination activities (e.g., co-mingling of trips sponsored by different funding programs) abound in the ring counties of the Twin Cities metropolitan area, the community transportation services in the two core counties (Hennepin and Ramsey) are largely uncoordinated. The 2006 study noted that the participation by the two counties were essential to improving coordination in the core area. However, efforts to bring the counties and a broad-based coalition of partners to the table have stagnated.</p>

Best Practice: State-Level Coordination Oversight and Monitoring

Wisconsin Application: Minnesota’s efforts in coordination illustrate that it is not enough to create a state-level coordinating agency; the state-level agency needs sufficient “top down” authority to compel state level agencies to make material changes to foster coordination. The dearth of coordination resulting from the original statutes also demonstrates why the group needs more broad-based representation and why active championing is so important.

Best Practice:	Bi-Level Coordination Oversight and Monitoring
Case Study:	State of North Carolina: Human Service Transportation Council
How it Works:	<p>In 1978 North Carolina’s governor issued an Executive Order establishing the state-level Human Service Transportation Council.</p> <p>The role of the Human Service Transportation Council is to address problems, concerns and opportunities regarding the provision of human service transportation and to make policy recommendations to the North Carolina Department of Transportation, Department of Health and Human Services, and other state agencies. Its mission is to provide leadership in improving the coordination of human service transportation and to ensure that funds are maximized to serve as many elderly, disabled and financially disadvantaged individuals in the state of North Carolina as possible in a safe, efficient and effective manner.</p> <p>The council’s membership includes the Departments of Transportation (NCDOT), Health and Human Services (NCDHHS), Commerce, Administration and Public Instruction, and the Employment Security Commission. Other members are representatives of people with disabilities, the Developmental Disabilities Council, the Division of Aging, the Division of Medical Assistance, Work First (North Carolina’s TANF Program), vocational rehabilitation, Head Start, child development and the community colleges.</p> <p>The Executive Order also requires that each county — or group of counties — must have a transportation advisory or governing board in order to be eligible for any FTA program funds. Even before SAFETEA-LU, counties were required to prepare a coordination plan as a prerequisite for FTA funding.</p>
Tricks:	As a vehicle to get the local advisory/governing boards organized, North Carolina mandates a Transportation Memorandum of Understanding between the transportation systems and human-service agencies.
Traps:	None apparent.
Wisconsin Application:	The North Carolina model has several components that are directly applicable to Wisconsin. First, it recognized that a bi-level oversight was essential, and that top down authority is needed; in the case of North Carolina, this is accomplished through an Executive Order. Second, the model is based on counties as the principal building block to coordination. Third, FTA funding is directly tied to the establishment of local advisory/governing boards and local coordination plans. This has potential application in Wisconsin for its state funds if not FTA funds. Fourth, groups of counties are encouraged to bind together into regions for the purpose of coordination.

Best Practice:	State-level Task Force; Single Agency Promulgation of Coordination
Case Study:	State of Ohio: Ohio Department of Transportation, Statewide Transportation Coordination Task Force
How it Works:	<p>With support from the governor, the Statewide Transportation Coordination Task Force was formed in 1996, consisting primarily of several state agencies that studied policies of state agencies and sought to eliminate regulatory barriers to the coordination of transportation services. Agencies contribute staff to a variety of efforts, including statewide conferences and information sharing regarding transportation planning and coordination.</p> <p>With the blessing of the Task Force, ODOT has developed a coordination program involving the provision of planning and implementation grants to local groups who demonstrate a coordinated approach to accommodating unmet need. These grants are available through a competitive process.</p> <p>ODOT also provides additional technical assistance and monitors the results of the coordinated systems.</p>
Tricks:	Although Ohio has no statewide human service transportation coordination statute, it does have a state-level coordination task force and an agency in ODOT with state funds sufficient to provide local coordination grants and accompanying assistance.
Traps:	Enticing local groups to apply for coordination funds has been successful in expanding the number of coordinated systems around the state; however, there will continue to be areas in the state for which this enticement will not be enough to get organized and apply for these grants.
Wisconsin Application:	<p>Ohio's commitment to coordination is demonstrated in part by the various state agencies involved in community transportation that contribute staff to a variety of efforts, including statewide conferences and information sharing.</p> <p>The Ohio model demonstrates how one well-funded agency, with the blessing of a state-level coordination council, can promulgate coordination, not through mandate, but by dangling funding grants as an incentive. Such a strategy has particular relevance to Wisconsin should it be able to carve out funds from existing state sources into a "Coordination Fund."</p>

Best Practice:	State-level Coordination; Single Agency Promulgation of Coordination
Case Study:	State of Pennsylvania: State Transportation Coordination Committee
How it Works:	<p>In 1996, the State Transportation Coordination Committee was established by statute to bring together several different state departments and agencies responsible for providing transportation services (PennDOT, Aging, Commerce and Economic Development, Education, Health, Labor and Industry, Military Affairs, Public Welfare and the Governor’s Policy Office). The committee encourages state-level coordination through interagency communication.</p> <p>Pennsylvania’s statutes also require the Department of Transportation to coordinate transportation services for senior citizens. These statutes also broadly require coordination of other programs and services to disadvantaged populations at the local level. Other legislation establishes funding for rural public transportation, again, with a requirement for local coordination.</p>
Tricks:	<p>The state has achieved broad-based representation at the state level through its inclusive State Transportation Coordination Committee, authorized by state statute. PennDOT serves as the focal point for coordination on the state level. Coordination effectively becomes a pre-requisite for specific state funding sources that respectively provide for senior shared-ride services, and rural transportation services for persons with disabilities. In Pennsylvania, coordination plans are specific to each county.</p>
Traps:	<p>As part of these plans, entities are designated/appointed to be the coordinating agent in each county. In most counties, it is the transit agency or county who serves as this lead coordinating entity. This is more common in rural counties or counties with small urban areas. While there are some urban counties like Allegheny County (Pittsburgh), where through the Port Authority’s ACCESS brokerage, ADA paratransit, senior transportation, and human service agency transportation are well-coordinated, the services in Philadelphia have had a history of being not well coordinated.</p>
Wisconsin Application:	<p>Coordination in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania benefits from (1) state statutes that provide for a state-level transportation coordination committee, (2) a recognition that planning of local coordination is based at the county level with flexibility to designate whichever lead entity in the county makes the most sense for that county; and (3) tying in state funding sources to requirements for coordination.</p>

