

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

Meeting Summary

**Wednesday, June 16, 2010 – 10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.
California Department of Aging
1300 National Drive
2nd Floor Conference Room
Sacramento, CA 95834-1992**

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 this is the final meeting with the consultant team and they will present the Strategic Implementation Plan (SIP). She said that they have recommendations to bring forward and the plan is for the MAP PAC to continue and begin moving forward with the strategies identified in the plan.

Lynn Daucher welcomed the committee and said that she is pleased with the recommendations. She said that this meeting is important as this is the last chance to provide input on the recommendations that they hope to present to the agency secretaries in hopes that they will bless the action plan and enable them to move forward.

Kimberly Gayle said that they began this project with Judith Norman and NCSL in July of 2008. She said that she is pleased that they have completed a majority of action items up to this point in the project. She said that out of 59 items, only 7 remain.

Ms. Gayle said that item number six on page one is a MAP PAC review of MOU and the plan is to postpone this until state budgetary issues are resolved and future plans will be developed following the study's completion. She said that they will hopefully get something out before the administration change next year.

Ms. Gayle continued to item 17 on page two, and said that they will cover this issue in future items and everything above this item has been completed. She said that item 18 was part of the original task to complete but due to funding cuts in the project and amendments that did not occur, they streamlined activity and this is postponed to a future endeavor.

Ms. Gayle said that item 19 will be discussed in the future. She continued to page 3, and stated that the funding review of California state agency resources will be deferred as well. She said that item 36 on page 4 was not exclusively included in the outreach

effort but when they reach finalization of the Strategic Implementation Plan, they will make a formal presentation at that time.

Ms. Gayle said that regarding item 41, there was an introductory session at CalACT in 2008 and when they reach the final phase of the report, they can add this to the fall agenda. She said that she will speak with Jackie Montgomery about performing a session. She continued to item 49 on page 5 and said that Caltrans will work with the consultant team to identify coordinated plan projects derived from coordinated plans and they will include this in the SIP selected as a result of coordinated plan efforts. She said this was a highly successful action plan status matrix as most were completed and noted in the document.

Tracey Frost said that the meeting materials are available on both the Caltrans website and the California Coordinated plan on the Mass Trans website. She continued that the legislative report, draft Strategic Implementation Plan and the stakeholder involvement process report are also posted. She said that today's meeting materials are posted on the website, as well as the executive summaries.

Judith Norman said that the April 14 meeting summary is also posted on the Interagency website.

Cherie Phoenix said that on page 2 of the meeting summary there is discussion about NEMT trips for people who use wheelchairs and today's matrix said that it is yet to be completed. She asked why this item has not been completed.

Judith Norman said that they completed stakeholder outreach, coordinated plan reviews and legislative analysis during the two years of the project. She said that the issue was initially presented at an early meeting regarding accessibility issues and it was on the agenda to hold a special session but other items surfaced in terms of the dialogue. She said that they intended to establish subcommittees but they ran out of time due to the enormous amount of material to cover. Ms. Norman said that there are opportunities for this item as they begin to plan based on the recommendations that they established in the SIP.

Kimberly Gayle said that this tends to be an operational-type issue and they began with the founding statutes recommendation but this issue will fit better with Medi-Cal on the brokerage activities. She continued that time wise and progression wise, this has moved toward the implementation phase which is the next phase of the effort.

Cherie Phoenix said that from the perspective of the disability community, they would like full accessibility to be a policy issue as well. She explained that the new state plan for independent living takes effect on October 1, and one objective is to ensure better transportation accessibility for people with disabilities. She said that the SILC would be interested in collaborating with the MAP PAC to strengthen and expand the independent living network and this is an excellent way to work together to move forward.

Kimberly Gayle said that they would like to examine the recommendations related to transportation to formulate a policy or pilot program and they want to incorporate their perspectives.

Cherie Phoenix reminded the committee to inform their agency as they would like to be involved. She said that this is a great opportunity for collaboration because there is an overlap between the disability and aging communities.

Kimberly Gayle said that they will identify those two documents and examine transportation recommendations and components and add the link to the website for members to access.

Judith Norman said that their agenda includes presentation, discussion and feedback on the SIP. She said that slide 3 includes the purpose of the SIP and MAP goals 2 and 4. She continued that the associated strategies and steps are outlined in the Mobility Action Plan of 2005. Ms. Norman discussed both MAP goals 2 and 4. She said that the SIP document will address and take steps to address both goals.

Ms. Norman moved to slide 4 and discussed the SIP purpose and documents necessary for accomplishing their goals. She said that the MAP PAC reflects one of these outreach opportunities. Ms. Norman moved to slide 5 and discussed the rationale for the SIP recommendations. She said that they understood the need for a comprehensive approach and recognized that there is not one solution to these issues. Ms. Norman explained the need for a cohesive and focused approach to address coordination barriers and challenges.

Ms. Norman moved to slide 6 and detailed the stakeholder involvement recommendations. She said that the stakeholder recommendation report is posted on the web for further review by members. She said that these reflected a great first start in terms of figuring out what was happening in terms of coordination.

Ms. Norman moved to slide 7 and said that the stakeholder involvement process showed that the TDA farebox recovery ratio is a long standing issue and has surfaced as a key issue during the stakeholder involvement process. She said that this is a recommendation in the SIP and would require legislative action to modify the TDA statutes.

Ms. Norman moved to slide 8 and detailed the review of the coordinated plans and the SIP recommendation. She said that they examined the coordinated plans, which punctuated the need to modify the state's guidance to ensure consistency. She explained that one recommendation was presented to modify the coordinated plan funding guidance to improve quality and consistency of the plans. She said that the recommendations are simplistic but would help improve the plans across the board.

