

**Mobility Action Plan (MAP) Phase I Implementation Study
Project Advisory Committee (PAC)**

Meeting Summary

**Wednesday, April 14, 2010 – 10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.
Florence Sylvester Memorial Senior Center
23721 Moulton Parkway
Laguna Hills, CA 92653**

Meeting Attendees

See Attachment A

Meeting Summary

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m. by Kimberly Gayle, MAP PAC Chair. She informed the committee that there is a special emphasis today on consolidated transportation services agencies and she is hoping for an active discussion by the committee.

Lynn Daucher welcomed the committee and emphasized the meeting's importance in concluding this year's work and she thanked members for attending.

Tracey Frost read the meeting summary from the February 17th MAP PAC meeting and asked for questions or comments on the meeting summary from committee members.

Kimberly Gayle reminded the committee that the DMT website contains copies of all meeting materials under the Coordination Liaison tab, including the meeting agenda.

Tracey Frost added that the PowerPoint meeting outline is also on the website for members to follow along during the meeting.

Kimberly Gayle highlighted Action Items from the previous meeting. Kimberly noted that the first item, scoring criteria and priorities, has been presented and discussed by stakeholders and the findings will be incorporated in the final Strategic Implementation Plan document. She said that the third item is ongoing, which is the requested suggestions for additional MAP PAC roster names. She said that the roster has grown from the beginning of the study, as they have maintained a steady group of attendees during the process. She said that the next item includes the July 31, 2008, review of MOU and plans for development which has been postponed due to state budgetary issues. Ms. Gayle explained that after the Strategic Implementation Plan is developed and presented in June, it will identify how they move forward in developing the MOU, which will be discussed after the June meeting.

Ms. Gayle moved to the ninth item on page two, regarding accessible transportation, which discusses emergency vehicles that are not typically equipped to transport to

nursing facilities. She said that this will be covered in the final Strategic Implementation Plan, along with the next item, the examination of federal funding sources, as well as item 19 below that.

Ms. Gayle continued in saying that on item two on page three, they identified establishing the TDA working group as part of the stakeholder involvement process and they will forward opportunities for members to join the group and provide their meeting schedules on the website. She said that the fourth item on page four, the stakeholder outreach opportunity, is not completed due to staffing and budgetary issues; however, she reports regularly at the rural county task force meetings.

Ms. Gayle said that the last item on page 4, the documentation of all coordinated plan projects as an element of the statewide plan, will be completed as an appendix to the final strategic plan. She said that all existing items on page seven will be covered in the Strategic Implementation Plan. She continued that the last meeting will include the Strategic Implementation Plan and they want to make sure all action items are identified and covered in the preceding meetings in order to move forward with implementation after the June meeting.

Dave Cyra said that item 17 on page two discusses accessible transportation in emergency vehicles and he continued saying that there are vehicles that transport people for non-emergency trips that carry both stretchers and wheelchairs.

Kimberly Gayle said that this was an item offered by a committee member and this information is imperative in providing a response for the strategic plan and they must distinguish between those that can or cannot hold these items. She asked whether or not the constraints are based on the size or the configuration of the vehicles.

Dave Cyra answered that it is the vehicle configuration because it is usually a stretcher vehicle with a place for a stretcher and a wheelchair.

Dan Palumbo said that they have a local ambulance company that initiated a program in which they offered their ambulances for non-emergency medical trips when they were not in service. He said that they included pieces of equipment and -emergency medical transportation that was available throughout the day to transfer discharges or patients from nursing facilities. He said that they ran the program for a year and a half and it was only recently terminated. He said that he can provide the contact information of administrators to obtain information regarding barriers and he added that it might be more than funding that was the problem.

Dave Cyra said that some ambulance companies have spun off in non-profit business and provide non-emergency trips as well, creating two prongs to their business.

Meeting Overview

Judith Norman outlined the meeting purposes, which included the presentation of study updates and the reception of comments and feedback from members as it is a working meeting. She thanked Dan Palumbo for hosting the meeting.

Ms. Norman said that they plan to discuss the status of non-emergency medical transportation regarding medical transportation reimbursement, coordination governance

and its relationship to the CTSA discussion and overview, and outline the Strategic Implementation Plan development and its timeline.

NEMT Reimbursement

Judith Norman moved to page 3 of the PowerPoint and discussed the NEMT issues. She said that they captured many issues in previous legislative analysis discussions and thanks to Lynn Daucher, a teleconference was held with the California Department of Aging and the Department of Health Care Services with Barbara Bailey, to discuss reimbursement issues. She explained that they discussed reimbursement issues involved in public transit relative to Medi-Cal and NEMT trips, as well as other underlying issues like costs and program administration. Ms. Norman continued in saying that Caltrans will work to spearhead this study and give DHCS more information to evaluate their participation. She said that the San Diego model was referenced in the meeting, which provides reimbursed Medi-Cal trips. She added that there was discussion of NEMT brokerage and this raised the discussion of a potential research project to evaluate this possibility. Ms. Norman asked for discussion from the committee on providing DHCS with information.

MAP PAC Questions and Comments

Lynn Daucher said that DHCS has already requested information, which they agreed to send after this meeting.

Judith Norman said that DHCS has agreed to work with Caltrans and the Department of Aging but they wanted to discuss this possibility with the committee first.

Dave Cyra said that fixed route should be examined as well and they might examine Tulare County and contact Dan Fox, who sells 150 passes of which 70 are purchased by regional centers.

Lynn Daucher asked if these passes are reimbursed by Medi-Cal.

Dave Cyra answered that most likely they are not but the point is that even if the state does not recognize cost savings, the local administrators do and instead of purchasing services, they can purchase a bus pass for clients.

Lynn Daucher asked if Kimberly Gayle has a grant with them.

Kimberly Gayle answered yes and said that she will check whether it is a New Freedom grant.

Jean Foletta said that their regional center in Stockton is one of the largest bus pass purchasers as they buy in bulk for fixed route and demand response. She said that would be a common theme throughout the state if they are examining regional centers.

Judith Norman said that they must ensure they focus on the current issue which is the difficulty in obtaining Medicare-certified transportation providers.

Floyd Willis said that this is an important piece of information happening in Tulare but they must not lose focus on the NEMT aspect and the difficulty involved with providers

resisting the certification process. He said that they are searching for a local brokerage to handle this cumbersome process in the state.

Lynn Daucher asked if this is different from the San Diego plan.

Floyd Willis answered that the ADA services have achieved NEMT reimbursement capacity because there are people who are picked up within the corridor and taken to drop off points within the corridor. He said that with that accomplishment, that is a piece of the model but it needs to advance to the point for a local entity to handle the certifications.

Lynn Daucher said that the agreement with DHCS was to examine that narrow model. She said that ideally they thought that Kimberly Gayle would have grant money to study an established model to gather data to convince DHCS that this is a cost effective model.

Floyd Willis said that the model could be replicated and built upon to broaden it so that a jurisdictional hub can handle the certifications to serve people outside of the ADA corridor.

Kimberly Gayle said that the encouraging factor is that the DHCS managers were open to understanding the issue. She said that DHCS must be educated and they are willing and open to using the San Diego model, which is already in operation, and this will allow for a broader pilot program.

Jean Foletta commented on Mr. Cyra's statement and said that the regional center understands the cost saving measures by using public transit, fixed route and Dial-a-Ride. She said that they receive money from the state and might be a resource to bump this to the next level. She said that the regional centers have operating these programs for some time and saving money.

Lynn Daucher said that the Medi-Cal cost neutrality that DCHS examines is much more stringent and they set a higher bar to institute programs and she is unsure if they are comparing apples to apples.

Kimberly Gayle said that they must find a new representative at the Department of Developmental Services. She said that it is an easier process than what they want to achieve with Medi-Cal and they can look into that program at the state level.

