

Examining and Defining Strategies to Implement a Coordinating Council on Access and Mobility Model at the State Level

ITCC Background

The state of Iowa has a long history of transportation coordination. In 1976, Iowa passed the first in the nation coordination law, now Iowa Code Chapter 324A. A compliance review process was added to that legislation in 1984. To assist in developing the administrative rules for coordination, an Ad Hoc Interagency Advisory Committee was formed that same year. Therefore, Iowa's coordination history dates back over 40 years and the use of a coordination committee over 30 years.

In 1991, the Iowa Transportation Coordination Council (ITCC) was formed with three member agencies: the Iowa Department of Transportation (DOT), the Iowa Department of Human Services, and the Iowa Department of Elder Affairs (now Iowa Department on Aging). The membership of these three agencies on the ITCC is written into the Iowa Code. Also by Code, the ITCC must be chaired by a representative of the Iowa DOT. Since 1991 the activity level of the ITCC has ebbed and flowed, finally becoming more of what it is today in 2006 in taking up the Federal Transit Administration's (FTA) "United We Ride" effort. Membership currently reflects a good blend of state agencies, statewide human service interests, public transit, and planning representatives. Current active ITCC member agencies:

- Iowa Department of Transportation
 - Office of Public Transit
 - Office of Systems Planning
 - Motor Vehicle Division
- Iowa Department on Aging
- Iowa Department of Human Services
 - Bureau of Refugee Services
 - Iowa Medicaid Enterprise
- Iowa Department of Corrections
- Access2Care
- American Cancer Society
- Iowa Department of Public Health
- AARP Iowa
- Iowa Developmental Disabilities Council
- Iowa Public Transit Association
- Iowa Vocational Rehabilitation Services
- Iowa's MPOs and RPAs
- Epilepsy Foundation Iowa
- Iowa Mobility Manager's Network
- Public transit advocate and consumer

The ITCC meets bi-monthly, in-person, for four hours in the Des Moines area. Meeting space is arranged and lunch is provided by the Iowa DOT Office of Public Transit. Recent agenda items have included: Passenger Transportation Summit agenda setting and planning, Medicaid Transportation/non-emergency medical transportation, updates from the Iowa Mobility Manager's Network, transportation options for those who do not drive, and review of Iowa Code Chapter 324A. The ITCC also reviews the required biennial report to the Iowa General Assembly and Governor. The report is due on December

15 of even-numbered years and recommends methods to increase transportation coordination and improve efficiency of federal, state, and local government programs used to finance public transit services and may address other topics as appropriate.

Work on the ITCC agendas, meetings, and projects is done by Iowa DOT staff as part of their regular job duties and is paid for as part of their regular salaries. No special funding is set aside for ITCC work.

Successes

Thanks to the efforts of FTA's *Untied We Ride*, the successes of the ITCC in the past five to ten years include the start of the annual Passenger Transportation Summit in 2014 ~~and~~ now in its fifth year, creation of the Statewide Mobility Manager position and encouragement of local transit agencies to hire mobility managers, along with increased community outreach to build awareness of public transit in Iowa. An important component of relationship building has been attitude. Iowa DOT staff supporting the ITCC are always willing to sit at the table, attend the meeting, make a presentation, and take the telephone call all with the attitude of education, cooperation, and coordination to solve any problem – both real and perceived.

Several new transit or human service partnerships have formed based on this relationship building. For example, the Statewide Mobility Coordinator has partnered with American Cancer Society (ACS) to build awareness of safe access to medical appointments. Upon joining the Council, ACS struggled to understand the true needs of medical clinics and/or barriers for patients to safely travel long distances to receive cancer treatment. Through this partnership, ACS and Iowa DOT has increased awareness of the perceived barriers, allowing for the Iowa Cancer Consortium to include 'access to transportation' as one of their long-range planning goals and bringing public transit to the table for the first time. Next steps include community conversations with various medical providers, clinics and patients.

