

January 30, 2009 Meeting Minutes

Specials Transportation Fund Advisory Committee (STFAC)

STFAC Members Present: Teresa Christopherson, , Jeff Hill, Virginia Jennings, Dick Jones, Dave Keyes, Clair Kuppenbender, Stan Lewis, Ross Mathews, Kathy Miller, Raissa Moore, Claire Potter, Beth Rehm, Claudia Robertson, Carol Ryan, Stephanie Spann, Julie Stephens, Ron Thompson, Elaine Wells

Guests: Karen Hermens, court reporter, Shirley Lyons, South Clackamas Transit, Julie Wehling, from Canby Area Transit, Joseph Lowe and Roxanne Tolva, Clackamas County, Scott Chapman and Connie Soper, Nelson Nygaard, Scott Gates and Julie Wilcke, Ride Connection

Claudia Robertson begins by saying that Jan Campbell will arrive at 9:30, so as vice chair of the STFAC she will fill in until then. Julie Stephens also asks that everyone keep Tom Ciesielski in their thoughts because he was heading back to the hospital that morning.

First order of business is the approval of the December 5th minutes.

Beth Rehm moves the minutes to be approved, Dick Jones seconded. All in favor are in favor.

Claudia Robertson begins the process of reviewing the JARC applications.

David Keyes asks if the figures are correct on the Washington County application because it shows 4,100 boardings being supported at a cost of \$150,000.

Elaine Wells asks Julie Wilcke to address this question and adds that it should be kept in mind that that job access trips are five days a week so each individual is getting a minimum of ten trips a week because they're commuting to work.

Julie Wilcke responds that she will double-check the figure with a quick call. Just to confirm, though, the total project cost is 150,973, and the estimated one-way trips are 4,100. Then we have the average trip

coverage is about 12 and a half miles at a cost of 23.79. So I think the numbers work out for one-way trip.

Claudia Roberson asks for more explanation on the match sources. The South Clackamas says match source required, and there's no match source. For Sandy the job access reverse commute doesn't have a match source.

Julie Stephens responds that the matched source would be BETC, and she will make sure that it is filled in on the application.

Claire Potter points out that Shirley Lyons would also need to fill that in and re-send it showing that her general fund payroll taxes will support the match on the SCTD JARC application.

Claire Potter also points out that we don't need to score these projects, as much as the group needs to review and concur. The concern is where does a new service, like the proposed Mountain Express, fall on our list of priorities, compared to other programs that are providing service already.

Teresa Christopherson recommends that all of the projects be recommended for funding with the consideration that existing projects receive priority. While Clackamas County Social Services did put in an application for the new Mountain Express, they do recognize that they would not want the project funded if it meant that the service to Estacada and South Clackamas went away, because those are equally important services. The importance of the new Mountain Express is primarily to bring the project that has no other resources, to the forefront so that people are aware of it, and are aware that they're a committed group of businesses and other entities who very much would like to see this project launched. While it is of equal importance, because it provides the same kind of services everyone else does, another project that already exists should not be cut to fund it.

Julie Wehling points out that there is an error in the Canby Area Transit proposal. There is a mistake on the number of service hours that would be required, so it changes the cost of the purchase agreement, which changes all the numbers on the application. The error will be corrected to show that the total project cost would be \$280,051.

Elaine Wells asks that there be a motion to support Teresa Christopherson's recommendation on new projects vs. existing projects. Claire Potter agrees

Teresa Christopherson makes a motion that all of these applications be approved with submitted changes, with equal consideration. Claire Potter that all applications be forwarded to the state, recommended for funding, with existing services receiving priority. Jan Campbell seconded.

Stephanie Spann requests that the group sure that all the projects are cost-effective, because maybe there could be a new project, if some might scale back.

Julie Wilcke than returns with a clarification on figures in the Washington County application that shows 4,100 individuals being supported at a cost of \$150,000.

