Attachment A Common Acronyms

## Common Acronyms

AARP American Association of Retired Persons

ACS American Community Survey

ADA Americans with Disabilities Act

AVL Automatic Vehicle Location

BRT Bus Rapid Transit

CAT TriMet Committee on Accessible Transportation

CAR Catch-a-Ride

CCAM Coordinating Council on Access and Mobility

CCO Coordinated Care Organization

CCSSD Clackamas County Social Services Division

CL Central Loop

CTP Community Transportation Program

DAR Dial-a-Ride

EDTP Tri-County Elderly and Disabled Transportation Plan

FAST Fixing America’s Surface Transportation

FLAP Federal Lands Access Program

FY Fiscal Year

FTA Federal Transit Administration

JPACT Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation

MTP Medical Transportation Providers

NADTC National Aging and Disability Transportation Center

NTI National Transit Institute

ODOT Oregon Department of Transportation

OHP Oregon Health Plan

OSHU Oregon Health Sciences University

PNA Pedestrian Network Analysis

POV Privately Owned Vehicle

PSU Portland State University

RTP Regional Transportation Plan

RTCC Regional Transportation Coordinating Council

SAM Sandy Area Metro

SCTD South Clackamas Transit District

SMART South Metro Area Rapid Transit

SPD Seniors and People with Disabilities (formerly SDSD)

STF Special Transportation Fund (Discretionary and Formula)

STFAC Special Transportation Fund Advisory Committee

TAC Transit Advisory Committee

TCRP Transit Cooperative Research Program

TMA Transportation Management Association

TNC Transportation Network Company

TRP Transportation Reaching People

WCDAVS Washington County Disabilities, Aging, and Veterans Services

WTS Woodburn Transit

WVDO Willamette Valley Development Officers

 Attachment B Glossary of Terms

## Glossary of Terms

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Accessibility | The extent to which facilities, including transit vehicles, are barrier-free and can be used by people who have disabilities, including wheelchair users.  |
| ADA | Americans with Disabilities Act: Passed by the Congress in 1990, this act mandates equal opportunities for persons with disabilities in the areas of employment, transportation, communications and public accommodations. Under this Act, most transportation providers are obliged to purchase lift-equipped vehicles for their fixed-route services and must assure system-wide accessibility of their demand-responsive services to persons with disabilities. Public transit providers also must supplement their fixed-route services with paratransit services for those persons unable to use fixed-route service because of their disability. |
| ADA Eligible | ADA Eligible refers to eligibility for complementary fixed route paratransit. Individuals who qualify must be unable to used fixed route due to a disability. |
| Boarding Rides | Boarding rides are counted each time a person enters a vehicle. Boardings and rides all refer to boarding rides. |
| Boarding Rides per Vehicle Hour  | The number of boardings divided by the vehicle hours of service. Describes a route’s productivity.  |
| Brokerage | A method of providing transportation where riders are matched with appropriate transportation providers through a central trip-request and administrative facility. The transportation broker may centralize vehicle dispatch, record keeping, vehicle maintenance and other functions under contractual arrangements with agencies, municipalities and other organizations. Actual trips are provided by a number of different vendors. |
| Complementary Paratransit | Paratransit service that is required as part of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) which complements, or is in addition to, already available fixed-route transit service. ADA complementary paratransit services must meet a series of criteria designed to ensure they are indeed complementary. |
| Coordination | A cooperative arrangement between transportation providers and organizations needing transportation services. Coordination models can range in scope from shared use of facilities, training or maintenance to integrated brokerages or consolidated transportation service providers. |
| Corridors  | The Corridor concept is from the 1997 Regional Framework Plan. Corridors are not as dense as centers, but also are located along good quality transit lines. They provide a place for densities that are somewhat higher than today and feature a high quality pedestrian environment and convenient access to transit. Typical new developments would include row houses, duplexes and on to three story office and retail buildings, and average about 25 persons per acre.  |
| Curb-to-Curb Service | A common designation for paratransit services. The transit vehicle picks up and discharges passengers at the curb or driveway in front of their home or destination. In curb-to-curb service the driver does not assist the passenger along walks or steps to the door of the home or other destination. |
| Demand-Response Service | The type of transit service where individual passengers can request transportation from a specific location to another specific location at a certain time. Transit vehicles providing demand-response service do not follow a fixed route, but travel throughout the community transporting passengers according to their specific requests. Can also be called dial-a-ride. These services usually, but not always, require advance reservations. |
| Deviated Fixed Route | This type of transit is a hybrid of fixed-route and demand-response services. While a bus or van passes along fixed stops and keeps to a timetable, the bus or van can deviate its course between two stops to go to a specific location for a pre-scheduled request. Often used to provide accessibility to persons with disabilities. |
| Disability | The limitation of normal physical, mental, social activity of an individual. There are varying types (functional, occupational, learning), degrees (partial, total) and durations (temporary, permanent) of disability.  |
| Door-to-Door Service | A form of paratransit service which includes passenger assistance between the vehicle and the door of his or her home or other destination. A higher level of service than curb-to-curb, yet not as specialized as door-through-door service (where the driver actually provides assistance within the origin or destination). |
| Fare Box Revenue | A public transportation term for the monies or tickets collected as payments for rides. Can be cash, tickets, tokens, transfers and pass receipts. Fare box revenues rarely cover even half of a transit system’s operating expenses. |
| Fixed-route | Transit services where vehicles run on regular, pre-designated, pre-scheduled routes, with no deviation. Typically, fixed-route service is characterized by printed schedules or timetables, designated bus stops where passengers board and alight and the use of larger transit vehicles. |
| Frequent Service | TriMet service that operates every fifteen minutes or better, every day. 16 bus routes and all MAX lines meet this level of service. |
| FY (Fiscal Year) | In Oregon, public agency Fiscal Years start on July 1 of the preceding calendar year. FY 2005 is from July 1, 2004 to June 30, 2005.  |
| JARC (Jobs Access Reverse Commute) | Federal formula funds available to provide transportation to assist low income individuals get to work. |
| Match | State or local funds required by various federal or state programs to complement funds for a project. A match may also be required by states in funding projects, which are joint state/local efforts. Some funding sources allow services, such as the work of volunteers, to be counted as an in-kind funding match. Federal programs normally require that match funds come from other than federal sources. |
| Medicaid | Also known as Medical Assistance, this is a health care program for low-income and other medically needy persons. It is jointly funded by state and federal governments. The Medicaid program pays for transportation to non-emergency medical appointments if the recipient has no other means to travel to the appointment.  |
| New Freedom | Federal formula funds for transit agencies to provide services to people with disabilities that are above and beyond what the ADA requires. |
| Paratransit | Types of passenger transportation that are more flexible than conventional fixed-route transit but more structured than the use of private automobiles. Paratransit includes demand-response transportation services, subscription bus services, shared-ride taxis, car pooling and vanpooling, jitney services, and so on. Most often refers to wheelchair-accessible, demand-response van service. |
| Service Route | Another hybrid between fixed-route and demand-response service. Service routes are established between targeted neighborhoods and service areas riders want to reach. Similar to deviated fixed routes, service routes are characterized by flexibility and deviation from fixed-route intervals. However, while deviated fixed routes require advanced reservations, service routes do not. A service route can include both regular, predetermined bus stops and/or allow riders to hail the vehicle and request a drop-off anywhere along the route. |
| Special Transportation Fund (STF) | State funds for transportation for elderly and people with disabilities. |
| Total Transit System | TriMet’s term for all of the attributes that make transit an attractive choice for riders, including customer information, easy access to transit, comfortable places to wait, high quality transportation (frequent, reliable, comfortable), safety and security. |
| Trip | A one-way movement of a person or vehicle between two points. Many transit statistics are based on unlinked passenger trips, which refer to individual one-way trips made by individual riders in individual vehicles. A person who leaves home on one vehicle, transfers to a second vehicle to arrive at a destination, leaves the destination on a third vehicle and has to transfer to yet another vehicle to complete the journey home has made four unlinked passenger trips. |
| Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) | The UGB controls urban expansion onto farm, forest and resource lands. Metro, the regional government, manages the UGB as required by state law. |
| Vanpool | A prearranged ridesharing service in which a number of people travel together on a regular basis in a van. Vanpools may be publicly operated, employer operated, individually owned or leased. |
| Vehicle Hours | Vehicle hours include revenue hours plus the time it takes a vehicle to travel from the garage to the end of the line.  |

 Attachment C STFAC Membership Roster

## STFAC Membership Roster (march 8, 2016)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Membership Category Description** | **Number of Persons** | **Committee Members** |
| **Name** | **Through Year** |
| Those interested persons who are members of the TriMet Committee on Accessible Transportation (CAT), excepting the CAT member who is a Board member | Up to 14 | Jan Campbell, Chair  | 2016 |
| Claudia Robertson, Vice Chair  | 2016 |
| John Betts | 2017 |
| Leon Chavarria | 2017 |
| Zoe Presson | 2016 |
| Chris Walker | 2016 |
| Paul Pappas | 2017 |
| Patricia Kepler | 2017 |
| Deidre Hall | 2017 |
| Seniors or persons with disabilities who reside in Clackamas County | 2 | Dick Jones  | 2016 |
| Joseph Lowe  | 2017 |
| Seniors or persons with disabilities who reside in Multnomah County | 2 | Raissa Moore  | 2016 |
| Andrea Belcher | 2017 |
| Seniors or persons with disabilities who reside in Washington County | 2 | Ross Mathews  | 2016 |
| Anthony Butler | 2017 |
| Seniors or persons with disabilities who reside outside the TriMet District | 2 | Glenn Koehrsen  | 2016 |
| (Vacant ) |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Membership Category Description** | **Number of Persons** | **Committee Members** |
| **Name** | **Through Year** |
| Staff representatives of the respective County Agencies on Aging and Disability; one per county | 3 | Teresa Christopherson, Clackamas County | 2016 |
| Jeff Hill, Washington County  | 2016 |
| Monica Sandgren, Multnomah County | 2017 |
| Staff representative of TriMet | 1 | Kathy Miller  | 2017 |
| Staff representative of Ride Connection | 1 | Elaine Wells  | 2016 |
| Staff representatives of public transit entities other than TriMet, including a rural transit entity representative | 2 | Andi Howell, City of Sandy  | 2017 |
| Steve Allen, City of Wilsonville  | 2016 |
| Seniors or Persons with Disabilities Living in the Service Area | 4 | David Keyes | 2016 |
| George Payne  | 2016 |
| Ron Thompson | 2017 |
| Mary Lou Ritter | 2017 |

Attachment D STFAC Meeting Summaries

**STFAC Meeting #1**

**Friday, January 29th, 2016**

**Meeting Summary**

Attendees:

Steve Allen

Jan Campbell

Leon Chavarria

Teresa Christopherson

Deidre Hall

Jeff Hill

Andi Howell

Dick Jones

David Keyes

Glen Koehrsen

Kathy Miller

Raissa Moore

Paul Pappas

George Payne

Zoe Presson

Claudia Robertson

Ron Thompson

Chris Walker

Elaine Wells

Dion Graham

Julie Wehling

Karyn Criswell

Melody Macready

Mamak Tabrizian

Molly Hanson

Hannah Quinsey

Alan Lehto

Susan Wright

Zachary Horowitz

Anais Mathez

*The meeting agenda and packet materials can be found online at:* <https://trimet.org/meetings/stfac/index.htm>

**Welcome and Introductions**

Jan Campbell (STFAC Chair)opened the floor at 9:05 AM. All attendees introduced themselves around the room.

**Review of STF Discretionary Fund Applications**

Alan Lehto (TriMet) provided context for the STF discretionary funds.

* He noted that the good news is there are available funds, but the bad news is that there is not enough to meet all the requests.
* He explained that there are two items to for the committee to accomplish:
	+ Provide a recommendation to the state n how to distribute the STF funds
	+ Update TriMet’s Coordinated Transportation Plan for Elderly and People with Disabilities (CTP)

**Coordinated Transportation Plan: Purpose and Desired Outcomes**

Hannah Quinsey (TriMet) introduced the Coordinated Transportation Plan, explaining that the upcoming series of STFAC meetings will set the stage to provide an updated CTP, recommendations to the TriMet Board, and then final approval.

* The CTP packet materials were reviewed, which included:
	+ Agenda
	+ STFAC meeting list
	+ STFAC committee roster
	+ Chapter 1 of the CTP (Vision and Guiding Tenets)
	+ The existing CTP’s continuum of services matrix
	+ Surveys for transit and social service providers
	+ Summary of Oregon Project Independence
* Hannah reminded the group that she and Alan are in TriMet’s Planning Department – their roles with the STFAC is to reflect and support the committee’s consensus. The TriMet Board has approved all new members of the STFAC.

**Scope and Schedule for Plan Update**

Susan Wright (Kittelson & Associates) introduced the role that the consultants will play in updating the CTP, noting:

* The STF funding awards and the CTP are separate processes.
* The CTP will include information on how to make the STF process (for the next funding cycle) better in regards to applications and reporting – though this is a secondary goal of the CTP.
* Susan reviewed the proposed “big picture” agendas for the upcoming STFAC CTP meetings (6 meetings in all, running from January to May in 2016). Two other STFAC meetings will be dedicated to the 2016 STF Discretionary Fund Applications.
	+ The next STFAC meeting discussing the CTP will be on February 19 and cover chapters 2, 3, and 4 of the CTP.
	+ The March 4 meeting will be a worksession where the identified needs will be discussed.

**Process, Roles and Responsibilities**

* The roles and responsibilities of the STFAC, TriMet, and the consultant team were reviewed.
	+ STFAC members have the responsibility to report on the needs of their representative constituencies.
* The updated CTP will not be able to include and address everything. The plan will need to be completed on time and approved in order to prepare for the next funding cycle.
* The “ground rules” for the CTP meetings were discussed – the concept of consensus was defined.

**CTP Vision and Guiding Tenets**

Susan introduced Chapter 1 – Guiding Vision and Tenets and reviewed the 7 tenets. She asked the STFAC to reflect on what they want changed or what they think is missing.

* There was a suggestion to include more of a land use focus, and to possibly include a representative from Metro on the STFAC.
* Missing infrastructure (e.g. sidewalks) can be as much of a barrier to accessibility as service gaps.
* It was suggested that follow-up reviews after STF money has been spent (on service, vehicles, for example) would be helpful in evaluating performance and reporting on the benefits of funding decisions.

**Existing Transportation Services and Needs Assessment – Research to Date**

Anais Mathez (Cogan Owens Greene) provided an overview of research to date. She reviewed the continuum of services matrix and described it as the foundation of the needs assessment work in the CTP.

* The list of transit service providers and details about their services will be updated, and could include two new elements: populations served and the level of service provided (who is eligible, geographic area, etc.)
* Suggestions to update the matrix included:
	+ Grovelink in Forest Grove
	+ Identify Cornelius and Forest Grove as being within the UGB
	+ Add Banks, North Plains, Tualatin, Hillsboro and Estacada
* Alan Lehto commented that only areas with unique services should be included in the matrix.
* There was interest in refining the geographic categories (urban, rural, large and small communities) to provide better details.
* Suggestions included:
	+ Add intercity connections as a way to drive the “coordinated” aspects of Plan, and include overall statewide transit goals.
	+ Include updated population and Census data as part of the demographic section and define geographic service areas.
	+ The level of service should be defined to include day of week, time of days, geographic extents, service frequencies, type of service (door-to-door, curb-to-curb).
* Anais asked all providers and STFAC members to complete the survey that was sent out. She will follow up with phone calls.
* Hannah asked the STFAC who else should be included on the surveys. Suggestions included:
	+ Community planning organizations
	+ Edwards Center
	+ Senior centers
	+ Churches
* It was noted that the responsibility to include social service agency information falls to the STFAC members that represent the social service agency in each county.
* Discussions of transportation needs with a wider audience will occur over the next three STFAC meetings (not including the 2/12 meeting).
* The survey is baseline information that will help identify gaps.

**Oregon Project Independence**

Anais briefly described Oregon Project Independence (OPI), noting their potential role in the CTP process.

* OPI can be an applicant for STF funds
* OPI can help define transportation needs.
* Most transportation needs as part of OPI need to be approved by the state – only Washington County is currently approved.
* Clackamas County is not currently a AAA, and meets some OPI needs through case management and in-home care.

**Next Steps**

* The next steps will be to continue working on updating the first set of chapters, completing the survey results and continuum of services. Susan noted that the team will report back on February 19th.

**Adjourn**

Jan adjourned the meeting at 12:00 PM.

**STFAC Meeting #2**

**Friday, February 12th, 2016**

**Meeting Summary**

Attendees:

Zoe Presson

Raissa Moore

Dave Keyes

Dick Jones

Glenn Koehrsen

Jeff Hill

Elaine Wells

Deidre Hall

Jan Campbell

Claudia Robertson

Alan Lehto

Hannah Quinsey

Kathy Miller

Teresa Christopherson

Steve Allen

Chris Walker

Ron Thompson

Andi Howell

Karyn Criswell

Molly Hanson

Cora Potter

Dion Graham

Jessica Escobar

Kevin Chambers

Patty Fink

Dean Orr

Emily Nichols

Julie Wehling

Melody Macready

Kevin Chambers

Jackie Tate

Joseph Lowe

*The meeting agenda and packet materials can be found online at:* <https://trimet.org/meetings/stfac/index.htm>

**Welcome and introductions**

Jan Campbell (STFAC Chair) opened the floor at 2:00 PM. All attendees introduced themselves around the room.