Challenges

One of the challenges for the ITCC through the years has been to stay relevant. Every so often a new FTA initiative will be announced and invigorate the Council for a while – like the United We Ride effort noted in the Background. However, the Iowa DOT staff, acknowledges difficulty at times in setting the bi-monthly agendas to include items that would be of interest to the membership, that hopefully inspire coordination of transportation services, and are not time fillers – holding a meeting for the sake of holding a meeting. It can be challenging to keep a group together without tangible incentives. No grants or funding are available exclusively for participating agencies. There are no consequences for not participating on the Council. There is no carrot and there is no stick.

Ongoing efforts have been made to gather new members to the table; through presentations given and new partnerships formed, Iowa DOT staff and current members are always seeking new agencies to join. Because there is no stick or carrot, ITCC often struggles to gather new member agencies. Using the CCAM member agencies, as an example, the ITCC continues to reach out and gather valuable input from those underrepresented communities.

In order to give the ITCC some future direction, the Iowa DOT applied for and received a grant from Easterseals, as a partner of the National Center for Mobility Management, to examine transportation coordination in Iowa. The Iowa DOT took this opportunity to host a retreat of current and prospective ITCC members to explore ways to keep the ITCC relevant and inspire more coordination around the state.

Retreat

The ITCC retreat was held on March 26-27, 2018, at the Honey Creek Resort in Moravia, Iowa. Honey Creek Resort was chosen for its location in southern Iowa, away from the distractions of workplaces and homes of most of our attendees to enhance participants' ability to focus on the task at hand. The purpose was to engage ITCC members and other stakeholders in exploring next steps of passenger transportation coordination in Iowa. The retreat's intended outcome was to develop planning strategies focusing on the Coordinating Council on Access and Mobility (CCAM) goals and objectives for ITCC.

Retreat Process

The Iowa DOT contracted with a facilitator to develop and facilitate the retreat. The retreat consisted of two consecutive half-days. The process was designed to maximize attendees' time in small groups to brainstorm, assess, and develop strategic objectives for three established CCAM goals.

Day One (5 hours)

Introduction of Attendees

Each attendee stated their name, organization they represented and shared a brief response to the question: "How is my agency or organization impacted by public transit?" The question identified the connections among the attendees and their stake in public transit, serving as a way to open the dialogue and allow for attendees to start thinking about transportation solutions

ITCC and CCAM History

Iowa DOT and Easter Seals staff gave a 30-minute presentation on the ITCC and CCAM history to identify key issues and challenges for public transit viability in Iowa.

Small Group Activities

The attendees were assigned to one of four small groups (4-5 attendees per group) with all groups representing a cross section of public transit agencies and stakeholders. The groups recorded their proceedings on flipchart paper.

Three rounds of small group activity used the same process focusing on each of the three CCAM goals:

- Goal 1: Improve Access to the Community through Transportation
- Goal 2: Enhance Cost-Effectiveness of Coordinated Transportation
- Goal 3: Strengthen Interagency Partnerships and Collaboration with State, Local, and Industry Groups

Each round lasted about 60 minutes followed by the small groups reporting to the entire group. The first two rounds occurred on day one; round three was held on the second day.

The process used for the small group activity:

- List questions that need to be asked about their CCAM goal on flipchart paper.
- Engage in discussion in response to the questions listed.
- Brainstorm ideas to improve access to coordination, in light of the questions and discussion.
- Assess the viability (ability to be implemented and potential to be successful) of ideas listed by assigning a rating to each idea as follows:
 - 1 = most viable
 - 2 = viable
 - 3 = somewhat viable

- 4 = least viable

The process used for the small groups reporting to the large group for questions and clarification:

- List of questions with a brief highlight of your group's discussion.
- Ideas with a viability rating of 1 and 2.

Debrief at End of Day One

At the end of day one, the facilitator asked the group to debrief their activity for the day asking two questions:

- What are the takeaways from your day?
- What needs to be changed or given attention to for tomorrow's session?