Lynn Daucher said that they will find a contact and find out what they can learn and what information has already been gathered.

Frances Jacobs said that she does not know if they will receive information at the regional level and they should speak with the local level for bus passes and Dial-a-Ride. She said that she has a group that meets on a periodic basis that can provide that information to the committee. She said that it is important to start with DHCS and if the door is open they will be able to tell them everything in the future.

Dave Cyra said that he hopes they do not get penalized for sharing information.

Lynn Daucher said that they are not getting reimbursed so there should not be a penalty.

Frances Jacobs said that they must bring them to the table, involve them and feed them information as they progress.

Clay Kempf said that they should examine models in Santa Cruz and Monterey County which operated similar to San Diego for a number of years. He said that DHCS came down hard and forced them to stop providing those services.

Lynn Daucher said that this is her worry but they must start with opening the door.

Dan Palumbo said that with respect to NEMT as it relates to Medicaid benefits, Medi-Cal and Cal Optima, it is unique in every county. He said that the issues are not unique to California and there is a move today where administrators of Medicaid transportation benefit for NEMT access to healthcare. He said that there are a number of individuals that are Medicaid beneficiaries and are losing benefits for access to healthcare of NEMT.

Mr. Palumbo said that they have a partnership and resources of funding and capacity, with which they have leveraged money. He said that there is a push from Medicaid or Medi-Cal to public transit and they must remember it is about the individual, independence and the quality of life, especially at their end states of life. He continued in saying there is a push at the local and federal levels between FDA and HHS and advocacy groups and they must get to bottom of this.

Mr. Palumbo said that outside of ADA, brokerages can create programs that would qualify as trips if they need to report under ADA. He said that they must focus outside of ADA and reduce the demand for people to qualify under ADA and provide service at lower costs by replicating models that work. He said that they have used tobacco settlement revenue and also creative pilot projects. He explained that he does not know how much HHS must be involved beyond those who qualify for their benefit and at the end of the day, this is a smaller percentage. He said that they temporarily use New Freedom and tobacco settlement revenue, which keeps pressure off public transit. Mr. Palumbo continued that they must address the large gap by establishing a brokerage and funding projects for the non-senior disabled population that will lose their Medi-Cal healthcare benefits. He said that he has an efficient and cost effective system for on-time performance which is not under ADA regulations. He summarized that the bottom line is that they would like to meet with committee members to provide information on their program.

Dianna M. Daily said that they are bound by Title 22 on the criteria they must use. She said that over the last year they drifted away from these criteria and allowed more rides and eliminated prior authorization and were out of compliance. She said that the criteria are restrictive on what Medi-Cal must pay for and they have a large number of people who do not meet the medical necessity criteria. She said that they joined with other groups in order to meet their clients' needs. She continued in saying that the need is for clients who do not meet the criteria and they have partnered with local organizations. Ms. Daily said that their biggest need is for the under-60 population and they are interested in piloting a program to show cost effectiveness.

Lynn Daucher asked if the capitated rate could include transportation.

Dianna M. Daily said that the Title 22 criteria is included in their capitation rate.

Lynn Daucher asked if they can expand the capitation.

Dianna M. Daily answered no because they have to consider administrative costs and they cannot cover this under medical costs. She said that they have to show cost effectiveness in order to do this.

Lynn Daucher asked if this is a federal or a state limitation.

Dianna M. Daily answered that it is a state limitation. She asked if they can incorporate something in 11-15 but they must pilot a program and show cost effectiveness.

Dave Cyra said that in places where the system is working, it is because of coordination, not consolidation and there is an emphasis on the customer not the regulation.

Coordination Governance

Judith Norman moved to slide 4, regarding coordination governance. She said that they have discussed a number of issues that surfaced throughout stakeholder outreach and MAP PAC discussions and she reminded the committee that these surfaced during the legislative analysis.

Dan Palumbo said that true coordination has brought them to this point, with the ability to relieve the pressure on public transit. He explained that they have a huge gap for the non-senior disabled and they need auditable outcomes, at least as far as cost, efficiency, on-time performance and quality of service so they can make comparisons to ADA mandated service and find partners to help meet gaps and work through barriers. He said that it is a coordinated model and it has evolved rapidly over the last few years and they did not see it coming at the local level but this is a great opportunity.

Judith Norman said that they will be satisfied with their final findings and priorities that come out of the MAP PAC committee.

Judith Norman continued to slide 4 and said that this issue is part of the study's goals and objectives and they want to talk about looking at additional formalized structures and viabilities. She explained that greater state-level assistance is needed to provide structured guidance. She said that Caltrans DMT is the sponsor of this study but there are other partners, including the Department of Aging. She said that they are focusing on public transit and health and human services, as well as other departments in addition to Caltrans.

Ms. Norman said that a plan at the state level and agreement between departments will facilitate what must happen to make changes at the local level. She said that one option is to develop coordinated councils, as they do exist in other states.

Ms. Norman continued to slide 5, which highlights a direct state and local relationship and establishes a local community board. She said that there is guidance in terms of agenda and coordination and there is potential to identify dedicated long term funding sources. She said that coordinating councils currently exist in Florida, Washington and Wisconsin and they have discussed those particular coordinating councils and best

practices. She explained that due to state budgetary issues, the ability to make immediate recommendations would be problematic.

MAP PAC Questions and Comments

Floyd Willis said that he is unsure if a separate body is needed to help accomplish the first bullet point on slide 5 and the second point is related to a state oversight council. He said that there would be a tendency for that body to become a figurehead and reading paperwork, and he continued that often many things are said on paper that sound like coordination but it is ultimately up to the local CTSA to ensure coordination is going to take place. He said that this could be accomplished from a monitoring level of a department that already exists to ensure that TDA is implemented in the CTSA establishments, versus having to explain to the state how coordination is happening or not happening.

Judith Norman said that it is a multifaceted solution and they are currently discussing the structure side. She said that they have discussed the need for additional information, including making a recommendation to provide more information on websites and links to regional websites, relative to the unmet needs issues. She said that as far as structured guidance, Caltrans deals with coordinated transportation plans and the study implementation plan will address possible improvements. She said that the unmet needs findings and results should be included in the coordinated plan, which is a structured-guidance recommendation.

Floyd Willis said that they must clarify current department expectations instead of creating a new oversight body.

Judith Norman said that she agrees with Mr. Willis and Mr. Palumbo and she emphasized that it must be grassroots at the local level; however, the impetus rests in different places. She said that they performed a legislative analysis to discover inhibiting policies and barriers. She continued that she is certain that they cannot solve the problem within the two years of the study, but they can surface the priorities and issues and one facet of these is the state-level organization idea which is highlighted on slide 5 with the direct state and local relationship. She agrees that they are discussing coordination that takes place between state and local and regional agencies or community managers.

Deleted:

Floyd Willis asked if those are outcomes that Ms. Norman is describing. He said that he does not think that they need another state body that has only one job to ensure that coordination is taking place.

Dan Palumbo said that this is a high priority issue and at the local level they also have other stakeholders, including local hospitals and foundations of community benefits, involved who contract separately for NEMT. He said that the last thing they need is another federal state or other body that will govern and command coordination at the local level so they must find a balance. He said that another opportunity is the expansion of Medicaid and the healthcare system, which must contribute and understand benefits. He continued that they need research on preventive care and preventive surgeries in order to avoid hospitalizations so they can remove that barrier from HHS versus public transit at the local, state, and federal levels.

Judith Norman said that those are services that the locals cannot deliver and they already know this. She said that she is not recommending councils but instead saying that they are potential mechanisms to address issues. She said that in prior NEMT discussions, they have mounted many assaults against the state to force them to allow public transportation providers such as Medi-Cal. She continued in saying that the state must buy into this idea because the reality is that ultimately the regional departments are funded from these very people. She said that they do not mean meddling in regional decisions as those involved in the study know that this is the last thing that they advocate.