**Review of the Charge and Timeline**

Alan reviewed the meeting timeline and reminded the committee that the outcome of this meeting is to bring a recommendation to bring to the board the following week.

* Awards are announced in May and money will be ready for expenditure starting July 1st.
* The rankings of all the projects and proposals will be done through consensus unless a decision warrants a vote.

**Review of the Results of the STFAC Project Evaluation**

* A correction is noted to Application #13. The scaled request is now $214,764.
* Hannah noted that evaluation scores were received from 16 committee members. There were six staff, nine non-staff and one unidentified responses. So far, responses reflect the right mix of representation between those that receive services and those that provide services, as per state law.
* Evaluation scores were calculated by looking at each of the scores provided for the transportation goals. These score were averaged for an overall rank. Projects are ranked from highest score to lowest score.
* Ride Connection was able to re-rank the projects within their organization, which is reflected in the updated sheets provided.
* Two questions were posed regarding TriMet’s LIFT fleet information: What is the expected lifespan of these vehicles and is there anything to note about the timing of their replacements? Kathy Miller (TriMet) said she would follow up.

**Straw Proposal Review**

Alan described how they got from scores to straw proposal. Order on the Straw proposal is same as the order of the evaluation scores. Where it made sense, we went with the scaled back amount to see whether it was possible to get many of these projects above the black line.

* Some projects could be plucked out by ODOT and get funded by the statewide pot. Alan proposed to the group that when they take the ranked list, they would identify those specific projects that are good candidates for statewide funding. Do what we can to bolster that argument, allowing more room for projects out of the STF pot.

**Discussion**

Alan opened the floor up to discussion.

* Cora Potter (Ride Connection) clarified the process Ride Connection used for organizing their applications. Generally they fall into 3 categories: network significance, supporting existing programs or expanding programs.
* Claudia Roberson (STFAC Vice-Chair) emphasized that knowing the purpose of the funds was very helpful in scoring the projects.
* Application #19 (Clackamas County Dialysis Project) is identified as a potential fit for statewide funds because it is a delivery model that could be helpful for other rural communities.
* Glenn Koehrsen (STFAC Member) commented that application #7 doesn’t have any cost estimates, i.e. how much are capital expenditures versus operational expenses. Kathy and provided a breakdown of costs.
* Ron Thompson (STFAC Member) commented that a transit center project should be funded primarily by the community.
* Application #3 is identified as a core-service project because it will help continue transit service along that corridor, which may not be able to continue without a new operations center.
* Glenn noted that because this fund comes as a surprise, the opportunity for extra funds should be geared towards projects that need a one-time capital investment that would sustain itself in the long term.
* Elaine Wells (Ride Connection) suggested that those people who were a part of writing the project application and in the room should feel free to answer any questions or provide further information.
* The following data point was offered for the SCTD Transit Center project (which currently operates from Shirley Lyon’s home): when SCTD had their last compliance review by the state, one of the items of note is that it is not a best practice to have a transit service provided out of someone’s home. This project is critical because the ridership of this service is 30% elderly and people with disabilities (PWD).
* Kathy Miller comments that application #3 has been scaled down to the minimum amount necessary to qualify for matching funds from 5310. Application #8 could be scaled down to $100K because that would give them enough to be able to match for other funding pots. That would put TriMet’s overall request at 18% of total funding, which Kathy thought was fair given TriMet’s service area and ridership.
* The committee agreed to prioritize projects that require one-time funds versus those that may be more dependent on continuing expenditures.

**Project Ranking Recommendation (Develop and approve a recommendation to TriMet Board)**

* Claudia moved that the Straw Proposal be used as a starting point and take any amendments that come as discussion moves on. Jan made a motion to approve and the motion passed.
* The committee came up with the following ranking recommendations:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Rank** | **App #** | **Applicant** | **Program** |
| **1** | 9 | Ride Connection | Inclusive Planning for Delivery of Dialysis Trans. in a Statewide Setting |
| **2** | 3 | SCTD | SCTD Transit & Operations Center |
| **3** | 15 | Ride Connection | Vehicle Match |
| **4** | 6 | TriMet LIFT | LIFT Revenue Vehicles |
| **5** | 5 | City of Canby | CAT Vehicle Match |
| **6** | 10 | Ride Connection | Mid Multnomah County Funding Parity |
| **7** | 7 | TriMet LIFT | LIFT Automated Customer Information |
| **8** | 22 | City of Canby | CAT Security Cameras |
| **9** | 16 | Metropolitan Family Services (RC Partner Application) | Metropolitan Family Services Project Linkage |
| **10** | 8 | Ride Connection | Hands Free Fleet Retrofit |
| **11** | 21 | City of Sandy | Deviated Route, "Sandy Shuttle" |
| **12** | 13 | Ride Connection | Server Virtualization |
| **13** | 19 | Clackamas County Transportation Consortium | TRP F/T Paid Driver – Dialysis Transportation |
| **14** | 2 | SCTD | 3 - 20 Passenger Vehicles |
| **15** | 20 | Mary's Woods @ Marylhurst (Clackamas County Application) | LO Medical Rides Enhancement |
| **16** | 18 | Clackamas County Transportation Consortium | TRP F/T Paid Driver – Medical Transportation |
| **17** | 12 | Ride Connection | New Partner Development |
| **18** | 23 | City of Canby | CAT Wilsonville Midday |
| **19** | 14 | Ride Connection | Addressing Unmet Need |
| **20** | 1 | Wilsonville SMART | Medical Transportation for E&D Operations |
| **21** | 4 | Clackamas County | Villages Shuttle Restoration/Expansion |
| **22** | 11 | Ride Connection | Mileage Reimbursement Rate Unification |
| **23** | 17 | Impact NW (RC Partner Application) | Transportation Services |
| **24** | 24 | City of Canby | CAT Southern Canby Connector |

* Jan called a motion to vote on the project ranking recommendation. The vote passed.
* Alan confirmed that Applications #3, 9, 4 and 23 are identified as having statewide significance.
* Jan called a motion to vote on the recommendation for Applications #3, 9, 4 and 23 to be considered for statewide funding. The vote passed.

**Adjourn**

Jan adjourned the meeting at 12:00 PM.

**STFAC Meeting #3**

**Friday, February 19th, 2016**

**Meeting Summary**

Attendees:

John Betts

Jan Campbell

Teresa Christopherson

Deidre Hall

Jeff Hill

Andi Howell

Patricia Kepler

Glen Koehrsen

Joseph Lowe

Kathy Miller

Raissa Moore

Paul Pappas

Zoe Presson

Claudia Robertson

Ron Thompson

Chris Walker

Elaine Wells

Julie Wehling

Jamie Snook

Francine Peterson

Hannah Quinsey

Alan Lehto

Jake Warr

Susan Wright

Zachary Horowitz

Anais Mathez

*The meeting agenda and packet materials can be found online at:* <https://trimet.org/meetings/stfac/index.htm>

**Welcome and Agenda Overview**

Jan Campbell (STFAC Chair)opened the floor at 9:00 AM. All attendees introduced themselves around the room.

* Alan Lehto (TriMet) thanked the group for their efforts in reviewing and ranking the STF Discretionary Fund Applications at the last meeting. He provided an update on the process.
* Jamie Snook (Metro) introduced herself as a new representative from Metro, and described her relevant work as project manager for the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).
* Susan Wright (Kittelson & Associates, Inc.) reviewed the agenda, as well as the overall meeting list and outcomes. She noted the research, stakeholder outreach and survey information that the team has collected in the past few weeks.
* It was suggested that a call-in number is set up for people to dial in should they not be able to make one of the meetings. Hannah Quinsey (TriMet) confirmed that they will send out a phone number for the following meetings.

**Chapter 2: Summary of Existing Services**

Anais Mathez (Cogan Owens Greene) provided an overview of the background research to date regarding the summary of existing services. She reminded the group of the process through which this information was being updated. The Chapter 2 narrative was reviewed, in addition to the Continuum of Transportation Services matrix. The following suggestions were made:

* Add more information about the organizing and coordinating principle for the CTP. Review the former RTCC and their charge and duties regarding the CTP. Elaine Wells and others will help with providing this historical information.
* Add current and upcoming transit projects to the narrative, specifically under the TriMet section.
* Add Columbia County Rider, Yamhill City Transit and Tillamook WAVE to the narrative (all regularly-scheduled fixed routes).
* A question asked whether other services, like the Beaverton RideAbout, Cherry Blossom Shuttle and other deviated-fixed route and shuttle services should be added to the matrix.
* Eliminate the urban/rural service category column, and add TriMet to Cornelius and Ride Connection to Lake Oswego and West Linn
* Jackie Tate has more information to provide about the excerpt on Multnomah County.
* Elaine Wells has edits to provide for the Ride Connection piece.
* Hannah noted that she will send an email to the STFAC with the contact information for the consultant team, should anyone have any more edits to send.

**Chapter 3: Service Guidelines**

Susan introduced Chapter 3: Service Guidelines. She reviewed the narrative, noting the definitions that will be used to define service type (fixed route and paratransit) and service area (within and outside of the TriMet service area). These definitions will help in the review conformance to service guidelines. The following suggestions were made for Figure 3-2:

* Add a separate line for cities that are cut off by the TriMet service boundaries. Organize this table to clarify that if the city is served by TriMet then TriMet provides all of the paratransit services (door-through-door).
* Add a column for deviated route to Figure 3-1
* Change Large Community to > 2500, Small community from 250-2500, and Rural Community to <250
* The language should change from “Guidelines to “Goals.”

**Demographic Overview**

Zachary Horowitz (Kittelson & Associates, Inc.) presented a preview of the demographic update to the CTP. He noted that the demographic information comes from the 2010 US Census and the 5-year American Community Survey (2010-2014). *See powerpoint slides included in the meeting packet for the key facts reviewed in the presentation.*

* He reminded the group that the demographic information is required in the CTP, and provides baseline information about the region to identify how well transportation needs have been served and what gaps exist in service. This helps inform strategies and priorities to address.
* Zachary referred to the set of draft maps in the meeting materials, noting that these visual elements will be included in the updated CTP.
* Jake Warr (TriMet) noted that they have TriMet ridership data that can be provided to identify trends and patterns for seniors and people with disabilities through Honored Citizen passes and LIFT boarding data. Zachary and Jake will connect on this after the meeting.
* A suggestion was made to overlay the various transportation service areas with the senior and disabled population.
* Hannah suggested that another useful map would depict missing sidewalks, data from which could be pulled out of TriMet’s Pedestrian Network Analysis.

**Next Steps**

Susan reminded the group that the next meeting will be a worksession with invited stakeholders that will focus on identifying transportation needs and gaps across the region.

* The preliminary agenda for this meeting will include a presentation that provides an assessment of needs, changes in demographics and changes in service standards. The break-out session will be small group discussions.
* The invite list is currently being compiled, and will include, as per STFAC recommendations, transit service provider staff, community planning organizations, senior centers, mental health centers, adult care programs, among others.
* It was noted that the worksession will have equal, fair representation from across the region.
* Anais will make a worksession flyer for distribution.
* Hannah announced that according to STFAC bylaws, a nominating committee must be formed in order to introduce any new members to fill vacant positions. Hannah noted that they currently have several recommendations for new members, but a committee must be formed first. Vacancies currently exist for Multnomah County, Washington County and the TriMet service district.
* Jan made a call for five volunteers for the nominating committee. John Betts, Raissa Moore, Elaine Wells, Patricia Kepler and Claudia Robertson volunteered.

**Adjourn**

Jan thanked the group and adjourned the meeting at 12:00 PM.

**STFAC Meeting #4**

**WORKSESSION**

**Friday, March 4th, 2016**

**Meeting Summary**

STFAC Attendees

Jan Campbell

Teresa Christopherson

Deidre Hall

Jeff Hill

Andi Howell

Dick Jones

Patricia Kepler

David Keyes

Glen Koehrsen

Kathy Miller

Raissa Moore

Paul Pappas

Zoe Presson

Monica Sandgren

Ron Thompson

Chris Walker

Elaine Wells

Anthony Butler

Leon Chavarria

Other Attendees:

Dan Herman

Zachary Horowitz

Julie Wilcke

Michelle Veenker

Stephan Lashbrook

Michael Parker

Martha Spiers

Amy Vlahos

Luke Norman

Jake Warr
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**Welcome**

Jan Campbell (STFAC Chair)opened the floor at 9:00 AM. All attendees introduced themselves around the room. The agenda was reviewed.

* Alan Lehto (TriMet) noted that they got unanimous approval for the STFAC’s project recommendations. They will go on to the state the following week.
* Jake Warr (TriMet) announced that TriMet’s Access Transit Program has made funding available for organizations that serve low-income transit riders and provide free or discounted passes.

**Coordinated Transportation Plan for Elderly and People with Disabilities: Overview**

Susan Wright (Kittelson & Associates, Inc.) provided a brief presentation of background information on the work done so far preliminary assessment of transportation needs, changing demographics and factors influencing those needs, as well as the level of service standards. Susan also noted the following:

* The goal of this worksession is to further expand the committee’s understanding of transportation needs and service gaps for seniors and people with disabilities across the region.
* The information gathered will be used to inform the strategic initiatives in the 2016 update to the Coordinated Transportation Plan.

**Workshop Discussion**

Kirstin Greene (Cogan Owens Greene) introduced the worksession format and went over instructions and group assignments.

* The room broke out into seven small discussion groups, lead by the following discussion leaders: Jake Warr, Anais Mathez (Cogan Owens Greene) and Jamie Snook (Metro), Susan Wright, Alan Lehto, Vanessa Vissar (TriMet) and Zachary Horowitz (Kittelson & Associates).

*Please see the meeting packet materials for the worksession questions and comment form accompanying the discussion.*

**Report Back**

*Please see the Workshop Summary attached to this document.*

All the groups came back and each discussion leader provided a brief summary of their table discussion. Some of the highlights included:

* Group 1
	+ A need for better weekend service, especially outlying areas.
	+ Better coordination between the region’s various transportation and social service providers.
* Group 2
	+ Better mental health training and coordination between transportation service and medical providers.
	+ 211 Info has access to a lot of resources and could be utilized better as a major clearinghouse for information related to all available services by type of need.
	+ The CAHOOTS program in Eugene was identified as a good model for providing additional support for individuals with cognitive and/or mental health challenges.
* Group 3
	+ Strategies should focus on infrastructure improvements and innovative public-private partnerships to help an individual complete the first or last mile of their trip. Specific focus areas for infrastructure improvements included Aloha and east Multnomah County.
	+ More support for mental health training, and a need for continued non-emergency medical services.
	+ The RTCC should be reconstituted to help implement the updated CTP.
	+ Funding should be more stable so services can be adequately planned.
	+ While technology should be improved, some areas in the region still don’t have adequate web or data service.
* Group 4
	+ Not everyone knows what services are available or how they overlap. Efforts to better disseminate information is needed.
	+ Customer experience is important; additional support for individuals with mental and/or cognitive disabilities should be considered.
* Group 5
	+ The need to better coordinate service with medical facilities, particularly around hospital discharge and dialysis schedules.
	+ Provide on-demand ride matching and e-fare technology.
	+ Provide more fixed-route service and dedicated funding to rural areas.
	+ More community-based circulator service to address spatial mismatch between populations and service area.
* Group 6
	+ Customer experience was especially important, i.e. even knowing where restrooms are located along transit corridors and long medical trips.
	+ Services should be scheduled to minimize wait times.
	+ Social service organizations should employ “transportation ambassadors.”
	+ Two common themes were “getting it right the first time” and “no wrong door.”

Worksession and non-STFAC attendees were thanked and dismissed.

**STFAC Housekeeping**

* Jan gave an overview of the STFAC vacancies for (1) Multnomah County (2) Washington County and (3) Outside the TriMet District and (4) Senior or person with disability.
* Hannah Quinsey (TriMet) provided a brief background of the individuals nominated for the vacancies: Anthony Butler, Andrea Belcher, Mary Lou Ritter and Monica Sandgren.
* Elaine Wells (STFAC) moved that the STFAC accept Monica Sandgren as the Multnomah County provider, Andrea Belcher as the Multnomah County resident, Anthony Butler as the Washington County resident, and Mary Lou Ritter as TriMet service district.
* Glen Koehrsen (STFAC) seconded the movement. Vote passed; no oppositions or extensions.

**Adjourn**

Jan thanked the group and adjourned the meeting at 12:15 PM.
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*The meeting agenda and packet materials can be found online at:* <https://trimet.org/meetings/stfac/index.htm>

**Welcome**

Jan Campbell (STFAC Chair)opened the floor at 9:00 AM. All attendees introduced themselves around the room.

**Needs Assessment Worksession: Report Back**

Anais Mathez (Cogan Owens Greene) summarized the feedback from the last worksession, highlighting the following key themes from the discussion:

* Infrastructure improvements near key destinations such as senior centers, medical offices, etc are especially important.
* More funding is needed from more predictable sources of transportation.
* Better driver training is needed for people with cognitive and/or mental health challenges.
* Real-time, location-based technology services are important but a human hand is always necessary.
* Public-private partnerships can expand the number of transportation providers, encourage software integration and improve customer experience through first-mile/last-mile transportation

**2012 CTP: Overview of Historical Context**

Jan provided a historical context of the CTP.

* Mary Lou Ritter (STFAC Member) recounted the story of how Ride Connection started.
* Julie Wilcke (Ride Connection) recalled that the first plan was put together by a stakeholder group in 2000, prior to the requirement from the Federal government to have a Plan.
	+ When the Regional Transportation Coordinating Committee was established, it was determined that 51% of its members had to have a disability or be an older adult.
	+ In 2006, the Plan was updated and became the “Human Services Transportation Plan.” The guiding tenets included coordinate, innovate, involve the community and improve the service foundation for the region.