Day Two (4 hours)

Check-in and Recap from Day One

Continuation of Small Group Work on CCAM Goal 3

Identification of Top Three Ideas for each CCAM Goal as Recommended

Objectives

All ideas generated by participants for the three CCAM goals were posted on the walls with each idea's assigned viability rating. The process used to identify the top three ideas for each CCAM goal, as follows:

- Attendees were given three Post-It Notes for each CCAM goal.
- Attendees placed a Post-It Note on ideas for objectives to be considered in ITCC's strategic plan.
- The facilitator led a discussion for each CCAM goal.

Next steps

Discussion followed as to next steps in the process of developing strategic objectives.

Debrief and final thoughts:

Debrief of Day Two. Participants shared inspiring messages to close out retreat.

Assessment of Retreat Process

Facilitator's Observations:

How did this process serve to accomplish the retreat's purpose and outcomes?

1. Highly engaging. Everyone was able to participate, to have their voice heard, all ideas were posted.
2. Interactive small group processes. Brainstorming, discussion, charting, ratings, making personal statements.
3. Questions served as a catalyst for discussion and idea generation.
4. Small group work whereby people developed a relationship and trust.
5. Self-facilitated – attendees monitored their time to accomplish their tasks.
6. Clear focus of tasks and outcomes.
7. Cross-section of people in small groups – heard from various perspectives.

8. Created a sense of personal responsibility for the future of public transit.
9. Resulted in specific ideas for objectives.

What were some challenges this process presented?

1. The need for sufficient work space for small groups to record on flipcharts and to be able to hear each other without disrupting a nearby small group.
2. Sufficient wall space to hang flipchart paper of small groups' work when reporting out.
3. Some people were not able to be there the second day. So, we had to combine one group with another. Loss of people's input by not being there and a change in small group dynamics.

What were other insights or special moments during the process?

1. Attendees commented they liked this process because it was not a typical meeting structure.
2. Attendees liked monitoring their own time and to make adjustments to the process to accomplish their task.
3. Attendees selected ideas they thought were most important for the future of public transit.
4. Personal sharing about transit usage by attendees in small and large group work.
5. Insights offered by an attendee from the Iowa Department of Corrections of the challenges released inmates encounter in accessing public transportation to get to jobs, grocery stores, or doctor's visits that are critical in establishing a new life outside of prison.
6. One attendee's quote that emotionally resonated with everyone was, "The sidewalk is my road." This was shared by an attendee who is in a wheelchair. It drove home for everyone the personal impact public transit has on people – their ability to get to their jobs, places of worship, stores, doctors, schools, etc. Public transit is more than highways, roads, and buses. It is even sidewalks and access to buildings. It was an emotionally moving experience for everyone. She put a human face to public transit.

Retreat Results

As noted above, attendees identified the top three ideas for each CCAM goal as recommended objectives. These objectives will guide the work of the ITCC for the foreseeable future.

For Goal 1, Improve Access to the Community through Transportation, top objectives were:

- (1) researching if public transit should be fare-free to improve access,
- (2) determining the policies/insurance/laws that are road blocks to transportation coordination
- (3 – tie) survey where people are traveling to determine if public transit is available
- (3 – tie) identify passenger transportation redundancies and gaps
- (3 – tie) centralize available passenger transportation services via technology

Goal 2, Enhance Cost-Effectiveness of Coordinated Transportation, top objectives:

- (1) investigate cost sharing and combined funding opportunities for passenger transportation providers
- (2) increase ITCC exposure to drive membership with social media and showing benefits to members
- (3) use centralized technology for payments and scheduling on any service available

Goal 3, Strengthen Interagency Partnerships and Collaboration with State, Local, and Industry Groups, top objectives:

- (1) work on ITCC's "brand" to define why we exist, our purpose, and objectives
- (2) more direct and frequent communication to and between ITCC members through social media or other means
- (3) identify little projects which would give quick victories and a purpose, perhaps offer gap grants to members to accomplish projects

Evaluation

The decision to hold a retreat was a good one. The bonding that occurred plus the objectives determined at the retreat will re-invigorate the ITCC. This was an excellent way to determine a path forward for the Council and hopefully will result in new, active members and keep the current members engaged. Outcomes of the retreat indicate the Council needs to grow the table and attract new members, but also brand ourselves as a valuable entity. This alone will continue to push the group forward, and allow for more inclusive conversation.