Dan Palumbo said that this is a partnership that flows from the local level to the state level and eventually, the federal level.

Lynn Daucher said that the new health bill says that there is a three day period that keeps people from being readmitted to hospitals and funds the transition to homes. She said that this is the period of time for transportation to be available and it should be included in the capitated rate. She said that they should tell the state that they need transportation included in the capitated rate and it cannot be by the administration. She is unsure who they demand this from because Ms. Gayle has no influence over the other departments; therefore, they need somebody like Ms. Gayle and herself or their successors.

Dan Palumbo commented that Ms. Daucher said when they first opened discussion, "Do not come to the state and tell us, like everybody else, how every dollar in your program will save the state money. This trickles up if you follow the money to the federal level, but you must show this with honorable research and outcomes." He explained that the greatest challenge for nonprofits is to take a control group and provide service in a continuum safety net for five hundred lives and track this for three years and compare outcomes to a group that they deny service to. He said that they need partners in the healthcare industry.

Lynn Daucher said that it can be simpler because they have an opportunity if the state would allow it. She said that the capitated rate exists and there is risk but they will allow the decisions to be made without interfering.

Dan Palumbo said that they examined the state vendor requirements when providing NEMT and contracting with Medi-Cal but they ultimately bailed when it got to the point where they were told what type of light covers to purchase for their buses.

Lynn Daucher said that they will need someone like Ms. Gayle or herself, as well as a coordinated group, because they will know where to take with these issues.

Judith Norman said that this study, which the state decided to implement along with the MAP PAC group, facilitated this discussion and in order to surface these issues, they must understand the various connections between them. She said that this will yield additional work in this area and she continued that her recommendations are just that, and they will be accepted or rejected but the reality is looking at best practices that occur in other states and learning from them and moving forward.

Floyd Willis said that the word "coordination" is something that cannot be governed and they are trying to use this same label in this instance. He continued that coordination is

spirited and they must come on board to see possible advantages. He recommended using the idea of a state-level formalized government structure versus an advocacy structure and keeping the MAPPAC alive as an advocacy coordinating body. He said that he agrees that someone at the state level must coordinate rather than the local level.

Pam Couch said that the oversight and choice of the region of the CTSA, or whatever entity, is important but if they are discussing the continuous involvement of a council of stakeholders, that is also critical that they do not become a regulatory body with no input and who simply performs the work.

Judith Norman said that this concept will require an executive order for legislation and it will not happen immediately but it is something that must be discussed. She said that they have considered a state level interagency effort strategy because they need input from many departments. She said that the focus is not on governance but rather the organization behind coordination and having strength from top and bottom and currently coordination is missing this support. She continued that they need management support to accomplish goals which helps spearhead agenda from the local level.

Pam Couch said that there must be a connection to money because coordination is an unfunded mandate right now. She said that there is no way to coordinate or create a mechanism like the STIP program as there is nothing like that in these projects.

Judith Norman said that this is where they are headed and they will review and comment on these issues in the final document.

Christie Scheffer said that in Washington they have a technical-assistance type body that holds discussions and documents coordination throughout the state and they gather stakeholders to have those conversations. She said that through this process as they encounter coordination barriers, they have found that the real barriers are at the federal level. She said that state agency representatives might have the desire to allow reimbursement but it is prevented by federal regulations. She continued that they are in the process of establishing a federal work group to bring issues to federal representatives to receive resolution

Lynn Daucher asked if there is a country-wide organization that shares the work of all states with other states.

Dave Cyra answered that this is the CCAM, a nationwide council at the federal level, which includes health, children, elderly, etc., who discuss sharing rides and costs, which took 25 years to establish.

Kimberly Gayle said that she has monitored the CCAM and there is a very aggressive effort on the transportation side but a less informative effort on the HHS side. She said that they have been working to influence the FTA and they are present but the information is not flowing on the HHS side.

Dave Cyra said that Medicaid and Veterans Affairs are dragging their feet with many barriers.

Lynn Daucher said that from the HHS side, they view the transportation people asking for and taking money when there is already a lack of money. She said that they cannot approach it as a silo and demand money to deliver transportation. She said that it must be discussed in the context of capitation of taking people to doctor appointments rather than the hospital.

Dave Cyra said that it must be customer-centric.

Lynn Daucher said that it is the wrong approach to claim that they need money for projects. She continued that the transportation people must stop talking about projects and start talking about how to keep people healthy instead of getting sick and relapsing.

Christie Scheffer said that there was a research study performed by Dr. Joseph Cronnin at Florida State University in March, 2008, a "Return on Investment" study where they studied five programs with significant invested transportation dollars to discover the return on investment which includes medical, employment, education, nutrition and life sustaining. She explained that overall they found a return on investment of \$8.35 for every dollar invested in the program because these programs helped people age in place and provided access to lower cost medical services to keep them healthier and avoid long term care and hospital stays. She said that for medical alone, for every one dollar in lower cost transportation they saved \$11.

Dave Cyra said that the Transportation Research Board performed a similar study about the same time and he thinks it is \$75.

Lynn Daucher said that this study cannot be used to carve a piece out of Medicaid for transportation because that is the wrong approach. She said that the study must be used to convince hospitals and doctors to help their patients obtain transportation.

Christie Scheffer said that they used this study during legislative sessions this year to appeal to people about transportation value and lower cost options that include Medicaid and transit systems and relay the idea that it is important to continue to fund those programs.

Kimberly Gayle said that it is a good point to identify references, resources and information, and they must identify who the appropriate audience is and this might not be for HHS but the legislature in Sacramento are looking for every cost-saving measure and that would be a good source.

Lynn Daucher said that as a legislator, everyone who visited her office made that same case but it is not convincing because she does not have a new dollar to spend. She said that the better argument is to take a dollar that is currently being spent and tell her how to spend it more wisely.

Dan Palumbo said that NEMT in California can realize significant savings, economic development, and financial benefit by examining working models that are less expensive than what it would cost public transit. He said that dumping Medicaid clients on public transit will never be the solution because they do not have funding. He explained they need to find a way to keep these transit-dependent clients out of public transit and in special needs, and off of ADA service, which is expensive and inefficient. He said that

they must find a way to leverage existing resources to lower costs, increase quality of service and keep up with the growing need.

Judith Norman said that Ms. Daucher said that HHS views this issue as a carve-out but it is ironic because transportation has thought the same thing and it is a tough sale for public transit because HHS wants to use their service without paying.

Kimberly Gayle said that they must pick the resource and appropriate audience as the transit agency will look for cost saving measures and HHS will look to bridge gaps and save existing dollars.

Clay Kempf said that if you can allow it through an 1115 Waiver and it saves costs, it should be in Medicaid especially if it is a capitated care plan.

Lynn Daucher said it should be allowed and local providers figure out how to implement it.

Clay Kempf said that they were shut down in Santa Cruz and Monterey counties even though they were under the capitated rate that they were assigned. He said that they completed the cost savings and showed that they spent less per client than the rest of the state and still their program was shut down.

Lynn Daucher asked if they were shut down because the state said that they can ding them on transportation and so that they could pay less than they are already paying.

Clay Kempf answered yes.

Judith Norman said that they will examine this issue over the next month.

CTSA Overview and Discussion

Judith Norman moved to slide 7, regarding CTSA overview and discussion. She reviewed the questions and issues on slide 7, which were offered by stakeholders. She said that in examining the coordinated plans, the reality is that the CTSA's mean different things to different regions. She said that the rural regions depend on the CTSA's and are active in coordination and the large and small urban areas CTSA's are also active and have developed relationships but there are also other CTSA's who do less and have not matured to that same level.