Julie Wilcke confirms that 42 riders is the unduplicated amount for that project. The way that Washington County population is spread out, with largest cities having about 1,500 people in them, and the rest of the community is throughout the rural community. Pickup times in those outerlying communities were created to try and increase our shares as much as possible. The discussion on Zone C, we don't actually pay for the whole trip for the individuals that live out farther than 18 miles from where they need to go to work. A taxi voucher program was created where we only pay for 18 miles of the trip. If there is going to be a project to project comparison we need to fully understand what each project is, and how the service is provided. This is based on who we're serving, and how we're serving. It is most cost-effective way we can meet the need.

Elaine Wells adds that looking at cost-effectiveness in a little different way, too, one of the those riders has been off public assistance since the institution of this program because she has steady transportation into fixed route hub. She had been on welfare, and since our job access program started, she has maintained her employment. So it is a very cost-effective program, because it is helping folks who live in rural places in the county, who have unreliable personal transportation to get to work on a continual basis and to be able to maintain employment.

Julie Stephens asks that in looking at the 12 ½ at a cost of 23.29, you're looking at a couple dollars a mile, is there a more economical way to provide that. Are there some job access trips that you were better off buying a car for someone, it would save the taxpayers a lot of money. It might be an answer the person given as an example.

Elaine Wells disagrees and goes on to explain. In the early days, it was a very expensive trip. We now group that trip. The customer goes to work an hour early because we group her trip. We're reducing those costs that way. The other argument is that we're very strict about income guidelines. We ensure that the people who are getting the rides with our job access dollars truly meet the income guideline for this federally-funded program, so we can document that and substantiate it. Similar to Mountain Express, it's a very needed service in a very rural community.

Dick Jones comments that it seems that the 42 people shown must only do it pretty spasmodically, because this is a two-year grant, so if four people went 250 days, that would use up the 4,100 rides.

Elaine Wells agrees. Julie Wilcke adds that they too have found that too. There are no statistics on how many people move in and out of the program on a regular basis, very few that actually have been in it since the inception of this program. Those people are changing on a regular basis.

Julie Stephens comments they have the same situation in their rural area where we're trying to provide services. There are trade-off when doing a fixed route. There's no perfect answer, but ride sharing is a tremendous way to gain efficiency with the dollar. Julie Stephens also asks about the standard rate of a cost is per mile for a taxi delivery.

Julie Wilcke responds that the three providers are competitive, and there are situations where they will be competitive and lower their costs. They're also medical transportation providers, so they can't charge more than they would charge the medical transportation program. For what's available in the community it is a competitive fair rate. There is also Zone B service where they are trying to group as many rides as possible, having, set pickup times in the varying community and in Zone C trips are being paid for because they are feed to Zone B. They encourage shares in because the taxi voucher can be shared between two or three customers. Julie

Wilcke adds that they do have general public service out in that area, besides the two funded programs.

Claire Potter calls for a motion that recommends that the STFAC deem all projects recommended for funding, with existing services receiving priority.

All said "Aye." David Keyes abstains.

Next up is an update on the elderly and disabled transportation plan

Connie Soper will present some highlights of the update to the elderly and disabled transportation plan. This is an update to the plan that was originally adopted in 2006, and it's intended to guide investments for TriMet, and other service providers, and to serve as a blueprint for identifying a range of mobility options. It's also intended to fulfill federal and state planning requirements to access certain sources of funds, the federal funds that the group was talking about. The JARC and New Freedom funds are required to be derived from this plan. The state of Oregon also requires that its access to STF funds be based on this plan. This is the first time there has been a chance to see the full draft plan. We also have been working with individual service providers. They've provided us information specific to their programs, and also have suggested strategies. The sections that are not in bold are basically there from the 2006 plan.

This meeting will give the chance to comment and review on some of the elements of the draft plan as we walk through it. The next step will be to incorporate comments and finalize the plan, this Spring. As a reminder, the planned strategies were based on certain tenets, and those are to coordinate, innovate, involve the community, and improve the fixed route foundation.

The first part of the review is to briefly talk about the organization of the plan.

It's organized in eight sections. Section one provides an introduction and background to the plan, introduces a planning context, and establishes a vision for the plan, and also highlights progress that's been made since 2006. Bolded text throughout the presentation indicates that there's a new element or new section to the plan.