Best Practice:	State-level Coordination Oversight and Monitoring
Case Study:	State of Washington: Program for Agency Coordinated Transportation
How it Works:	<p>In 1998 the Washington Legislature passed a statute establishing the Program for Agency Coordinated Transportation for the purpose of facilitating a statewide approach to coordination and supporting the development of community-based coordinated transportation delivery systems. This led to the creation of a state-level coordinating council called the Agency Council on Coordinated Transportation (ACCT) charged with the responsibility of implementing coordination throughout the state. The composition of WSDOT includes state agencies, a representative from the Washington State Transit Association and citizen representatives.</p>
Tricks:	<p>ACCT's strength is providing a structure across agency organizational boundaries to promote coordination, allowing seven state agencies and some 200 transportation providers to work together.</p> <p>ACCT also established a comprehensive, easily understood set of guiding principles for its coordination effort. These principles established a uniform standard of quality and service for the statewide transportation network. This standard was established in the legislative process and written into the legislation. These principles have governed all subsequent coordination activities and decisions in the state. ACCT officials recognize the importance that the first principle carries in setting the tone for the entire coordination effort by putting the needs of the client above any operational issues; "Organizations serving persons with special transportation needs share responsibility for ensuring that their customers can access services." When there is a "turf" dispute or an argument over responsibility, officials can point to this principle for guidance.</p> <p>ACCT has been very active in the areas of performance measures, evaluation, and reporting. ACCT created the Washington State Summary of Community and Brokered Transportation report in order to develop guidelines for setting performance measures and evaluating performance of coordinated special needs transportation. The report focuses on the performance of community transportation providers that receive grants through WSDOT and the brokers of transportation for Washington's Medicaid clients. The report presents uniform data to facilitate greater understanding of the work of these diverse providers and assist in the evaluation of coordinated transportation efforts.</p>

Best Practice: State-level Coordination Oversight and Monitoring

Traps: There is no question that ACCT’s efforts have helped to foster and breakdown obstacles that thwart coordination. While ACCT has focused most of its efforts on statewide programs and policies, the community transportation services on the local level are still not well coordinated. For example, while there are regional brokers who are responsible for the delivery of Medicaid-sponsored non-emergency medical transportation, these services are not coordinated with ADA, senior or other human service agency transportation.

It is also noteworthy that oversight of coordination at the state level is somewhat disjointed, and perhaps not as inclusive as it could be. There is the ACCT which is largely composed of state level public agencies and the Joint Transportation Commission which is composed of legislators. There are a significant number of stakeholders that are seemingly not represented in either group. These include, for example, private, non-profit agencies that fund/purchase/operate community transportation services and advocacy organizations that represent consumers who rely on community transportation services.

Wisconsin Application: Here again, a state, through a legislative statute, has provided for the creation of a state-level interagency coordinating council to foster oversight. The principal focus of ACCT’s efforts have been in the areas of performance measures, evaluation, and reporting. While this is an important benefit, and one that Wisconsin would do well to replicate, the fact that ACCT does not have a meaningful role in the distribution of funding or in establishing incentives or pre-requisites is key to why there are not more coordinated systems in Washington.

Dedicated State Funding, Incentives, and Required Planning

Aligning transportation funding resources available through different state and federal funding departments and programs with coordination goals is among the most challenging undertakings associated with state level coordination. Indeed, states can only work within federal program requirements. One way some states have helped remove funding barriers is by combining funding across state and federal programs. Wisconsin's WETAP provides an excellent example of this strategy. Other states have established what are, in effect, state coordination funds; in some cases, coordination funds are available for planning and implementation and in others, funding is available for operations only. This section provides additional information on the following best practices:

- State of Florida — Transportation Disadvantaged Trust Fund
- State of New Jersey — Casino Revenue Fund
- State of North Carolina — Elderly and Disabled Transportation Assistance Program (EDTAP)
- State of Ohio — Transportation Coordination Program Grants
- State of Oregon — Special Transportation Fund for the Elderly or Disabled
- State of Pennsylvania — State Lottery fund, Shared Ride and Free Transit Programs

Best Practice:	Dedicated Funding Source: Transportation Disadvantaged Trust Fund
Case Study:	State of Florida
How it Works:	<p>Through legislation, the state of Florida created a special Transportation Disadvantaged Trust Fund. This fund supports transportation to disadvantaged individuals who have no other means of transportation. This fund is administered by the state coordination body, Florida Commission for the Transportation Disadvantaged (CTD). Trust fund resources are distributed to county/regional Community Transportation Coordinators (CTCs) who manage local transportation services.</p> <p>The trust fund is supported by 15% of the state’s public transit block grant and a \$1.50 fee on annual vehicle registrations for passenger vehicles and trucks that weigh less than 5,000 pounds. Additional voluntary contributions can be made by motorists when they register their vehicles. The trust fund totals approximately \$38 million annually.</p> <p>Approximately 6.1 million one-way trips were provided with the Trust Fund during FY 2006. Note that this number includes bus passes, which are allowed to count a single monthly bus pass purchase to equal up to 40 one-way trips per month. Persons with disabilities account for 57% of all trips provided in the state.</p>
Tricks:	<p>This program funds the unsubsidized trips of persons who rely on community transportation. Thus, while a customer might be ADA paratransit eligible, a senior, and a Medicaid recipient, this fund might cover non-medical trips at times (or to places) not eligible under ADA or senior transportation programs.</p>
Traps:	<p>With the institution of this fund comes the requirement to determine “first resort” and “last resort” funding. For folks whose trip may be eligible for more than one funding program, the CTC staff must determine which funding program is the source of first resort, and which program would be the last resort (rather than simply splitting the cost of a trip equivalently between/among the eligible sources). The decision process, often based on the availability of federal and state funds, creates an administrative challenge.</p>

Best Practice: Dedicated Funding Source: Transportation Disadvantaged Trust Fund

Wisconsin Application: For Wisconsin, there are two potential applications of this dedicated funding model. First, one of the Florida CTD's primary roles is the administration of this Trust Fund and the distribution to the CTCs. The Wisconsin ICTC's effectiveness in promulgating coordination could be increased if its role were directly tied to distribution of coordination funding. Second, the idea of a dedicated trust fund that covers the transportation of those consumers who "slip through the cracks" of funding programs has merit. Third, in addition to carving money from Wisconsin state transportation funding programs for coordination planning and implementation, the ICTC may wish to also consider carving out additional money to cover the cost of unsubsidized trips of those who are transportation disadvantaged.

Best Practice:	Dedicated Funding Source: Casino Revenue Fund / SCDRTAP
Case Study:	State of New Jersey
How it Works:	<p>New Jersey’s use of Casino Revenue Funds dates back to 1978 when voters approved legislation that levied taxes on certain types of casino revenue. An 8% tax is levied on the gross revenue of all casinos and is deposited into the Casinos Revenue Fund. The Casino Revenue Fund is used to benefit senior citizens and the disabled. In 2004, the fund took in \$595 million in revenue, \$25 million of which went to transportation for older adults and persons with disabilities, as administered by NJ Transit.</p> <p>The legislation is known as “The Senior Citizen and Disabled Resident Transportation Assistance Program (SCDRTAP).” The program was designed to assist all counties within the state with the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developing and providing accessible feeder transportation service to accessible fixed-route transportation services where such services are available • Providing accessible local transit service for senior citizens and the disabled, which may include but not be limited to door-to-door service, fixed-route service • Assisting with local fare subsidies, and user-side subsidies, which may include but not be limited to private rides or taxi fare subsidies <p>Over-arching goals of the SCDRTAP were to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strengthen the county role in transportation • Foster coordination among various county transportation programs and funding sources (Offices on Aging, Transportation and Human Services) by requiring annual applications, coordination planning, a local Citizens Advisory Committee and a local public hearing process to address the use of funds and the provision of transportation services • Focus efforts on increasing mobility and accessibility for seniors and persons with disabilities in an effort to maintain their independence as part of the community <p>In addition to directly funding transportation services for seniors and the disabled, the SCDRTAP can also be used to provide and maintain capital improvements that support accessibility to fixed-route and other transit services. The SCDRTAP can also be used for capital improvements that enhance accessibility under the NJ Transit’s ADA paratransit program such as the purchase of mobile data terminals, AVL and IVR systems, and other software/hardware items that improve accessibility.</p> <p>NJ Transit coordinates the activities of the various participants in the</p>

Best Practice: Dedicated Funding Source: Casino Revenue Fund / SCDRTAP

program by providing administrative support and management services for the counties.