Ms. Norman said that one issue is whether the CTSA's should be the primary entities responsible for spearheading regional public transit and human service coordination at the regional or local level. She asked whether the established statutory framework which created the CTSA's should be modified to delegate additional authority to promote regional coordination or mobility management activities, or if an entirely different approach is needed. She said they have discussed the fact that many agencies support CTSA's, including the SSTAC and area boards. Ms. Norman asked for comments from the committee on these issues.

MAP PAC Questions and Comments

Floyd Willis suggested that because the discussion is so broad and vital perhaps they should review all potential alternatives before commenting.

Judith Norman said yes and she explained that they analyzed these issues from a legislative side and then used feedback from stakeholders and coalesced that into the alternatives. She discussed the proposed issues from the stakeholders, beginning with the first alternative.

Dave Cyra asked if this is the time to bring up the case for changing the “C” word from coordinated to consolidated. He said that if he calls for a vote he thinks it will fly and although it might be difficult, this might be the best thing to do.

Lynn Daucher asked what other agencies might be designated as a CTSA.

Judith Norman answered that they have issues with certain agencies not understanding the definition of CTSA or whether or not it is appropriate to be a CTSA. She said that they are discussing whether people are aware and if agencies who are involved in coordination should be allowed to be designated as a CTSA. She said that the regional agency is ultimately going to designate a CTSA and it will not just be any agency that becomes designated. She continued that they must make education broader in terms of the criteria to become a CTSA.

Dave Cyra said that it comes down to responsibilities and accountability because data is an important part and if they are not asked to collect data then they should drop the issue. He said that they need operational data in the region in order to move forward as a CTSA and coordinate transportation. He said that they must know needs, resources, operation details and whether it includes one or more persons per vehicle. He explained that with central transportation the productivity is not as important as sustaining a life and that it should be recorded not only for legislators but for state administrators as well.

Phi McGuire said that in Sacramento they have a well refined CTSA which has operated for 30 years. He said that they have partnership agreements with a number of service agencies in the community but one thing they have not done well is document the statistical factors associated with their operations. He said that this becomes important with challenges to the model because they do not have hard information in these cases. He continued in saying that if there is a partnership with an agency they do not document that agency's financial contribution to the program or the clientele that they transport, even if they are ADA eligible. Mr. McGuire said that even with a sophisticated agency, they have done a poor job of gathering the data that pertains to the model.

Linda Deavens said that as one of the original three MAP PAC members, this topic is important and she said that she felt that in Sacramento they operated by using friendly persuasion, because they lacked the authority to force health and human services to cooperate with them. She said that they have managed to accomplish coordination with real partnerships and that is missing because there is no power of authority. She continued in saying that she is unsure of the bullet points on slide 8 but they must expand to other human service organizations. She said that they must be flexible in the regional planning agency because what might work in one area might not work in

Deleted: s

another. She said that rather than reform laws, they need to inform health and human organizations that they can become CTSA's, more education might be helpful.

Judith Norman said that it is a local issue of more guidance at the state level about the nature of the CTSA's because they already have legislation and CTSA's but many people lack education in these areas.

Linda Deavens said that they need more education, guidance and encouragement.

Judith Norman said that their members coordinate with human service agencies and create excellent programs with them.

Pam Couch said that information, communication and education are needed for the RTPA. She said that it was the predecessor to mobility management but there is not currently a CTSA in the nine counties of the Bay Area because MTC does not think they are necessary.

Judith Norman reminded the committee that they must move forward but she clarified that the language on the slide is confusing. She said that since that is the case, they are all discussing the same thing that there should not be a change in the law, it is the regulatory framework that guides creation of CTSA's.

Floyd Willis said that the for-profit human service organizations would not be allowed currently and the RTPA cannot perform as a CTSA.

Phil McGuire asked if every county has a CTSA.

Judith Norman answered no and stated that that is the next discussion point.

David Cyra said that he would like to add to slide 8 as a recommendation to change "coordination" to "consolidation."

Floyd Willis said that the word "mobility" should be included as well.

Pam Couch said that they should change the wording to "coordinate" because that is critical.

Kimberly Gayle said that doing this will open up the statute for changes which is very dangerous.

Virginia Webster said that they all understand that it is coordinated and they were previously successful in consolidating but they are currently moving toward a coordinated model.

Judith Norman said that in Mr. Cyra's coordination discussion he realizes that it is a progression from the beginning to work together and gradually consolidate areas if possible but the focus is on flexibility.

Dan Palumbo said that it has evolved at the most local level and it is 180 degrees opposite of consolidation as they are finding new players to become part of the coordinated system of direct services, including health, human, transit and NEMT. He

explained that 25 years ago there were five small agencies using an older van that operated as the CTSA but things have changed dramatically.

David Cyra said that this is important because what is happening to Ms. Deavens is consolidation but they should have coordination. He said that the transit agency is trying to consolidate all services which will remove them from the service level of delivery and it is displayed in the name: Consolidated Service Transportation Agency. He said that it should be a coordinated transportation agency and they should allow them to actively participate in working with community groups to serve their clients and offer customer-centered service.

Kimberly Gayle said that they must remember that they have never heard "consolidated" but they can agree for MAP PAC purposes that CTSA can mean coordination and they will leave the statute alone if everyone agrees.

Lynn Daucher said that the next time they examine the statute, that change should be instituted.

Kimberly Gayle said that once they open a law in California, it never finishes the way that they intended.

David Cyra asked the committee for long term consideration of this change.

Pam Couch said that the last bullet point should be changed to two statutory changes and they should refer the concept of examination to the TDA group rather than the MAP PAC.

Judith Norman said that almost everything related to TDA will be included in her recommendation and the reality is that it must be handled by a group that already exists.

Linda Deavens said that everyone on the phone line must become members of the TDA working group.

Pam Couch said that the TDA meetings must include a focused agenda in order for participants to arrive at their specified time because they discuss many issues at the TDA meetings.

Floyd Willis wanted to clarify that they are not changing any statutes but rather they are discussing reform and how they might be implemented.

Kimberly Gayle answered that Caltrans is assigned in statute as the oversight agency, so there is a regulatory requirement that goes to CTC; therefore, it is ultimately a joint effort between Caltrans and CTC

Linda Deavens asked if there are any recommendations short of changing the law that will give implementation responsibility to one of the two agencies.

Kimberly Gayle answered that the two entities work together.

Linda Deavens said that she does not understand how MTC and other agencies do not think CTSA's are necessary and refuse to designate agencies in these positions.

Pam Couch said that one issue is that there is no penalty for not designating, although they did designate agencies in the beginning but then they undesignated.

Jennifer Yeamens said that she does not think MTC is a barrier to establishing CTSA's because there have not been requests to establish local CTSA's. She said that they might get to the issue of Article 4.5 and the establishment of CTSA's later in the meeting but she wanted to clarify that there has been no recent requests.

Kimberly Gayle asked if Ms. Yeamens said that MTC is open to having CTSA's established within their region.

Jennifer Yeamens answered yes and explained that there is a process outlined in their action plan of the early 1980s. She said that the current coordinated plan does not include a process for designating but this does not mean that it cannot be amended or updated to include this.

Kimberly Gayle asked if they are considering outreach as a potential in moving forward.

Jennifer Yeamens said that their process in the region includes requests from the county level and the board of supervisors at the local level, but they have not received anything like this.

Kimberly Gayle asked if they could discuss these procedures because they do not have this information and they would like to document that MTC has procedures for establishing CTSA's.

Linda Deavens asked if there are other counties without a CTSA besides MTC.

Jean Foletta said that RTD has attempted to become the CTSA in the Stockton metropolitan area but they have received a push back from the local MPO. She said that they need to educate the MPO on the importance of a CTSA because they are being held back due to a lack of understanding. She explained that a current project provided information and modeled projects after Sacramento but they are still receiving resistance. Ms. Foletta said that this is a frustrating situation and she thinks it must be happening in other places.

Kimberly Gayle asked if they have an active system and a current social services action plan.