- Section two describes the existing transportation services provided by these agencies. There are a couple of new programs that are included, that were not included in the 2006 report: the Clackamas Transportation Consortium and Mountain Express.
- Section three talks about innovations, or ways to improve mobility, to augment or complement those existing transportation services. There are a couple of new innovations that we're going to be talking more about, having to do with the LIFT paratransit program. One is to review LIFT service standards, and one is to develop a comprehensive ADA-eligibility system.
- Section four of the plan talks about coordination. There have not been any significant changes, but we are suggesting some new strategies with respect to coordination, and when we walk through the strategies, we'll give you more detail on those.
- Section five has not changed. It talks about service guidelines in terms of level of service goals.
- Section six is a new section to the report. This is one of the required elements of the coordination plan is that there be a needs assessment. The information that's included in the document summarizes the needs that were identified in the previous planning process, but just calls it out as a separate chapter, and it discusses both regional and rural and needs.
- Section seven is the financial plan that identifies financial constraints, and summarizes cost control efforts.
- Section eight is the implementation plan, where all of the strategies are highlighted. The table that we're going to be showing is exactly the same as the plan document. Where we've proposed new language, it will be reflected in strike-out version and new strategies are included in bold. There are a few boxes that are not filled out. We do want to confirm today with you for some of those strategies who the responsible parties should be, and to see if you have any thoughts about time frames and cost estimates before we proceed with the next draft.

Connie Soper reminds the group that one of the other requirements for the coordinated plan is to prioritize the strategies. The first tier of prioritized strategies would be to maintain existing services and to seek new resources to support operating and capital expenses. Those short-term strategies that have a targeted completion date would be the second tier. The short-term strategies that are more ongoing in nature would be the third tier. And then the long-term strategies would be the fourth tier. And one other comment to make on Section eight is that the rural strategies are integrated in with the regional strategies, rather than being in a separate chapter, which is what it was in the 2006 report.

Connie Soper asks if there are any questions on the section discussion.

Jan Campbell ask about the part in section three where it says walking, if we could put pedestrian friendly, or something, instead of walking. Jan Campbell also asks about the context of word homebound, if the correct wordage is homebound.

David Keyes comments that the population data is 2000, and in the areas where we have a lot of growth in the last nine years, if Portland State's information, would it at least be better.

Scott Chapman responds that when you look at people with disabilities, and elderly, really the census is still the best. We can paint a broader picture. A focus on those populations, it will still be the 2000 data in the census change, a question between the 2000 and the current survey, and how to measure people with disabilities. It's really confusing if you mix and match. We'll try to paint the biggest picture we can in the appendix.

Scott Chapman also reminds the group that the time frame for some of these strategies is going to sort of be agreed on between this first draft and the next pass. So '09-2010 strategies may be called short-term. In either case, keep in mind that where you see sort of a break between short-term, long-term, as a group we may suggest things move from one category to the other, based on priority, based on available resources, both funding and staff. The first two strategies are ones we're suggesting new to the project. Again, bold is new -- to sort of point to, for the applications. This is keeping, sustaining, maintaining, and the most appropriate services.

All the applications we're looking at in this session, and previous sessions, are really aimed at sustaining ongoing services that merit, you know, maintenance. So we're suggesting these first two strategies as a way to just say, preserve these services.

Scott Chapman point out that the other strategies are all opportunities for innovation, coordination, new service, delivery. In the name of priorities, we're going to call those second tier, just because, unless there's funding available at hand, we don't see the region calling it the highest priority. Both of those top two strategies address all the appropriate strategies to point to for all the applications and other efforts you're undergoing to maintain existing services.

Number two is simply put in all plans capital placement program. It's a strategy that is sort of unwritten but if it's not in the plan, and you want to do some vehicle replacement, you will have a hard time pointing to the coordinated plan to say why you're spending \$400,000 on replacement buses. So you want a strategy to maintain our fleet. You want a strategy that says we want to maintain working services. It's very broad, so whatever you do application wise, you can point to.