Casino Revenue Funds allocated to NJ Transit for use in SCDRTAP are distributed in the following manner: 85% is allocated to eligible counties; 15% is provided to NJ Transit to fund program support to the counties. Two-thirds of the proceeds allocated to NJ Transit (10%) are used to cover general administration costs. One-third of the proceeds allocated to NJ Transit (5%) are used to administer the counties' SCDRTAP programs and for: (1) rendering technical assistance and conducting planning studies; (2) developing, providing and maintaining NJ Transit capital improvements that afford accessibility for seniors and the disabled.

Additional activities administered by NJ Transit under the SCDRTAP are as follows:

- Annual application review — requires a local public hearing and advisory committee input
- Monitor operations — site visits
- Review vehicle specifications/inspect equipment as necessary.
- Verify reimbursement requests
- Attend local citizen advisory committee meetings during the year
- Provide driver and management training
- Promote best practices

The SCDRTAP Funds are awarded to the counties based on a formula that uses the U.S. Census, specifically the total county population and the number of eligible seniors and disabled who reside within the county. All eligible counties receive at least \$150,000 during a fiscal year, except that, during the first fiscal year a county participates in the program, that county shall receive a minimum of \$50,000 but not more than \$150,000.

County Committee/Board — As a pre-requisite to receipt of Casino Revenue Funds, each county must establish a committee or board consisting of 51% seniors and disabled citizens. This group must be allowed to make recommendations as to the merits of the proposed transportation services. Quarterly hearings are held to allow the public the opportunity to comment on the appropriateness of the county's transportation services prior to application submittal. All applications must be in the form of a proposal for transportation assistance and specify the degree to which the proposal meets the purposes of the program.

Additional key points concerning the Casino Revenue Fund's SCDRTAP Program are as follows:

- This program is separate and apart from the NJ Transit's ADA paratransit service in terms of funding, operations and

Best Practice: Dedicated Funding Source: Casino Revenue Fund / SCDRTAP	
	<p style="margin-left: 40px;">administration</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Counties are free to determine who and how SCDRTAP services are provided • Counties are free to determine fare policies and procedures <p>The single largest funding source for SCDRTAP transportation services is state lottery proceeds, which funds about 41% of county transportation budgets (statewide average). The trend of about 40% of county transportation funding stemming from lottery proceeds is expected to remain relatively constant in the short-term.</p> <p>Results — The coordinated services provided vary from county to county, but each of the 21 counties provides a transportation service for seniors and people with disabilities. Most counties provide a demand-response service where registered clients call ahead and schedule a trip for medical, nutrition, shopping, educational or any other purpose. Non-emergency medical transportation is the most significant and largest trip purpose in these systems. Some counties also provide modified fixed-route or shuttle types of services which run on a regular schedule.</p>
Tricks:	<p>NJ Transit is the administrative entity which distributes this funding to each of the county programs, and monitors the performance of these systems. Over the years, NJ Transit has been very involved in providing technical assistance and even software to many of the counties.</p>
Traps:	<p>None apparent.</p>
Wisconsin Application:	<p>The application to Wisconsin is centralized distribution of state funding, and tying in state funding with county-based coordination planning and service delivery. Wisconsin’s state funding program shares commonalities with the New Jersey SCDRTAP except that New Jersey has conditional elements to the distribution of funds while Wisconsin does not.</p>

Best Practice:	Conditional and Consolidated Funding: Elderly and Disabled Transportation Assistance Program (EDTAP), Community Transportation Services Plans, and Human Service Transportation Management Program
Case Study:	State of North Carolina
How it Works:	<p>In 1987, the legislature enacted the North Carolina Elderly and Disabled Transportation Assistance Program (EDTAP), with funds appropriated for use by counties on a formula basis from NCDOT to provide elderly and disabled transportation services. For FY 2007-08 EDTAP funds total nearly \$9.5 million.</p> <p>To receive funding, counties are required to have (1) an approved Community Transportation Services Plan (see below), (2) a transportation advisory board that includes representation from agencies and (3) programs that serve the transportation-disadvantaged, and that operate in a coordinated manner consistent with the local Community Transportation Service Plan (CTSP).</p> <p>Note that as an incentive for regionalization, NCDOT allows multi-county or regional systems to transfer EDTAP funds from one county to another based on the level of demand for services.</p> <p>As a further incentive to provide services to the general public, the NCDOT makes Rural General Public (RGP) funds available to those community transportation systems that serve the general public. RGP was funded with \$7.5 million during FY 2007-08.</p> <p>Community Transportation Services Plan — The coordination process begins with a Community Transportation Services Plan or CTSP. The CTSP examines the transportation needs and resources and looks at trends and performance measures over a five-year period.</p> <p>NCDOT requires that every five years each county in the state complete a Community Transportation Services Plan (CTSP) as a prerequisite for federal and state funding for capital, administrative and operating assistance. Each plan must (1) evaluate the system’s current approach in all facets of management and operations, (2) evaluate the results of the system’s current direction, and (3) identify organization strengths and target opportunities for improvement.</p> <p>The plan must be approved by NCDOT and subsequently adopted by the board of county commissioners. Counties are encouraged through these planning efforts to coordinate their public transportation services on a regional basis, thereby consolidating services where possible.</p> <p>Consolidated Funding — To support the coordination efforts, NCDOT consolidates the Section 5310, 5311 and several state funding programs</p>

Best Practice: Conditional and Consolidated Funding: Elderly and Disabled Transportation Assistance Program (EDTAP), Community Transportation Services Plans, and Human Service Transportation Management Program

into one community transportation services block grant program known as the Community Transportation Program (CTP). The CTP supports capital and project administrative expenses for local coordination projects. Projects must provide coordinated human service transportation that is also open to the general public to receive funds under CTP.

Human Service Transportation Management Program — North Carolina also recognizes that not all counties (or groups of counties) elect to participate in the CTP program (e.g., elect to provide public transportation). In these instances, the North Carolina Department of Transportation still encourages the coordination of human services transportation as a means to promote mobility among transit disadvantaged populations. These counties may still receive capital funding, and are also eligible for coordination incentive grants from a program known as the Human Service Transportation Management (HSTM) Program.