Jean Foletta said that their system is active but she is unsure of their action plan.

Kimberly Gayle said that these are statutorily required and there is no penalty for non-compliance. She explained that Caltrans had an oversight role of collecting and monitoring information, but that role was removed and it is now a self-governing statutory requirement.

Floyd Willis commented that the statute says "shall" and not "may."

Kimberly Gayle said that this is because there is no oversight from the state to ensure that this is happening.

Linda Deavens asked what the recourse is if a social service agency requests that designation and they are unwilling to grant the designation.

Kimberly Gayle said that it is still required to be designated by the RPTA, and Caltrans and the state controller would only recognize that entity.

Linda Deavens asked if they can appeal to Caltrans if their MPO will not grant this.

Kimberly Gayle answered yes, that this has come to Caltrans but their authority was removed so they also have no recourse.

Linda Deavens asked if litigation is the only recourse.

Kimberly Gayle answered that it is a local decision by the regional planning agency on the designation and because the state no longer has that role, it is based on the honor system.

Linda Deavens asked how their role was removed and if that is part of the TDA statute.

Kimberly Gayle answered that it was AD-120 and this bill removed Caltrans but requirements remained the same, leaving no reports to legislature on compliance.

Linda Deavens asked if those reports originate with the planning agencies.

Kimberly Gayle answered that they come from the CTSA's, through the planning agencies.

Linda Deavens said that some CTSA's may have provided information, but it is up to the planning agencies to update periodically and she thinks the planning agencies have no authority to ask human service agencies for data; therefore, it was difficult to report and that is why the statute changed.

Kimberly Gayle said that one was an inventory of all systems and the other was the action plan.

| Pam Couch said that it was 157 in 1985.

Linda Deavens asked if the inventory was an RTPA responsibility.

Kimberly Gayle answered yes; it belongs to the RTPA with input from the CTSA and operators in the region that provide social service transportation.

Linda Deavens asked if that was part of AD-120 and if they asked for a reform would that affect any important policies.

Kimberly Gayle said that she will return to the legislative report for that information, which will be finalized soon and is documented on the website.

Judith Norman said that in some cases, the CTSA and the RTPA are one and the same, and they issue county-wide surveys to obtain information from agencies.

Pam Couch said that in general, the responsibility was with the RTPA but they must be careful what they wish for because no single agency can win a case for entitlement as a CTSA. She said that she wrote the original AD-120 plan for MTC and in the interim, there have been requests for CTSA designations but MTC would not consider designating certain agencies.

Katie Heatly said that the Bay Area is currently rethinking the entire process of CTSA's. She said that they have conversed over the last couple years and navigated an unclear path between parties on how to accomplish this with ease and without harming others but there are issues over TDA money that is dedicated to paratransit. She said that in working proactively, this process might also work for other areas as this conversation becomes open and moves forward.

Linda Deavens asked if Ms. Heatly means for them to stay out of this issue.

Katie Heatly answered no and said that the CTSA's are here to stay and they must support the state's position, which is different throughout the state but this is a good time to move forward together in this planning process.

Jennifer Yeamans said that they are interested in exploring the flexibility within the existing framework and legislation to promote coordination and mobility management through a designated agency or a CTSA.

Judith Norman said that this relates to the last bullet on slide 9, which allows local flexibility to determine the value and the capability of a CTSA. She said that this study shows the undisputed value of a CTSA, which comes through in every document. She said that given Caltrans' involvement of designating a CTSA and their lack of power when refused; there must be local agencies that work through this. Ms. Norman said that they must begin to allow this and move toward flexibility, while also including in the report that MTC is one area that is open and willing to hold discussions.

Dan Palumbo said that when their transit authority became the CTSA post-ADA, there was concern for the county controlling utilization. He said that there must be willingness by the public agency that controls transit to perform the duties of the CTSA. He said that the fear is that if they facilitate coordination with human services and transit providers, then utilization would go through the roof. He explained that under ADA, that could potentially cost tens of millions of dollars if they open doors and let everyone in. Mr. Palumbo continued that over the last decade, they have partnered with agencies and he cannot see why a human service agency would want to be a CTSA in their county where they can barely survive because they lack the capability. He explained that there must be willingness to understand the value and not drive clients into the unfunded mandate of ADA because of regulation. He said that a model working in one region is going to be completely different in other regions.

Judith Norman said that every study she facilitates includes the need for information, education and research, which fuels the advancement of these issues. She said that maintaining flexibility of regional agencies and encouraging them to educate agencies is important.

Dan Palumbo said that there are programs in rural counties that are extremely sophisticated in coordination.

Judith Norman said that these programs have flexibility because they are smaller.

Lynn Daucher said that if her job is to help human service agencies work with transportation, she should bring their problems to Ms. Gayle and ask her what tools she has to help these agencies.

Judith Norman said that without executive management they would not be able to complete this study. She said that she is pleased to have had Ms. Daucher present to help navigate through this study.

Linda Deavens said that this is the most helpful committee of her working years. She said that she also thinks that because the state association works with coordination, they should promote training opportunities through CalACT for MPOs and RTPAs.

David Cyra said that they must also include the Department of Health and Human Services.

Pam Couch said that because this is about money, they should mention a tribal component if it is relevant as they are huge institutions that provide money.

CTSA Potential Alternative #2

Judith Norman said that everyone agrees on the value of the CTSA in terms of coordination and their continuance is critical to the promotion of coordination. She said that they recognize two types of CTSA: those that provide transportation and those that promote other activities. She said that some CTSA are less mature and this is dictated by the climate or the necessity that exists, but the reality is that there may not be the impetus for the CTSA or available funding to achieve goals. She said that they need a champion and without management support there is no leader to bring forth issues. Ms. Norman explained that they are open to the idea of providing greater preference to CTSA that provide transportation on projects related to coordinated plans. She continued that there must be a demonstrated recognition that CTSA are doing well and they want to promote this at Caltrans. She said that CTSA could be the lead agencies to supporting and/or sponsor local mobility management activities. Ms. Norman asked for questions and comments on this alternative.

MAP PAC Questions and Comments

David Cyra said that if they were hypothetically thinking that a CTSA could act as a mobility manager that would be fine but it might be possible to have other local mobility managers and this brings flexibility into play. He continued that a CTSA is not necessarily the only mobility manger in a region and they might have other locations like a regional center, which is how it is developing here in California. He explained that these other agencies include anyone from transit to human services whose initial concerns are taking care of their own clients but may expand in the future. He said that the flexibility is great and creating more mobility management is how they should operate.

Judith Norman said that flexibility continues to surface and in the Los Angeles County coordinated plan, the concept was regional and sub regional because within the region there is potential for agency-based coordination. She said that CTSA's are not the only possibility but they are the only agency spearheading and providing considerable coordination, thus they are trying to empower CTSA's to strengthen the coordination network and surface those that want to rise. She said that the next few pages discuss allowing flexibility and here in southern California the plans contain a number of sub regional mobility management activities and projects as the current direction. She said that Ms. Jacobs has been encouraged to look at being a mobility manager with the regional centers because they operate a great transportation program which has dynamic impact on their own recipients and therefore they should consider moving forward. She continued that the field is wide open but they included this slide because throughout this study, they have found that CTSA's have continually surfaced, as they are dynamic and outspoken and included in the plans. She said that this is reason to award scoring priorities and a discussion about aiding CTSA's to continue makes sense.

Phil McGuire said that in San Joaquin County dialogue has reached the point to create a new CTSA and they are fighting off management regarding the Stockton metro area but some issues are political. He said that they can take political support for certain pieces and move forward from there.

Lynn Daucher asked if they have court-made plans for this or if there is a relationship present or if they need one.

Phil McGuire answered yes and said that there has been and in the CTSA work around California, interest has grown out of a federal emphasis, which starts to tie funding at the federal level to the coordinated plans. He said that this has brought CTSA's back to the forefront.