**Draft Chapter 5: Strategic Initiatives**

Zachary Horowitz (Kittelson & Associates, Inc.) presented a peer review of innovations and best practices in other Coordinated Transportation Plans.

* The review aimed for geographic diversity and covered agencies that are roughly the size of TriMet.
* Strategies gleaned from other plans were categorized under the themes of funding, technology, customer service and environment and coordination.

**The Future of Coordinated Transportation Services: Guest Speakers**

Hannah Quinsey (TriMet) invited four guest speakers to speak about their vision of the future for some of the themes that were mentioned in the last worksession.

* Andi Howell (City of Sandy) spoke about customer service and the need to coordinate and reframe the conversation between customers and providers that encourages teamwork and coordination to overcome jurisdictional barriers. She also spoke about the opportunity to develop creative, simple solutions to redesign public transit infrastructure like bus stops.
* Dion Graham (TriMet) spoke about the importance of coordinating infrastructure improvements, like bus stops and sidewalks, to provide better access for people with disabilities and the elderly. He also spoke about opportunities for first-mile and last-mile transportation challenges.
* Julie Wilcke spoke about the importance of collaboration, authentic communication and encouraging public-private partnerships to create solutions.
* Bibiana McHugh (TriMet) spoke about technology advancements in transportation, noting the role of data in connecting complementary, on-demand transportation services.

**Guiding Principles and Priorities for Developing Strategies**

Susan Wright (Kittelson & Associates, Inc.) introduced the process for reviewing and updating the strategic initiatives.

* The committee shared reflections on the presentations and the information that resonated for updating the CTP strategies.
* Susan reviewed the updated language between the 2012 CTP guiding principles and draft 2016 CTP guiding principles, noting that the discussion groups will review the updated language for the draft guiding principles, priorities for project evaluation, and draft categories of applications for service expansion or improvement.

**Discussion Groups and Report Back**

The committee broke into smaller discussion groups to discuss the guiding principles and priorities, and the funding application categories. Then the groups came back to an overall discussion. Some of the highlights included:

* Group 1
	+ Guiding principles are generally on track. add evaluation of performance to Principle #6. Add a principle regarding collaboration
	+ Wasn’t a need to prioritize the guiding principles but should be listed. The prioritization should eb determined every time there are funding decision to be made to reflect the current context.
	+ Application categories were helpful. Add category for capital expenditures and a total breakdown of costs.
* Group 2
	+ Do not prioritize the principles, but add language about land use, design and sustainability to the guiding principles.
	+ Funding categories should identify which initiatives are new.
	+ Data operating worksheets are helpful for a breakdown of costs.
	+ Applications need to be presented to the committee, which emphasis on how much of the service will be geared towards the elderly and people with disabilities.
* Group 3
	+ Guiding principles should be prioritized for cost-effectiveness
	+ Require the listing of new partners to demonstrate collaboration efforts.
	+ Add a category dedicated to vehicle maintenance and replacement.
	+ A discussion of priorities needs to happen at each funding cycle to address lower tier applications).
* Group 4
	+ Overall, guiding principles should not be prioritized, but the committee should establish priorities per funding cycle before projects are solicited.
	+ Funding should be distributed equitably and relate to the user.
	+ Multiple application types – include capital replacement.
* Group 5
	+ Guiding principles are on track, and should not be prioritized,
	+ Cost-effectiveness should be considered for each principle, not as a standalone.
	+ Application categories should match to a principle.
	+ Add capital expenditures to each category.
	+ Include demand data in applications.

Anais noted that all the raw data will be included in the next meeting packet.

**Next Steps**

Hannah reviewed the committee timeline and meeting outcomes. Jan commented on the success of the breakout group format and encouraged a similar format for the remainder of the STFAC meetings.

**Adjourn**

Jan adjourned the meeting at 12:00 PM

**STFAC Meeting #6**

**Friday, April 15th, 2016**

**Meeting Summary**
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*The meeting agenda and packet materials can be found online at:* <https://trimet.org/meetings/stfac/index.htm>

**Welcome and introductions**

Jan Campbell (STFAC Chair) opened the floor at 9:00 AM. All attendees introduced themselves around the room.

**Guiding Principles Worksession: Report back**

The results of the discussions from the last meeting were discussed. Some highlights included:

* The group did not want to numerically prioritize the principles
* There was a strong preference for clearly identifying what was a capital request (vs operating or staff)

**Draft Coordinated Transportation Plan elements: Guiding Principles**

The updated draft guiding principles which were included in the agenda packet were reviewed. These were updated based on the feedback from the previous workshop. During the discussion, several points were raised:

* Bus shuttles provided by retirement communities should be included as an opportunity for collaboration and coordination.
* Other specific edits were discussed and noted by the consultants.

**Funding Application Process and Application Overview**

The application process and the form of the application were reviewed. Some questions and comments were raised during the discussion:

* When do we do an evaluation of the funded projects and at what level? How does that coordinate with the periodic reporting?
* Currently, the basic computer system available, especially in rural areas, is not very capable. How do we incorporate advocacy for this into CTP?
* Where do zero emission vehicles fit in the categories?
* Include in Question #6: cultural and language diversity.

The committee broke into smaller discussion groups to discuss the categories, and application. Then the groups came back to an overall discussion. Some of the highlights included:

* Group 1
	+ Generally want some days after the meeting to finalize scores.
	+ Should applicants be able to review their own applications?
	+ Like the categories.
	+ Generally prefer ranking rather than scoring, though scoring should be part of the process to get to ranking.
	+ Interest in seeing straw proposal in categories.
	+ Like the two-form format for applications. May need to update measurable for capital and thinking about how to address projects with both capital and operating.
	+ Make sure website is listed.
* Group 2
	+ First meeting can be scheduled quite a bit earlier.
	+ Categories not missing.
	+ Ranking is helpful, though individuals could do scoring. Ranking should be by category, not overall.
	+ Cost per hour and number of people served would be good additions.
	+ Like the two-form approach.
	+ Move table 2-1 through 2-3 to form 1 so it’s only filled out once.
	+ Consider asking how applicants measure success on goals.
* Group 3
	+ Want to start as early as possible. Ask ODOT to present at the first meeting about what they are thinking for criteria.
	+ Three categories look good. Should add enhancement to service expansion (like new technology, improved shelters, etc. that enhance the service so are like additions but not specifically service related).
	+ Form 1 and 2 make sense.
	+ Keep the scores.
* Group 4
	+ Get info from ODOT as soon as possible.
	+ Reduce bureaucratic barriers and be innovative.
	+ Consider zero-emission vehicles, right-sizing vehicles, and rural services
	+ Consolidate STFAC and ODOT criteria.
	+ Form 1 should include mobility management and travel training (not just direct transit service).
	+ How to include need for advocacy for additional funding.

**Funding opportunity**

Last year the STFAC earmarked $100,000 for a to-be-defined innovative or highly needed project. Alan asked that the committee start brainstorming ideas, noting that future meetings would help narrow options and then decide what this should be spent on. Highlights of the brainstorming discussion included:

* Needs to keep consolidated and updated information about available transportation. Ways to get local information out to those who need transportation. Also consider other information sources beyond web:
	+ Newspapers
	+ 211
	+ ADRC
	+ Ride Connection did some work with social service providers to understand what questions there were. They will send out a summary sheet or example for members to see.
* TNC/on-demand software integration – maybe scoping this for additional future grant opportunities.

**Adjourn**

Jan adjourned the meeting at 12:00 PM.

**STFAC Meeting #7**

**Friday, May 6th, 2016**

**Meeting Summary**
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*The meeting agenda and packet materials can be found online at:* <https://trimet.org/meetings/stfac/index.htm>

*The draft document reviewed at this meeting can be found at:*

<http://trimet.org/meetings/stfac/pdfs/ctp-draft-2016-05-02.pdf>

**Welcome and introductions**

Jan Campbell (STFAC Chair)opened the floor at 9:10 AM. All attendees introduced themselves around the room. Alan Lehto, TriMet, introduced the agenda.

* Karyn Criswell (ODOT) gave a quick update on the STF funding recommendations process. The current ranking has been posted online, but it must still go through PTAC and OTCC. The final outcome will be in June.
	+ Another announcement: On May 27th ODOT will be starting a new 2-year pilot program for a public transportation service that will connect between the Gateway Center, Rooster Rock and Multnomah Falls. There will be 2 ADA stations per vehicle.

**Application Worksession: Report Back**

Susan Wright, Kittelson and Associates Inc., discussed the results of the worksession from the last meeting, noting:

* There was a strong desire for advanced notification of the process.
* The group really liked the 2-worksheet format, and supports ranking the applications. Alan noted that at the last meeting the group voiced interest in a ranking system, but also keeping the scoring system available to support and back up the ranking.

**Draft CTP: Chapter Overview and Attachments**

Susan walked through the major revisions in the draft CTP document. She noted that Tuesday is the deadline for handing in comments, if additional time is needed beyond today’s worksession.

* Yellow highlighting indicates pieces of information that are still missing.
* Description of agency services, summary of deficiencies, and actions are still somewhat incomplete.
* Chapter 1-3 doesn’t have any major changes other than updates provided by the committee. Chapter 4 brings together all the descriptions of what the current needs are and ends with an overview of deficiencies.
* The list of attachments will include meeting and workshop summaries and raw notes.
* Chapter 5 has the most changes. It is condensed with Chapter 6 so that the list of strategies is discussed and followed up with a list of action items.
1. Guiding principles are now called Priorities and Strategic Initiatives are called Actions.
2. Table 5-1, pg 5-3 is organized to help connect the priorities to the actions. It has the Actions separated into 6 major categories.
3. Table 5-4 lists the tiers for the Actions. Currently they are all Tier 1 or 2; Susan asked that the group focus on identifying which Actions could be Tier 3, i.e. those actions that may require more time and funds.
* Chapter 6: Financial Plan talks about the most current federal authorization, along with some highlighted notes.
* Glenn Koehrsen (STFAC Member) gave positive feedback on the document.

**Draft CTP Worksession**

The committee broke into smaller discussion groups to discuss the categories, and application. Then the groups came back to an overall discussion. Some of the highlights included:

* Group 1
	+ The Plan is very comprehensive. The Introduction should mention the social determinants of health to show how transportation is not isolated from these other issues.
	+ Add information about age-friendly communities.
	+ Emphasize wheelchair capacity.
	+ Make language regarding “seniors and people with disabilities” consistent throughout the document.
* Group 2
	+ The Plan needs a glossary.
	+ Provide more footnotes or connections that help reference the action that implements the item being described.
	+ Make sure any subcommittee instituted to see this Plan out consists of CAT members in addition to providers.
* Group 3
	+ A map should be provided that overlays the population of seniors and people with disabilities population with major destinations and the service area.
	+ Include special groups/cultural groups.
	+ Emphasize marketing and advocacy help with community work.
* Group 4
	+ Disentangle actions from projects; make actions more general, and maybe list projects under comments.
	+ Move more projects to Tier 3.
	+ Take out “Elderly” in the Plan title and replace with “Seniors.”

**Brainstorm Technical Project**

Alan asked the group to brainstorm on the use of the funds that have been set aside for an innovative technical project. He reminded the group that they are now halfway into the biennium and they need to decide what the funds get spent on.

* Leon Chavarria (STFAC Member) suggests artistic signage to engage children.
* Kathy Miller (STFAC Member, TriMet) requested that funds be used towards an interactive voice recognition system, which would allow LIFT customers to call into the program and automatically review their trip reservations and ETA. The first module of the program could be provided for 200K and includes the one-time licensing fee. TriMet could match 100K towards the first module. The second module includes an app and web access, which could use FY18 funding from TriMet.
* Elaine Wells (STFAC Member, Ride Connection) mentioned a proposal going around for technology and open source software. She noted that it often provides strength to a grant proposal to show funding available for it from elsewhere. Maybe we could put that towards that project to help strengthen the larger application for funds.
* Alan described a specific City of Portland application called Smart Cities Challenge (in addition to another $8 million national grant called “Mobility on Demand Sandbox”). The SCC is a big grant (40-50$million) for a whole range of things from travel information to air quality monitoring to increased web access. The central idea for Portland is to provide the ability to access all transportation options in one place (either by app or on the web). This includes walking, biking, transit, Car2Go, Lyft, LIFT, Ride Connection, and anyone who is out there providing services. Information on options, cost and travel times would be in one place, and ultimately the app or web interface would allow direct payment. This would be great not only for individuals but also to ensure service providers are not missing customers. Alan suggested that they pledge their $100,000 towards the City’s application for this project.
* Hannah Quinsey (TriMet) reminded the group that they have a short timeline for drawing on these funds; they need to be expended over the next fiscal year.

**Adjourn**

* The May 27th meeting is rescheduled for June 3rd. A simple buffet lunch will be provided afterwards.
* Jan adjourned the meeting at 12:00 PM.

**STFAC Meeting #8**

**Friday, June 3rd, 2016**

**Meeting Summary**

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**
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*The meeting agenda and packet material, including the final CTP, can be found online at:* <https://trimet.org/meetings/stfac/index.htm>

**Welcome**

Jan Campbell (STFAC Chair)opened the floor at 9:00 AM. All attendees introduced themselves around the room. Announcements included:

* New transit service to the Columbia Gorge was a success on opening weekend.
* Congratulations to Patricia Kepler (STFAC) for her front page cover on the Oregonian for Access Recreation.

**Summary of Previous Meeting**

Susan Wright (Kittelson & Associates, Inc.) gave a recap of the last meeting and talk about what we did to incorporate the work and comments prior into the final document today.

* The appendix includes a list of acronyms, glossary, fleet inventory, meeting summaries and STF application information.
* Terminology has been changed to “Seniors and Persons with Disabilities”
* Chapter 2: Swan Island and Washington Park TMA shuttle are added to the list of existing services. A section also notes all the providers that come into the region (i.e. Amtrak)
* Chapter 3: A new map was added on low-vehicle access areas, in addition to a discussion about access to smartphones by income and race, with supporting graphs.
* Chapter 5: the guiding principle of “maintaining existing services” includes the caveat “so along as that service is meeting the needs for seniors and persons with disabilities.”
	+ The cost column is deleted.
	+ Additional strategies include enhancing access and increasing efficiency, with more language regarding caveats and general concerns.
* Chapter 6: statistics were updated, and a new FTA resource was noted.
* Chapter 7: a new conclusion chapter was added.

Hannah Quinsey (TriMet) recommended:

* Adding another action: “A STFAC subcommittee convenes each biennial cycle to review the application forms.”
* Changing the cover photo.
* Updating the page number errors.

**Updated Draft CTP**

Jan opens the floor up for comments and questions. The following edits were identified in the discussion, to be included in the final draft for recommendation to the TriMet board by the STFAC committee. Alan Lehto (TriMet) reviewed them prior to calling a vote:

1. General copyedit for grammar, punctuation and the phrase “people with disabilities” and changing “older adults” to “seniors.”
2. Fix page number errors.
3. Add a new cover photo.
4. Chapter 1:
	1. Include the introductory paragraph about social determinants of health from Glenn Koehrsen (STFAC).
	2. Moved the section on *Development of CTP* before Fig 1-1.
	3. 1-7: delete repeat description of STFAC makeup.
5. Chapter 2:
	1. 2-12: Add 5339 funding source to CAT.
	2. 2-15: Add 5339 funding source to SAM.
	3. 2-22: Add phrase to Ride Connection: “and under other local funding resources.”
	4. 2-24: Add First Transit to last sentence under Multnomah County.
	5. 2-25: Add language about demand response for CAT in the State section.
	6. 2-25: Add section about SAM and South Clackamas to the State section.
6. Chapter 3:
	1. 3-10: Add language about the link between transportation and public health.
7. Chapter 4:
	1. 4-3: Add the Mt. Hood Express stop in Sandy to the transit service coverage map
	2. 4-13: Fix the graph with accurate numbers and explore the option of adding age as another variable, if data exists.
8. Chapter 5 (Action Items):
	1. Item 18: Add STFAC to responsible parties.
	2. Item 28 and 29: Add 211 and ADRC to responsible parties.
	3. Item 28: Change text to “information.”
	4. Item 31: Request that TriMet and other agencies do surveys that include a question about age and smartphone usage to understand the relationship. Add Independent Living Resources as a responsible party.
	5. Item 41: Add ADRC and 211 to responsible parties and change language to say “STFAC and subcommittee to identify likely lead.”
	6. Add section called “Other Funds” and include language about *Rides to Wellness* and other funding sources under 5310.
9. Appendix: Add language for each bullet point under Clackamas County in Attachment F.

Jan announced that a formal vote is needed from STFAC members: Steve Allen, Andrea Belcher, John Betts, Jan Campbell, Leon Chavarria, Teresa Christopherson, Deidre Hall, Jeff Hill, Andi Howell, Patricia Kepler, Dick Jones, David Keyes, Kathy Miller (Susan Florentino sitting on behalf), Raissa Moore, Paul Pappas, Zoe Presson, Claudia Robertson, Monica Sandgren, Ron Thompson, Chris Walker, Elaine Wells, Glen Koehrsen.

* Dick Jones (STFAC) made a motion to recommend the TriMet board adopt the updated CTP with the edits noted. Zoe Presson seconded the motion. No oppositions or abstentions; the vote passed.
* Glen Koehrsen (STFAC) made a motion to recognize the help from the TriMet team and consultants and forward these thanking comments to the TriMet Board. Ron Thompson seconded the motion. No oppositions or abstentions; the vote passed.