Lessons Learned

In the months leading up to the retreat, the Iowa DOT staff had been speculating about what kept the core group of ITCC members coming back to each ITCC meeting. After all, only two other state agencies are 'required' to attend the meetings by Iowa Code – the Department of Human Services and the Department on Aging. No major initiatives were being discussed, no funding was available exclusively for attendees. What was discovered through conversations at the retreat and other meetings was that the core group of ITCC members get something out of every meeting. They are informed about the work of their peers around the table that they might not otherwise hear about, consequently building unconventional partnerships between agencies.

Members are encouraged to think about transportation at the planning stages of a new project or service, rather than just before the project is scheduled to start or even after operation has begun. The members have contacts at the Iowa DOT to call upon when wanting guidance on transportation issues. The lesson learned being that conversations about coordinated transportation matter. The results may not show immediately, and may not be measurable, but those conversations will have an impact.

To reiterate a point made in the Successes section, above, the biggest lesson learned is that attitude matters. All of the ITCC members are open to working together, and participating in the retreat only solidified that willingness to collaborate. There is not a lot of emphasis on the 'cannots' of a funding source, rather the question asked is "*How can we make this work?*" We expect that positive attitude to continue as the ITCC dives into the work of the objectives identified during the retreat.

Supporting Tools

The Iowa Code and Iowa Administrative Code sections discussing the coordinating council can be found online:

- Iowa Code, Chapter 324A
<https://www.legis.iowa.gov/docs/code/2018/324A.pdf>
- Iowa Administrative Code, Chapter 761.910
<https://www.legis.iowa.gov/docs/iac/chapter/761.910.pdf>

Transportation Coordination in Iowa: Report to the Iowa General Assembly and Governor,
https://iowadot.gov/transit/regulations/Transportation_Coordination_2016.pdf

Iowa Transportation Coordination Council website: <https://iowadot.gov/transit/itcc>

ATTACHMENT A: The Retreat Agenda.

ATTACHMENT B: ITCC Goals Worksheet.

ATTACHMENT C: Retreat group work results.

Attachment A



ITCC Retreat | Honey Creek Resort | March 26-27, 2018

Purpose: To explore the future of passenger transportation coordination in Iowa

1. Identify key Questions, Ideas, Strategies, and Objectives for the Following CCAM Goals:
 - Improve **Access** to the Community through Transportation
 - Enhance **Cost-Effectiveness** of Coordinated Transportation
 - Strengthen **Interagency Partnerships** and **Collaboration** with State, Local and Industry Groups
2. Assess the Viability of Ideas
3. Develop into Long-Range Strategies

Monday, March 26	
11:30 am	Lunch provided, <i>Mercy Medical Center meeting room</i>
12:00 pm	Welcome – Kristin Haar and Jeremy Johnson-Miller, Iowa DOT Office of Public Transit Kevin Pokorny, Pokorny Consulting
12:15 pm	Introduction of Attendees
12:30 pm	Review Agenda
12:35 pm	ITCC and CCAM History – Kristin Haar, Iowa DOT Office of Public Transit Judy Shanley, Easter Seals & NCMM
1:00 pm	Small Group Work CCAM Goal 1: Improve Access to the Community through Transportation Round #1: Deliberation <ul style="list-style-type: none">• List questions that need to be asked regarding access to transportation• Based on each question, generate ideas to improve access through coordination• Assess the viability (ability to be successful) of our ideas. Assign a rating to each idea, as follows:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ 1=most viable○ 2=viable○ 3=somewhat viable○ 4=least viable
2:00 pm	Small Group Report Out CCAM Goal 1: Improve Access to the Community through Transportation Round #2: Each group will present the following information: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Questions to Ask

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ideas with a viability rating of 1 or 2
--	---