Elaine Wells asks about a question earlier about whether the estimated costs should be filled in. Would that estimated cost be the true need, or what was actually funded in this last process?

Scott Chapman responds that this is more the true need. If we as a committee can agree on the strategy, then we'll work one-on-one with responsible parties to make sure we have a good cost estimate and an accurate time frame in there.

Teresa Christopherson comments on the responsible party issue. For example, preserving cost-effective services, number one, it lists Ride Connection and transit agencies, but the Mountain Express program is neither. It's not part of the Ride Connection network, although Clackamas County is one of the partners in the ride. All of our service partners need to be working together on that. A preference would be if we would change the language where that crops up while we're working on coordinated services, to language that is similar to another responsible party statement, where we're saying, all service providers, transit agencies, and Ride Connection.

Scott Chapman responds that some people may fall into two categories, but that would be over inclusive.

Scott Chapman then moves on to strategy three.

Strategy three was something that we put in there early on in the process after hearing from some of the rural providers, and also knowing that we were heading the application review and allocation meetings. The question or concerns were related to distributing of limited funds that we do have. A better strategy for number three is how to increase the pie itself so the region as a whole has more money to allocate for all of these strategies as a whole.

A suggestion is to change how it's written, which is how to divvy up the pie. Through three, as it's written here, which is basically expanding the size of the pie, by first working with the state legislature, advocating for more funding in all places.

Julie Stephens comments that everyone want to see more funding for these services, it's a different strategy.

Claire Potter clarifies for new members that this issue has been addressed. We do recognize that over 20 percent of the formula funds go to out-of-district areas, precisely because of just those issues. In terms of the funding that we have now there's not a whole lot more that we can do to redistribute funds, when we have recognized it in the past. The law says that the formula funds need to be based on population, but we have interpreted that law very favorably for the out-of-district areas, because we recognize that there are vast areas of Washington and Clackamas Counties that do not have fixed route service, therefore, do not have complementary paratransit service.

And so when you look at actually in and out of the district, and how the funding is received, they have nine percent of the population, but receive well over 20 percent of the funding.

Claudia Robertson comments that she agrees with Julie Stephens that increasing the funding should be a strategy of its own, not necessarily replacing this one. This plan is going to be in effect, updated, and then

updated again. There is always going to be the discussion of the equity of the distribution of funds, and it should be in our plan.

Claire Potter responds that we need more specifics on this. The next step thing here was what -- "Discuss at meeting to address recent application process and rural provider concerns," sitting right next to "Provide equitable distribution of funding sources," that somehow we inequitably are distributing these funds. The whole thing needs to be put in a positive way as to what we've done, and how we've addressed it in the past, as opposed to that we've done it wrong, and need to fix it now. The goal needs to be stated.

Scott Chapman comments that the strategies need to recognize the rural/urban differences, then the next step is to maintain the work we have done in the allocation process.

Claudia Robertson replies that in language, those first three strategies, since they are grouped together as the top three, I think that those, as just strategies, without any qualifiers. It's just things we do, we preserve our existing, and we make sure that everything gets to where it needs to go.

Claire Potter adds that we need to make sure, then, that we all understand it that way. It's been a very controversial issue in the past, and it's bogged us down badly in the past.

Connie Soper agreed that the choice of words is unfortunate, and we can work to address it, and phrase it in a more proactive and positive way, while recognizing that there needs to be some ongoing discussion or review of it when the plan is updated.

Julie Stephens comments that she concurs with Claire. There has been great work to work collaboratively and recognize what each area needs, and how to best serve the populations. There still is an ongoing concern. Rural providers have not seen increases in funding for four years, and we're still providing more services. A rural provider has the smallest tax base and they provide as much service as most of the other agencies with that. We have to be very creative and resourceful in how we find funding mechanisms to serve the population.

Over the last year state funding, and all levels of funding, has gone to more of a formula, which by its essence will put more of the dollars in the urban centers, where the population is denser. There needs to be an acknowledgment of the fact that it costs more to provide service in a rural area because of the cost of doing business, and what Ride Connection was just saying about job access is true throughout all the rural areas.