**Technical Project**

Alan reminded the group of their last brainstorming session regarding the technical project that should be recommended for funds. He opened the floor for additional feedback and information about the two proposals.

* Susan Florentino (TriMet) described the LIFT proposal from TriMet. The platform will include the ability to confirm and cancel trips through an automated phone system. It is a stepping stone to getting full automated capability for ETA, web booking, smart phone apps, etc.
* Cora Potter (Ride Connection) describes the Ride Connection proposal for an information referral systems integration project. The proposal is primarily a planning project with the goal of creating better access to information for both customers and referral personnel. It will act as a central repository where all the information is kept in a manner that allows anyone to access it, no matter the means (phone, computer, person, organization). An automated web interface will allow people to check, request and cancel rides across multiple systems.
* Kevin Chambers (Ride Connection) explained the open source software called RideClick. The software has a strong level of readability, including referral and integration. The more difficult aspects of this type of technology have been tested and work, but the key thing is that there is a foundation of coordination, cooperation and governance underpinning the technology. The scope of this project could be statewide if they received the funding, but for now it remains regional.
* Glen Koehrsen made a motion to adopt the Ride Connection proposal. Deidre Hall seconded the motion. There was 1 opposition and 2 abstentions. Vote passed.

**Housekeeping**

Jan introduced the topic of setting up a subcommittee for the STFAC in order to start identifying core members. The subcommittee will review the work and action items in the CTP, and can start in September.

* Glen Koehrsen commented that the subcommittee should convene before September.
* The following members identified interest in participating on the subcommittee: John Betts, Jan Campbell, Deidre Hall, Dick Jones, Patricia Kepler, Glen Koehrsen, Raissa Moore, Paul Pappas, Zoe Presson, Chris Walker, Elaine Wells, Michael Parker (non-STFAC member) and Julie Wehling.
* Andrea Belcher asked to receive a hard copy of the final CTP.
* Alan announced that the final decision on STF funds will be decided soon.
* The TriMet board meeting will be on Wednesday, June 22nd at PCC Sylvania. Hannah will send out the address and agenda information. STFAC members should come to support their recommendation of the CTP for adoption by the TriMet board.

**Adjourn**

Jan adjourned the meeting at 11:45 AM.

Attachment E Transit Provider Fleet Data

## Transit Provider Fleet Data

### TriMet Vehicle Fleet

The 267 LIFT vehicles listed in **Table E1** are all owned and operated by the TriMet. All the vehicles in the fleet are currently in active use. Nearly 75 percent of the vehicles are Chevrolets, with the rest of the vehicles’ make either Ford or Dodge. The majority of the vehicle fleet is comprised of medium-size light-duty buses that have more than ten general use seats and three ADA seats. 15 vehicles are E-3 modified minivans that have three seats and one ADA seat. Nearly half of the vehicles in the fleet are five years old or older. Currently, approximately one-third of the vehicles in the fleet have passed their usable life end date, and all vehicles will be past their usable end of life date by 2021.. Less 20 percent of the fleet is considered to be in excellent condition, approximately 25 percent of the vehicles’ conditions are identified as marginal, and the rest of the fleet is classified as being in adequate or good condition.

### Sandy Area Metro (SAM) Vehicle Fleet

The SAM vehicle fleet in **Table E2** is owned and operated by the City of Sandy. All nine vehicles in the fleet are active and comprise several different makes and models. Six of the vehicles are five years old or older and five vehicles have over 100,000 miles. There is one vehicle in poor condition and this vehicle has an end of usable life date in January 2015. The newest vehicle is from 2014, has just over 17,000 miles, and has an end of usable life date in November 2019. Two vehicles, including the newest vehicle, are classified as being in excellent condition.

### South Metro Area Regional Transit (SMART) Vehicle Fleet

**Table E3** shows detailed information on the SMART vehicle fleet. All 12 SMART vehicles are owned and operated by the City of Wilsonville and are currently in active use. Most of the vehicles are Ford or Eldorado models and are medium-size, light-duty buses with two ADA seats apiece. Three vehicles are considered to be in poor condition and more than half of the vehicles are five years old or older. The oldest vehicle is from 2002 has passed its usable life end date in January 2007. The four newest vehicles are from 2013 and have an end of usable life end date in September 2018. Half of the fleet vehicles have more than 100,000 miles.

### Canby Area Transit (CAT) Vehicle Fleet

The City of Canby owns and operates the CAT fleet detailed in **Table E4**. The seven vehicles are all active and have less than 30,000 miles each. Most of the vehicles are either Chevrolets or Gilligs, and range from small, light-duty buses to large, heavy-duty buses. Most of the vehicles either have two or four ADA seats, and one has 16 ADA seats. The smallest buses have five seats and largest buses have 35 seats. All the buses are considered to be in good condition. The oldest bus was placed into service in 2010 passed its end of usable life date in June 2015. The newest bus is from 2014 and is still in excellent condition has an end of usable life date in January 2018. The two large, heavy-duty buses have an end of usable life date in January 2026.

### South Clackamas Transit District (SCTD) Vehicle Fleet

The South Clackamas Transportation District owns and operates all four vehicles from the SCTD vehicle fleet shown in **Table E5**. Each vehicle is a medium, light-duty bus with two ADA seats and 14 non-ADA seats. Half of the fleet is in good or marginal condition and the other half is in poor condition. Currently, only three vehicles are active. The backup or spare vehicle is the oldest vehicle and passed its end of usable life date in February 2013. The newest vehicle is from 2014 and has an end of usable life date in June 2021.

### Ride Connection Vehicle Fleet

All 116 vehicles in **Table E6** are owned and operated by Ride Connection, Inc. Most of the vehicles are medium, light-duty buses with more than 10 seats and either two or four ADA seats. There are 39 vehicles that have fewer than two ADA seats or no ADA seats available. These vehicles are considered small buses or vans and have less than eight seats. More than half of the fleet is five years old or older. Approximately 44percent of the vehicles are in good or excellent condition. 67 percent of the vehicles are lift equipped and 28 percent of the vehicles have an accessible ramp.

### Clackamas County Vehicle Fleet

**Table E7** shows the five active vehicles in Clackamas County’s fleet. Three of the vehicles are medium-sized, light-duty buses with more than two ADA seats in a 14 seat configuration. The newest vehicles are large, heavy-duty vehicles delivered in 2015 and have 37 seats and two ADA seats. Most of the vehicles are in good condition and have fewer than 90,000 miles. The oldest vehicle is from 2009 has passed its usable life end date in August 2014. The newest vehicle was delivered in 2015 has an end of useable life data in August 2026.

 Attachment F Ride Connection Partner Network

## Ride Connection Partner Network

### Clackamas County

The **Clackamas County Transportation Consortium**: Clackamas County Social Services Division serves as the lead organization in partnership with community-based Senior/Community centers around the County. One service offered through this partnership is door to door transportation for seniors and persons with disabilities. The centers contract with Clackamas County to provide a host of services funded by the Older Americans Act, STF and other State and local resources. Some of the supportive services provided by the Centers are nutrition (congregate and home delivered meals), health and wellness activities (fitness/fall prevention classes and health screenings), case management, information & assistance, and reassurance.

Rides for the purpose of coming to the community center for exercise, nutrition, supportive services, or to partake in the center’s monthly/bimonthly grocery shopping trip are scheduled as group rides on the mini bus. Rides to medical appointments, and/or personal business or shopping that is not part of a monthly/bimonthly group trips, are scheduled with volunteer drivers operating their own vehicles. TRP dispatch staff schedule rides primarily for medical and life-sustaining medical purposes as well as limited use shopping, personal business and nutrition (trips to local food banks).

This network includes:

* Canby Adult Center
* Friends of Estacada Community Center
* Gladstone Senior Center
* Hoodland Senior Center
* Lake Oswego Adult Community Center
* Milwaukie Center
* Molalla Adult Community Center
* Pioneer Community Center (Oregon City)
* Sandy Senior and Community Center
* Transportation Reaching People (TRP)

The City of West Linn though their community center provides limited recreational rides outside of the Consortium services.

**Mary’s Woods**, a residential community in the Marylhurst area of Lake Oswego, operates the Shuttle in the Woods service which provides publically accessible transportation Monday to Saturday to locations in Lake Oswego, including the senior center, and also providing linkages to transit centers in Lake Oswego and Oregon City. The service focuses on providing shuttle service to residents of low income housing, seniors and persons with disabilities to access shopping, employment and other services.

### Multnomah County

The **American Cancer Society** Road to Recovery program provides transportation to and from treatment for people with cancer who do not have a ride or are unable to drive themselves. Volunteer drivers donate their time and the use of their cars so that patients can receive the life-saving treatments they need. Patients must be traveling to an appointment required to begin or complete cancer treatment, or to an appointment for complementary therapy during cancer treatment. African American Chamber Of Commerce

**David’s Harp** offers transportation to adults with severe and persistent mental illness. The program provides a shuttle to and from Gateway MAX for the day. Vans are also used to support member integration in the community. This component allows members to discover and access social, educational and health related resources that assist in their psychiatric stabilization.

**Ride Connection Dahlia** – A pilot project established to provide door to door transportation for dialysis patients to test if reliable, affordable and accessible transportation can help improve health outcomes.

**Ride Connection East County U-Ride**-This service provides local area door to door transportation services to seniors and people with disabilities, a daily shuttle to meal sites, and group trips to shopping destinations. East County U-ride also serves the rural areas of East County including Corbett.

**Ride Connection Mid-County U-Ride**- Door to door service for seniors and people with disabilities in areas west of 82nd Ave and east of 162nd Ave. Mid-County provides daily shuttles to meal sites, community centers and shopping destinations.

**Ride Connection Northwest Portland**- Door to door services for seniors and people with disabilities residing in areas of Downtown and Northwest Portland.

**Ride Connection Veterans Transportation**- A service in which veteran volunteers transport veterans in Multnomah and Washington Counties.

**Project Linkage** is a program of **Metropolitan Family Service** that has several parts to it. Transportation is the largest part of the program. They also provide have a Community Visitor Program and a Minor Home Repair Program. The transportation program is a door through door service that serves older adults and people with disabilities. Project Linkage operates 21 shopping shuttles during the week from different parts of North, Northeast Portland and Midcounty to take people to grocery stores and food banks. They also collaborate with the service center at Ride Connection to take people to medical appointments, dialysis, cancer treatments and any other requests that clients might have.

**Neighborhood House** provides door-to-door transportation to adults 60 and over and adults with disabilities residing in SW Portland. Trips are provided by paid and volunteer drivers in fleet vehicles and volunteers’ personal vehicles. Services include pre-scheduled shopping shuttles in SW and downtown Portland, and recreational group trips for the Neighborhood House Senior Center.

**Northwest Pilot Project’s** Transportation Program provides door through door rides to seniors and people with disabilities who live in downtown Portland and who are unable to take fixed-route public transportation. NWPP provides rides for medical, shopping and personal business needs, with highest priority given to medical appointments. Albertina Kerr

**Impact NW** provides escorted door-through-door transportation services to seniors over the age of 60 and adults of any age with disabilities residing in SE Portland or accessing services at the Multi-cultural Senior Center on SE Belmont. Impact NW has vehicles that are lift equipped for individuals who have wheelchairs or scooters.

**Providence Elderplace** is a Program of All Inclusive Care for the Elderly. Along with coordinated care solutions, we provide transportation for program participants from home, to and from medical appointments, the social center and ElderPlace coordinated events and outings. We also collaborate with area programs to provide trips for shopping, nutrition, and recreational opportunities.The

**Urban League** provides door to door services to seniors living in the North/Northeast communities. The service includes but is not limited to, Medical appointments, Medication pickups/Personal Business/Supportive services/Shopping/Recreation/Daily visits to meal sites for nutritional needs.

Washington County

The **American Cancer Society** Road to Recovery program provides transportation to and from treatment for people with cancer who do not have a ride or are unable to drive themselves. Volunteer drivers donate their time and the use of their cars so that patients can receive the life-saving treatments they need. Patients must be traveling to an appointment required to begin or complete cancer treatment, or to an appointment for complementary therapy during cancer treatment.

**Edwards Center (client-based services only)**

**LifeWorks Northwest\Michael’s Place (client-based services only)**

**Ride Connection Dahlia** – A pilot project established to provide door to door transportation for dialysis patients to test if reliable, affordable and accessible transportation can help improve health outcomes.

**Ride Connection Forest Grove**- Provides door to door transportation to older adults and people with disabilities in Forest Grove and Cornelius. Ride Connection’s Forest Grove office also coordinates the Washington County Community Bus (which picks up rural riders in Banks and North Plains to connect with the Hillsboro Transit Center) and GroveLink, the Forest Grove community connector.

**Ride Connection Veterans Transportation**- A service in which veteran volunteers transport veterans in Multnomah and Washington Counties.

**Ride Connection Washington County General Public**- Door to door service for all Washington county residents residing in areas outside the TriMet service district and within the city limits of Banks, North Plains, and Gaston. Riders are transported to destinations in Forest Grove, Cornelius or Hillsboro where they can access public transportation.

**Ride Connection Washington County U-Ride-** Door to door service for seniors and people with disabilities serving the urban areas of Washington County.

**Tualatin Valley Workshop (client-based services only)**

**Maryville Nursing Home (client-based services only)**

**Providence Elderplace** is a Program of All Inclusive Care for the Elderly. Along with coordinated care solutions, we provide transportation for program participants from home, to and from medical appointments, the social center and ElderPlace coordinated events and outings. Providence Elderplace also collaborates with area programs to provide trips for shopping, nutrition, and recreational opportunities.

Attachment G Performance Measures and Reporting

## Attachment G: Performance Measures and reporting

Performance measures have a variety of different uses. The funding applications that the STFAC evaluates include a variety of performance measures related to the projects and programs seeking funding. The STFAC also receives monthly reports that include data and performance measures from each of the transit providers within the tri-County area. The STFAC desires to update the monthly reports to provide data that is:

* more directly related to the performance measures reported in the funding applications;
* provides information that helps the STFAC understand how well they are serving seniors and persons with disabilities, how many people they are serving, and what progress is being made on implementing the CTP; and,
* aides the STFAC in their decision making; and,
* is succinct and not overly burdensome on the providers to prepare.

The types of performance measures that may be useful to the STFAC include measures that do the following:

* Assess compliance with federal regulations such as the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)
* Evaluating the merits of funding applications with the TDP Guiding Principles
* Evaluate the performance of providers
* Evaluate the performance of a specific program or project funded by the STFAC
* Identify unmet needs per the TDP Service Guidelines
* Identify program or project benefits to customers and the community
* Identify how many additional people are being served or helped by a program funded by the STFAC
* Document customer satisfaction

Characteristics of effective performance measurement that should be considered when selecting performance measures include:

* Stakeholder acceptance
* Linkage to goals
* Clarity
* Reliability and credibility
* Variety of measures
* Number of measures
* Level of detail
* Flexibility
* Realism of goals and targets
* Timeliness
* Integration into agency decision-making

The following provides a list of performance measures relevant to paratransit, dial-a-ride, and small fixed route systems which may be applicable to the types of programs and projects that the STFAC evaluates. The CTP Guiding Principles that the measure could help evaluate are identified.

It is recommended that the smallest number of measures that address priority policy issues be used. Too many measures tend to obscure the most important needs and can hinder effective management.

Additional information on each of these measures can be found in the Transit Cooperative Research Program (TCRP) Report 88: A Guidebook for Developing a Transit Performance-Measurement System.