Judith Norman said that giving priority and preference in certain situations will spur action and they can now implement necessary projects. She said that these are the necessary steps to ensure that they remain within the power and responsibility of Caltrans for this to happen.

Floyd Willis said that he would like to discuss the second bullet point on alternative 2 regarding Article 4.5 funding and possibly providing greater preference to CTSA's that provide transportation. He said that 4.5 funding, as he understands, provides a range from 2% to 5% of funding to support CTSA's and the experience in San Diego has been that their funding is at the 2% level. He said that the tension to raise funding to 5% would be a direct subtraction from funding that supports ADA paratransit. He said that it may be the practice in SANDAG but he is unclear what the preferential priorities off the top are in order with 4.5. He continued that in order to make up the composite of their workable budget, they sought other grants like JARC and New Freedom to obtain money to fulfill the dimension that a local CTSA might fill in the mobility management role. He continued that it takes more than 2% but 5% might not provide a full range for a CTSA.

Mr. Willis said that instead of awarding the CTSA's more money because they provide transportation, the local areas must step in to create a business plan, find revenues and carve out a piece of support. He said if that becomes part of the funding factor from Sacramento, it will be a disincentive to coordinate or support parochials and more incentive to absorb services into already existing programs. He said that he does not

support the idea of preferential funding for transportation products and he added that it might be interesting to provide funding for mobility managing CTSA's as high as 7% if they are operating with added benefits.

Judith Norman said that there are two different parts: issues in the statute with Article 4.5 and reaching out for external funding in JARC and New Freedom

Floyd Willis said that any CTSA can operate for their clientele, whether it is transportation, mobility management, or transit training, and they can search for pots of money to support what each locality wants to shoulder.

Judith Norman said that if they added a guideline from the state to regions in the development of coordinated plans, project selection would follow. She said that this would look favorably upon CTSA's that provide transportation and use mobility as a major activity.

Floyd Willis said that the only preferential treatment above the 2-5% range would be exercising the organizational frame of mind to move into mobility management, which is individual planning for needs and relates to transit training. He continued in saying that statewide funding might be a factor to create a uniform field throughout the state for those that want to do this because mobility management is in line with the spirit of the CTSA and part of a one-stop shop that human service agencies support. He said that it would be nice if mobility management was uniform throughout the state but that might require a statute change, which is currently optional but they might receive additional funding.

Judith Norman said that if they give preference it is because they stepped into the mobility management role within their sub region but many CTSA's that provide transportation already perform mobility management and practice travel training, voucher programs, and taxis. She said that these activities are already present and they are accomplishing great things and by taking on an operational element and the other activities and programs, they should be rewarded.

Floyd Willis said that moving into a provider role should not bring extra funding to a CTSA and instead they should use their local plan to create funding through available funds. He said that they do not want CTSA's to compete in the transit arena with private nonprofits.

Judith Norman asked about trip brokering and attempting to establish activities.

Floyd Willis said that a broker would not be considered a transportation provider.

Judith Norman said that they are not directly operating but a transit operator does not only operate directly; they also purchase service and are still considered an operator if they contract service.

Floyd Willis said that in brokering a ride there is some factor in that ride that was delivered that goes back to the CTSA. He continued in saying that it is much more straightforward to provide a piece of TDA funds and let the local CTSA create a budget and functions that serve their area.

Linda Deavens said that they are limiting the discussion to Article 4.5 but CTSA's are also eligible as operators under 6.0. She said that this is controversial because it takes transit money and gives it to the CTSA but there is no 5% count.

Floyd Willis said that if a CTSA wanted to provide service above and beyond the floor of minimal expectations and move into the purveyor of transportation, they could attempt 6.0 for those components that they want to offer.

Linda Deavens said that it is an eligible expenditure depending on the 6.0 rules and this is a regional call.

Floyd Willis said that it is a regional call but it is not preferential on the state level.

Judith Norman said that the aftermath of preference is one thing but the issue centers on Article 4.5 and 2% versus the upper range of 5% and she asked if they are suggesting that it is an RTPA decision on the level. She said that if they are discussing sharing with ADA, there must be parity with fixed route that dictates the level of ADA and therefore the funding as well.

Deleted: a parody

Floyd Willis said that he would like to know what the law prescribes in terms of priority of funding and whether or not a CTSA has priority over ADA and fixed route because this changes dynamics. He asked if Article 4.5 funds mass transit fixed route service.

Linda Deavens answered that it funds community transit for the elderly, disabled, and transit dependent.

Floyd Willis asked if 6.0 funds mass transit.

Judith Norman answered yes.

Floyd Willis said that if the CTSA is higher than ADA, meaning ADA needs support from 6.0, and if that is the ranking, there is an indirect local lid on that slide from 2-5% from the pragmatics of the budget which is political. He said that he is unsure if Sacramento can fix that without a change in the law that requires a flat 5% to go to the CTSA.

Kimberly Gayle said that these discretionary funds are federal funds and this would not apply to Article 4.5, as those are TDA formulas. She said that applications currently require a sign off or coordination with a CTSA for every project through 5310. She said that they want to avoid duplication of service and because the state is unaware of every existing service, they rely on coordination with CTSA's and RTPA's, who are aware of regional activity as their main goal is to avoid duplication.

Floyd Willis asked if they are describing giving a CTSA the authority to evaluate an applicant's coordination because they brought CTSA's into the application process to help validate an applicant's coordination participation.

Kimberly Gayle said that they ask questions about overall coordination and why they cannot coordinate and there are legitimate reasons why an operator cannot and should not share rides. She said that regarding the second bullet on page 10, they are asking if Caltrans should give CTSA's greater priority in mobility management programs.

Floyd Willis said that greater preference should go to CTSA's that have achieved coordination and not necessarily those that have delivered transportation because they may have avoided coordination by delivering transportation.

Kimberly Gayle said that the goal of coordination is transportation.

Floyd Willis disagreed and said that the goal of coordination is to ensure that less people are on the road delivering transportation.

Phil McGuire said that the RTPA has designated a CTSA and presumably they have done that on the basis that they are planning to do various kinds of coordination.

Kimberly Gayle said that the state assumes that the CTSA is doing what they are directed by statute to do and that is why they have the requirement.

Phil McGuire said that if there are incentives and Caltrans has the authority to change guidelines and give CTSA's preference, that might encourage development of CTSA's strengthen their position and their viability in delivering service.

Floyd Willis said that a viable CTSA should not be measured by whether or not it is behind the wheel delivering rides and providing transportation. He said that a viable CTSA may simply be working with transportation providers, buyers, selling rides, arranging for purchase, and plugging in passengers on empty seats. He said that rides and trips are rendered because of coordination.

Lynn Daucher said that Mr. McGuire said that anytime they have a CTSA its operation is unimportant and Mr. Willis said that what is written is that they care what the CTSA is doing regarding transportation. She asked Ms. Gayle which statement they support.

Kimberly Gayle said that she intends it for transportation because she reports performance measures on all dollars and must count trips. She said that there is not a minimum number of trips but the goal is to provide transportation for the target population.

Floyd Willis asked if it is arranging or providing the trip.

Kimberly Gayle said that if the arrangement results in providing a trip then they count it as a trip.

Floyd Willis said that as a result of the CTSA role, someone may have received a ride but the CTSA may not have owned the vehicle or paid the driver.

Kimberly Gayle said that they do not have to drive the bus.

Floyd Willis said that the goal of transportation is to provide transportation.

Lynn Daucher said that Mr. Willis would like to see what Mr. McGuire also said, which is that any CTSA receives priority and she asked Ms. Gayle if that is acceptable or if that counters the trip count

Kimberly Gayle said that she is holding onto the "transportation" in CTSA.