HSTM is a state-funded program to help assist local agencies interested in coordination hire a transportation coordinator or manager to direct planning and implementation activities. HSTM funds can be used to pay for staff to support human service transportation systems in their coordination efforts. Lead agencies identified by locally adopted transportation development plans are the designated recipients for HSTM funds. Lead agencies play an important role in coordinating services, implementing plans, and submitting grant applications on behalf of other participating local agencies. Only human service transportation systems which do not receive CTP funds but which demonstrate a high-level of coordination with human service agencies in their counties are eligible to receive HSTM funds. HSTM funds can be used for up to 75% of the cost of the salary and benefits of a full-time transportation coordinator, not to exceed \$18,750 annually. Part-time coordinators can be approved for smaller transportation systems where a full-time coordinator is not needed.

Results — The over-arching goal of all of these programs is to align available resources to facilitate each system's continuous improvement process. For example, the planning requirement for funding has resulted in the development of 85 community transportation systems serving each of the state's 100 counties. All of the transportation systems provide human service transportation (non-emergency medical, child care, elderly and disabled trips) and all but four serve the general public.

Best Practice:	Conditional and Consolidated Funding: Elderly and Disabled Transportation Assistance Program (EDTAP), Community Transportation Services Plans, and Human Service Transportation Management Program
Tricks:	North Carolina’s success story can be directly attributed (1) to consolidating the FTA Section 5310 and 5311 programs along with several state funding programs into one community transportation services block grant program; (2) to placing planning requirements and local advisory board requirements as prerequisites to receiving these block grants; and (3) to orchestrating an Executive Order that supported these strategies.
Traps:	None apparent.
Wisconsin Application:	The North Carolina model of consolidating into block grants FTA and state funding that come through WisDOT, and possibly adding to that other funding programs represented by ICTC members, and adding prerequisites for planning and broad-based oversight, is a funding model that merits consideration for Wisconsin, especially since it is also focused on counties as the principal building block.

Best Practice: Transportation Coordination Program Grants	
Case Study:	State of Ohio
How it Works:	<p>The primary goal of the Transportation Coordination Program Grants is to enhance and expand transportation through coordination in Ohio's counties with no public transportation system. This is done through an annual competitive bid, with grants up to \$80,000 supplied to winning applicants.</p> <p>Program goals are to improve and expand transportation services in Ohio counties with no public transportation system; increase efficiency and effectiveness of transportation service delivery; and develop interagency coordination models that can be applied to other communities. Major requirements of the program include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hiring and supporting a full-time project coordinator • The money cannot be used for capital or planning • The project must be up and running within 90 days of grant execution • All projects must demonstrate some level of interagency coordination in their local area <p>Eligible program applicants are: board of county commissioners, municipality or village in one of the counties with no public transportation system applying on behalf of a countywide or regional coordination project; a board of county commissioners, municipality or village in a county that is served by a public transportation system applying on behalf of a coordination project; and a Regional Transit Authority (RTA) or County Transit Board (CTB) applying on behalf of a coordination project.</p> <p>Applicants can apply for up to 75% of project costs, not to exceed \$80,000 per year for the first three years. For year four and beyond, applicants are eligible for up to 50% of their project, not to exceed \$60,000.</p> <p>Prioritization for these grants is first given to counties with no public transit, then counties with public transit systems that cover only a limited area, and then other counties with a broader public transit service area but that still have unmet demand. Applicants are typically counties, but may also include cities and transit boards.</p> <p>To be eligible for funding, projects must demonstrate interagency coordination, designate a lead agency to administer day-to-day operations, execute memoranda of understanding with participating agencies, have a full time coordinator and commence the project within</p>

Best Practice: Transportation Coordination Program Grants	
	<p>90 days of contract award.</p> <p>While the awardees are sometimes the municipality itself, private non-profit agencies are more commonly the designees. Eligible project expenses are limited to operating expenses only. The total funding available for these grants in FY 05 is \$1.3 million.</p> <p>In addition, the Ohio Department of Transportation sets aside approximately \$300,000 each year of its Section 5310 allocation for coordination projects. In addition to meeting Section 5310 requirements, applicants must document their collaborative efforts with other agencies and how this project will further those efforts. Consequently, Section 5310 applicants that aggressively pursue coordination are in a position to compete for additional vehicles. Approximately four to five projects may be funded each year. While not all projects have been successful, most of the projects have expanded to include services for the general public at the conclusion of the period of performance of the coordination projects.</p> <p>Results — Over the years, ODOT has supplied \$6.3 million in grants to 37 projects for the coordination of transportation services. Under the department’s leadership, the number of counties with no system or transportation coordination projects has decreased from 42 to 14.</p>
Tricks:	<p>ODOT has set the grant amounts at a level that supports planning and implementation over a two-year period. The grants also come with prerequisites including some level of interagency coordination and the designation of a lead agency that will execute MOUs with all participating agencies and administer day-to-day operations.</p>
Traps:	<p>None apparent.</p>
Wisconsin Application:	<p>ODOT’s program of creating a coordination fund and making access to these funds competitive is absolutely applicable to how Wisconsin might promulgate coordination.</p> <p>The Ohio model also demonstrates how a focused DOT and a well-funded program can result in the promulgation of coordination without an Executive Order or Legislation, should that not be possible in Wisconsin.</p>

Best Practice:	Dedicated Fund: Special Transportation Fund for the Elderly or Disabled
Case Study:	State of Oregon
How it Works:	<p>The Special Transportation Fund for the Elderly or Disabled (STF) was created in 1985 by the Oregon Legislature to help finance transportation services for elderly and people with disabilities. The Public Transit Division of the Oregon Department of Transportation administers this program. The funds are principally derived from cigarette taxes and are used for the purpose of financing and improving transportation programs and services for the elderly and disabled residents. Eligible recipients include mass transit districts, transportation districts, Indian tribes and counties.</p> <p>The governing body of each STF recipient is required to appoint an advisory committee to advise on the use of funds. Permitted uses of STF include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintenance of existing transportation programs and services for the elderly or disabled • Expansion of such programs and services • Creation of new programs and services • Planning for, and development of, access to transportation for elderly and disabled individuals who are not currently served by transportation programs and services <p>Funds are not limited to supporting ADA paratransit. For example, in the Portland area, STF supports a wide variety of programs operated by small towns and non-profit organizations.</p> <p>The STF program is now 20 years old and has grown considerably. The original, and still primary, source of funding is a tax on cigarettes. Currently, the full tax rate is \$1.18 per pack of 20 cigarettes, with \$.02 distributed to the Oregon Department of Transportation’s Special Transportation Fund.</p> <p>Originally, the STF was allocated entirely by formula based on population. In 1999, in response to the growing need for transportation services, the Legislature contributed an additional \$9 million in state general funds for the 1999-2001 biennium. In 2003, the general funds were replaced with two other funds: Transportation Operating Funds (TOF) contributed by the Department of Transportation and the excess revenues from the sale of DMV identification cards. In 2005, the program revenues from the cigarette tax, TOF and ID card revenues brought about \$18 million per biennium to the program. Of this, about \$14 million was allocated by formula and \$4 million through</p>

Best Practice:	Dedicated Fund: Special Transportation Fund for the Elderly or Disabled
	discretionary grants.
Tricks:	One reason for adding other funds to the STF is the nature of cigarette sales as a source of revenue. Cigarette sales per capita have fallen somewhat since 1999, although total revenue has been roughly constant due to population growth.
Traps:	None apparent, although revenues from cigarettes have decreased in recent years, and some may find fault associating a “sin tax” with the services it benefits.
Wisconsin Application:	Should revenues wane in Wisconsin to support the state transportation funding programs, consideration could be given to creating a Special Transportation Coordination Fund, augmented by a sin tax or other revenue source such as casino revenues or auto registration revenues.