<http://onlinepubs.trb.org/onlinepubs/tcrp/tcrp_report_88/Guidebook.pdf>

**Table 1 Potential Performance Measures**

|  | Relationship to CTP Priorities |
| --- | --- |
| **How many people are being served?** | **What or how much area is being served?**  | **Is capacity adequate?**  | **Is the service accessible?** | **Are the vehicles adequate or in good repair?** | **How cost-effective is the service?** | **Is the distribution of service equitable?** | **How is the rider experience?**  |
| Revenue hours | x |  | x |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stop accessibility | x |  |  | x |  |  |  | x |
| Passengers per mile | x |  |  |  |  | x |  |  |
| Passengers per hour | x |  |  |  |  | x |  |  |
| Passenger trips per employee | x |  |  |  |  | x |  |  |
| Percentage of no-shows | x |  |  |  |  |  | x | x |
| Service Hours | x |  |  |  |  |  |  | x |
| Total annual ridership | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Passenger miles traveled | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Trips per vehicle | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No shows and late cancelations | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Service coverage area |  | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hours of service |  | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Capital resource utilization Peak-to-Base Ratio |  |  | x |  |  | x |  |  |
| Demand to Capacity Ratio |  |  | x |  |  | x |  |  |
| Percentage of missed phone calls |  |  | x |  |  |  |  | x |
| Percentage of calls held excessively long |  |  | x |  |  |  |  | x |
| Response time |  |  | x |  |  |  |  | x |
| Passenger capacity |  |  | x |  |  |  |  |  |
| Service denials |  |  | x |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage of stops with shelters and benches |  |  |  | x |  |  |  | x |
| Equipment reliability |  |  |  | x |  |  |  | x |
| Maintenance work orders per bus model vs. total fleet |  |  |  | x |  |  |  |  |
| Fleet composition |  |  |  |  | x | x |  | x |
| Miles between safety incidents |  |  |  |  | x |  |  | x |
| Average age of fleet |  |  |  |  | x |  |  | x |
| Van miles per trouble call |  |  |  |  | x |  |  | x |
| Injuries per 100,000 passenger boardings |  |  |  |  | x |  |  | x |
| Equipment reliability |  |  |  |  | x |  |  | x |
| Road calls |  |  |  |  | x |  |  | x |
| Preventative maintenance inspections completed |  |  |  |  | x |  |  |  |
| Percentage of vehicles placed into service |  |  |  |  | x |  |  |  |
| Mean vehicle age |  |  |  |  | x |  |  |  |
| Subsidy per passenger |  |  |  |  |  | x | x |  |
| Cost per vehicle hour |  |  |  |  |  | x |  |  |
| Cost per vehicle mile |  |  |  |  |  | x |  |  |
| Cost per trip |  |  |  |  |  | x |  |  |
| Operating expense |  |  |  |  |  | x |  |  |
| Service Equity |  |  |  |  |  |  | x |  |
| Local Index of Transit Availability |  |  |  |  |  |  | x |  |
| Passenger Complaints |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | x |
| Passenger commendations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | x |
| Vehicle accidents |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | x |
| Late trips |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | x |
| On-time Performance (demand-responsive) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | x |
| Customer satisfaction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | x |

Attachment H Demographic Data

Table H1. Tri-County Population Profile

|   | 2010 Population | 2014 Population | 2035 Population Forecast | Annual Population Growth | Land Area (sq mi) | Population Density (pers / sq mi) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Clackamas County** | **375,992** | **384,697** | **512,731** | **0.6%** | **1864.01** | **202** |
| Barlow | 135 | 170 |  | 5.9% | 0.05 | 2,610 |
| Canby | 15,829 | 16,821 |  | 1.5% | 4.37 | 3,626 |
| Damascus | 10,539 | 10,711 |  | 0.4% | 15.23 | 692 |
| Estacada | 2,695 | 2,860 |  | 1.5% | 2.22 | 1,213 |
| Gladstone | 11,497 | 11,668 |  | 0.4% | 2.37 | 4,852 |
| Happy Valley | 13,903 | 15,693 |  | 3.1% | 9.42 | 1,476 |
| Johnson City | 566 | 573 |  | 0.3% | 0.06 | 9,040 |
| Lake Oswego | 36,619 | 37,310 |  | 0.5% | 10.76 | 3,404 |
| Milwaukie | 20,291 | 20,449 |  | 0.2% | 4.93 | 4,120 |
| Molalla | 8,108 | 8,247 |  | 0.4% | 2.31 | 3,503 |
| Oregon City | 31,859 | 33,834 |  | 1.5% | 9.64 | 3,306 |
| Rivergrove | 289 | 322 |  | 2.7% | 0.18 | 1,578 |
| Sandy | 9,570 | 9,945 |  | 1.0% | 3.35 | 2,855 |
| Tualatin | 26,054 | 26,604 |  | 0.5% | 8.11 | 3,213 |
| West Linn | 25,109 | 25,710 |  | 0.6% | 7.53 | 3,334 |
| Wilsonville | 19,509 | 20,335 |  | 1.0% | 7.29 | 2,674 |
| *Unincorporated* | *143,555* | *143,615* |  | *0.0%* | *1776.23* | *81* |
| **Multnomah County** | **735,334** | **757,371** | **909,947** | **0.7%** | **433.58** | **1,696** |
| Fairview | 8,920 | 9,094 |  | 0.5% | 3.15 | 2,827 |
| Gresham | 105,594 | 108,250 |  | 0.6% | 23.41 | 4,510 |
| Maywood Park | 752 | 894 |  | 4.4% | 0.17 | 4,479 |
| Portland | 583,776 | 602,568 |  | 0.8% | 134.36 | 4,345 |
| Troutdale | 15,962 | 16,339 |  | 0.6% | 5.92 | 2,695 |
| Wood Village | 3,878 | 3,946 |  | 0.4% | 0.95 | 4,073 |
| *Unincorporated* | *16,452* | *16,280* |  | *-0.3%* | *265.60* | *62* |
| **Washington County** | **529,710** | **547,451** | **782,316** | **0.8%** | **723.24** | **732** |
| Banks | 1,777 | 1,699 |  | -1.1% | 0.67 | 2,635 |
| Beaverton | 89,803 | 92,593 |  | 0.8% | 19.60 | 4,582 |
| Cornelius | 11,869 | 12,068 |  | 0.4% | 2.02 | 5,863 |
| Durham | 1,351 | 1,327 |  | -0.4% | 0.41 | 3,318 |
| Forest Grove | 21,083 | 22,070 |  | 1.2% | 5.86 | 3,599 |
| Gaston | 637 | 703 |  | 2.5% | 0.34 | 1,858 |
| Hillsboro | 91,611 | 95,765 |  | 1.1% | 24.64 | 3,717 |
| King City | 3,111 | 3,351 |  | 1.9% | 0.70 | 4,423 |
| North Plains | 1,947 | 1,868 |  | -1.0% | 0.91 | 2,149 |
| Sherwood | 18,194 | 18,687 |  | 0.7% | 4.33 | 4,202 |
| Tigard | 48,035 | 49,633 |  | 0.8% | 12.68 | 3,789 |
| *Unincorporated* | *240,292* | *247,687* |  | *0.8%* | *651.07* | *369* |

Source: 2010 Population, US Census Table P1; 2014 Population, American Community Survey Table B01003, Oregon Office of Economic Analysis.

Table H2. Largest Employment Nodes

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Primary Employer / Site | County | City | Jobs |
| [Oregon Health & Science University](http://www.ohsu.edu/)  | Multnomah | Portland | 19,439 |
| Nike, Inc. – Main Campus | Washington | Unincorporated | 8,462 |
| Providence Health and Services – Headquarters | Multnomah | Portland | 7,993 |
| Intel Corporation – Main Campus | Washington | Hillsboro | 7,691 |
| Portland State University | Multnomah | Portland | 6,331 |
| Intel Corporation – Jones Farm Campus | Washington | Hillsboro | 5,608 |
| Kaiser Permanente – Sunnyside Medical Center | Clackamas | Unincorporated | 5,205 |
| Portland International Airport | Multnomah | Portland | 5,007 |
| Washington Square | Washington | Tigard | 4,921 |
| Lloyd Center | Multnomah | Portland | 4,610 |
| Providence St. Vincent Medical Center | Washington | Unincorporated | 4,572 |
| Commercial Zone – I-5 / OR 217 Jct. Northwest | Washington | Tigard | 4,522 |
| Providence Portland Medical Center | Multnomah | Portland | 3,938 |
| Shipyard Commerce Center – Swan Island | Multnomah | Portland | 3,273 |
| Boeing Company | Multnomah | Gresham | 3,151 |
| Legacy Emmanuel Medical Center | Multnomah | Portland | 3,022 |
| US Bankcorp Tower | Multnomah | Portland | 2,987 |
| Portland Community College – Sylvania | Multnomah | Portland | 2,828 |
| Murray Business Center / Providence Health | Washington | Beaverton | 2,775 |
| Clackamas Town Center | Clackamas | Unincorporated | 2,691 |
| Kaiser Permanente – 500 Multnomah Street | Multnomah | Portland | 2,312 |
| Commercial Zone – OR 217 / OR 99W Jct. South | Washington | Tigard | 2,232 |
| Commercial Zone – Sandy Boulevard / NE 181st Avenue Southwest | Multnomah | Gresham | 2,231 |
| Industrial Zone – OR 99W / SW 124th Avenue Southwest | Washington | Tualatin | 2,223 |
| Commercial Zone – OR 217 / SW Hall Boulevard Southwest | Washington | Beaverton | 2,149 |
| World Trade Center – Portland | Multnomah | Portland | 2,134 |
| Commercial Zone - Centerpointe Drive | Clackamas | Lake Oswego | 2,133 |
| Clackamas County Administration | Clackamas | Oregon City | 2,054 |
| Adventist Medical Center | Multnomah | Portland | 2,045 |
| Commercial Zone - Merlo Road  | Washington | Beaverton | 2,025 |
| Moda Tower | Multnomah | Portland | 2,000 |

Source: Longitudinal Employment & Housing Dynamic - 2014.

Table H3. Income, Employment, and English Proficiency

|   | Median Income | Mean Travel Time to Work | Unemployment Rate | Non-English Speaking Population |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Clackamas County** | **$64,700** | **27.4** | **4.7%** | **4.6%** |
| Barlow | $34,922 | 17.8 | 8.4% | 20.7% |
| Canby | $58,653 | 26.6 | 5.0% | 9.9% |
| Damascus | $85,708 | 30.9 | 4.4% | 3.7% |
| Estacada | $42,674 | 34.7 | 5.1% | 2.9% |
| Gladstone | $54,494 | 26.8 | 4.8% | 5.3% |
| Happy Valley | $100,438 | 28.9 | 3.7% | 9.0% |
| Johnson City | $33,269 | 24.1 | 4.1% | 15.8% |
| Lake Oswego | $84,244 | 23.5 | 4.5% | 3.7% |
| Milwaukie | $55,827 | 24.3 | 5.0% | 3.9% |
| Molalla | $52,193 | 32.5 | 4.8% | 3.4% |
| Oregon City | $59,429 | 26.4 | 4.8% | 3.1% |
| Rivergrove | $105,500 | 20.6 | 3.3% | 4.3% |
| Sandy | $56,476 | 29.1 | 4.2% | 2.9% |
| Tualatin | $65,903 | 22.5 | 4.7% | 7.5% |
| West Linn | $83,933 | 24.8 | 4.0% | 2.6% |
| Wilsonville | $58,757 | 23.8 | 4.4% | 4.7% |
| *Unincorporated* | *$57,437* | *30.2* | 5.0% | *4.2%* |
| **Multnomah County** | **$52,845** | **25.1** | **4.8%** | **9.3%** |
| Fairview | $53,381 | 22.3 | 2.6% | 10.1% |
| Gresham | $47,706 | 27.6 | 5.9% | 13.3% |
| Maywood Park | $71,518 | 22.6 | 3.5% | 1.3% |
| Portland | $53,230 | 24.7 | 4.6% | 8.9% |
| Troutdale | $58,790 | 25.4 | 6.3% | 5.6% |
| Wood Village | $37,268 | 27.4 | 6.9% | 12.4% |
| *Unincorporated* | *$64,730* | *25.4* | 4.8% | *2.2%* |
| **Washington County** | **$65,272** | **24.2** | **4.3%** | **9.3%** |
| Banks | $77,115 | 28.4 | 4.3% | 0.2% |
| Beaverton | $57,068 | 23.7 | 4.5% | 11.1% |
| Cornelius | $55,203 | 23.6 | 8.0% | 22.5% |
| Durham | $66,094 | 23.0 | 3.1% | 3.5% |
| Forest Grove | $48,365 | 25.5 | 5.3% | 8.5% |
| Gaston | $52,917 | 30.0 | 13.9% | 3.3% |
| Hillsboro | $66,668 | 24.3 | 4.1% | 12.8% |
| King City | $33,662 | 23.8 | 3.7% | 3.2% |
| North Plains | $73,750 | 26.8 | 4.3% | 2.2% |
| Sherwood | $84,360 | 26.8 | 3.7% | 3.7% |
| Tigard | $60,849 | 22.6 | 4.1% | 8.6% |
| *Unincorporated* | *$69,971* | *24.3* | 4.1% | *7.6%* |

Source: Median Income, American Community Survey Table S1903 (2010-2014 5 Year Estimate); Mean Travel Time to Work, American Community Survey Table B08013 (2010-2014 5 Year Estimate); Unemployment Rate, American Community Survey Table S2301 (2010-2014 5 Year Estimate), normalized by the regional unemployment rate reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics; Non-English Speaking Population, American Community Survey Table DP02 (2010-2014 5 Year Estimate).

Table H4. Population of Seniors and Persons with Disabilities

|   | 2010 Population | 65 and Over Population | % Over 65 | Population with Disabilities | % with Disabilities |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Clackamas County** | **375,992** | **51,231** | **13.6%** | **45,777** | **11.9%** |
| Barlow | 135 | 17 | 12.6% | 22 | 12.9% |
| Canby | 15,829 | 2,247 | 14.2% | 1,881 | 11.2% |
| Damascus | 10,539 | 1,406 | 13.3% | 1,338 | 12.5% |
| Estacada | 2,695 | 347 | 12.9% | 414 | 14.5% |
| Gladstone | 11,497 | 1,581 | 13.8% | 1,726 | 14.8% |
| Happy Valley | 13,903 | 1,138 | 8.2% | 1,398 | 8.9% |
| Johnson City | 566 | 105 | 18.6% | 105 | 18.3% |
| Lake Oswego | 36,619 | 5,918 | 16.2% | 3,071 | 8.2% |
| Milwaukie | 20,291 | 2,767 | 13.6% | 2,472 | 12.1% |
| Molalla | 8,108 | 797 | 9.8% | 1,564 | 19.0% |
| Oregon City | 31,859 | 3,555 | 11.2% | 4,206 | 12.4% |
| Rivergrove | 289 | 53 | 18.3% | 30 | 9.3% |
| Sandy | 9,570 | 977 | 10.2% | 1,106 | 11.1% |
| Tualatin | 26,054 | 1,819 | 7.0% | 2,608 | 9.8% |
| West Linn | 25,109 | 2,785 | 11.1% | 2,200 | 8.6% |
| Wilsonville | 19,509 | 2,597 | 13.3% | 1,737 | 8.5% |
| *Unincorporated* | *143,555* | *23,139* | *16.1%* | *19,921* | *13.9%* |
| **Multnomah County** | **735,334** | **77,423** | **10.5%** | **94,564** | **12.5%** |
| Fairview | 8,920 | 890 | 10.0% | 1,763 | 19.4% |
| Gresham | 105,594 | 11,321 | 10.7% | 16,008 | 14.8% |
| Maywood Park | 752 | 118 | 15.7% | 113 | 12.6% |
| Portland | 583,776 | 60,789 | 10.4% | 72,519 | 12.0% |
| Troutdale | 15,962 | 1,215 | 7.6% | 1,858 | 11.4% |
| Wood Village | 3,878 | 291 | 7.5% | 617 | 15.6% |
| *Unincorporated* | *16,452* | *2,799* | *17.0%* | *1,686* | *10.4%* |
| **Washington County** | **529,710** | **53,109** | **10.0%** | **52,989** | **9.7%** |
| Banks | 1,777 | 70 | 3.9% | 169 | 9.9% |
| Beaverton | 89,803 | 9,374 | 10.4% | 9,502 | 10.3% |
| Cornelius | 11,869 | 744 | 6.3% | 444 | 3.7% |
| Durham | 1,351 | 139 | 10.3% | 110 | 8.3% |
| Forest Grove | 21,083 | 2,599 | 12.3% | 3,324 | 15.1% |
| Gaston | 637 | 38 | 6.0% | 109 | 15.5% |
| Hillsboro | 91,611 | 7,155 | 7.8% | 8,751 | 9.1% |
| King City | 3,111 | 1,494 | 48.0% | 612 | 18.3% |
| North Plains | 1,947 | 180 | 9.2% | 246 | 13.2% |
| Sherwood | 18,194 | 1,240 | 6.8% | 1,377 | 7.4% |
| Tigard | 48,035 | 5,413 | 11.3% | 5,081 | 10.2% |
| *Unincorporated* | *240,292* | *24,663* | *10.3%* | *23,264* | *9.4%* |

Source: Population Over 65, US Census Table DP-1(2010); Population with Disabilities, American Community Survey Table DP02 (2010-2014 5 Year Estimate) – Percentage calculated using 2014 estimated population.

Attachment I Summary of Stakeholder Workshop

**TriMet Coordinated Transportation Plan for Elderly and People with Disabilities**

**March 4th 2016 Stakeholder Worksession Summary**

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Thank you for your engagement in the Needs Assessment worksession for TriMet’s Coordinated Transportation Plan for Elderly and People with Disabilities (CTP). Your participation in the small group discussions and in sharing your comments helped make the Special Transportation Fund Advisory Committee (STFAC) worksession a great success. Together, we discussed the transportation needs, challenges and gaps for seniors and people with physical and/or cognitive disabilities. We identified the geographic, regulatory and structural barriers to addressing these needs, and shared ideas and strategies. The following provides some highlights from the worksession conversations and comments. A complete inventory of comments will be included in an appendix to the updated Plan.

**Over 50 people provided feedback, either through the worksession or online. Among you were seniors, persons with physical and/or cognitive disabilities and users of the transportation system, representing sixteen social service agencies and eight transit service providers across the tri-county area that include:**

* Albertina Kerr
* Canby Area Transit (CAT)
* Cascadia Behavioral Health
* Centerstone
* City of Forest Grove
* Clackamas Community College
* Clackamas County Disability Services

Advisory Council (DSAC)

* Clackamas County Social Services
* Clackamas County Transportation
* Consortium
* Committee on Accessible Transportation
* Community Partners for Affordable

Housing

* Community Vision
* Edwards Senior Center, Inc.
* Hollywood Senior Center
* Lifeworks NW
* Metro
* Multnomah Aging, Disability and Veterans Services

Division (ADVS)

* National Alliance on Mental Illness, Clackamas County
* Ride Connection
* Sandy Area Metro (SAM)
* South Metro Area Regional Transit (SMART)
* Special Transportation Funds Advisory Committee (STFAC)
* TriMet
* Vocational Rehabilitation
* Washington County Disability, Aging and Veteran
* Services (DAVS)
* Western Psychological
* 211 Info

**Key Themes**

*“As good as our system is, it is far from perfect. Many seniors and people with disabilities live in areas where land and housing is available. This puts them in areas where fixed route may be available, but not necessarily accessible. Last mile service, evening and weekend service, local service are all lacking in these outlying areas.”*

***General Trends***

* **Shifting demographics and displacement.** Rapid growth and rising housing costs have shifted the region’s aging and transit-dependent populations to outlying areas that are not well served by fixed-route service, and consequently not well served by paratransit.
* **Infrastructure improvements near key destinations.** Paved roads, complete sidewalks and curb cuts greatly affects an individual’s ability to access public transportation when they have a disability. While basic infrastructure still lacks in more rural areas, improvements should focus around destinations that accommodate a higher traffic of individuals with physical and/or cognitive disabilities, such as senior centers and medical offices. For example, corridors such as the Tualatin Valley Highway and facilities such as the Edwards Senior Center lack sidewalks to connect its users to the transportation system.
* **Funding gaps**. Overall, participants agreed that there is a desire to see more funding from predictable sources for transportation services that meet the needs of seniors and people with physical and/or cognitive disabilities.