Monday, March 26, <i>continued</i>	
2:45 pm	BREAK
3:00 pm	<p>Small Group Work</p> <p>CCAM Goal 2: Enhance the Cost-Effectiveness of Coordinated Transportation Round #1: Deliberation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List questions that need to be asked regarding cost-effectiveness • Based on each question, generate ideas to improve cost-effectiveness • Assess the viability (ability to be successful) of our ideas. Assign a rating to each idea, as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 1=most viable ○ 2=viable ○ 3=somewhat viable ○ 4=least viable
4:00 pm	<p>Small Group Report Out</p> <p>CCAM Goal 2: Enhance the Cost-Effectiveness of Coordinated Transportation Round #2: Each group will present the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questions to Ask • Ideas with a viability rating of 1 or 2
4:45 pm	Debrief
6:00 pm	Dinner provided – <i>Rathbun Lakeshore Grille</i>

Tuesday, March 27	
7:30 am	Breakfast provided, <i>Mercy Medical Center meeting room</i>
8:00 am	Welcome and Re-cap from day one
8:15 am	<p>Small Group Work</p> <p>CCAM Goal 3: Strengthen Interagency Partnerships and Collaboration State, Local and Industry Groups Round #1: Deliberation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List questions that need to be asked regarding cost-effectiveness • Based on each question, generate ideas to improve cost-effectiveness • Assess the viability (ability to be successful) of our ideas. Assign a rating to each idea, as follows:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 1=most viable ○ 2=viable ○ 3=somewhat viable ○ 4=least viable
--	--

Tuesday, March 27, <i>continued</i>	
9:15 am	<p>Small Group Report Out</p> <p>CCAM Goal 3: Strengthen Interagency Partnerships and Collaboration State, Local and Industry Groups</p> <p>Round #2: Each Group will present the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questions to Ask • Ideas with a viability rating of 1 or 2
10:00 am	BREAK
10:15 am	<p>Small Group Work</p> <p>Each group will identify 1-2 objectives for each of the 3 CCAM Goals discussed</p>
11:15 am	Debrief and Next Steps
12:00 pm	Box Lunch provided

THANK YOU for participating in the ITCC Retreat, your input is greatly appreciated and encourage each of you to become regular members at our bi-monthly meetings held in Des Moines. The work done at the retreat will enable ITCC to keep moving passenger transportation in Iowa forward.

A final report will be submitted at the end of May, outlining the goals and objectives discussed, as well as being presented at the annual 2018 Passenger Transportation Summit.

You are all encouraged to attend the **2018 Passenger Transportation Summit** on May 24 at the FFA Enrichment Center, located on the Ankeny DMACC Campus. Registration is free and lunch is provided.

Please register by May 4: <https://tikly.co/events/2545>.



Improve Access to the
Community Through
Transportation

OBJECTIVE 1

OBJECTIVE 2

OBJECTIVE 3



Enhance
Cost-Effectiveness of
Coordinated Transportation

OBJECTIVE 1

OBJECTIVE 2

OBJECTIVE 3



Strengthen Interagency
Partnerships & Collaboration with
State, Local, & Industry Groups

OBJECTIVE 1

OBJECTIVE 2

OBJECTIVE 3

Attachment C

Office of Public Transit Retreat Agenda March 26-27, 2018

Questions and Ideas and Viability

Viability rating for ideas:

- 1=most viable
- 2=viable
- 3=somewhat viable
- 4=least viable

Goal #1: Improve access of public transit to the communities

Group A

Questions

1. What is the impact of Iowa's older population (650,000, 60+) on transportation systems?
2. How to get people to jobs/training during non-transit hours?
3. What is meant by "community?"
4. How to get from county to county or other regional hubs?
5. How to maintain a healthy community?
6. How to align regions/areas of responsibility?
7. Can ITCC drive more analysis of coordination?
8. Can funds be provided for anything on wheels, e.g., bike, mopeds, etc.?