Lynn Daucher asked if there is any CTSA in the state that could not count trips as a result of receiving extra moneys and if not, then it's semantics.

Kimberly Gayle said that how they phrase the question is up to the stakeholder group but the goal is to encourage CTSA's when coordinating trips or transportation services within a county and support them with dollars as a priority if this is already occurring as opposed to new applications. She said that if a county is not communicating or unaware of the CTSA then it is the state's job to ensure coordination occurs. She said that if the CTSA refuses services due to unique circumstances that are acceptable but at least communication occurred because they do have entities that cannot coordinate but at least it is proven, applied for, and accepted. She said that where it should be coordinated, Caltrans wants to see it happen.

Dan Palumbo said that the CTSA must be an active participant in the decision making process.

Judith Norman said that the trip is the ultimate goal and outcome.

Dan Palumbo said that Article 4.5 funds, as part of the CTSA package, are easy to describe as "seed money", which is a small amount of money. He said that even at 5%, they will not deliver a great amount of trips using their own driver and vehicle. He said that the original intent of the 5% TDA money in Article 4.5 was to serve as seed money to perhaps conduct various planning and coordination activities at the local level, to match grants, to collaborate in funding agreements and to leverage Agency on Aging funds or various other programs that have transportation components. He said that the way the law is written it says it is up to 5%, not a 2% floor, which means anywhere from 0-5%.

Floyd Willis said that it is a problem if it is zero because some of RTPAs could designate CTSA and fund zero dollars out of Article 4.5 and they must correct this if it is below 2%.

Dan Palumbo said that the law allows CTSA designation without a 4.5 allocation.

Floyd Willis said that they must doctor that law.

Dan Palumbo said that this relates to the current Bay Area discussions.

Floyd Willis said that it is not a turnkey sum of money to open up shop and operate a full range of CTSA mobility management activities. He said that seed money enables the CTSA to partner to coordinate and transport clients, and they may not be involved beyond that but they produced the connection and the coordination outcome. He said that in growing to receive calls, broker rides and arrange trips, they may not deliver directly, but they arranged for the trips; therefore, the semantics are critical to define what the CTSA is producing as a benefit for the community.

Judith Norman said that they can refer clients and arrange trips, and the direct provision of the contract for trips is solid so they must think about what they are discussing and whether they can measure these actions, which is in the upcoming reauthorization. She said that they heard today that even some of the most sophisticated systems have no

measurement system so they must decide if they are meaning trips to measure or trips to arrange.

Christie Scheffer said that with Medicaid brokerage, the centers for Medicare and Medicaid services favor a pure broker model where brokers do not provide trips. She said that in thinking ahead of the CTSA potential as a broker, they would want to protect their ability to prevent penalization in scoring.

Floyd Willis said that as a pure broker, they avoid a conflict of interest of funding themselves to provide rides and that may not be the best quality ride.

Kimberly Gayle asked if they track efforts for trips.

Christie Scheffer answered yes and said that they want to ensure that there is no requirement to provide a trip in the priority for funding.

Floyd Willis asked why they would need a priority of funding with the Medi-Cal brokerage service because part of the brokering service includes prior authorization that they receive from the state when that service is self-contained through Medi-Cal.

Christie Scheffer said that she was simply referencing the conversation about the CTSA having priority to provide trips.

Floyd Willis said that Medi-Cal is a revenue stream for the ride itself and would pay for the arrangement of ride counting trips, which is good to report. He asked what preference they receive from the state when that ride was a self-contained and reimbursed effort.

Christie Scheffer answered that as long as they can track cost allocation because feasibly they may want to share the ride, thus CMS is interested in seat-share miles. She said that finding this information through auditing and keeping costs separate would be fine. She said that the state would look at Medicaid trips in priority screenings.

Floyd Willis said that this would be double pay.

Lynn Daucher said that they should define the bullet point to provide transportation trips that can be measured. She said that there is no disagreement to that. Ms. Daucher asked if 4.5 is a different statute.

Kimberly Gayle answered yes, that it is a different statute.

Phil McGuire asked if it is 0-5% or 2-5% and what the ranked priority is.

Judith Norman said that there are certain issues to refer to the TDA working group and because they cannot make pronouncements on them.

Phil McGuire said that maybe a recommendation should be made to the working group that is not a subjective recommendation with a range.

Judith Norman said that he is asking about the range but they know that it could be from 0-5 and there might be a floor.

Pat Piras said that there is a clear hierarchy of funding choices outlined in the TDA book online and it is the administration of planning and Article 3 and Article 4.5, which is up to 5%. She said that there is no minimum requirement and also, there is specifically a provision that says that they can move funds to Article 4 if they determine that they can be better used for public transportation purposes.

Floyd Willis said that this is why they do not have a uniform team of CTSA's in the state because they are not required to be funded.

Lynn Daucher said that there is great opposition to this idea from transit.

Kimberly Gayle answered yes.

Lynn Daucher said that there would be a benefit to put this into a parking lot for the TDA working group.

Judith Norman said that there are issues that surface from priorities and the reality is that they return to local control and decisions by RTPAs in the region but it is better if they can frame it properly and provide food for thought.

Lynn Daucher said that they can update their secretaries and to provide a preview of their current discussion and its value.

Floyd Willis said that the belief is that a CTSA funded even at 2% is going to ensure rides through arranging where transit cannot, so it is the other composite of transportation geography that fixed route and ADA will not reach.

Judith Norman said that they are discussing issues under statutes that are under the radar. She said that service levels dictate a budget which flows to Article 4.5 but because of cuts, Article 4.5 is less thus everyone receives less.

Floyd Willis said that there is an assumption that the transit system is the "high and mighty" but it cannot fulfill this assumption, as it is not even fully funded to have full geography coverage. He said that Article 4.5 is higher than mass transit because services can be coordinated to do a better job to help fulfill the bill. He said that smaller coordinated parochials can perform better geography coverage than mass transit so it is the prospective under TDA about the attitude to transport clients.

Pat Piras said that there are more details to cover than this over-simplistic discussion.

Kimberly Gayle said that this is why we want to refer this matter to TDA working group because this is complex law and they have full time on these issues. She said they are identifying what steps they can take and which steps should be investigated further in another form.

Pam Couch said that she is concerned with the trip definition. She said that the client defines a trip as where they start to where they want to go but transit defines a trip as the corner where the client is picked up. She said that a CTSA or other provider may define a trip as delivering the client to the transit provider who takes them the rest of the

way, especially in areas with greater distances to cover. She said that fundamentally they must define the term "trip."

David Cyra said that a trip is defined as one origin and one destination.

Lynn Daucher said that this does not necessarily mean the customer was satisfied.

David Cyra said that it would be defined as two trips.

Judith Norman agreed and said it is either a single trip or trip chaining but most fixed route and specialized transportation have similar issues relative to defining a trip in terms of customer satisfaction.

Kimberly Gayle said that they will not require passenger per vehicle service hours.

CTSA Potential Alternative #3

Judith Norman moved to slide 11, regarding CTSA Potential Alternative #3 and reinstating reporting requirements. She said that there was a former reporting requirement which they could not reinstate without legislation. She moved to slide 12 and explained that when they receive clear information they have a better picture of the current regional environment. She said that coordination plans might serve as a vehicle for reporting unmet needs which is in the unmet needs recommendation from the last meeting.

MAP PAC Questions and Comments

Dan Palumbo said that they will have quite a different perspective and perception when they receive the census results. He said that they understand current unmet needs but in moving forward they must focus on challenges with unmet needs and he said that it will be interesting to see the census reports of trends. He said that recovery will be slow as California is quite unique and has grown from 34 to 38 million in population and they must examine the aging phenomenon.

Floyd Willis said that they cannot reinstate minimum reporting requirements if CTSA's do not have a minimum funding floor. He said that it is an unfunded mandate.

Kimberly Gayle said that they agree.