Scott Chapman replies that they will work with the interested parties to make sure that strategy remains as a sort of allocation strategy between urban and rural.

Julie Wehling adds that she agrees with what people are saying about this. It's important to have some kind of placeholder for the fact that there are differences between urban and rural, and that we need to, as part of our strategies, balance those needs. How you say that, should be a positive, proactive kind of statement. Also, as a region, we've done a wonderful job in the rurals.

Elaine Wells comments that she agrees with Julie Stephens Julie Wehling. In regards to the innovations there is always a frustration around creating new and innovative programs. As long as that stays as a number one priority, the innovations that we create one year become the existing services three years down the road. We always need to be looking at innovative new services, but we can't negate the people that we're serving with the existing services, that were once termed innovative. So I think that's the conundrum that Julie Stephens was talking about earlier.

Teresa Christopherson brings up the of use the word strategic. That we would be well served to consider using the phrase provide strategic distribution of funding sources. TriMet makes strategic decisions withdraw their request for funding so that they can further enhance the community-based network. We make the strategic decision to, enhance some of the funding resources available to the rural providers. If we focus around that we are making strategic decisions with the scant resources that are available to try to provide the best possible service we can, including in underserved areas. That's really what it boils down to.

Scott Chapman confirms that there will be a new strategy, which is what is called 3B, and this is the one to increase the size of the pie.

Claire Potter then asks Elaine Wells to talk a little bit about the legislative and the advocacy efforts that were involved in to achieve the number three up there on the screen.

Elaine Wells begins by talking about an effort that the Oregon Transit Association is working on. It's a statewide effort, where all transit agencies and all rural community-based services, like Ride Connection, are going out and collecting stories for the legislature. There are stories from every district around the state to promote elderly and disabled transportation.

Originally, the governor had elderly and disabled transportation in his transportation budget at raising the cigarette tax by five cents. His first step was to reduce it to two and a half cents, and now he has taken it out of the transportation budget and put it into health services, and kept it at the two and a half cents a pack. Then Representative Beyer has introduced a bill, a separate bill, to raise the cigarette tax to five cents a pack. OTA had recommended to her that the bill be graduated with the cost of living increase, and she didn't go for that. So her bill is a flat five cents a pack, which would mean we would have to go back in a couple years and ask for more. At five cents a pack, it only addresses today's need.

When the cigarette tax was first introduced 20 years ago, plus, it provided 30 percent of the E&D funding for the state. It's now down to 13 percent. At the five cents a pack, it would raise it to 17 percent. So it's still not up where it was when it was first introduced.

So the E&D funding committee, OTA's E&D funding committee, our goal is to get that funding level up to 30 percent, like it was originally. We have a long, long way to go with that. But at the seven cents a pack rate, it would get us very close, and then if we had cost of living increases built in, it would get us closer, about 27 percent. So that E&D legislative committee, through OTA, that's what we're trying to do, but as of yet, we haven't found a legislator who would promote that during these dire economic times.

Julie Stephens adds that the cost of living, it's not just keeping current with inflationary costs, but looking at the boomer effect, and the fact that as the population -- the aging population increases in ratio to the population, we would be able to manage it.

Elaine asks that anyone is willing to go to Salem to advocate, we would be more than happy to take you down. James Uyeda has put together a list of 20 people who are willing to go, through Elders in Action, and the different service partners. We need folks ready to go, we follow the Oregon Transit Association instructions, and they might call us on a Wednesday and say, we need five people down to testify before the transportation committee, or the ways and means committee, tomorrow at ten. We need people who can drop what they're doing and be willing to go down to testify.

Scott Chapman then brings the meeting back to the strategy and the board. Confirming that there is a general agreement that the goal is to increase funding. The strategy is to get something out of the legislation session. A big part is to participate an advocacy program. We have basically the responsible parties, everybody around the table, and they should reach out to their constituents through their own local electives and make it happen

Scott Chapman continues on to paragraph number four. It was an old strategy, and it was basically initiated what I believe is an M-tip (phonetic) funded project, and has been funded, and now it has to be carried out. That's why the language here, is just make that happen. This is sort of assessing the walkability issue and pedestrian access.