***Customer Service and Environment***

* **Driver training for people with cognitive and/or mental health challenges.** Participants expressed a need for more comprehensive driver training in order to better serve individuals with cognitive or mental health challenges. In addition, providing support personnel or audio/visual distraction for riders may help improve driver safety.
* **First-mile and last-mile trips.** Transportation access is often limited by an inability to reach a fixed or deviated-route transit stop due to distance or terrain. Participants noted that strategies should focus on public-private partnerships to help an individual complete the first or last mile of their trip. Otherwise, the effectiveness of system improvements may be compromised.
* **Circulator transit service.** Transit users and providers alike emphasized that local transit routes can help individuals better access services within their own community. Whereas most major transportation corridors link outlying areas to downtown Portland, more circulator service can alleviate the demand for community-based transit providers such as Ride Connection to access local destinations. Participants mentioned GroveLink as an example of a successful, small-scale circulator service for the Forest Grove community.
* **Transit stop amenities and design.** Improving transit stops with shelters, benches, lighting, curbs/curb-cuts and designated pedestrian crossings improve safety and accessibility. Participants suggested that poorly designed or nonexistent facilities may be what prevents an individual from using fixed-route services instead of LIFT services.

*“Infrastructure provides safety, comfort and dignity.”*

***Coordination and Organization***

* **Coordination of transportation service with medical facilities.** Participants expressed the need for better coordination between transportation services, hospitals and medical clinics in order to ensure patients arrive to their appointments on time and are well supported when discharged.
* **Information dissemination.** While several discussion groups agreed that there is a wealth of transportation services provided through various agencies, organizations and communities, the information lacks centralization. Suggestions for improving access to information included clearinghouse of all available services by type of need (similar to 211 Info), “transportation ambassadors” for social service organizations and a standardized menu of services and contact information on all transit fleets.
* **Plan implementation through a governing body.** Participants called for reinstating a governing body, like the former Regional Transportation Coordinating Council, to better support the implementation of the CTP’s strategies and initiatives.

***Technology***

* **Real time information and location services**. Several discussion groups supported the use of mobile apps and web platforms to request and track rides, plan trips and pay for fares. Of note, some rural areas lack adequate cellular service.
* **Human service in the age of technology.** While there was strong support for greater technological capabilities for transit service providers, several participants expressed concern that the digital divide could further isolate individuals who are unable or uncomfortable using technology. They emphasized that human personnel services, whether manual payment of bus fare or a person-to-person phone call, is crucial.
* **Integration of public-private transportation services.** Participants expressed interest in transportation network companies (TNC) such as Uber and Lyft to help address first-mile/last-mile issues, as well as the use of TNC software for seamless integration between different services and trip legs.

***Ideas and Strategies***

* **Provide greater mental health training for drivers and support staff.** For example, transit drivers in Eugene, OR know to call CAHOOTS, a mobile crisis intervention team, in case additional support is needed for individuals with cognitive and/or mental health challenges.
* **Utilize and update existing ridesharing platforms.** Drive Less Connect, an online ridesharing platform operated by ODOT and promoted by Metro, could be upgraded and expanded to help connect rides among individuals who have accessibility challenges.

*“I have faith in the providers in our region. I have never questioned their commitment, dedication, or ability to dig deep and find ways to do what they can to find ways to provide more and/or better options for our seniors and people with disabilities.”*

* **Explore partnerships with Uber and Lyft.** Public-private partnerships can expand the number of transportation providers, encourage software integration and improve customer experience through first-mile/last-mile transportation. This is currently being done in Kansas City, Kansas and Dallas, Texas

**FOR MORE INFORMATION:**

If you have questions or ideas about TriMet’s next steps to support accessible transportation through the 2016 CTP Update, please don’t hesitate to contact TriMet CTP project manager, Hannah R. Quinsey at RitchieH@TriMet.org or 503-962-4912.

Attachment J Peer Review on Strategies

## Peer Review On Strategies

*The draft text below reflects strategies identified through a review of peer agency Coordinated Plans, literature from the Transit Cooperative Research Program (TCRP), and stakeholder input from the STFAC worksession on March 4, 2016. The next step is to gather further input from the STFAC at the March 18, 2016 meeting.*

*The information on strategies is organized along three main tracks developed through stakeholder input on unmet needs and cover provider and social service agency coordination, strategies to improve customer service, opportunities to increase the use of technology to meet the transportation needs of seniors and people with disabilities, and a set of categorized strategies for funding.*

### Coordination Strategies

* Institutional strategies
	+ Agency-wide governance strategy.
	+ Regional coordination council, which could include committees that focus on specific aspects of coordination (service delivery, maintenance, technology issues).
	+ Hire a regional mobility manager.
	+ Continue to hold coordination meetings with seniors, people with disabilities, and people in poverty and associated representatives.
	+ Consideration of a “no one size fits all” philosophy that aims to provide tailored approaches to coordination of transportation service for different groups of people.
	+ Region- or system-wide shared paratransit eligibility
	+ Review legal and insurance barriers to shared transportation.
	+ Manage risk.
* Operational strategies
	+ Creation of a “concept of operations” document describing the options and needs of seniors and people with disabilities.
	+ Vehicle/cost-sharing agreement between providers.
	+ Centralized demand-response dispatching with on-line options (text, web, mobile).
	+ Centralized transportation brokerage to integrate various transportation resources
	+ Development of seamless transportation technology to allow for easier cross-system use.
* Performance/mobility strategies
	+ Performance measurement
	+ Cost/benefit analyses
	+ Track success, promote and market, and duplicate successful projects from within and from outside of the region.
	+ Explore public-private partnerships
	+ Continued to promote and market public transit usage
	+ Continued to promote regional accessibility and livability

### Customer Service and Environment Strategies

* Increase driver sensitivity training for all types of drivers (volunteer, fixed route, paratransit)
* Reduce transfer times.
* Reduce total trip times.
* Increase the availability of real-time information across multiple platforms (this is also a technology strategy).
* Increase availability of travel training programs.
* Determine which infrastructure improvements (e.g. bus stops improvement, completing sidewalk gaps, ADA upgrades) would have the ability to increase customer experience the most.
* Provide same day paratransit service.
* Adapted and assign vehicles to meet the needs of target rider groups.
* Create and/or enhance a centralized customer care center (Salt Lake City has a particularly good example) or something similar to the Veterans Transportation Community Living Initiative.
* Provide additional service to “lifestyle” activities such as recreational sites (e.g. movie theaters, hiking, cultural activities).

### Technology Strategies

* Develop software for a regional one-click/one-call center to connect seniors, people with disabilities, and those in poverty to mobility options. Software would allow for connections to related systems throughout the service area (or regionally). An integrated software package could include the following specific applications:
	+ Rideshare matching software
	+ On-line scheduling/dispatching systems (Salt Lake City has a cgood example)
	+ Develop database of users in multiple agency directories – opportunity to build on and expand functionality of the current regional 211 database.
* Electronic fare systems incorporating technologies such as e-fare cards, multiple fare products, multiple point-of-sale locations/systems, and centralized data collection for system-wide analyses.
* Incorporate end-user training on technology products into travel training efforts.
* Use of open-source software and database tools
* Mobile application development including:
	+ Bridj, which provide data that can be used to increase efficiency in demand-response transportation. See: http://www.metro-magazine.com/bus/news/710635/bridj-kcata-ford-partner-for-urban-mobility-pilot-project
	+ Tiramisu: Bus location app (Pittsburgh)
	+ Let’s Go: transit information via phone (Pittsburgh)
	+ Dynamic scheduling app (Pittsburgh)
* Systems integration with Uber/Lyft services for first- and last-mile service enhancements that improve mobility: See:
	+ http://www.thetransitwire.com/2016/02/24/psta-teams-with-uber-and-taxi-company-to-improve-mobility/
	+ www.thetransitwire.com/2016/01/13/lyft-tests-senior-transportation-service/

### Funding

* Review of existing programs and identify all recipients of monies from 5310, STF, and other programs.
* Create a schematic map of funding sources and identify funding sources by jurisdictions at the federal, state, and local levels. (Denver)
* For each strategy included in the final CTP, identify what unmet need(s) it would address, what potential projects would be completed, and what would be the potential funding source.
* Include map or link to a list of fiscally-constrained transit improvement projects.
* Funding application processes
	+ Review Pittsburgh application selection process (plan begins on page 56 of the document).
	+ Project selection criteria could include: ability to meet coordination needs, project benefits, level of innovation, opportunities to increase organizational capabilities, and budget.
	+ Allow scoring methodology to assign different weights to each category.
* Focus on financial sustainability and program efficiency such as: reduce costs, selecting cost-effective strategies, technology solutions that would reduce costs, and opportunities to coordinate the maintenance of vehicles, equipment, and other resources
* Pooled funding for specific programs
* Provide free/reduced cost transit passes, taxi vouchers, and create affordable fare programs.
* Advocacy white paper for legislators/statewide advocacy effort to increase funding sources.

### Relevant Research

### TCRP 101 – Toolkit for Rural Community Coordinated Transportation Services

*Westat, Nelson Development, Ltd., and Nelson\Nygaard Consulting Associates, Inc. Transportation Research Board, Washington, D.C., 2004.*

This report summarizes strategies and lessons learned about the successful provision of coordinated transportation services in rural areas. It also provides information about basic concepts, it identifies the entities that may be involved in the provision of coordinated transportation services, and it describes the benefits of coordinated transportation services. Identified challenges to coordination include actual or perceived regulatory barriers, actual or perceived agency mission incompatibilities, challenges of accountability and reporting, inability to provide the local match for federal funding, and lack of knowledge about how coordination works.

Chapter 3 of the report discusses establishing a new coordinated transportation service program. Chapter 4 contains answers to "frequently asked questions" about coordination. Chapter 5 describes strategies for improving existing coordinated services. These strategies include the following:

* Finding and using new funding sources and sources not currently utilized
* Decreasing direct costs
* Improving productivity and utilization
* Taking advantage of economies of scale
* Providing service were service currently does not exist
* Taking advantage of opportunities created by multiple provides and modes
* Providing trips on fixed routes where possible
* Providing ADA services via private nonprofits instead of public transit agencies, to take advantage of the lower cost structures of the former
* Using volunteer drivers and/or volunteer staff
* Providing incentives to paratransit users to use fixed-route transit
* Consolidating the services provided by individual human service agencies
* Implementing a coordinated dispatching system

The report identifies strategies to avoid as well. These include duplicating dispatch and administrative functions, duplicating services, and serving only one type of client or trip.

Identified factors for success include the following:

* Effective stakeholder leadership and participation (in depth and from the outset)
* Clear identification of stakeholder needs and concerns
* Sound planning (with goals, objectives, a strategic plan, an operational plan, an implementation plan, and commitments)
* Sound technical support (including reporting, sharing of technical resources, and use of information technologies)
* Demonstrated benefits
* Modified services and financial participation arrangements

Chapter 6 suggests approaches to addressing specific coordinated transportation issues. Chapter 7 contains examples of and model processes for state-level involvement in coordinated transportation. Chapter 8 describes lessons learned from case studies of successful coordinated transportation services.

### TCRP 105 – Strategies to Increase Coordination of Transportation Services for the Transportation Disadvantaged

*TranSystems Corporation, Center for Urban Transportation Research, Institute for Transportation Research and Education, and Planners Collaborative. Transportation Research Board, Washington, D.C., 2004.*

This report summarizes the development of strategies for improving coordinated transportation services that support travel by the transportation-disadvantaged. The report includes an inventory of funding sources, service types/models, and planning and decision-making processes; case studies; technology discussion; and analysis. The case studies were intended to support the identification of successful and innovated coordinated transportation strategies.

Indicators of success identified in the report include the following:

* Building a coalition that comprises transportation providers and other stakeholders (e.g., businesses and institutions)
* Developing strong leadership at the state and local levels (including champions among elected officials)
* Leveraging federal programs and requirements to build infrastructure
* Taking advantage of state programs that support coordination
* Getting all stakeholders involved in the transportation planning process
* Evaluating the program
* Exploring non-traditional funding sources
* Coordinating at the regional level
* Using technology to provide information, coordinate operations, and improve customer service
* Being flexible with respect to changes in funding and changes in regulations
* Building trust among stakeholders (e.g., by involving all of them from the beginning and by tailoring service to meet each stakeholder's needs)
* Partnering with agencies that are amenable to changing the status quo
* Using a phased approach to program implementation
* Investing time upfront to develop resources, support, a framework, and clear goals and objectives
* Developing commitment to coordinated transportation at all levels of the stakeholder organizations
* Focusing on improvements that will benefit many people rather than few people
* Testing concepts before broader implementation
* Developing and using high-quality cost information
* Recognizing that benefits might not appear immediately

### Peer agency review

The review of peer agencies similar to TriMet included the following transit agencies. A link to each agency’s most recent version of their Coordinated Transportation follows the name of the city.

**Atlanta, Georgia:** <http://documents.atlantaregional.com/tcc/HST/2012-2013_HST_Plan_Limited_Update_FINAL.pdf>

**Baltimore, Maryland:** <http://www.baltometro.org/reports/2010-Human-Services-Transportation-Plan-final.pdf>

**Charlotte, North Caroline:** <http://charmeck.org/city/charlotte/cats/bus/ridingcats/documents/coordinated%20hs%20transportation%20plan%20rev%201.pdf>

**Salt Lake City, Utah:** <http://wasatchmobilityplan.weebly.com/>

**Las Vegas, Nevada:** <http://www.rtcsnv.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/06/Coordinated-Transportation-Plan-FINAL-031215.pdf>

**Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minnesota:** <http://metrocouncil.org/Transportation/Publications-And-Resources/Public-Transit-and-Human-Services-Transportation-C.aspx>

**Seattle, Washington:** <http://www.psrc.org/assets/11596/CoordinatedPlan2015-2018.pdf>

**Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania:** <http://www.spcregion.org/pdf/atwichs/FullFinalHSReport.pdf>

**Denver, Colorado:** <https://drcog.org/sites/drcog/files/resources/C1-DRAFT%20Transit%20Coord%20Plan-TAC%20Jan%202016.pdf>

**Tampa Bay, Florida:** <http://www.planhillsborough.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/Regional-Mobility-Needs-Chapter_2.27.14.pdf>

**Long Island, New York:** <http://nymtc.org/files/RTP_PLAN_2040_docs/Public%20Review%20Drafts/Appendix6.pdf>

Attachment K Summary of STFAC Workshop on Priorities and Strategies

**STFAC Meeting 5: WORKSHOP SUMMARY (RAW NOTES)**

*Table Facilitator Notes, Comment Form Responses, Flipchart Notes*

March 18, 2016

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Draft Guiding Principles and Priorities**

1. **New categories:**
	1. **Funding**
		1. Include language regarding cost, funding, money spent outside STF Funds, etc…
		2. Equitable funding (funding per capita?)
		3. Include “Consider cost-effectiveness with needed level of service in mind, in making funding decisions” in all guiding principles
		4. Budget tracking and expenses
		5. Reallocate poorly utilized service to new service
		6. Overview of providers prior to actual funding process
		7. Make new initiatives clearer
		8. Add needing additional funding
	2. **Partnerships, collaboration**
		1. Add evaluation of collaboration.
		2. Collaborate with schools and school buses.
	3. **Customer focus**
		1. Identify the population that is being served (seniors, people with disabilities, low income, etc.)
			1. *Improvements should be based on increasing accessibility for NOT ridership*
			2. *Should relate to user*
		2. Focus on under-served communities
		3. Introduce all applicants to an overview of providers
	4. **Sustainability**
	5. **Accessibility**
		1. Expand service
		2. Level of service
		3. Ride quality
	6. **Land use and siting (geography and design)**
	7. **New innovations – Localized solutions**
	8. **Equity and reliability**
	9. **Evaluation of performance/efficiency measurement**
2. **To include in each category:**
3. **Cost effectiveness**
	* 1. Consider cost-effectiveness for each principle not on its own.
4. **Capital**
5. **Prioritization:**
	1. **Do not prioritize 2016 CTP Guiding Principles. They should be simply listed.**
	2. **If prioritized, they should be ranked on:**
6. Cost Effectiveness
	1. *Include multi-year cost*
	2. *Consider future cost*
7. Service: preserve and expand services
8. Review each funding cycle (multi-year cost estimates)
	1. *Discussion of priorities needs to happen at each funding cycle (to address lower tier applications). Funding of cycle should be prioritized in order for each funding cycle to be equitable. Need to reserve some money for lowest priority.*
9. Need **–** what needs to be funded and why

**Funding Application Categories**

1. **Missing categories:**
	1. **Collaboration and partnerships**
	2. **Capital expenditures**
		1. Vehicle replacement and maintenance
		2. Facilities and stop improvements
2. **Improvements needed:**
	1. Clarify new initiatives
		1. I.e. does improving service quality refers to infrastructure or vehicles?
	2. The first question in application should be whether the baseline service is mentioned. Maintain existing service/baseline services.
	3. Match application categories with guiding principles and priorities more clearly
	4. Multiple application types
	5. Ask about number of customer, cost per mile cost effectiveness
3. **Information that would be useful for project evaluation:**
4. **Breakdown of full project costs** - Need cost breakdown for requests and provider budgets.
	1. STF money
	2. Budget
	3. Operational funding
	4. Number of FTE
	5. Shortfall funding (?)
	6. Data operating worksheets are helpful.
	7. Breakout how much of service serves E&D.
5. **Discuss priorities at each funding cycle** – shift money accordingly
	1. Project solicitation – meet before to establish priority.
6. **Improvements to service** (partnerships, extended service area, etc.)
	1. Breakout service level for seniors vs. young people with disabilities
	2. Use data operating worksheets to evaluate performance
	3. Include demand data in applications.
7. **Timeline for applications is too short**
	1. Begin process in November
	2. Advocate for more time to write, review and rank applications
8. **Have applicants present their applications**
9. **Ideas for consolidating information in application forms.**
	1. Application process should coordinate with ODOT
	2. Keep them brief
	3. Reduce narrative or move to appendix
10. **Technology pilot programs**
11. **Other things to consider**
	* 1. Administrative cost to administer grants
		2. Additional funding sources
		3. B/C analysis
		4. Consolidate application narrative
		5. Application process can be overwhelming for participants
		6. Coordinate ODOT app with STFAC needs
		7. Repetition among applications
		8. Time consuming

**Issues Specific to Draft 2016 CTP Guiding Principles**

***#1 –*** *Preserve existing services and avoid service reductions.*

* Language related too closely to the recession? (might be able to eliminate)
* Is there a need to account for increasing budgets?
* Consider that funding comes from two sources for ops and capital.