Best Practice: **Dedicated Fund: State Lottery fund, Shared-Ride and Free Transit programs**

Case Study: State of Pennsylvania

How it Works: The Pennsylvania Lottery is required to contribute 30% of proceeds (before prizes) to programs to benefit seniors. The funds support property tax and rent rebates, shared-ride and free-ride public transportation, pharmaceutical assistance, and Area Agencies on Aging and Senior Centers. In 2003-04, of \$825 million devoted to programs, \$116 million was dedicated to the shared-ride and free transit programs, both administered by PennDOT.

Senior Shared-Ride Program — This program offers door-to-door specialized transportation services (vans and mini buses) to seniors at a reduced fare. Seniors pay 15% of the shared-ride fare, which can either be paid by the customer or reimbursed by a third party or sponsoring agency. The 85% discount is available to seniors at any time that the demand-response service is available to the general public. The first fare-paying passenger in a sequence of trips cannot refuse to share the ride with the next passenger.

The Shared-Ride Program funding is provided by means of grant applications submitted by counties. Grants are provided directly to participating systems, which in turn either contract out or provide services directly.

Free Transit Program — This program allows seniors and persons with disabilities to ride scheduled fixed-route public transit services for free during off-peak hours on weekdays and all day weekends and holidays. Seniors are allowed to use their free transit ID card on any system statewide and transit operators are reimbursed for the full fare of the trip by the state. Reimbursing operators for the full fare has effectively rewarded operators who provide fixed-route services that meet the needs of seniors and persons with disabilities. As of 2006 there were 59 carriers that provided free transit services in all 67 counties in the state.

Operators in both programs include transit authorities, private taxis, paratransit operators, human service agencies, county governments, and nonprofit transportation providers. In 1986 regulations designed to improve coordination was adopted. This has led to a reduction in the number of carriers from 97 to 60. Local governments were encouraged to identify single coordinators to become program grantees.

The services subsidized by the Shared-Ride Program are often used by other government programs, including the Persons with Disabilities Program (PwD), Welfare to Work Program (W2W), Medical Assistance Transportation Program (MATP), Mental Health and Mental Retardation (MH/MR) programs, the Department of Labor and Industry's Office of

Best Practice:	Dedicated Fund: State Lottery fund, Shared-Ride and Free Transit programs
	<p>Vocational Rehabilitation, and many other human service agencies and at times the general public. There is an 85% discount for the PwD Program, which is covered by grants from the state’s General Fund. Fare structures for other users of the services are based on program authorizations, program features and budget structure.</p> <p>Human Services Development Fund — To facilitate the coordination and delivery of transportation services for the transportation disadvantaged, the state initiated the Human Services Development Fund (HSDF). It provides counties with a flexible source of funding to be used within the seven human services programs for which the counties are responsible: Adult Services, Aging, Children and Youth, Drug and Alcohol, Homeless Assistance, and the Community Mental Health/Mental Retardation programs.</p> <p>These funds are used to expand existing services in any or all of the seven program areas, for the coordination of services among those programs, and for specialized or generic services. Funds are distributed to all 67 counties. Each county develops a plan for the use of the HSDF and submits it to PennDOT for review and approval.</p>
Tricks:	<p>Identification of single coordinators, as the program grantees, improved the coordination of service delivery in counties. PennDOT administration of both the Shared-Ride programs and the Human Services Development Fund enhance opportunities for coordination.</p>
Traps:	<p>The Free Transit and Shared-Ride Programs pay participating systems on a per trip basis. This is a major concern for the Shared-Ride Program participants because there are times when actual trips are less than budget. Occasionally, when trip demand is below budget the provider has uncovered fixed costs. This has led some providers and local communities to rethink their approach to managing and operating under the program.</p>
Wisconsin Application:	<p>County-based coordination in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has benefited from tying in state funding sources to requirements for coordination.</p>

Technical Strategies and Assistance

In addition to broad policy-based strategies, there are numerous ways states can support coordination through technical strategies and assistance. With this next section, the Nelson\Nygaard team explored best practice techniques for some of the critical technical programs that challenge many local coordination efforts. Best practices covered in this section include state efforts associated with:

- State of North Carolina: Community Transportation Program Cost Allocation and Rate Setting Model
- State of Washington: Transit Insurance Pool and Non-Profit Insurance Program
- State of Florida: Training and Technical Assistance
- State of North Carolina: Technical Assistance
- State of Ohio: Coordination Handbook and Implementation Guide

Best Practice:	Cost Allocation: Community Transportation Program Cost Allocation and Rate Setting Model
Case Study:	State of North Carolina
How it Works:	<p>Lack of a consistent cost allocation procedure for services rendered, as well as a lack of uniformity within the coordinated systems for determining service costs and billing rates, can be a major impediment to the coordination of human service transportation.</p> <p>To address this obstacle, NCDOT developed a Community Transportation Program Cost Allocation and Rate Setting Model following the cost methodology contained in the MTAP/AASHTO manual, Financial Management Guidelines for Small Urban and Rural Transportation Providers. The model is presented in the form of a set of excel worksheets, which perform two functions: (1) computing the fully allocated cost of any service component and (2) establishing a rate to use in entering into agreements with other organizations to provide these services.</p>
Tricks:	<p>These functions provide the ability to calculate the rate of a proposed service based on fully allocated cost and the ability to add a "capital reserve fund" or an "operating reserve fund" contribution fee to the fully allocated cost. Following the prescribed steps, the user can also get the full cost allocation plan of any proposed contract service including fully allocated cost of service and fully allocated rate for charging a contract user of this service. It also allows the user to specify various scenarios for pricing transit service such as including or removing the capital reserve fund.</p>
Traps:	None apparent.
Wisconsin Application:	<p>Cost-sharing for shared functions, much less co-mingled trips, must be worked out among the various participating agencies in the course of or in the planning for any systems where one or more functions are consolidated. There are a variety of different approaches to trip cost sharing, ranging from per trip rates based on statistically relevant samples in cases where trip characteristics are relatively homogenous, to equivalent shares of a trip cost based on the time or mileage associated with the trip. The North Carolina Program not only is useful in determining rates, but also helps the service operator(s) and sponsors determine what the fully-allocated costs really are.</p>

Best Practice:	Group Insurance: Transit Insurance Pool and Non-Profit Insurance Program
Case Study:	State of Washington
How it Works:	<p>The state of Washington has established two innovative programs for transit and community transportation providers designed to mitigate the rising cost of insurance.</p> <p>The Washington State Transit Insurance Pool (WSTIP), first formed by eight public transit systems in 1989 as a self-funded liability-only pool, now includes 18 public transit organizations and three associate members.</p> <p>As a result of state legislation allowing non-profit corporations to form a self-insurance risk pool with other non-profit corporations or a local government entity for property or liability risk, the state of Washington established the Non-Profit Insurance Program (NPIP) in August 2004 and a Joint Insurance Purchasing program wherein members pool their losses and claims.</p>
Tricks:	<p>WSTIP now provides insurance for auto liability, general liability, errors and omissions, all risk property, crime, and boiler and machinery.</p> <p>NPIP members also jointly purchase insurance, and other services including claims adjustment, risk management consulting, and loss prevention. The primary benefits to the members are lower insurance premiums, stable access to the insurance market, and increased availability of risk management and loss prevention services.</p>
Traps:	None apparent.
Wisconsin Application:	Wisconsin has an insurance pool for transit systems; these examples provide further illustration of how state programs contend with the rising cost of insurance for community transportation providers. In addition, both the states of North Carolina and Vermont have instituted statewide policies that cover volunteer drivers involved in coordinated community transportation services.