Ideas and viability ratings

- Use bus pass to swipe your card and rent a bike – 3
- Public transportation should be free – 1
- Transit oriented development for logical transit routes – 4
- Partner with businesses and employers -2
- Each region should have MOB manager – 2
- Inventory of vehicles and coordination (TAG/plans, all volunteer groups, faith-based, private, local groups) – 2

Group B

Questions

1. Why is private transportation the first thought?
2. What does the term "community" mean?
3. What defines "transportation?"
4. Why so many hurdles and not one source for information?
5. Where can I go for information?
6. Why is there a stigma in Iowa Public transit?
7. What is the "public transit" culture in Iowa?
8. Where/how do we increase mobility literacy/awareness?

[Type here]

Ideas and viability ratings

- Action Plan – Mobility literacy: connecting access to mobility & existing infrastructure – no rating
 - Internal vs. external ABC's of mobility
 - How can public transit be accessed? How does it work, where does it go, how much, how do I pay?
 - What are the benefits and convenience to customer/rider?
 - Create an employer incentivization plan

Group C

Questions

1. Do we need more available hours when people need to travel?
2. How do people access the transportation, e.g., sidewalk, curb-out, construction, etc.?
3. Where are people going?
4. Do people have access to information to services already available?
5. Are vehicles equipped to transport all users and mobility devices?
6. What level of quality of ride is needed, e.g., time on bus, quality of vehicle, dispatch experience, etc.?

Ideas and viability ratings

Do we need more available hours when people need to travel?

- Hire more drivers – 2
- Get more money – 3
- Volunteer drivers – 2
- Night/weekend employers contribute funds for service – 1
- Using cab/private providers during off-hours – 1
- Mobility-on-demand grant - 2

How do people access the transportation, e.g., sidewalk, curb-out, construction, etc.?

- Sidewalks need to be maintained + bike laws – 2
- People need to actively monitor for problem locations and report findings to agency – 1
- Communities to have a sidewalk coordinator – 1
- Coordinate with Safe Routes to School Coordinator – 2
- Coordinate with bike advocates – 2

Where are people going?

- Survey where people travel – 1
- Build cities to put places closer together
- Mobility requirements for new developments – 2
- Include transit planning with local planning and zoning long range plans – 2
- Transit-oriented development

-2-

Do people have access to information to services already available?

- Make sure information is in public places, e.g., libraries, schools – 1

[Type here]

- Public transit agencies need to publish information on services – 1
- Have a contact person identified – 1

Are vehicles equipped to transport all users and mobility devices?

- Should accommodate all users and equipment – no rating
- A certain % of vehicles should be accessible – 1

What level of quality of ride is needed, e.g., time on bus, quality of vehicle, dispatch experience, etc.?

- Provide on-demand transit – 4
- Direct routes (limit time on bus) - 3

Group D

Questions

1. Where are people going?
2. Where are people coming from?
3. When are people traveling, day and time?
4. What is the affordability?
5. What are the existing funding sources?
6. What are the length of trips?
7. What is the perception of public transit in areas?
8. Who provides transportation in the area?
9. What types of people are using the services currently?
10. What is the fleet age and conditions? How do these affect reliability and access?
11. What are the other providers competing (Uber, Lyft)?
12. What is stopping people from accessing the community?
13. Does insurance liability stand in the way of sharing services?
 - Is this real or imagined?
 - Do we need to change state liability laws?
14. Where do redundancies exist?
 - Identify them
 - Where are the gaps?
15. Centralization via technology?
16. Communication via technology?

Ideas and viability ratings

Where are people going?

- Do a GIS analysis to determine - 1

-3-

Where are people coming from?

- Assess inventory – 3

[Type here]

- Do surveys of general population - 1

When are people traveling, day and time?

- Do a “lit” review – 1

What is the affordability?

What are the existing funding sources?

What are the length of trips?

What is the perception of public transit in areas?

Who provides transportation in the area?

- Assess available funding
- Assess if silos really exist – 2
- Assess if policies allow vehicle and service sharing – 2

What are the other providers competing (Uber, Lyft)?