Ms. Norman moved to slide 9 and discussed the legislative review and analyses recommendations. She said that there were ten recommendations to address restrictive laws and programs relative to transportation programs. She said that two of the strategies were combined because they were related to transportation brokerages.

Ms. Norman said that slide 10 explains that the recommendations from the legislative review task were administrative in nature and do not require formal or regulatory action. She discussed slide 11 and said that they are searching for a statewide empowered framework to provide support to ensure coordination is addressed at the state level. She continued that the plans are in place and programs are implemented and they are now waiting to see local benefits from the federal statutes. Ms. Norman said that they are

currently discussing local and regional projects and implementation in the early stages. She said that the MAP study demonstrated the need for money, informational and educational support at the state level.

Ms. Norman moved to slide 12 and discussed what is needed to establish a statewide empowered framework for coordination. She said that they need connected dialogue and support from a high level which will require substantial and sustained effort. She continued that if they build this framework at the state level, this will fuel the local level because there is political will and committed support.

Linda Deavens asked for examination of the diagram of the SIP on page 8. She asked that if they all agree, if it is necessary to complete all identified action steps before they can move to MAP goal 1 and 3.

Judith Norman answered no because this is an integrated framework that works together with implementation of the various SIP recommendations. She said that one can stand alone but the reality is that they cannot reach goals unless all components are following through. She said that they must continue to progress to implementation of remaining goals because the state has done an excellent job. Ms. Norman said that the framework is comprised of all elements, including the concurrent implementation of SIP and progression toward implementation toward MAP goals 1 and 3.

Ms. Norman moved to the statewide empowered framework slide. She said that the agencies on slide 14 are the minimum required for a statewide empowered coordination framework. She said that RTPA and CTSA are mentioned repeatedly throughout the SIP, as they are critical organization for implementations to the SIP.

Laura Williams said that she would like to add the California Commission on Disabilities to the list, which was not in existence when the framework was established but it would be an important partner.

Kimberly Gayle asked for background information on this commission.

Laura Williams said that the Commission on Disabilities was formed out of legislation passed last year by Ellen Corbett and has been meeting since January of 2010. She continued that the vice chairs are Margaret Jacobsen and Tim Abrahams and they are meeting regularly.

Kimberly Gayle asked if they are working with Department of Developmental Services.

Laura Williams answered that they are a separate entity with the state commission.

Sherry Phoenix said that the State Independent Living Council would like to be added to the list of agencies.

Melody Goodman said that they might want to add the State Council on Developmental Disabilities, an independent state agency who performs advocacy on transportation.

David Wilder said that they might add the Department of Public Health to the list of agencies.

Heather Menninger said that the California Emergency Management Agency is overwhelmed with issues and should be included, which is the Office of Access and Functional Needs.

Judith Norman moved to slide 15 and discussed the implementation categories which result from addressing goals 2 and 4. She next moved to slide 16 and outlined the building blocks of coordination in California. She said that the base of the framework is the Mobility Action Plan which provides the impetus to move forward in meeting goals. She said that MAP goal 1 includes two action steps to move forward, while MAP goal 3 includes 13 action steps for completion. She said that it will take a number of years to address these steps and some of this is addressed in the SIP document.

Linda Deavens said that there is not enough funding for the steps in the SIP and she wants to hear from Caltrans regarding future funding potential for goals 1 and 3 or the action steps identified for goals 2 and 4.

Kimberly Gayle said that they plan to begin moving toward implementation of actions steps which is a priority. She said that there is staffing available and they will continue to hold bimonthly MAP PAC meetings and BT&H and HHS activities will continue. She said that there are resources for information gathering, coordination of activities and meetings but there are no resources to hire a consultant. Ms. Gayle explained that there is continuing resolution from the government through December but they are in the middle of reauthorizations. She said that coordination will continue as a requirement for funding but she is unsure of further requirements related to performance based decision making. She continued that they are moving in the right direction and after reauthorization they will examine available funding to secure funds to continue their efforts but based on the current cycle, resolution ends in December.

Lynn Daucher said that they will meet with agency secretaries to present MAP goal 1 and that one is in their hands.

Kimberly Gayle said that she now has documentation from the MAP PAC, focus groups, legislative reviews and analysis, to formulate and issue a memo through her department which will act as the building blocks for this MOU and she is more comfortable than two years ago to bring this forward. She said that there is nothing other than political will to act as a barrier.

Judith Norman moved to slide 17 and discussed new term benefits that can be realized through discussions and proceeding into web based and information based recommendations. She said that this is not necessarily a cost need but it is about who will volunteer and work to accomplish goals. She said that the TDA working group is who they are looking to for assistance on these issues. She continued that other recommendations will take years to accomplish. She said that the recommendations are mutually beneficial as one might help the other in coming to fruition.

Ms. Norman moved to slide 18 and detailed an overview of the 11 SIP recommendations.

Floyd Willis said that they are attempting to use existing legislation and the definitions of what needs to change come about as a result of a departmental cooperation with everyone recognizing the same thing. He said that they are attempting to solve these

issues through local input and continuation of a council as opposed to legislative confusion.

Kimberly Gayle said that they are working within the parameters of their roles as civil servants. She said that at the onset of the project they said they would continue to do this. She said that if individuals or organizations within the MAP PAC wish to seek legislative redress, they would provide documentation or information to support but this is definitely beyond their role. She said that they want to exhaust what is currently on the books and start here to discover what can be done better.

Judith Norman moved to slide 19 and said that the TDA recommendations will be referred to the TDA working group as a result of the study. She said that they want to work within the existing framework.

Linda Deavens said that Appendix D of the SIP document has a list of current TDA working members and offered that it might be out of date.

Kimberly Gayle asked if this is the most current document.

Gordon Arruda said that the 2009 list has been amended.

Linda Deavens said that this is an important community to belong to.

Judith Norman asked how membership is obtained in this group.