Best Practice:	Training and Technical Assistance
Case Study:	State of Florida
How it Works:	<p>The Program Administration Team within the Florida CTD provides training and technical assistance to all contracted Community Transportation Coordinators, Designated Official Planning Agencies and others across the state. The CTD provides training in first aid, driver sensitivity, passenger assistance, driver safety and CPR.</p> <p>For coordination officials the CTD staff provides management training, planning guidelines, contract management guidelines, quality assurance reviews, operational reviews, financial evaluations, employee drug testing programs, and assistance with federal requirements.</p>
Tricks:	Florida’s technical assistance program is aimed not only at the Community Transportation Coordinators, but also for agency planning staff who typically chair and provide administrative support to the Local Coordinating Boards.
Traps:	None apparent.
Wisconsin Application:	An oversight often made by state-level coordinating bodies such as Wisconsin’s ICTC is to assume that members of the county/regional coordinating councils that oversee/guide the local Community Transportation Coordinators are individually or collectively skilled in contract management, performance monitoring, quality assurance, and financial evaluations.

Best Practice: Technical Assistance	
Case Study:	State of North Carolina: Department of Transportation
How it Works:	<p>NCDOT provides extensive technical assistance in the areas of planning and project development, project management, and transit management. Such assistance includes the following items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assistance in the preparation of grant applications • Assistance in addressing/resolving coordination issues with human service agencies at the state or local level — note that this is a cooperative effort between NCDOT and the state DHHS • Assistance in involving private sector transportation providers in the planning for and delivery of community transportation services • Assistance for project implementation to establish new rural general public transportation service • Assistance with evaluation of system management or Management Performance Reviews as addressed within the local planning process • Assistance in third party contracting and development of a Request for Proposal when needed • Assistance in procedural matters relating to facility construction • Project monitoring and evaluation • Employee development/training • Assistance in system operations and management • Assistance in fiscal matters including invoicing, accounting, and purchasing <p>Training and technical assistance is provided directly by NCDOT staff in most situations, but the department does contract for assistance with these efforts when needed.</p>
Tricks:	NCDOT provides technical staff to help design/implement/guide/monitor coordination at the county/regional level. The state is divided up into urban and non-urban counties, each overseen by a NCDOT manager. NCDOT then assigns coordination specialists to regions of counties to provide ongoing technical assistance to the local advisory/governing boards and the county/regional community transportation coordinators, and to monitor the performance of the coordinated systems.
Traps:	None apparent.

Best Practice: Technical Assistance

Wisconsin Application: WisDOT may need to provide technical assistance to counties and regions as they plan and implement new/expanded coordinated services and strategies.

Best Practice: Technical Assistance: Coordination Handbook and Implementation Guide	
Case Study:	State of Ohio
How it Works:	<p>The Ohio Department of Transportation (ODOT) has historically worked with the Ohio Departments of Aging, Jobs and Family Services, Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities, Mental Health, Education, and the Rehabilitation Services Commission to increase transportation services available to people with disabilities, and the elderly and low-income individuals.</p> <p>Handbook for Coordinating Transportation Services — To support these efforts, ODOT developed a “Handbook for Coordinating Transportation Services” to assist local officials coordinate public and human service transportation programs in rural and small urban areas in Ohio. The document was prepared in a “user-friendly” format, providing a step-by-step direction of activities that can be undertaken to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of transit services through coordination. The manual was later revised and updated to include additional information, references, and examples to assist with the implementation process.</p> <p>A Guide to Implementing Coordinated Transportation Systems — As a supplement to the handbook, an implementation guide was also developed that provides additional reference materials and step-by-step directions and examples of essential policies and procedures.</p> <p>These two documents are recognized nationally as one of the best sources on the topic by other state transportation departments.</p>
Tricks:	The handbook especially doubles as a “Coordination 101” primer, thus educating potential participants as to the potential benefits and opportunities of various coordination strategies, all along the “Coordination Continuum.”
Traps:	None apparent, although as good and useful as these manuals are, they do not replace “live” technical assistance.
Wisconsin Application:	The basic outlines of these documents are fairly comprehensive. They should serve as a resource as WisDOT develops its Coordination Toolkit.

Regional Infrastructure

As discussed, a unique feature of Wisconsin is the strong role of county governments in the delivery of public sector services. Wisconsin is also unique in having a large number of sparsely populated rural counties. Many states have focused on counties as the foundation for coordinated systems, whether or not some or all of the counties subsequently form regions on their own accord. Other states have prescribed community transportation regions, with boundaries based on a variety of existing boundaries such as county boundaries, human service agency region boundaries, DOT regions and/or regional planning agency/district boundaries. Still other states have prescribed regions around transit agencies or successful community transportation operations. The following best practices illustrate different approaches and why they made sense for their respective state.

- State of Florida: County-level Coordination
- State of Minnesota: Dual Coordination Infrastructure
- State of North Carolina: County-level Coordination
- State of Ohio: Self-forming Coordinated Systems through Competitive Funding

Best Practice: County-level coordination	
Case Study:	State of Florida
How it Works:	<p>Florida made an overt decision to focus on county governments as the building blocks for coordination. This decision is based on the strength of county governments and existing community transportation services delivery and funding systems. In more populated counties, the public transit agency often, but not always, became the Community Transportation Coordinator (CTC). Among counties that split the roles (i.e. had a public transit operator and a separate CTC), some transit agencies' ADA paratransit system were included in the CTC's service delivery network. In more rural counties, there are a few instances where multiple counties have banded together with one CTC serving that multi-county region (and overseen by one multi-County Regional Coordinating Council).</p>
Tricks:	<p>In Florida, there was no attempt at grouping counties into prescribed regions. The county governments are very strong in Florida, most agency transportation services are funded through a county department, and the predominance of human service agency trips are intra-county. To split up the state into multi-county regions, therefore, would be counter-intuitive.</p> <p>Some groups of counties, however, elected to band together to form a regional approach to coordination. Flexibility to allow regionalization has contributed to the success of the coordinated services in these counties. Moreover, the Local Coordinating Boards that select, guide, oversee, and monitor the Community Transportation Coordinators almost always are led by or include a representative from the regional planning commission. Thus, if there is a need to provide inter-county service or develop an inter-county approach to a particular coordination strategy, the inclusion of regional planners on the LCB is of benefit.</p>
Traps:	None apparent.
Wisconsin Application:	Using counties as the principal building blocks for coordination, with built-in flexibility for County Coordinating Committees to designate the Community Transportation Coordinator and to combine efforts with other neighboring counties has direct applicability to Wisconsin, where most human service agency funding is routed through county departments, and where public transit and paratransit services rarely straddle county boundaries.