**Expand to include**

* Maintain baseline service (combine with #3)
* Maintain vehicles

***#2 –*** *Provide for adequate capital replacements and maintenance of vehicles and other fundamental requirements to provide service.*

***#3 –*** *Strive for strategic and equitable distribution of funding to address the needs of the region’s seniors and people with disabilities.*

***#4 –*** *Help mitigate shortfalls in funding from other sources of grant funds.*

* **Concern:**
	+ Old plan = new funding
	+ New plan = short falls

***#5 –*** *Increase capacity and improve service quality of existing services (such as providing additional or larger buses or other capital equipment, increasing frequency, span of service, or staff time).*

**Expand to include**

* Access to infrastructure

***#6 –*** *Consider cost-effectiveness in making funding decisions (such as $ per ride, % match)*

* Hard to compare with different types

**Keep and expand to include**

* Evaluation and performance (budget tracking and expenses)
* Cost effectiveness measures
* Show cost and money spent outside of STF funds
* Add statement about new sources, new language

***#7 –*** *Expand service in new areas, restore service where previously cut, or implement new initiatives related to technology and coordination.*

**Keep and expand to include**

* New collaborative partnerships
* Research, peer review, new technologies
* Add statement about new sources, new language
* Include more focus on underserved communities, individuals.

**Strategies**

* Collaboration and Coordination – for implementation (social service transit providers).
* Infrastructure improvements, physical barriers at stops.
* Partners (school buses, shuttles, circulator service). *See first bullet point.*
* Eliminate jurisdictional and political “issues”. *See first bullet point.*
* Peer review of other plans.
* No one size fits all! Population served.
* Advocacy white paper.
* Customer-centric projects.
* “Safe route to schools” – similar program?
* Collect RC donations through application?
* Crowd sourcing data and funding for new and innovative programs.

Attachment L Summary of STFAC Workshop on Funding Process and Application Criteria

**STFAC Meeting 6: WORKSHOP SUMMARY (RAW NOTES)**

April 15th, 2016

Funding Process. The proposed application review process for reviewing funding applications identifies a seven step process that includes 3 STFAC meetings instead of 2, and identifies actions that will occur by TriMet staff and STFAC members between meetings and between funding cycles.

**1. What questions or comments do you have on the proposed funding process? Would you amend the proposed process in any way?**

* Pre-evaluations – yes or no? Mixed.
* Pre-evaluation helps prepare questions.
* Don’t want to submit right away
* Need 1 – 2 days
* Some may need a week
* Friday to Tuesday maybe okay
* Seems strange that applicants vote.
* Concerned about past processes where providers discuss alone and make a decision that has more weight than STFAC.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

* When would notification/when would providers get information?
* As early as possible.
* Clarification.
* The process is too short.
* Start early on as possible.
* Check the legalities of the process.
* Have to wait for notice from ODOT to start the public process, accepting application.
* Not submit the application but fill it out.
* TM Board approves in March/OR in April/contracts in May.
* Multi-layer.
* Like have meeting #1 before the notice, have discussions ahead of time.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

* Empowering bureaucrats, not the community.
* Minimize/cut-out bureaucracy.
* Stay on top of ODOT.
* Get ODOT’s information ahead of time. Need to know.
* Do everything possible for streamlining.
* Timeline.
* Identify ODOT staff to get information out.
* Develop strategy.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

* More time for ranking/feedback
* First meeting could have been scheduled 2 months earlier.
* Any TriMet staff function that evaluates programs the STFAC should be in charge of. Maybe a subcommittee?

2. Do you have any suggestions on how to discuss priorities at STFAC Meeting #1?

* Review unmet needs → review 3-2
* Discuss any new demographic changes/issues → discuss specific gaps.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

* What projects are eligible and the priorities?
* Behind the scenes knowledge – What ODOT is thinking.
* Have ODOT give a presentation-perspective.
* Can guide us early.
* Ability to revisit priorities.
* Clarity on when funds will be available.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

* Identify during pre-meeting – current priorities as we know the targeted funding.
* Restore art books (?) if that – perennial priority.
* Identify list of cuts.
* Look for available technology if available for solutions.
* Develop consistency across apps by comparing to benchmarks. Easier to…
* Score apps.
* See excluded criteria.
* More objectivity.
* Elaine Wells wants to follow up.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

* Depends on the type of funding
* Go back to Guiding Principles. Identify priorities there.
* Providers need to be at the first meeting
* Review needs/geographic statistics by county.

Funding Application Categories. The proposed funding application categories were updated based on input received at the last meeting to more clearly separate capital from operations. The categories now include capital projects and operations projects under “Maintaining Existing Service” and “Service Expansion” projects. There is also a category for “New Initiatives”.

3. Do you have any additional comments on the updated Funding Application Categories? Is there any type of funding request that you believe may still be missing?

* Put categories right at top of applications – front and center.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*Operations – 5310 is considered a capital expense – more match, STF is more flexible, less match.

* Bring in 5310 categories and make compatible.
* Operations (includes 5310 purchase service)
* Why differ between capital and operations?
* Is the capital a one-time expense?
* Like the 3 major categories – simple.
* Technology (upgrades)/ITS in service (new) expansion, new initiative and maintain service (replace).
* Accessibility and mobility
* Lighting at stop (service expansion)
* Public safety.
* Service expansion or enhancement
* One or two sentences to describe the categories.
* Things in Maintain
* Is thing critical to keep those services running?

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

* Zero-emission vehicles.
* Increase cost.
* Timeline concerns.
* Right-sizing vehicles – where does it fit?
* Earlier comments chart – misleading.
* (d) new initiates.
* Better, cheaper examples.
* More to advocacy category.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

Evaluation Criteria. The proposed evaluation criteria identify criteria that relate to the Guiding Principles. The criteria each include a series of questions to help describe how different types of applications may address the criteria. Applicants will be asked specifically to address these criteria and the STFAC members will evaluate each application how well they address the criteria.

4. Do you want to evaluate each project on a 1 through 5 scale for how well they address each criteria (as you have done in the past), or would you prefer to rank all projects in order of preference based on how well you believe the project meets all the Guiding Principles?

* Ranking → 4 votes
* Unsure/Not rank → 1 vote →Like it but seems challenging
* Score – 0 or 1 vote
* Is there something in the middle?

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

* Priorities and rankings.
* Systematic approach – same level of standard.
* Formal ranking based on priorities, transparent, procurement process, in good faith.
* Presentations can help with those who aren’t good at grant writing.
* Point system.
* We should consider whether our application is ODOT’s application (that’s how they are going to prioritize applications).
* Maybe a few questions that address STFAC priorities?
* What about 5310 funds? Urban area.
* Consensus around the table:
* Form 1: Keep
* Form 2 (Main): ODOT
* Form 3: Question specific to addressing CTP-project specific

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

* Consistent and objective process.
* Considering a different scoring method.
* Provide some evaluation points for rural areas – need to meet needs of rural areas.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

* Ranking works well if the guiding principles are in front of you. Scoring can still be done individually, but you turn in a ranking by category.

*If ranking is preferable, would you rather rank projects within each category or provide an overall ranking?*

* Interest → Yes
* Consider ranking applications for capital vs. operations.
* When applicants have multiple applications, asking them to rank their own applications is not fair and the STFAC seeing something is an applicant’s 2nd priority out of 6 applications is not comparable to another applicants 2nd priority out of 2. Don’t want to create incentive for submitting multiple applications.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

* Limited by funding, so categories don’t matter.
* What accessibility and equity? Geographical equity. Something in the ranking.
* Keep description clear and concise.
* Those end up ranking higher.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

* Not answered on third form.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

* By category; if that’s possible with the money we have.

5. Do you feel that the proposed criteria adequately reflect the Guiding Principles and do they reflect the STFAC’s desired outcomes? What comments do you have on the proposed criteria?

* Customer surveys would be helpful.
* Question #1 – Concerned about cost/ride.
* Vehicle age and mileage – should be provided in the application if required vehicle.
* Can we tailor further to address people?
* How many different people are we serving?
* New people that will be served?
* Add to Question #2.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

* Don’t know if this meets the ODOT criteria.
* Ranking should follow ODOT rankings.
* ODOT criteria I-4
* 5th should be how well does the project meet the STFAC goals/guiding principles.
* Distill the local criteria into one or two.
* This is too much.
* Asking the question too many times – double the work.
* Questions are the same but tweaked differently.
* Use the ODOT criteria as it pertains to our guiding principles.
* Transparent – What you submit to STFAC is same as what is submitted to ODOT.
* ODOT criteria is the core – additional clarifying or questions to address the local goals (one-pager)(STFAC guiding principles).

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

* Add cultural/language barriers.
* Is the project “fair” to remote or rural area?
* Consider a separate question.
* Consider ODOT’s criteria in order to reduce duplication.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

* Sub bullets should be reviewed to make sure they align with the criteria questions
* Add Project to describe the type of application in Question 1 and 4
* Add question about number of people served, number of new people served, number of 60+/PWD to Question 1
* Add “cost per house” to “cost per ride” under Bullet 2, Question 1.
* Add bullet question under Question 1: Any new ways of strategizing for making things more cost-effective?
* Add to Question4: Does the project include new partnerships or collaborations between more than one agency or service provider and how does it reduce duplication of service or increase number of people served or enhance service quality?
* Add to Question 6: How does this project increase access or opportunity to people of color, those with language or cultural barriers and low income populations?
* Add to Question 7: Does it build on previous efforts and work towards a whole? (Generally unclear)

Funding Applications. The proposed updated funding applications have two forms. The first form provides information about the applicant’s organization and they will complete this only once, regardless of how many different project applications they submit. The second form will get filled out for each project application submitted by an applicant.

6. Do you have any questions or comments on the two-form approach?

* Like it!
* Seems more organized.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

* Like the two form approach.
* Do any of these need 900 words? Can it be captured in 500 words (or less)?
* As concise as possible.
* Evaluation of performance of funded projects – Like that.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

* Need to match up with ODOT.
* Good idea for 2 forms.
* Add days/hours of operation to both forms.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

* It’s good!
* Add Email and Website for organization contact info

7. The proposed applications include project goals and measurable (page 27). Is there anything the STFAC would specifically like to request in these sections or is the proposed table sufficient?

* Needs to be only for operating projects
* Doesn’t fit some applications like a computer server.
* Different table for capital vs. operations applications?
* This info cold still be good for capital to know how many people the program serves.
* Additional metrics for capital:
* # of vehicles.
* # of miles.
* Should this table be provided for each component of the application (maintain, expand, innovate)?
* How do we handle existing measurables vs. projected measureables for expansion?

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

* How are riders and number of riders served?
* Equitable?
* Geographic and demographic.
* % of E&D population covered/served?

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

* Travel training/mobility management.
* Need to provide this information.
* Include on application form #1, organizational.
* Include economic development
* Always keeping them as active consumers.
* Consider opportunities.
* Number of individuals in remote rural area.
* Time of day.
* Add “Type of Vehicle” – lifecycle.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

* On Pg 27, add question after Table 1.3: How would you measure your success?
* Describe fleet and type of vehicle (fleet info will help discern/measure these project goals by type of fleet).

8. Do the proposed application forms include all of the information the STFAC would like to see the applicants provide?

* Website.
* Organization contact info.
* Project contact vs. organization contact.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

* Not answered on second form.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

* Sensitivity training.
* Passenger safety.
* Improvements.
* Opportunity.
* Driver training.
* Mental Health.
* Coordination with other organizations that provide these types of drivers.
* Costs:
* Education/training for different populations.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

* Form 1:
	+ Pg 19: change Table 3,4,5 to transportation-specific, i.e. Table 3: Transportation Service Days and Hours of Operation, Table 4 to: Annual Transportation Budget and Table 5 to: Transportation Operating Data
	+ Move Table 2.1-2.3 (section 2 of Form 2) to Form 1
* Form 2:
	+ Add at the top under Section 1: Project Overview:

Indicate the type of funding request:

* + - * Maintain Existing Service
				+ Operating funds for services
				+ Equipment, vehicles or infrastructure investments
			* New Service or Service Expansion
				+ Operating funds for services
				+ Equipment, vehicles or infrastructure investments
			* New initiatives (not currently funded)
				+ Operating funds for new services
				+ Technology or infrastructure investments
* Add “transportation” program to describe program and project
* Pg 12 change #4 to say “Project Design” or “Project Description”. Under this ask:
	+ Who will you serve?
	+ What level of service will be provided to customers?
	+ Describe if volunteers are utilized to provide service and how will this occur (is the volunteer program supported with STF or other funds? Will you provide mileage reimbursement to volunteers using their owner vehicles?)
	+ How will the service be marketed?
* Pg 13, under describe need for this project, add: Attach your data or study.
* Pg 13 under question “How do you measure cost-effectiveness and what are your measurable goals?” Add “*how many people will be served?*
* Pg 14: Under meeting project needs for PWD, add question: How will the project improve customer satisfaction, increase ride matching and reduce wait times?
* Pg 14: Under increasing accessibility, add:
	+ Are you expanding service hours? *By what specific amount?*
	+ Are you increasing the capacity of an existing service? *How?*
	+ Are you addressing a service gap per the Service Guidelines and Standards listed in the Coordinated Transportation Plan? *Which ones?*
* Pg 15: Add under equity: How does this project increase access or opportunity to people of color, *those with language or cultural barriers and low income populations?*
* Pg 25, under customer service: Add question about how they measure customer satisfaction and eliminate last bullet (i.e. how many people would be affected)
* Pg 27: Add number of turn downs to Table 1.3
* Move Table 2.1-2.3 (section 2 of Form 2) to Form 1

9. What other comments do you have?

* Not answered on first form.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

* Not answered on second form.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

* Art funding for lights at bus stops.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

Summarizing key points:

Was there a central issue and opportunity from your group about:

* Funding Process
* Pre-evaluations before meeting #2 are good
* Need few days (Friday-Tuesday) to submit.
* Questions on applicants reviewing their own applications
* Is this conflict? ½ of committee so seems necessary but is there a conflict?
* When discussing priorities
* Want to revisit/review needs/services gaps.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

* Start as early as possible.
* At first meeting:
* Preliminary thinking – What is ODOT thinking?
* Have ODOT give a presentation.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

* Build advocacy into funding process.
* Private funding.
* Coordination, advance notice, transparency, reduce bureaucratic barriers, increase creative solutions.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

* Funding application categories
* Good.
* Want them front and center at top of application with description.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

* Like the 3 major categories.
* Would like to see “Enhancement” added to service expansion.
* This could include technology/ITS, which could also be added to new initiatives.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

* Zero-emission vehicles.
* Rural services.
* Right-sized vehicles.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

* Evaluation Criteria
* Majority agreed ranking would be better, encourage individual scoring to develop individual ranking.
* Ranking in categories seemed interesting
* Interested in seeing straw proposal using categories and pre-agreed priorities.
* Make sure we are focusing on people served.
* Make sure adequately address capital.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

* The criteria should follow ODOT’s criteria.
* Additional criteria to address how project meets the STFAC guiding principles/goals.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

* Have objective guidelines to evaluate.
* To be consistently applied.
* Cultural/language.
* Include ODOT’s criteria.
* Specifics.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

* Funding Applications
* Like 2 worksheet format.
* Measures on p.22 may need to be more tailored for capital, consider separate.
* How do we answer for program with expansion component?