Kimberly Gayle said that for three or four years DMT identified a working group to help with TDA issues and this group meets two or three times a year depending upon the issue. She said that they develop recommendations and carry them forward working with Gordon Arruda. She said that many issues were within the realm of TDA and it was feasible to work within the existing infrastructure and the MAP PAC gave submitted draft recommendations earlier for their input. She asked Mr. Arruda to forward the most recent roster of the TDA working group and procedures for participating in the working group.

Linda Deavens said that when the topic of MAP was first brought to TDA, it was foreign and it will be a reeducation process if they join.

Judith Norman said that if they examine the MAP PAC roster, they contain the same organizations and names on both rosters. She said that it might be a matter of the issue of focus.

Lynn Daucher asked if the TDA working group is a transportation group without the human services.

Kimberly Gayle said that the focus is the transit and regional planning agencies represented in the group. She said that Jacklyn Montgomery is on the roster but the focus is on planning and transit.

Lynn Daucher asked if this is by statute or if Caltrans determines membership.

Kimberly Gayle asked Mr. Arruda if there is a bylaw or preamble for this group.

Gordon Arruda answered that it is an informal stakeholder group but they have a charter. He said that in the beginning they had representatives from disabled and aging groups on the TDA working group but they have since moved on to other agencies. He said that they have not been replaced but it is open to human resource agencies and they would like to see them in the group.

Lynn Daucher asked Ms. Gayle if she can make this happen.

Kimberly Gayle said they will work with Brian who is the supervisor, as a follow up to this meeting and they will identify how interested members can join the group for the next meeting in October. She said that they would like to add to the agenda to bring recommendations forward to this group in October.

Judith Norman moved to the first recommendation on slide 19 regarding the unmet transit needs process. She said that they discussed at length working with RTPAs on website links and unmet needs. She said that these discussions produced a lack of information available and also discovered that stakeholders were uninformed about their local processes.

Phil McGuire said that the unmet needs process is an annual ad-hoc planning process and usually is not tied to a larger scale formal planning process, thus it tends not to be a scientific process and they are left with questions of what is reasonable to meet. He said that this issue should be part of a larger question of planning and decision making that fits into short range transit plans in the transit world and human service coordination plans in the human service world. He said that they should avoid anything dramatic other than to hopefully elevate the whole unmet needs dialogue to reconsideration of how it fits into the planning framework. He said that unmet needs dialogue should be brought into the larger context of planning, especially in rural areas.

Floyd Willis said that this is an excellent point and it is planning by the squeaky wheel, as one year to the next does not relate to a master plan but the process does produce a list of findings and out of that, those that are reasonable to meet get on the books for funding. He said that all of the findings can be routed to the master planning process so they are not lost and it is possible that they can be given ongoing visibility.

Judith Norman said that they will see this issue in further recommendations and she recommended that regional agencies begin this process as this was shown coming through the coordinating planning process rather than the regional planning process. She said that she had a conversation with Brian from Caltrans who also mentioned that if they elevate the process they become aware of other plans that may have handled similar issues of unmet needs. She said that there is an example in the SIP regarding this issue.

Linda Deavens asked if Ms. Norman is suggesting that they edit this section in the draft.

Judith Norman answered yes and said that this makes sense to edit the draft.

Clay Kempf said that from the social service perspective there is an equal responsibility for the disconnect. He said that when social service agencies create planning documents those must be for the two transportation agencies. He said that they need

unmet needs testimony in their plans and also must gather further documents for the community that express where the transit is lacking.

Lynn Daucher said that some entities do not have to conduct an unmet needs process but she thinks a recommendation should only apply to the unmet needs requirement but this issue should extend to everybody.

Phil McGuire said that the planning process in the larger urban areas tends to be more sophisticated than smaller rural areas and bringing the unmet needs process into a formal planning process includes surveying data and formal outreach mechanisms to solicit unmet needs in a fashion other than a hearing. He said that this would be a better use of resources and result in a more comprehensive view in those areas that use the unmet needs approach.

Judith Norman said that one recommendation relative to the SSTAC will help address these issues.

David Wilder said that the unmet needs process in rural areas presents an opportunity for the consumer base to address issues and see a response to their requests. He said that larger planning area consumers do not see feedback when they drop their penny in the well.

Judith Norman said that this is true and they will see that she recognized these issues in the SIP when they get to that slide.

Linda Deavens said that page 57 contains a list of counties that are not required to hold unmet needs hearings. She continued that Sacramento performs this process even though it is not required. She asked if there is a way to find out if counties are holding these meetings even though they are not required.

Kimberly Gayle deferred to Gordon Arruda on this issue and asked if he reviews the unmet needs process for each county.

Gordon Arruda said that this role is limited by statute in that he examines whether processes defined in TDA law have been followed. He said that he does not give a subjective judgment on the value or reasonable to meet on unmet needs as it has been presented to the RTPA.

Kimberly Gayle asked if he reviews those that are not required.

Gordon Arruda answered that if it is not required then they do not submit for review.

Kimberly Gayle asked how they can find out if an area is performing an unmet needs process.

Gordon Arruda said that he keeps a log that contains a list of those required to perform unmet needs process and he tracks submissions of documentation and knows who is tardy and who is on time with submissions.

Kimberly Gayle asked if the districts might have information about these areas that are not required to hold these hearings.

Gordon Arruda said that they can obtain this information through the district office.

Pat Piras said that the five urbanized MTC counties are not required and do not hold an unmet needs process.

Gordon Arruda said that LA County is an exception and conducts three unmet needs hearings annually.

Kimberly Gayle asked Mr. Arruda for help in identifying what areas are conducting these hearings.

Judith Norman said that she included this information in the appendix.

Linda Deavens said that Appendix C has an asterisk by the 48 counties that perform unmet needs. She asked if the ones with an asterisk take program planning out of TDA and asked what the other counties give for streets and roads to TDA.