Best Practice:	Dual Coordination Infrastructure
Case Study:	State of Minnesota
How it Works:	<p>The 2006 Minnesota Public Transit — Human Services Transportation Coordination Study recommended a dual coordination framework.</p> <p>Urbanized areas — Within urbanized areas, the public transit systems would become the “Mobility Managers” within their service area. For these areas, each local community will determine the implementation timeline and role of the mobility manager through the regional planning process.</p> <p>Non-Urbanized Area — In non-urbanized areas, the existing Regional Development Commissions (RDCs) will be utilized for planning. Where the planning jurisdiction of a RDC contains one or more urbanized areas, the RDC and Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) will coordinate planning activities to encompass all of one or more counties. Depending upon the local area, either the MPO or the RDC will be responsible for creating area-wide coordinated public transit-human services transportation plans with the planning process monitored by Minnesota DOT.</p>
Tricks:	<p>The elegance of this design involved taking advantage of the networks already established. In the case of the urban areas, most of the public transit agencies already have established networks of services to accommodate human service transportation. Thus, the jump to become the regional mobility managers is not such a leap. And in the rural areas, while there are different and in some cases very few community transportation services being delivered, it is the planning agencies that are in the best position to understand unmet need and how best to put together an organized, coordinated approach.</p>
Traps:	<p>Not all of the public transit agencies in Minnesota currently have the wherewithal or inclination to look beyond their current mission. Thus, the design makes sense but so far has only resulted in the transit agencies who “get it” promulgating coordination in their region.</p> <p>In the non-urban areas, it behooves the regional planners to include human service agency representatives in the coordination planning, as human service transportation is an area that traditionally has eluded or not been a focus of rural planning agencies.</p> <p>Coordination efforts in the Twin Cities metro region have stagnated seemingly due to local resistance and a lack of political will/interest.</p>
Wisconsin Application:	<p>The regionalization of Greater Minnesota has some intriguing elements, particularly the designation of transit agencies as the mobility manager in urban areas and the regional planning agencies service as the leads in planning efforts elsewhere. The inclusion of transit agencies in the</p>

Best Practice: Dual Coordination Infrastructure

planning process in Wisconsin is critical; however, instead of designating the transit agencies as the mobility manager, it makes sense to use coordinating councils from a county or group of counties to first understand whether or not a particular transit agency is in the best position to serve as such (vs. another entity such as the county) and whether it is in a position to provide or arrange for coordinated services beyond its current service area if needed. Or, if not, perhaps the transit agency could best serve as a resource in the county or region.

The focus on regional planning districts to lead coordination planning in rural areas is applicable to Wisconsin. We suggest that this lead role especially makes sense for a county or group of counties where coordination planning is new. In other non-urban counties, it makes more sense to include regional planners at the table of county/regional coordinating councils that have already formed.

Best Practice:	County-level coordination
Case Study:	State of North Carolina
How it Works:	<p>With 100 counties, North Carolina currently has 84 community transportation systems that operate as single-county or multi-county systems.</p> <p>To be eligible for FTA funding through NCDOT, counties have to fulfill two prerequisites. First, counties must put together a local advisory/governing board to guide/oversee coordination planning and implementation, and to monitor the coordinated services. Second, counties must develop a coordination plan.</p> <p>In order to encourage the development of regional (multi-county) coordinated systems, NCDOT provides 100% of the cost of preparing regional transportation feasibility studies and follow-up implementations plans if needed. To be eligible for this funding, local transportation systems must have a broad-based transportation advisory or governing board representing different entities through the region.</p>
Tricks:	<p>NCDOT states that (1) the funding requirements for a local/regional coordinating council and for the preparation of a local/regional coordination plan have both been instrumental in promulgating coordination activities in every county throughout the state; and (2) the additional incentive for multi-county efforts have been instrumental in encouraging regional approaches.</p> <p>On an ongoing basis, NCDOT also works with counties and local transportation systems to explore opportunities for more regional coordination, with a focus of coordinating rural and urban planning efforts in the state's urban counties. In several cities with fixed-route transit services, the rural systems have been encouraged to contract with the city to provide paratransit services to meet the requirements of the Americans with Disability Act (ADA), thereby not requiring the city to establish a separate paratransit system.</p>
Traps:	None apparent.
Wisconsin Application:	Establishing local/regional oversight and planning activities as prerequisites to state and potentially federal (FTA) funding has a potential role in Wisconsin.

Best Practice: Self-forming coordinated systems; competitively-accessed funding	
Case Study:	State of Ohio
How it Works:	In Ohio, coordination catchment areas are not prescribed. Rather, the Ohio Department of Transportation (ODOT) provides funds — through a competitive procurement — for locals to plan and implement and initially operate coordinated services. Thus, the coordinated systems in Ohio are self-forming, and may encompass a single county, multiple counties, a transit service area, or any catchment area that make sense to the group of partners applying for a grant. The more broad-based the group, and the more coordinated the proposed system, the better the chance that they will get a grant, especially if it is in an area with little or no public transportation.
Tricks:	<p>The theory behind this effort is that the implementation of new or expanded coordinated systems, especially in areas where there is little or no public transportation, will eventually evolve into new or expanded public transportation systems. Over the years, this theory has proven to be correct.</p> <p>Because the budget that ODOT is able to dedicate to this effort does have its limits, ODOT instituted a competitive procurement process. This turned out to have several benefits. First, because the process is competitive, it encourages applicants to put together broad-based partnerships and to address specific unmet needs, as these are two of the more critical evaluation criteria. In this way, ODOT can devote funds to those efforts that, because of the broad-based partnership, probably have the greatest chance of success, and/or address compelling unmet needs. Second, having a limited number of planning efforts and limited number of implementation efforts going on during one year circumvents ODOT’s staff being spread too thin.</p>
Traps:	This strategy has not resulted in coordination across Ohio quickly. It has, however, promulgated an orderly march of coordination through the state by providing planning and implementation funding to those areas interested in expanding and coordinating service.
Wisconsin Application:	While Ohio’s coordination program is not strictly based on counties or regions, ODOT’s program of creating a coordination fund and making access to these funds competitive is applicable to how Wisconsin might promulgate coordination and encourage regionalization.

Chapter 5. Conclusions

Overview

As demonstrated in both the peer review and best practices, while no state has completely addressed and solved all coordination challenges, much progress has been made. In studying the successful coordination concepts utilized by various states, common attributes include a strong statewide infrastructure of organizations, policies, programs and guidelines that collectively create a framework in which coordination can succeed. Another truism pervades the various state programs: the best way to encourage and facilitate coordination is to make sure that the climate and environment for coordination at the county/regional level is conducive to coordination via the types of best practices reviewed in the preceding sections. Indeed, the best practices and state experience summarized in this document suggest to us the following conclusions, lessons learned, and next steps for Wisconsin.