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

* Like Form 1.
* Criteria – ODOT.
* One-pager for STFAC.
* Keep scores.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

* Include mobility management/training – can turn into projects.
* Advocacy.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

**Other Comments?**

* Include website and project contact rather than organization contact on applications.

Attachment M Proposed Funding Process

Proposed Funding Process

1. **STFAC Meeting #1** - STFAC meets to discuss upcoming funding opportunities and priorities and discuss the following:
	1. Which funding sources will be available and approximately how much will be available?
	2. What projects are eligible under each funding opportunity?
	3. What are the STFAC’s priorities for each of the funding opportunities?
	4. How well are existing programs meeting the STFAC’s goals? *(This will inform applicants on how to improve their applications or project scope before drafting an application.)*
2. **TriMet Staff Actions**
	1. Inform applicants of upcoming funding opportunities and the STFAC’s priorities for each fund this funding cycle.
	2. Solicit applications (Impress on ODOT the need for increased time for the project solicitation process and STFAC review evaluation and deliberation).
	3. Review applications for completeness of information and ask applicants for any necessary application updates.
	4. Distribute complete applications to STFAC for review and preliminary evaluation.
3. **STFAC Action** – STFAC members review and complete preliminary evaluation of applications.
4. **STFAC Meeting #2** - STFAC meeting for applicants to present their applications and for the STFAC to ask questions. STFAC members complete their application evaluations and submit them to TriMet staff at the end of the meeting.
5. **TriMet Staff Action -** TriMet summarizes STFAC evaluations and creates a funding straw proposal for discussion (includes ranking by application type and combined).
6. **STFAC Meeting #3** -STFAC meets to discuss the funding straw proposal and make a recommendation to the TriMet Board.
7. **TriMet Staff Action** – Upon TriMet Board approval, TriMet staff sumbits applications for funding to the State and Federal agencies. In agreement with ODOT and the FTA, TriMet administers pass-through and sub-recipient agreements for grant funds to service providers in the region.
8. **Between funding cycles**:
	1. **TriMet Staff Action**
		1. TriMet staff provides regular updates on the status of future funding, including grants beyond STF and §5310 – what’s happening at the federal and state level?
		2. TriMet staff provides a history of the previous funding cycle and review of previous recipients of funding.
	2. **Transit Providers** provide a status report on how previously funded programs are meeting specified goals and if not meeting these goals, describe why.
	3. **STFAC** or a subcommittee meets to discuss opportunities to enhance effectiveness of the funded programs in the next funding cycle.

Proposed Funding Application Categories

Applications for STF and §5310 funding can generally be placed into the following general categories:

* **Maintain Existing Service**
	1. Capital
		1. Dispatch or computer system
		2. Replacement vehicles
		3. Vehicle Preventative Maintenance
		4. Capital Equipment Replacement
	2. Operations
		1. Operational funding to maintain existing transit service levels
		2. Operational funding to maintain existing coordination service
		3. Operational funding to maintain existing mobility management service
* **Service Expansion**
	1. Capital
		1. Dispatch or computer system
		2. Purchase additional vehicles or right-sizing vehicles
		3. New equipment or Stop/Transit Center amenities
	2. Operations
		1. Increase amount of service - this provides more transportation service than currently provided, such as adding weekend service or having more frequent service.
		2. Restore service area – this restores transit service to an area that has received service in the past.
		3. New service area – this expands transit service to an area that has never received service before
* **New initiatives** – this category would include other new efforts which could include projects such as introducing new technologies and new ways to coordinate or collaborate on services.
1. New technology project
2. New ways to coordinate or collaborate on services
3. New type of Mobility Management
4. Accessibility Improvement (e.g. sidewalks, curb ramps, crossings, etc.)

Proposed Application Review Criteria

STFAC members may provide project rankings or evaluation scores for each project. An evaluation scoring process is described below to assist STFAC members with developing their rankings if that is their preferred approach. Either ranking or scores will useful to TriMet in compiling the evaluations.

The evaluation criteria and questions provided are intended to help articulate how a project addresses the priorities identified during the CTP Update process. These evaluation criteria will be addressed in the application forms completed by the applications and will be useful to the STFAC members responding during their evaluations.

Review each project and evaluate each project on the degree to which they implement the Priorities of the CTP. Rate each project on a scale of 1 to 5 point value for each criterion to reflect how well the proposed project satisfies each of the four ODOT public transportation goals.

Greatest 5 4 3 2 1 Least

1. How cost-effective is the application?
	1. Is it leveraging other funds? What %?
	2. What is the cost per ride or potential maintenance savings?
	3. Will it improve the cost-effectiveness of all service (such as through improved dispatch, ride matching, technology, etc.)?
2. Does the project provide accessibility that is otherwise not available for seniors and persons with disabilities?
	1. What percentage of the rides will be for seniors and persons with disabilities?
	2. Is this the only available service for seniors and persons with disabilities?
	3. Does it address the needs of an underserved population?
	4. Does it address a service gap per the Service Guidelines and Standards?
3. Does the project increase accessibility of existing services?
	1. Does it expand the service hours?
	2. Does it increase the capacity of an existing service?
	3. Does it improve physical access to transit (more accessible vehicles, sidewalks, transit stop/station amenities)?
	4. Does it address a service gap per the Service Guidelines and Standards?
4. Does the application include a new or innovative approach to coordinate and collaborate?
	1. Does the project implement new technology to enhance service or improve cost-effectiveness?
	2. Does the project include new partnerships or collaboration between more than one agency or service provider?
5. Would the project improve customer service?
	1. Does the project improve ease of scheduling, or on-time performance, or communication between rider and driver?
	2. Does the project improve the customer on-board experience?
	3. Does the project improve their wait time at a stop or station?
	4. How many people would be affected?
6. Does the project improve equity?
	1. How is the project geographical/demographically/financial equitable?
	2. How does this project increase access or opportunity to people of color and low income populations?
	3. Does it address the needs of an underserved population?
7. Is the project sustainable?
	1. Does it complete a one-time gap or need funds every year?
	2. Does it build on previous efforts and work towards a whole?
	3. Would “seed money” create a long-term funding source?
	4. Does the project leverage other infrastructure

Attachment N Draft Funding Applications

## Draft Funding Application

***Tri-County Area***

***FYX Special Transportation Fund Program***

**STF Grant Application**

**Worksheet 1:**

**STF Applicant Information Form**

Instructions:

Applicants submit one copy of the Worksheet 1: Applicant Information.

Applicant Contact Information

Name of Organization:

**Contact Person:**

**Address:**

**Telephone:**

**E-Mail:**

**FAX:**

**Type of Organization** (mark one)**:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Public Entity  |  |
| Private non-profit |  |
| Educational Institution  |  |
| Private Provider or Contractor |  |

Provider’s geographic area of service is (mark one):

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Inside the TriMet Service District |  |
| Outside the TriMet Service District |  |
| Both Inside and Outside of the TriMet Service District |  |

**Days and Hours of Operation:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Days** | **Hours** |
| Monday |  |
| Tuesday |  |
| Wednesday |  |
| Thursday |  |
| Friday |  |
| Saturday |  |
| Sunday |  |
| Please list any planned periods of service closure greater than 3 days. (ex. Closed the last week of December) |  |

**Service Area:**

Describe your service area/district by indicating the geographic features that define your service area/district boundaries, such as streets, rivers or jurisdictional boundaries. Attach a map(s) of your service area as separate, single page, letter sized attachment(s).

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**Total Transportation Program Budget by Year:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FYX** | **FYX** |
|  |  |

Amount of other funds leveraged to support the total transportation program: (list county contributions, STF Discretionary funds, donations, other):

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Contribution/Source** | **Number of Units/Hours** | **Amount** | **% of Program Funding** |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **FYX Total Program Costs** |
| **Type** | **Dollar Amount** |
| Admin  |  |
| *Labor (payroll)* |  |
| *Insurance, services or supplies (IT, travel, office expense, telecommunications, etc.)* |  |
| *Eligibility* |  |
| *Facility (rent, janitorial, utilities, etc.)* |  |
| *Professional Services* |  |
| *Other (Describe)* |  |
| Contracted services |  |
| Materials and supplies |  |
| Operations |  |
| *Fuel* |  |
| *Maintenance* |  |
| *Dispatch* |  |
| *Operators* |  |
| Preventative Maintenance |  |
| Capital Equipment |  |
| Technology |  |
| Contingency |  |
| Other (type description) |  |
| Other (type description) |  |
| **Project Grand Total** |  |

***Tri-County Area***

***FYX Special Transportation Fund Program***

**STF Grant Application**

**Worksheet 2:**

**STF Project Proposal Form**

Instructions:

Applicants submit one copy of the Worksheet 2: Project Proposal Form ***per project***.

**Worksheet 2:**

**Project Proposal**

**Section1: Project Description**

1. **Project Title:**

Provide a brief summary describing this project. What will be the finished product or service? (limit 200 words)

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. **Geographic Area to be** **Served** **by Project:**

Indicate the geographic features that define your service area such as streets, rivers or jurisdictional boundaries)**:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| North Boundary |  |
| East Boundary |  |
| South Boundary |  |
| West Boundary |  |
| Other General Geographic Area |  |

1. **Is project derived from the Coordinated Transportation Plan for Seniors and People with Disabilities (CTP)?**
* Yes – Page
* No

How does your project meet the guiding principles in the CTP (describe activities) (limit 900 words)

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Does your program address one or more of the strategic initiatives in the CTP or improves service coverage as recommended in the CTP? (describe activities) (limit 200 words)

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. **Project Quality**

Describe the services or capital investment to be provided by this project. Please include a description of the following: (limit 900 words)

* Who do you serve
* Level of service provided to customers
* Operational activities; how customers request and receive rides, including scheduling and dispatching
* Describe if volunteers are utilized to provide service and how this occur (is the volunteer program supported with STF or other funds? Do you provide mileage reimbursement to volunteers using their own vehicles?)
* How the service is marketed.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**Describe the need for this project.** How was this need determined or assessed? Do you have data that reflects this need? (limit 200 words)

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Provide a detailed description for how this project meets each of the following criteria. STFAC members will evaluate your application based on this information. The STF Application Instructions document includes specific questions your application needs to address for each criterion below. Limit 200 words for each answer.

**Describe how your project is Cost-effective.** (limit 200 words)

* How does the project leverage other funds? What %?
* How do you measure cost-effectiveness and what are your measurable goals?
* Does this project improve the cost-effectiveness services (such as through improved dispatch, ride matching, technology, etc.)?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**Describe how your project meets the transportation needs of Seniors and Persons with Disabilities.** (limit 200 words)

* What percentage of the rides will be for seniors and people with disabilities?
* Is this the only available service for seniors and people with disabilities?
* Why is this project the best method to address the previously described need?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**Describe how your project increases accessibility.** (limit 200 words)

* Are you expanding service hours?
* Are you increasing the capacity of an existing service?
* Are you improving the physical access to transit (more accessible vehicles, sidewalks, transit stop/station amenities)?
* Are you addressing a service gap per the Service Guidelines and Standards listed in the Coordinated Transportation Plan?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**Describe the level of collaboration and coordination for this project.** (limit 200 words)

* How duplication of services avoided?
* Does the application include a new or innovative approach to coordinate and collaborate?
* Does the project implement new technology to enhance service or improve cost-effectiveness?
* Does the project include new partnerships or collaboration between more than one agency or service provider?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**Describe your projects customer service and experience.** (limit 200 words)

* Does the project improve ease of scheduling, or on-time performance, or communication between rider and driver?
* Does the project improve the customer on-board experience?
* Does the project improve their wait time at a stop or station?
* How many people would be affected?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**Describe how your project is equitable.** (limit 200 words)

* How is the project geographical/demographically/financial equitable?
* How does this project increase access or opportunity to people of color and low income populations?
* Does it address the needs of an underserved population?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**Describe your sustainability of your project.** (limit 200 words)

* Does the project complete a one-time gap or need additional funding in future funding cycles?
* Does it build on previous efforts and work towards a whole?
* Would “seed money” create a long-term funding source?
* Does the project leverage other infrastructure?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. **Project Milestones:**

Explain the milestones of the project. Include the project start date and end date if applicable. Example milestones: design, public involvement, contract award, capital purchase, service implementation, etc.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Milestone description | Estimated milestone completion date (m/m/yy) |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

1. **Project Goals and Measurables:**

Explain your ridership goals and/or other measurable goals you intend to meet with this project during this funding cycle. Note: transit services must provide at least ridership, vehicle hour and vehicle mile goals.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Goal** | **Deliverable**  | **Timeframe** |
| Ridership |  |  |
| Vehicle Hours |  |  |
| Vehicle Miles |  |  |
| Total paid driver hours |  |  |
| Total volunteer driver hours |  |  |
| Cost per trip |  |  |
| Number of individuals served |  |  |
| Other (Describe) |  |  |
| Other (Describe) |  |  |
| Other (Describe) |  |  |

**Mobility Management:** For mobility management/coordination projects, please indicate activities support with STF Discretionary funds and the number of individuals that benefit from project activities.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Activity | FYX | FYX |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

1. **Application Attachments**

You can attach additional supporting documentation, such as maps, additional budgets, etc. to your submission email.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Attachment File Name | AttachmentDocument Title | Description |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Section 2: Project Funding Request**

1. **Total Project Cost: $\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

Enter all estimated costs involved in the **total** cost of the project in the tables below.

|  |
| --- |
| **Total Project Costs by Year (Total for all years should match the project grand total.)** |
| FYX | FYX |
|  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Estimated Total Project Costs** |
| **Type** | **Dollar Amount** |
|  | FYX | FYX |
| Admin  |  |  |
| *Labor (payroll)* |  |  |
| *Insurance, services or supplies (IT, travel, office expense, telecommunications, etc.)* |  |  |
| *Eligibility* |  |  |
| *Facility (rent, janitorial, utilities, etc.)* |  |  |
| *Professional Services* |  |  |
| *Other (Describe)* |  |  |
| Contracted services |  |  |
| Materials and supplies |  |  |
| Operations |  |  |
| *Fuel* |  |  |
| *Maintenance* |  |  |
| *Dispatch* |  |  |
| *Operators* |  |  |
| Preventative Maintenance |  |  |
| Capital Equipment |  |  |
| Technology |  |  |
| Contingency |  |  |
| Other (type description) |  |  |
| Other (type description) |  |  |
| **Project Grand Total** |  |  |

Amount of other funds leveraged to support the total project cost: (list county contributions, STF Discretionary funds, donations, other):

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Contribution/Source | Local/Federal/Other (describe) | Number of Units/Hours | Amount | % of Project Funding |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Project Grand Total:** |  | **100%** |

\*For any amounts in Section 2.1 listed over $5000, please provide an explanation of services rendered. Limit 300 words.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. **Total STF Funds Requested for Project : $\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

% of project funded by STF: $\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. **Project Category Breakdown**

**Instructions:** Select each category you are requesting STF funds for related to this project, as well as the type of use for each category using the checkboxes below. Identify how much total STF funding you are requesting for each category. Do not duplicate costs in multiple categories. Identify if one category is dependent on another category receiving funding first. Requests listed under all categories should have the same total as total STF request listed under Question 2: Total STF Funds Requested for Project.

* **Maintain Existing Service**

STF Request Amount: $\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

* + Dispatch or computer system
	+ Replacement vehicles
	+ Vehicle Preventative Maintenance
	+ Capital Equipment Replacement
	+ Operational funding to maintain existing transit service levels
	+ Operational funding to maintain existing coordination service
	+ Operational funding to maintain existing mobility management service
	+ Shortfall funding to maintain existing service levels (help mitigate shortfalls in funding due to reductions and loss of funding such as BETC and JARC). Please describe the funding shortfall and identify the amount of shortfall funding needed (limit 200 words):

|  |
| --- |
|  |

* **New Service or Service Expansion**

STF Request Amount: $\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

* + Dispatch or computer system
	+ Purchase additional vehicles or right-sizing vehicles
	+ New equipment or Stop/Transit Center amenities
	+ Increase amount of service - this provides more transportation service than currently provided, such as adding weekend service or having more frequent service.
	+ Restore service area – this restores transit service to an area that has received service in the past.
	+ New service area – this expands transit service to an area that has never received service before

Describe how the project provides new or expanded service) (limit 200 words):

|  |
| --- |
|  |

* **New initiatives (Not currently funded)**

STF Request Amount: $\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

* + New technology project
	+ New ways to coordinate or collaborate on services
	+ New type of Mobility Management
	+ Accessibility Improvement (e.g. sidewalks, curb ramps, crossings, etc.)
1. **Vehicle Information**

Does this application request either match or total cost funding for a vehicle?

* No, application does not involve a vehicle purchase of any kind.
* Yes, application requests match for a vehicle.
* Yes, application requests the total cost of a vehicle
1. **Staffing data:**

(please identify the positions supported by your STF funding request and the amount of FTE per position.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Position** | **FYX** | **FYX** |
| *Example: Driver* | .5 | 1 |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

1. **Project Scalability**

You are strongly encouraged to request the full amount of STF funding that is needed for each project, including funding for new projects, under the total STF request field listed above under Question 2: Total STF Funds Requested for Project. However, funding is limited. Describe if and how you are able to scale back your STF Funding request below. Then describe how you scaled down your request and what aspects of the project would not be funded under this funding scenario.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Enter your scaled request amounts as it relates to the applicable categories below:

* **Maintain Existing Service**

STF Scaled Request Amount: $\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

* **New Service or Service Expansion**

STF Scaled Request Amount: $\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

* **New initiatives (Not currently funded)**

STF Scaled Request Amount: $\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_