Gordon Arruda answered that before any money of TDA funding can be diverted to streets and roads they must go through unmet needs process and determine whether they are reasonable to meet. He said that if they have been approved they must fulfill those unmet needs before money can go to streets and roads.

Kimberly Gayle asked if it is possible to fulfill unmet needs and still have money remaining.

Gordon Arruda answered that yes that can be possible.

Kimberly Gayle asked if they keep track within Caltrans of who spends money on streets and roads or if the state controller has this data.

Gordon Arruda answered that the state controller includes this information in their yearly report.

Kimberly Gayle summarized that if a county or region with rural areas was formally required to hold an unmet needs process, if that same area now has an urbanized area, they cannot use the money for streets and roads in that urbanized area.

Gordon Arruda answered yes but they can use the money in the rural areas.

Cherie Phoenix asked that for those counties that are unrestricted if there is an accountability process of following up after they have voluntarily performed the unmet needs assessment to discover what they accomplished to address those needs.

Gordon Arruda answered that they do not follow up. He said that if those needs are reasonable to meet they are required by law to address needs before they go to streets and roads. He said that there is no accountability or investigation on this matter.

Lynn Daucher said that this goes back to the appeal to the secretary.

Kimberly Gayle said that there is an appeals process through Caltrans to the secretary which is already in statute and there are other ways through public hearings to make needs aware.

Lynn Daucher said that there are ways to define reasonable to meet and ways to move around this but the final appeal is to the secretary.

Pat Piras said that in many cases the use of Article 8 money for streets and roads is to avoid funding public transit but they must keep in mind that public transit needs streets and roads to run on. She said that the concept of complete streets is an important issue in improving pedestrian access especially for the aging and disabled communities.

Brian Travis said that regarding coordination, this is why he raised the earlier questions. He said that they live in a world with limited resources with pressure to add amenities such as sidewalks, bike paths, etc. and in light of complete streets, they must coordinate on unmet needs in regional transportation projects or Caltrans projects. He said that they can examine the design and determine whether there is opportunity for cost saving by incorporating the design into a preexisting planned project. Mr. Travis continued that there may be a local development that can absorb the cost of unmet needs or projects identified in RTPA that could absorb costs. He said that there are ways of stretching TDA dollars.

Judith Norman said that she included examples of the need to raise the bar in terms of participation at the highest level possible in the planning process.

Ms. Norman moved to slide 20 and said that relative to this recommendation, Caltrans DMT is the responsible party with a number of stakeholder partners including the TDA work group, SSTAC, and CTSA's because there is a process to update and share information among groups. She said that she estimated 9-12 months as the best case scenario and she believes this is possible as it is simply a matter of gathering current information.

Clay Kempf said that another partner should be health and human services to share the responsibility of getting their needs acknowledged in the process. He said that they are not a responsible party but should be a partner.

Ms. Norman moved to slide 21 to discuss the next recommendation regarding the TDA farebox recovery ratio requirements. She said that the TDA group has been working with this issue and she included their study in the document. She said that this strategy would require legislative modifications. Ms. Norman continued that they must revisit the survey to ensure a higher response rate and ask more detailed questions in order to obtain further information to institute changes at a state level.

Heather Menninger said that the farebox ratio is sometimes a useful tool and she asked if Ms. Norman is recommending lower standards.

Judith Norman said that because transit is funded from a mix of revenue sources there is a need to enhance farebox to minimize money coming from other sources. She said that in looking back at the TDA survey, they emphasized simplification of the statute. She explained that they need further clarification because of the inconsistencies in the statute. Ms. Norman said that she is uncertain whether the standards should be lowered

because they do not have enough data to make this recommendation. She explained that the TDA group can help determine these factors but they will need concrete data relative to the impacts of the farebox ratio in order to determine whether the ratio must be simplified, lowered, raised, etc.

Cherie Phoenix said that she is unfamiliar with the survey but a large issue is transit must justify its performance where streets and roads do not. She said that if they want to get the current state compliance report there are annual TDA fiscal audits submitted to the controller annually.

Judith Norman said that if they do not have a foundation for decision making, they will not obtain the required support. She said that they will be delayed if they do not have data on the current impacts of the programs.

Lynn Daucher said that there is importance in ensuring they are well represented on the TDA working group on the human service side.

Judith Norman said that not only do they have the farebox issue but they must have their agenda prepared to proceed if the statutes are ever opened to change.

Ms. Norman moved to slide 22 and discussed all parties and partners needed for involvement. She said that they suggest an availability of 12-24 months to agree on agenda, create a plan, survey and complete the process and development of proposed language.

Ms. Norman moved to slide 23 and discussed the next recommendation on the SSTAC. She said that they need another level of review after the regional agencies in order to examine and provide comments. She explained that there is currently no discussion on when the review occurs. She said that she recommends meeting cooperatively once the hearings are over as this is the time for both the RTPA and SSTAC members to discuss issues based on the region's unmet needs definitions. Ms. Norman explained that they must develop collective recommendations to present to the board. She said that since the RTPA appoints the SSTAC in some ways they empower themselves by doing so.

Cherie Phoenix asked if every county has an SSTAC and where the list of members is located.

Judith Norman said that yes they are supposed to appoint in the statute.

Pat Piras said that SSTACs are only required in the counties not subject to the apportionment restriction; thus urbanized counties are not required to have an SSTAC.

Lynn Daucher asked how they make this applicable to all counties because the first bullet on slide 23 is unclear as to what kind of action is required. She asked how they extend this point to make it broader.

Kimberly Gayle said that TDA was 30 years before SAFETEA-LU and they are attempting to best utilize existing requirements with the current need for improved coordination. She said that if something is not required it does not mean it cannot exist.