Coordination Oversight and Monitoring

Without exception, the states generally regarded as having developed the most successful coordination models have effective broad-based state-level oversight bodies. With few exceptions, these state-level oversight bodies are either legislatively ordained by statute, or established by way of an Executive Order. Exceptions appear in states (such as Ohio) where a particular state agency (typically Departments of Transportation) has a significant amount of money to dedicate to coordination efforts and is firmly committed to coordination. In addition, the effectiveness of state-level coordination oversight bodies is markedly increased when it has decision-making authority over funding dedicated to coordination or coordinated services.

With this in mind, we recommend the ICTC continue to provide oversight of coordination activities in the state, but also consider expanding such that it becomes integrally involved in the review and selection of any coordination funding grant applications, as well as the official “recognition” of local coordinating councils throughout the state. Furthermore, the ICTC could assume responsibility for:

- Promoting educational/awareness and technical assistance efforts throughout the state, and otherwise any actions that will encourage or foster the coordination of community transportation services on a county or regional basis
- Streamlining, coordination, and consolidation of grant/funding applications and disbursements for community transportation services
- Removing or revising duplicative and/or administratively-burdensome reporting requirements associated with state funding/grants, i.e., that are not beyond the control of the governmental entities on the ICTC

- Eliminating coordination barriers at the state level through the use of multi-agency action plans or policy directives which would be agreed upon at the ICTC and then implemented at individual agencies

A key challenge facing coordination is the fragmented delivery of transportation funding to different agencies, mainly local county/tribal aging units and public transit agencies, but also Medicaid NEMT funding. Strengthening the position and role of the ICTC would give it authority to remove barriers to coordination at the state level and ensure increased involvement from stakeholder agencies involved in the administration and use of transportation funding.

Initial steps include establishing “top down” authority for the ICTC by either Executive Order or Legislation (the latter would be preferred for the sake of permanence). Such Executive Order or Legislation would prescribe ICTC membership and possibly prescribe changes to the way 85.20 and 85.21 funding should be better coordinated and disbursed (see discussion on this below). Membership in the ICTC may be established by legislative authorization and should include state agencies that sponsor community transportation as well as private non-profit agencies that fund community transportation and advocacy groups (representing the three target populations) that have a statewide reach. Membership would be institutionalized via Memorandums of Understanding, and By-Laws.

As mentioned above, the ICTC could be instrumental in helping form county or regional based coordinating councils to oversee, guide, and monitor local coordinating efforts. These councils would be composed of county/regional representatives of governmental agencies represented on the ICTC, representatives from the county planning department(s), the transportation planner from the regional planning council or council of governments, and any pertinent stakeholders in the county/region. The role of this group will be to:

- Implement/improve coordination in their county or region
- Decide what coordination strategies should be pursued locally
- Assign/select an entity to serve as the lead for all or specific coordination strategies that are pursued
- Lead/be involved in coordination grant application efforts
- Help guide those entities in planning and implementing those strategies
- Monitor the performance and results of those strategies

Some counties and regions in Wisconsin already have county-based or regional coordinating councils that meet regularly to discuss local transportation needs, gaps and strategies to improve services. These counties and mini-regions are invariably further along in the coordination process. In some cases, however, existing coordination councils have not always included all stakeholders in the discussions.

The purpose of mandating ongoing coordination councils will be to bring together in a single unit all stakeholders involved in the delivery or funding of transportation to meet and discuss transportation services. We recommend that the authorizing executive order or

legislation provide for the establishment of these coordinating councils by all stakeholder agencies, which at a minimum reflect participation in the ICTC.

We also recommend the ICTC remains a policy body and not a contracting body. This will enable the Council to receive more support and less resistance in its early years. Funds would still flow from the individual state agencies down to the local agencies, or perhaps to county or regional community transportation coordinators. That said, the ICTC could be empowered to establish or “authorize” county or regional coordinating councils to provide a more localized level of oversight that a statewide body could not effectively provide, as well as to approve a county or regional community transportation coordinator.

Indeed, one of the commonalities among the successful coordination models from different states is bi-level oversight structure. As statewide coordination champions are in place and balanced by a very strong county presence, this type of structure would seem to be particularly applicable to Wisconsin.

Coordination activities in each county or region, should be overseen by coordinating council similarly composed of funding agencies (e.g., regional representatives of the state funding agencies), representatives from other local/regional purchasers of service and possibly local service providers and other stakeholders as well. The role of the county/regional coordinating council would be to:

- Implement coordination and related policies in their region
- Select, guide, assist, monitor, and if necessary, replace the Community Transportation Coordinator (CTC) in their region
- Work with the CTC to develop the local service design, e.g., how service is delivered, how inter-regional trips are coordinated
- Provide feedback to the ICTC, relative to the policies that are – or are not – working well in their region

One of the most important elements for both state-level and county/regional level coordinating councils is ongoing monitoring of coordination projects. This is particularly important for new systems that may struggle during initial stages. There should be clear and reasonable performance measures assigned to each project to determine their efficiency and effectiveness. It is important that projects be held accountable for the funds and other assistance that they have received and to insure the consumer that services are being provided in a safe and competent manner. It is also necessary to insure that projects are complying with federal and state regulations.

Funding

Several states have established state coordination funds; use of these coordination funds tends to fall into two categories:

- To support local level programming, planning and implementation
- To provide coordinated services on an ongoing basis

Dedicated funding for coordination would likely help counties and regions in Wisconsin introduce/expand coordinated services. In concert with this observation, we suggest the creation of a coordination fund to be overseen by the ICTC. Ideally, participating agencies on the ICTC would contribute some resources to the coordination fund. With legislation, Wisconsin could carve out a small percentage of the 85.20 and 85.21 funding programs to provide a number of planning and implementation grants. For example, based on figures from 2006, 3% of the combined 85.20 and 85.21 monies would yield a coordination fund of \$3.4 million, which would be sufficient to fully fund \$50,000 planning and implementation grants to almost all of the 72 counties. Similar with the Ohio program, these grants could be competitive, with selection criteria based on demonstrated inclusiveness and the extent to which unmet need is served/addressed with locally-appropriate strategies.

In concert with the North Carolina model, ICTC or WisDOT could also impose coordination prerequisites for the receipt of 85.20 and 85.21 funding (and possibly FTA funding that flows through WisDOT). For example, receiving transportation funding could be contingent on (a) formation and participation in a county or regional coordinating committee and/or (b) preparation and periodic update of a "Coordination Action Plan."

Indeed, with the blessing of ICTC, FTA funding that flows through WisDOT to transit agencies or other entities could be made to be contingent on their active participation on coordination councils.

Technical Assistance

Wisconsin will likely need to establish a quality technical assistance program at the state level as a key ingredient of its coordination program. While providing technical assistance can be expensive and resource consuming, the benefits are substantial. Technical assistance should be provided not only to the transit providers but also to local officials so they can make informed decisions regarding the coordination program.