Connie Soper asks Claire Potter who will be actually sponsoring this study.

Claire Potter replies that she believes it is a TriMet-funded project. The idea is to prioritize the pedestrian access improvements that need to be made in the region.

Scott Chapman moves the strategy five. Strategy five is a carryover, and it's highly related to number four. It was sort of aimed at federal highway guidelines. The way it was written before, it was a non-issue, because ODOT said they were already in conformance with the federal highway guidelines. In a previous meeting, we talked about keeping the strategy there to make sure our transportation network works to fill the gaps in the system. These gaps are identified in the study that's going on in strategy four.

Scott Chapman asks if we still see this as two separate strategies. The study's going to identify the needs in the region, and then we want to work

with whatever gaps there are, whether it's sidewalk connectivity, or new paths needed, et cetera, we work to make sure they're filled in. How do you make it aging-friendly transportation. It could be a path, it could be a widened street, whatever it takes to make it work. That's why it would all be specific with a strategy. We just want to make sure that we're keeping a focus on the issue.

Stan Lewis states that we're really going into a land use issue, rather than a transportation issue. As far as the pedestrian movement is going nationally, the federal guidelines is that to promote people to walk as much and as long as possible, you have to provide safe sidewalks.

Scott Chapman moves the next two strategies, the 511, 211 systems. We work to get information into them, so the strategies are staying in the way of maintaining that information.

Claudia Robertson points out that this is the one that Jan Campbell says the 211 and 511 help line is not in here either. In Multnomah County, there's the aging and disabilities hotline, and that's 3646.

Scott Chapman replies that we'll make sure it's in the text of the document. It may be a rewrite just so all the systems are maintained, just so we don't have six strategies for the six systems.

Strategy nine was written as a statewide eligibility issue. We're just saying also to keep on the table any regional differences we may see. Number twelve, the suggestion was to make sure all this information and outreach is done at not just safe driving events, but wherever possible in the region. The old plan looked at rural strategies as an appendix, and a lot of the strategies are listed twice, so we made an effort here to include it all in the same table. Any strategy, whether it's even regional, or just focused on rural, if we think it has a rural emphasis or focus, we're noting that. And you'll see that in the strategies 12 and 13.

In a previous meeting we talked about how this one strategy, which was 14, really was two things at once: the feeder issue, and the sort of helping people make transfers. So 14 stays as the feeder issue, and a strike in the language that was "and travel hosts."

Strategy 15 is a new "assist people making transfers," as a new strategy, listing travel host as an example. It's a way to get people to connect with fixed route, whether it's from community shuttles, or for paratransit, dial-a-ride.

Then the second half, which is now number 15, what you have here is not in your draft plan, because I just thought of the next step language. If we agree that we want to make a strategy about helping people with these transfers the first step is what's in place. There are a lot of programs in the travel training world, and a lot of facilitation, how much are these programs meeting the need of assisting of transfers, and if there's any gaps, what are those gaps, and how do we meet them.

Julie Wehling comments that she would like to see the small transits included in that, because they do a lot of that as well. They help the folks that are in-district make transfers to the TriMet system, or to SMART system, or whoever, wherever they need to go, or between services.

Scott Chapman continues that number 19 is something that was discussed before. The old strategy is written really around the high-tech solution for sharing vehicles. Changing a word here, just make a strategy to increase the use of shared vehicles, and then an online system is just one example.

Number 20 was sort of a combination of the old strategy, with the thought of using retired LIFT vehicles where appropriate. Which is being done in cases. It's just getting vehicles to organizations that can put them to use.

Number 21 was something that came out of a lot of strategies. We're talking about voluntary programs, focusing on how to pay volunteers, et cetera. We just want another strategy to increase the capacity overall of volunteer programs. As far as responsible parties, Ride Connection's there, because that's where it came up. If you want to broaden this, and/or if somebody has suggestions for how, to make this happen as the first next step.

Teresa Christopherson responds that Ride Connection should be partnering with existing voluntary programs in order to enhance recruitment and capacity strategies. Some of these strategies are already in place, including in the rural areas, so just a great opportunity to partner with

existing programs, and then enhance recruitment in areas where there aren't current strategies in place or current systems in place.