Floyd Willis said that the decision maker for the unmet needs process or the RTPA decides what needs are reasonable to meet. He said that the process is prior to that of allowing the public to speak and is by way of a hearing panel that the RTPA establishes. He continued that they are not necessarily the same individuals who conduct the hearing and draft the set of unmet needs. He said that the key point is to ensure that the draft is in front of the SSTAC on its way to the RTPA.

Brian Travis said that there are two different levels of advisory committees in the county: the SSTAC and the RTPA. He said that perhaps a seasoned SSTAC member should be appointed to the regional TAC to ensure discussions and points carried to the board for approval are incorporated into the regional TAC discussion.

Jane Perez said that all RTPAs and MPOs usually have technical advisory committees based on the regional planning process that the agency performs that moves forward to their boards.

Floyd Willis said that in San Diego those bodies are combined into one group but remain under the SSTAC.

Judith Norman said that the TAC is usually one of the many bodies that a RTPA has and this combining of groups is great.

Kimberly Gayle asked if it is a natural progression for the SSTAC to flow into the RTAC.

Jane Perez answered yes and said it is not defined but the process varies.

Kimberly Gayle asked if a process flow would help identify where the SSTAC would provide the comments for the recommendations that move forward to the RTPA board.

Floyd Willis said that a flow chart would be helpful. He said that the hearing is for the public to advise on issues but at the same time, agencies feel that it is also their opportunity to speak. He said that the SSTAC exists for the various social service agencies but he is unsure if the hearing process recognizes the input from the SSTAC on its way to the RTPA right after the hearing to be of equal value to the input described at a public hearing; thus the need for a professional to give their input.

Phil McGuire said that many rural counties used the SSTAC as their formative guidance body through this entire process and these bodies can meet on a limited basis of maybe once a year. He said that some counties have bodies meet on a monthly basis as a representation for the human service community and they are an excellent functional component for outreach for the human service coordination process. He said that he urges the elevation of this to the human service plan and transit arena to short range transit plans.

Judith Norman said that the biggest challenge is to connect these because when they plan within committees through the regional TAC, they make recommendations within their own perspectives. She said that the problem with one single SSTAC member on the regional TAC is that they will be lost because they have regional issues to consider. She said that they should equalize the importance of everyone's input and this is one reason that they moved in this direction to set the tone for beginning in one position and gaining the right representation and becoming part of the RTPA planning process. She

said that they will eventually see the necessity and logic in including the regional member in the process. Ms. Norman said that the SSTAC in some regions does hold hearings but the issue is that it is conducted in various ways which must be understood in order to simplify decision making. She said that the recommendation is to elevate the importance of social service transportation issues in the region. She said that the long range transportation plan in LA County has no mention of human services.

Cherie Phoenix asked if the recommendation is specific to include who at the Caltrans level will be accountable to ensure that every county's SSTAC and regional TAC hold discussions and work together.

Judith Norman moved to slide 24 and highlighted responsible parties in the SIP recommendations. She said that they must discover what Caltrans and TDA can do as many duties are not part of their responsibilities.

Ms. Norman moved to slide 25 and detailed the timeline of recommendations.

Kimberly Gayle asked Mr. Arruda if this is a statute change or a regulation change. She said that they handle regulatory actions through the commission and it may be a procedural issue.

Lynn Daucher asked if it is a regulatory change if they would need to go through the TDA working group or the MAP PAC.

Kimberly Gayle said that they established the TDA group as a stakeholder involvement so they can inform the commission that they received information beyond Caltrans to continue this process. She said that they can include the MAP PAC and follow the same process to present to the commission as a regulatory change involving stakeholders beyond Caltrans.

Linda Deavens asked if the MAP PAC has stature now.

Kimberly Gayle said that they could expand when they move forward to the CTC. She said that they can offer that the stakeholder group involved the MAP PAC and the TDA working group and they have investigated issues and worked concurrently to make recommendations. She said that with Caltrans' internal structure, they would need the director's buy off and he wants to know that they are meeting with stakeholders which would include the MAP PAC.

Lynn Daucher asked if they have the regulatory authority to require an SSTAC to exist in every region.

Kimberly Gayle answered no and said that the statutes are complicated. She said that this is something already required in statute and it might be a regulation to define how it is implemented which they can examine from a regulatory point of view.

Heather Menninger asked if there is administrative action that might be directed to the state level departments of aging and developmental services about participation in the unmet needs process and the SSTAC processes because it is difficult to have the onus only on transit.

Kimberly Gayle said that her vision was to complete this with a cooperative effort with Director Daucher and identify an MOU. She said that she would educate the health and human services side about the transportation decision making process. She said that in addition to requiring participation, they need to educate on the process and not overwhelm members. Ms. Gayle said that they can include this in the agreement to require that their parallel programs participate but they must also educate and market on hearings, coordinated plans, outreach sessions, etc.

Lynn Daucher said that the MOU will provide teeth if this is made into a requirement. She said that she can point to this as a state policy which is in addition to the Californian Act and they must adhere to these things. She said that there is a willing partnership but they are unsure of the future.

Linda Deavens said that this is a political world with an upcoming election and she asked if Ms. Daucher will be with them after the election.

Lynn Daucher answered that this is unknown.

Linda Deavens said that this makes the MOU timing extremely critical.

Lynn Daucher said that part of her job as a governor's appointee is to set things up so they continue with or without her presence and her ultimate goal is that they will still be implemented if she is absent.

Kimberly Gayle said that Ms. Daucher is prepping a two year mobility management project through New Freedom and JARC in order to ensure that her legacy continues regardless of whether she is with the Department of Aging.

Judith Norman said that Pat Piras commented that the urbanized areas complete their own coordinated plans but she is unsure what authority can require this.

Phil McGuire said that if the coordinated plan is not updated regularly including the unmet needs hearings, the plan is not functional. He asked where they stand on this topic.