Floyd Willis said that they can use one with the other but not both, they have to go together.

Judith Norman said that the coordinated plan stands as the main report and it must be updated so they can use that as a vehicle.

Phil McGuire said that they can at least coordinate their coordination report.

Judith Norman said that the committee agrees that the coordinated plan contains a great amount of reporting and incorporating unmet needs will potentially fund projects and this will cover all bases.

Strategic Implementation Plan: Next Steps

Judith Norman moved to slide 13 and summarized the next steps in the Strategic Implementation Plan. She said that under the auspices of the two-year study, there are four separate reports: the statewide executive summary of coordinated plans, which will be finalized at the end of the month; a stakeholder involvement report; a legislative report, which will be online by April 30; and the Strategic Implementation Plan, which is the culmination of the study. She said that this document discusses implementation and action steps relative to priorities developed, the legislative report, and actions necessary for their next steps. She said that the state priorities of the top 3-5 issues and alternatives will remain as the focus.

MAP PAC Questions and Comments

David Wilder said that one concern is that they use ADA and that makes sense to transit administrators but they have problems with legislative staff understanding that ADA means "paratransit" in this context. He said that they write "ADA paratransit" or "ADA in this context means paratransit" from this point forward.

Judith Norman said that they have a glossary that will accompany the document and they will account for this clarification.

Pat Piras said that they must remember that ADA is a civil right and CTSA is not a civil right.

Judith Norman discussed slide 14 and the unmet needs in the Strategic Implementation Plan. She said that this was discussed in previous meetings and it may be happening but they want to make a formal recommendation that it goes to the SSTAC or a designated entity. She said that the SSTAC is a logical entity.

Kimberly Gayle said that they must differentiate between what is statutory and what is permissive. She said that the first bullet point on slide 14 is a statutory issue and the second two are permissive issues. She said that this can be done through policies and procedures as opposed to statutes and regulations.

Phil McGuire said that the TDA unmet needs process is tied to allocating money for streets and roads in jurisdictions where 100% is allocated to transit, and he asked if there was a discussion about the relevance of the unmet needs process.

Kimberly Gayle said that Gordon Arruda made a presentation to the committee and he distinguished between those that had requirements for an unmet needs process and those that did not.

Phil McGuire said that as population grows and they reach thresholds, people drop off and the relevance of unmet needs is established.

Judith Norman said that she will differentiate between statutory and administrative in nature.

Floyd Willis said that there is value in holding a hearing even if all transit is producing is a description of transit needs, where institutionalized services are not molding, modifying

and accommodating new and higher priority needs. He said that this exercise enables all transit moneys to be responsive to the greatest needs, even if it shifts away to create an unmet need. He asked if it is a requirement to hold a hearing or if they can be excused.

Kimberly Gayle said that there must be a hearing if they are within that threshold and RTPA must identify what "reasonable to meet" means in their region.

Floyd Willis asked if the hearing is excused or waived if all money is spent on transit.

Pat Piras said that there is no requirement.

Kimberly Gayle asked if there is an unmet needs process required.

Pat Piras said that an urban county that does not spend TDA on streets and roads has no requirement for an unmet needs process.

Floyd Willis said there must be another process each year whereby other situations or unmet needs can be described, which may be a currently funded service and funds should be better directed to a different population need.

Kimberly Gayle said that transit operators must have a public involvement identification process which is not tied to TDA.

Judith Norman moved to slide 15 and discussed the next steps in the Strategic Implementation Plan regarding the NEMT Reimbursement and Governance.

Kimberly Gayle said that there is AB 2127, which is a measure that requires the Department of Healthcare Services to establish a two-year pilot program and they might want to monitor this legislation in accordance with other pilot endeavors.

Pam Couch said that they should reference AB 2127 and include the phrase "and other such proposals."

Lynn Daucher said that this is a broker model.

Judith Norman said that they will mention the broker model because it is relevant as a progression. She explained that their research was a step backwards to build a stronger planning base.

Lynn Daucher said that transportation is included in capitation models and they might want to include this in the recommendation. She said that this may be a federal issue rather than a state issue.

Kimberly Gayle said that she thinks that is the case because when they build the formulas, they include transportation because they include how many programs operate transportation.

Dan Palumbo said that they can create models or pilots and work at the local level to attempt to quantify and measure outcomes, not just outputs.

Judith Norman said that they will remove the “coordination of governance” term. She said that local control is part of the landscape and will be maintained because it is necessary as they know what is happening in their own regions.

Dan Palumbo asked what they have seen with cuts in service and reduction in funding and if they are getting close to the crisis point.

Judith Norman said that they have arrived at the crisis point and they are attempting to mitigate and leverage their current resources.

Dan Palumbo said that the situation has created a great opportunity.

Judith Norman said that there are issues that inhibit operation, including NEMT, unmet needs, funding, insurance, etc. and they will provide information on these topics.

Ms. Norman moved to slide 16 and discussed the next steps regarding CTSA's. She said that the previous meeting materials are online. She continued that the link to the materials is included in the invitation to the meeting that was sent to committee members. She said that they will finalize the legislative report and post it to the website and they will provide paper copies and electronic media soon for the other reports. She said that once all materials are reviewed by Caltrans, they will be posted to the website. She explained that the timeline for the Strategic Implementation Plan is May 30 and they will incorporate meeting discussions in this document.

Next Meeting

Judith Norman said that the final MAP PAC meeting is scheduled for June 16 in Sacramento and they will conclude with presenting the Strategic Implementation Plan details.

Pam Couch said that this will be a voluminous study to read and in order to prevent it from sitting on a shelf, she recommended that the executive summary be punchy and typed and include the most important points. She said that if they want to accomplish anything in the next phase, this is critical.

Kimberly Gayle said that the Strategic Implementation Plan will encompass the next meeting and she wants to ensure that it is posted in time for committee members to make comments. She said that the draft is scheduled to be finished by May 30 and she wants members to focus on the Strategic Implementation Plan because June 16 will be the last opportunity to provide comments to finalize the study by June 30, 2010. She said that this is the guiding document to continue this study's effort and she requested the committee's involvement.

Jena Foletta asked for a reminder when those documents are ready for members to examine and submit comments.

Kimberly Gayle said that they will inform the committee and ask for feedback by email up until the meeting and all further comments can be received at the meeting.

Judith Norman said that the committee will have approximately 2-3 weeks to examine the documents before the next meeting.

Kimberly Gayle said that they will not have an agenda for the next meeting as it will focus on the Strategic Implementation Plan. She said that she hopes the CTSA discussion was useful and they will have some usable recommendations to influence areas that are lacking active CTSA's.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

Attachment A

**MAP PAC Meeting Attendees
Wednesday, April 14, 2010**

In-Person Meeting Attendees

Kimberly Gayle, Chair
Lynn Daucher, Co-Chair
David J. Cyra
Gracie A. Davis
Dan Palumbo
Dana Wiemiller
Dianna M. Daily
Phil McGuire
Frances Jacobs

Telephone Meeting Attendees

Todd Allen
Linda Deavens
Maureen El Harake
Jean Foletta
Tracey Frost
Katie Heatly
Tom Hicks
Clay Kempf
Kimberly Martinson
Pat Piras
Philip Tron
Virginia Webster
David Wilder
Floyd Willis
Roger Sanchez
Jennifer Yeamans
Jane Perez
Dan Douglas
Christie Scheffer
Scott Richardson
Sylvia Mann
Marilyn Ditty
Pam Couch

MAP PAC Study Consultants

Judith Norman
Ray Clay
CJ Smith
Jim Reed

- Deleted: . . .
- Deleted: ¶
- Formatted: Right
- Deleted: ¶
¶
- Formatted: Left
- Deleted: ¶

- Deleted: ¶

- Deleted: ¶

- Deleted: ¶

- Deleted: ¶