- Form relationships with TNCs – 2

What is stopping people from accessing the community?

- Need to identify if there are services available – 1

Does insurance liability stand in the way of sharing services?

- Is this real or imagined? - 1
- Do we need to change state liability laws? - 3

Where do redundancies exist?

- Identify them - 2
- Where are the gaps? – 2

Centralization via technology? - 4

Communication via technology? – 4

Goal #2: Enhance the cost-effectiveness of coordinated transportation

Group A

Questions

1. Is there enough data to evaluate or examine the cost effectiveness on current ROI?
2. Is there a list of contributors and sources of funds?
3. What are the best practices for cost savings in other states?
4. Who is determining what cost effectiveness is, both for the deliverer and rider?
5. How can area service regions be more aligned?

-4-

6. What measurement systems do we have in place to assess urban vs. rural? Is it the same or different?

[Type here]

7. What are the overlapping and adjacent services with different rules, regulations, pay, etc.?

Ideas and viability ratings

- Transparency in systems (MCO transportation providers) - 3
 - What do they spend on rides?
 - How many denied rides?
- Provide incentives for government/public/private agencies and entities to coordinate services – 1
- Need citizen participation vs. institutional/agency driven measures – 2
- Establish performance based practices, outcomes and data driven decisions – 3
- Leverage social media – 1
- Pooled insurance for shared transit by non-profits, private, etc. – 3
- Provide a tax incentive or credit for individuals providing rides – 1

Group B

Questions

1. What data measures are there currently to capture ROI?
2. What are the policy barriers?
3. Why aren't local providers pooling resources?
4. What are the barriers and fears for local providers to pool resources?
5. Are we successfully using member resources first, e.g., having intern for ITCC?
6. Do our needs equal our resources?
7. Where is ITCC's local voice at the policy level? Why no day "on the hill?"
8. Why isn't ITCC on social media, e.g., canned messaging?
9. Are GAP grants an option for members?

Ideas and viability ratings

One overarching idea: Increase ITCC exposure to drive membership – no rating except for last idea

- Social media presence on Facebook, twitters, monthly newsletter
- Membership benefits
 - Network, tools, resources
 - Access to customizable canned messaging (can be specific)
 - Resources to GAP grants or other funding sources
- Increasing membership increases resources and voices which creates more local presence opportunities
- Capturing data (qualitative and quantitative) and using the data to benefit membership which evidences ROI, e.g., mixed medical appointments, cost of onboarding for employers
- ITCC INTERN for data collection, surveying, marketing – 1

-5-

Group C

Questions and Ideas and Ratings combined

[Type here]

1. Where do “transit” funds exist?
2. How to reduce the six-sigma? – 1
3. What are the insurance barriers that may drive up costs?
4. Will transit ever be cost effective?
5. Leverage emerging technologies (AV) – 2
6. Utilize non-government/private fleet
7. Use driverless vehicles to supplement failing operations – 2
8. Sustainable funding sources
9. Why do people call an ambulance for non-emergencies?
10. We need to reduce number of trips, e.g., use grocery delivery options – 1
11. Implement one-stop medical centers for pharmacy, hospital with transit and multi-providers – 1
12. Education and outreach
13. Reduce routes and supplement with on-demand response using mass and micro-transit – 1

Group D

Questions and Ideas and Ratings combined

From the users’ perspective:

1. Why can’t I use my funding source on multiple transportation providers?
 - Need a centralized funding data bank to sort out barriers – 4
 - Need policy changes – 4
2. Should fares be on a progressive scale based on income?
 - Conduct a study on who is riding – 1
 - Assess cost benefit of fares (free or reduced fares) – 1
3. How many trips can I take and still pay my bills?
 - Need data on cost of using a transit pass vs. pay per ride fare – 1
4. Is the cost savings using the bus, bike or walk worth the length of time spent on a trip?
 - Need data on cost per mode (time + \$) – 1

From the providers’ perspective:

1. How can I serve more passengers efficiently?
 - Coordinate across agencies to look at the overall trip needs to plan services – 3
 - Identify or develop technology to help group our own trips – 3
2. What are barriers to coordinated transportation? Insurance? Policies/laws?
 - Need to do a review – 1
 - Need to identify what is fact vs. fiction – 1
 - Make recommendations or improvements – 1
3. What is the most effective way to provide services in rural areas vs. urban?
 - Assess differences in fleet needs – 2
 - Assess use of vehicles during down times – 3

-6-

4. What is the benefit to my organization by coordinating with other agencies?
 - Assess financial savings – 2

[Type here]

- Assess use of vehicles all hours and days – 2
5. How could public transit apply cutting edge private technologies?
- Scheduling softwares – 3

**Goal #3: Strengthen interagency partnerships and collaboration
with other state and local groups**

Group A

Questions

1. How do we identify TRN dollars at the state level?
2. How to coordinate and consolidate experience for effectiveness?
3. How to have more transparency for NEMT experiences?
4. What is the relationship between ITCC, NPO, RPA, MPO, TAGS, and PTP?
5. How to engage more business participation?
6. What does coordination really mean? Are all the agencies on the same page?
7. What does success mean and look like?

Ideas and viability ratings

- Shared resources, dollars, vehicles policy between state agencies – 2
- Develop MOU-guide efforts – 2
- Collaborate events for state agencies to participate in business groups (ABI, ECI, HLSEM, CERT, COEOC) and hold meetings in Ames or different locations – 1
- Generate communication on ITCC goals, outcomes, highlight all coordinated efforts, etc. in department/agency publications – 1
- Have an ITCC new member orientation – 1
- Have agency directors involved beyond their state agency reps for transparency for NEMT – 1
- Encourage elected officials to take public transit – 2

Group B

Questions

1. What opportunities exist for informal connections among “partner” agencies?
2. Why don’t we go to each other’s conferences?
3. How do we access each other’s silos?
4. What is one ITCC brand?
5. What are examples of other state’s best practices?
6. What’s in it for me?

-7-

Ideas and viability ratings

- Need to define - What’s in it for me? - 1

[Type here]

- Need to develop a platform for outreach and information sharing, but also to support “insider” communication
- We need to see ourselves as ambassadors
- We want UBER.gov
- ITCC to identify and participate in a clearinghouse “each one teach” – 1
- We need to attend new conferences and events – 1
- Highlight member spotlights; needs sharing and expectations for sharing promising practices and innovative solutions

Group D

Questions

1. What is the current state of existing partnerships?
2. How can we clearly define all stakeholders?
3. Who do we need to work with and who is NOT at the table?
4. What are best practices in local areas, states, nationally?
5. What does it take to keep investing in the process long term?
6. Do we understand all funding sources in Iowa?
 - Non-profits?
 - Community colleges?
 - Faith-based?
 - Refugees and immigration?
 - Grants?
 - Medical clinics and hospitals?
7. How do we prioritize stakeholders?

Ideas and viability ratings

- Goal #3 should be goal #1 for ITCC: marketing, branding, expand the table FIRST. Then we address goals #1 and #2, which will be easier. – 1
- Let’s get an intern to work on our ideas – 1
- Ideas to keep current members engaged:
 - Show how progress can be made – 1
 - Celebrate small victories – 1
 - Identify little projects to work on – 1
 - Obtain a “gap” grant to/for participants of the group – 3
 - Provide technical assistance – 1
 - Do data sharing – 1
- Ideas to get stakeholders who are NOT at the table:
 - VA – need a veteran advocate – 2
 - Dept. of Education – to address “transition” events and accessibility – 1
 - IME – for data/cost/research on dollars lost on ineffectiveness – 3 or 4
 - DHS – extend an invitation to them – 1
 - IDPH – can transit fit within their current initiatives in dealing with “obesity?” – 1 or 2
- County public health agencies – how transit issues can be a part of their 5-year plan – 1 or 2

[Type here]

- MHDS regions – meet them and invite them – 1 or 2