Judith Norman said that many rural plans already include unmet needs incorporated in the needs section and when these needs are tallied with resources and gaps, there are consistencies which become high priority. She said that these priorities then become potentially fundable under the coordinated plan. She said that before these needs were not necessarily visible to the entire county.

Ms. Norman said that the result is potentially more unmet transit needs funding from other sources which leverages money on the TDA and FTA, New Freedom, JARC and 5310 money.

Lynn Daucher asked if this unmet need requirement gives Ms. Gayle a reason for requiring the SSTAC. She said that the fact that there is a separate need requirement might provide for this.

Kimberly Gayle said that they discussed how the coordinated plans should be developed and what they should contain and how they can be used. She said that there were

issues with stakeholders early on because plans were not performing outreach but it only took a phone call to include groups in this process. She continued that the plan to provide guidance in the future for agencies that compile coordinated plans and the SSTAC would be a natural involvement agency. She said that they could provide a checklist or have agencies verify who was part of the plan and they can implement this as part of future development.

Ms. Gayle said that SAFETEA-LU requires that plans be updated as often as metropolitan plans which are every four years and they are at the due date for the next update. She said that she hesitates because they are at the expiration of SAFETEA-LU with the new requirement and there is a possibility of another element requiring performance based criteria.

Heather Menninger asked if they anticipate being part of the MOUs to encourage state level agencies to advise local partners to seek out planning processes so the onus is not on transportation providers.

Kimberly Gayle agreed and said that it would be guidance through HHS as well as business transportation housing. She said that she focused on the coordinated plan aspect which will most likely be funded through the transportation planning side because it is tied to grants administered by DOT and Caltrans.

Judith Norman said that they discussed timelines and modifications which would be in concert with other modifications as there is need to wait until the federal guidance is known.

Ms. Norman moved to slide 28 and highlighted the recommendation for Medi-Cal transportation provider reimbursement. She said that the LAOs are helping with regulatory guidance and in this case on the pilot research project they discussed issues relative to reimbursement for public transit operators. She continued that they spoke with HHS, aging, health care services and Caltrans and there was agreement to move towards development of a project. She said that they must demonstrate the potential benefit for members to move forward with the project. Ms. Norman explained that they want to factor in the elements of the San Diego model but there is a need to educate health and human service agencies and present coordination benefits and cost savings.

David Cyra asked if the pilot project would involve the demonstration of a brokerage. He said that if San Diego is used as a model they have reimbursement for demand responsive trips and fixed route trips through the purchase of tickets. He emphasized that the brokerage concept is important and should be included in the pilot.

Judith Norman said that the brokerage component is a recommendation that will be presented under NEMT as the same issues and people are involved.

Ms. Norman moved to the timeline on slide 30 and explained that Ms. Gayle has staff to implement these steps and she feels comfortable issuing this recommendation and its timelines.

Heather Menninger said that they might want to invite state level hospital associations as partners because the new legislation says that there will be new levels of expenses on

for the participation of the hospitals to ensure consumers arrive. She said that possibly at the state level the hospital audiences could be of use.

Judith Norman said that the LAO recommendation discusses three locations in the state and this is a useful fact.

Heather Menninger said that the hospitals have incentive now to examine these issues.

Judith Norman moved to slide 31 which highlights NEMT provision recommendations. She said that it is in concert with the previous recommendation and it would be good to address these two with coordination and Medi-Cal related issues. She said that this addressed the discussion of viability and cost-effectiveness of transportation brokerages. She said that it makes sense to work together on programs and they need coordination in order to achieve coordination.

Ms. Norman moved to slide 32 and 33 and discussed involved parties and timelines for this recommendation.

David Cyra commented on page 33 and said that one of the services the brokerage could examine is stretcher non emergency. He said that this is something to consider in the future, as it is big on cost saving side and could be included in the brokerage.

Clay Kempf said that he would encourage examination of Santa Cruz as a pilot model because their service has run the gamut from individual cars to working through a Medi-Cal managed care facility. He said that it also included gurney stretchers in transportation. He said that he is disappointed that the TAR issue is not addressed and he is concerned that the motive of the Department of Health Services is different than the transit side. He said that the simple solution in Santa Cruz was briefly using a permanent year-long approval rather than a trip by trip approval basis. Mr. Kempf said that the final draft report on page 27 includes discussion on TARs and they require that documents be submitted prior to the NEMT ride is provided, which is a mistake. He said that pre-approval to TAR decreases the chance ride reimbursement and the trip is put on an immediate timeline.

Lynn Daucher said that they need a recommendation for the MAP PAC to periodically reexamine the TAR process. She said that this is one way to not lose it and allow them to report back in order for the MAP PAC to comment on their work before it turns into a legislative change.

Clay Kempf said that input before the change happens is the key.

Judith Norman said that she will add a recommendation to monitor the TAR process that is undertaken by health and human services. She said that she will add timing as an issue to examine as well.

Linda Deavens said that page 27 in the Phase I Study Report reads that: ~~%~~study stakeholders agreed that Medi-Cal should progress toward implementation of LAO's recommendation that the TAR process be amended to be less cumbersome and required that TAR documents submitted prior to, not after the NEMT ride is provided which will ensure reimbursement for transportation providers.+

Clay Kempf said that he agrees with the first part but an annual pre-approval of the TAR process would be great. He said that the current process is that each TAR must be approved prior to each individual ride.

Lynn Daucher said that it is perceived as a money saver for the state and the solution is when they travel to managed care medical homes, services will be bundled and providers will have choices on how they spend the money. She said that they will discover that it is better to have someone come than not come and they will pay for transportation using bundled rates.

Clay Kempf said that the concern is the way this is worded because if they do not have substantive changes to the TAR process, they will have to pre-approve for every ride.