Elaine Wells responds that Ride Connection works with service partners on volunteer recruitment. When our outreach specialist recruits a volunteer, they are linked them with a service partner that's in their neighborhood.

Julie Stephen asks about a driver pool, although it may not work in rural areas.

Elaine Wells replies that this came out of the strategic planning process several years ago, where it came up at RTCC, where people thought it would be really helpful to have a driver pool that they could call on. It hasn't worked out, and due to funding. There are also a lot of issues around department of labor laws and stuff. There's a lot of research that has to go into this before it could even be put into place. It's still good to have as a strategy. If we keep this as a strategy, but look at different options, rather than hiring operators, maybe pooling on-call drivers, or something, that might work. But it just raised so many issues around doing that, and then there hasn't been any funding to do it, anyway.

Claudia Robertson suggests that maybe it should go into the long-term strategies. Claire Potter agrees.

Scott Chapman moves on to Number 23, maintaining the distribution and updates and translation on the Tri-County brochure.

Claudia Robertson asks that a correction be made where it says that a consultant and TriMet put together the brochure, when it was actually RTCC and Ride Connection. Claudia Robertson also suggests that gets put in the strategy, because it is still ongoing.

Connie Soper moves on to long-term strategies.

Starting with number 25, this has to do with recognizing the fact that as we consider implementing new innovative services, that we want to take a look at taking advantage of existing resources and capacity to make sure that as a first shot, that they could maybe accommodate some of these newer innovative services.

Julie Stephens suggests that this needs to come out of long-term, and be prioritized much higher. It's using the current structure and resources at hand, and just adding capacity to it, which is a much more efficient use of funds, most often, than adding a new program.

Claudia Robertson adds that, as we were doing those first three, and then adding the other one. Claudia Robertson wants to be sure have had those three, maybe increasing the capacity of existing programs, and new and innovative, maybe that should go right underneath that, and then move to the aging friendly streets and highways. Or the livable community evaluation, move that down, and make the strategic distribution of funds, and then the one that was added, and then make this increase the capacity as number five. It should be up there that high.

Julie Stephens is not sure about the placement, but agrees that it needs to go that high.

Connie Soper continues on to another new strategy, to coordinate with medical facilities to optimize trip scheduling. An example that was provided by Ride Connection is that sometimes hospitals, when they discharge a patient to go home, and that person needs transportation home, if those kind of trip requests could be organized and coordinated, it could be a win-win-win, in that the person would be able to get home sooner, the transportation provider could possibly provide services more efficiently, and the hospital would benefit, too, because they'd have more efficient use of their bed space. So this is just a matter of really doing some outreach, and trying to identify where there would be some immediate payoff, and to try to start coordinating that with some of the larger medical facilities.

Julie Stephens asks if this would be like taking the options brochure to those departments, getting those into the right departments at medical staff.

Connie Soper replies yes. By doing some strategic and targeted outreach, or identifying those facilities, maybe having some one-on-one conversations with folks, and certainly leaving them with a brochure, or some kind of information, would be a good thing.

Claudia Robertson adds that it might even be as much as educating the medical facilities that they need to speak to each other. The people

that are supposed to help you discharge, sometimes find out an hour or so before that you're leaving, and they don't have time to set things up.

Elaine Wells comments that these ideas are all really good first steps. Where this came from is actually replicating something that's being done in Seattle, through Hope Link, which is a nonprofit organization. It has some similarities to Ride Connection.

Claire Potter comments that it sounds like the next step might be to identify a partner, and to look for an opportunity to have one success, and to work with that partner, that hospital, on developing this program. It sounds like a really good idea.

Carol Ryan suggest that there could be some ongoing planning with a position in the hospital, that most hospitals have, called a discharge planner. There might be some type of future program that can be worked out with this particular position in the hospital. There's also a patient representative program, but the discharge planner might be the place to start to see if there could be better coordination with the medical facilities and the transportation that is needed.