Lynn Daucher said that they must be careful on the wording because it is a budget issue.

David Cyra said that kidney dialysis is an exception and is taken on a yearly TAR basis.

Judith Norman said that they can make the point with the model they already have but it is recognized as a perceived cost issue.

Lynn Daucher said that it is a ~~per~~ perceived cost+because they are unsure if it is a real cost issue.

David Wilder said that there is cost saving shown for processing each individual TAR versus bundling them together. He said that it is an expensive process to approve each individual TAR.

Floyd Willis said that the TAR issue per ride would be a hurdle to clear with Sacramento for the individual versus a policy with a local brokerage. He said that if they want individual trips, the local brokerage process is an easier concept while an annual authorization ride is used for the chronic individual.

Lynn Daucher said that they might include something about TAR for the chronic individual in their pilot project for brokerage. She said that they would have data to present to DHCS in order to demonstrate cheaper costs with a tested model.

David Wilder said that most doctors treat patients on a quarterly basis with three months worth of medication and instead of using annual authorizations they could use quarterly authorizations to match the medical practices.

Pat Piras asked if these two recommendations have been examined in light of the medical waiver request that was recently submitted.

Judith Norman said that they examined this in the stakeholder involvement process with the brokerage rule.

Kimberly Gayle said that it was a second request from the prior waiver. She said that the current waiver expires in August.

Lynn Daucher said that it includes new concepts and moving people into managed care, an integrated payment system on a pilot basis and she said that it is contrary to what is in the waiver.

Judith Norman moved to slide 34 and discussed the SIP recommendation on CTSA's. She said that this was driven by the need to raise the awareness of the benefits of CTSA's. She said that the coordinated plans show that rural regions in particular depend upon the CTSA's for guidance, direction and training. She continued that they need more information distributed and this is an online method with web links and informational materials. She said that CalACT has materials on their website which can be used as a base to update and add to and begin to have available on the DMT and CalACT sites. Ms. Norman said that they need to update these materials and put them online and members will have to step up as volunteers to move forward in this process.

Kimberly Gayle said that the last meeting was important because the primary topic was CTSA's and how to support them. She said that this is important to their programs because they focus their project selection upon involvement coordination and working with CTSA's. She said that they must support this endeavor where it will work, understanding that there are unique issues in the state and there will not always be an easy fit.

Floyd Willis said that the CTSA's by the California statutes were ahead of their time.

Judith Norman agreed and said that CTSA's are the basis and rationale port today as compared to many years ago. She said that it is a perfect vehicle for many things to happen and needs their support.

Ms. Norman moved to slide 35 and covered the participants, responsible parties and timeline involved with the CTSA's. She said that it depends on the resources and available time by involved parties.

Ms. Norman moved to slide 36 and explained the second recommendation involving CTSA's. She said that they are attempting to develop opportunities to educate parties in order to inform them on why they should be involved. She said that they must gain individual participation agreements and then organize groups for collective discussions and idea sharing. Ms. Norman said that many members of the MAP PAC have been instrumental in moving forward with the SIP and she challenged them to continue moving forward in these efforts.

Ms. Norman outlined the participating parties and the timeline on slide 37. She said that workshops on transportation 101 are necessary to educate involved parties.

Ms. Norman moved to slide 39 which outlines the recommendation on CTSA scoring and preference. She said that they require and modify the funding applications to give priority to CTSA projects and programs that result in measurable increases and trips. She said that this is a stepping stone of what to expect relative to the reauthorization.

Heather Menninger asked if they gave any thought to the rural parts of the state where the CTSA may not be operational but rather a small entity applying for funding with a valid project.

Kimberly Gayle asked if she means a CTSA that is not operating per definition. She said that if a CTSA is operating how it is defined, it should coordinate and not consolidate. She said that she wants to encourage agencies that are performing the right duties of a CTSA because they have limited funds and resources. She said that they can discuss alternatives for areas in the state where the RTPA has not designated a CTSA because of a local or political issue.

Ms. Gayle said that there are certain operators who must provide their own vehicle for their clientele and there may be a justifiable reason why their project cannot be coordinated through a CTSA but she does not want this for the norm. She said that they have continually focused on regions not using CTSA's but she now wants to focus on those regions that are coordinating with a CTSA.

Heather Menninger said that it is not an issue of not coordinating but rather whether there is a CTSA in place.

Kimberly Gayle commented that she agrees with Ms. Menninger.

Pat Piras asked if there is a way to identify areas where an RTPA has not been cooperating or complying so if it is a political decision by the RTPA, local agencies can use the information to attempt a change. She said that people making decisions whether to designate a CTSA are not affected by the local constituents who are left out.

Kimberly Gayle said that there were several areas in the state that did not complete a coordinated plan and Caltrans had no power over this. She said that this is why she has this methodology and she posted those regions who have complied with the coordinated plan online. She said that many regions without coordinated plans inquired why they were not listed and local constituents took action and now they are at 100% compliance.

Paul Branson said that a member of the transportation task team, the predecessor group to the MAP PAC, began with the idea of mobility management and CTSA's were discussed as effective means to implement mobility management. He said that he supports what Ms. Gayle said about examining alternatives for areas that will not designate CTSA's but what they are focusing on is coordination of services produced on the ground and not whether an agency has a designation.

Kimberly Gayle said that she agrees and noted that they did not specifically name mobility management but they tied it to the funding programs where mobility management is an eligibility category in California, except for 5310 which could be included as a priority area.

Linda Deavens said that page 37 includes a paragraph addressing performance measure issues and she said that as a CTSA she is considered a transit operator and subject to TDA laws and performance audits. She said that she hopes they do not add to the performance measures.

Judith Norman said that she was not proposing to add anything to this because they must wait until the reauthorization is final. She said that she is proposing that they remain consistent and compliant with the reauthorization and judgment on whether they are performing successfully will come from future dialogue.