Connie Soper moves on to Number 28.

This is to build on some existing marketing efforts, but more strategically develop campaign to promote transit use.

The next thing to bring to everyone's attention is strategy number 30. This is one we talked a little about before. To develop one or two pilot projects that could investigate the feasibility of mingling or sharing Medicaid trips with other types of paratransit trips in order for both kinds of programs to share those costs. Right now, Medicaid and other paratransit and LIFT paratransit program are pretty much separate, but sometimes they have passengers going to the same place, and if they could be put on the same vehicle, and a methodology figured out to share costs, then both agencies could benefit. There would be some complications, and you just have to work out with the state, the department of human services, you know, a protocol to make sure that you can actually track those expenditures. It is something that would be worth looking at.

Dick Jones asks Claire Potter if this is the same as something that came up a couple of years ago. Claire Potter agreed, it is a work in progress. It's a really good idea.

Number 35 would be a new strategy to provide incentives to use fixed route where appropriate. This might be for people who are new to fixed route, or when trained, maybe to provide them with a free pass for one or two trips to encourage them to try it.

And then moving ahead to the next page, new strategies could include reviewing LIFT service standards. This would be to assess whether or not the LIFT service standards in any way exceed minimal ADA standards, and if so, to consider bringing them more in line with the ADA standards.

Number 37, is a recommendation or suggestion that this also be moved up as a short-term strategy. TriMet is going to be meeting with CAT next week to discuss a proposal to make some revisions to their ADA paratransit eligibility process, and that's going to be done in close partnership with CAT over the next year or so. We should be move that up to a short-term strategy.

The next two strategies have to do with connectivity. This is recognizing that when a person has to transfer even within the same system, like from one TriMet route to another, there are sometimes difficulties with transferring, but especially transferring from one system to another. There are still some opportunities to improve the connectivity for passengers who do have to transfer, or make use of more than one service provider, to complete their trip.

Julie Stephens suggest using a similar system that they have used with TriMet. At the Gresham Transit Center, they were able to coordinate with TriMet that the pickup point is at the same shelter, where there's a phone, and a bench, as our drop-off point, which is around the corner from where the normal LIFT drop-off point is and it's known to be the SAM transfer point. It has made a world of difference in connectivity, and the quality of service, the safety of the individuals who are transferring.

Connie Soper moves on to the last few strategies.

The last few strategies are really focusing on some that were raised by the rural providers. The first one has to do with reinstating some of those programs in Washington and Clackamas, that had been dropped, and consider ways to reinstate some of those that had been funded with JARC. Maybe some of those folks want to speak to that?

Then strategy number 43, would be to develop a pilot program to provide a pool of funds for people with no transit options. In other words, they're not eligible for a certain program to get transportation, so it would be kind of a safety net, I think, for people who occasionally need the service, and they're not eligible for any particular program.

Then strategy 44 would be to increase outreach efforts specific to rural transportation programs. And, finally, to reestablish a rural transportation advisory committee to work on some of these issues specific to rural projects.

Teresa Christopherson asks to clarify, that that would need to happen in Washington and Multnomah because Clackamas already has one.

Elaine Wells responds that they've reinstated the Washington County one. The Multnomah County one still needs to be done.

Connie Soper asks if there are any other comments and suggests revisiting the issue of prioritization.

Connie Soper recaps that through the discussion there was a suggestion that increasing the capacity of the existing programs be moved up to the new strategies number five, because we're going to add the new one about seeking additional funding as number four. Then those would be the highest-tier priorities.

There was another suggestion to move the driver pool strategy to be long-term, and moving the eligibility process to short-term. Those that have sort of a designated target date for completion would be considered a second-tier priority, and those that are ongoing would be third, and then the long-term strategies would be the fourth tier.

Connie Soper also reiterates that there will be a chance to look at this again before the plan is finalized.

Stan Lewis asks to be able to make a statement of the meeting formats. Stan states that he found the meeting very disturbing in terms of E&D, particularly the glare from the presentation. He suggests in the future going through materials in a manner that does not require looking at illuminated glare.

Proceedings concluded at 11:45 a.m.