Linda Deavens said that everything they measure is defined in the statute so they measure everything the same statewide.

Kimberly Gayle said that separate from her office on the federal side they currently have performance measure reports in which operators report directly to FTA contractors on their specific projects. She said that they have included this in their quarterly report and last year for the first time projections requested in the projection process. She said that this is the way of the future but she is trying to use what is already required make it work in the project selection process.

Judith Norman moved to slide 41 and discussed the timeline of the CTSA scoring priority preference. She said that it could be longer than the 9-12 month estimate depending on funding guidance and stakeholder input.

Ms. Norman moved to slide 42 and the last recommendation of state-level coordination and oversight, which addresses MAP goal number 4. She said that this is an incremental process that will take time because everyone has various duties and responsibilities and they must bring them into the process. She said that she is recommending establishing an oversight council as mobility management councils are currently working well throughout the United States. She said that during the process of bringing this to California they leave it to the state to determine the nuances of the program. She said that the important point is involvement and coordination with other departments.

Ms. Norman moved to slide 43 and outlined responsible parties and partners. She said that the group is lead by Caltrans DMT.

David Cyra said that in addition to this slide he would suggest that the insurance commissioner of the state be involved because they can show him that they should be cooperating since insurance is a barrier and especially with the mixing of clients.

Judith Norman said that this is a great idea.

Lynn Daucher said that this must be an internal state group along with the MAP PAC. She said that there must be a high level administration function that must coordinate with the MAP PAC. She said she would keep it to departments and agencies.

Kimberly Gayle said that because they are taking this to the end result, they are seeking a buy in at the state level and although this does not negate inclusion, funding flows through those departments and agencies. She said that there are people on her staff that support her and they must move from the top down because the final decision makers are above them.

Judith Norman said that the document proposes a high level agency to ensure that these groups participate. She said that there is pressure on Caltrans to light the first fire and Ms. Gayle has done this. She gave thanks to the committee and Ms. Daucher and Ms. Gayle for their commitment.

Ms. Norman said they estimate 12-15 months to educate people but she has found that once a partner is on board, they remain for the duration. She said that they will organize into individualized planning and negotiating bodies. She said that state approvals

include program implementation and state level organization in which they must examine implications on the state, which involves high level policy-driven strategic planning. She said that this will ultimately empower the local and regional agencies. Ms. Norman continued that they do not want to interfere with the local process and with this plan she respected that idea of local control. She explained that they want to provide power for coordinated planning for the regions and local communities.

Ms. Norman continued to the roles and responsibilities of Caltrans on slide 46 and said that they must ensure they make changes to coordinated plans, which Ms. Gayle is ready to move forward with. She moved to slide 47 and explained that Caltrans assumes the lead role in order to reinvigorate the interest of state level departments to establish coordination.

Ms. Norman moved to slide 48 and stressed that they must educate all agencies and provide information for all parties. She said that they discussed fact sheets, concise information and short informational sessions in which they cover basic concepts.

Ms. Norman continued to slide 49 and discussed the next steps for the MAP and proceeding to implement the SIP recommendations and MAP goals 1 and 3.

Ms. Norman discussed the legislative report and said that she added recommendations at the end. She said that she wants to ensure consistency between the legislative report and the SIP.

Linda Deavens said that she does not see definitions in the back for RTPAs. She also said that she is unsure about Table 1 with the duplication and overlap which she did not understand.

Judith Norman said that they initially examined restrictive, duplicative and overlapping regulations and they did find overlap. She said that they analyzed the statutes relative to these issues in the legislative analysis and the duplication overlap analysis in that table and the following narrative discusses findings. She said that the solution is at the regional planning level and RTPAs must involve community members and human services must also participate. Ms. Norman continued that the glossary will be in the book of appendices.

David Cyra said that the final draft report would be more applicable if it is put under the insurance liability impact regarding inclusion of the insurance commissioner's office which is on page 36 of the recommended strategy.

Ms. Norman said that this will also be seen in the recommendation report.

Floyd Willis pointed to the brokerage system on page 63 in the glossary. He said that brokerage is a key concept with recommendations and there was a point in the definition of a brokerage system that was omitted. He said that the definition names providers that make arrangements for specific clientele but he added that there is a third player which is naming or servicing the needs of the buyers, or the entity that has money to buy rides for the clients.

Judith Norman asked for any corrections and edits to be sent by email.

Floyd Willis proposed that Ms. Daucher, Mr. Kempf and he hold a separate conference call regarding AAA and the mechanism for preserving funds for transportation purposes in the 5310 arena. He said that they lack a method to inform local providers in the match requirement of the 5310 vehicle because their fund balance cannot be preserved over the length of time necessary for 5310 process.

Judith Norman thanked the committee for their efforts and participation in the meeting.

Kimberly Gayle thanked Ms. Norman and said that when they began two years ago she was thankful for the team and the endeavor and they have made great progress in the last two years. She thanked Ms. Norman for her leadership and for bringing the NCSL team on board. She said that she feels comfortable that they have a usable document to bring forward and move toward implementation to make tough decisions. Ms. Gayle said that they need all comments for the SIP to be sent to Judith Norman by next Friday. She said that Ms. Norman will work until June 30 to the end of her contract and will issue a formal SIP.

Ms. Gayle said that she will meet with Director Daucher to identify which strategic steps they want to take forward internally through their respective areas and they will return in September with an action plan through the MOU. She said that her goal is to have a draft available at that time. She said that she will educate and inform her own department as they have experienced various directors throughout the project and she explained that their challenge is to educate staff members throughout the turnovers.

Ms. Gayle said that there is great information to share while other things occur within Caltrans and she plans to follow behind their strategic transportation transit plan which moves forward next month and addresses the strategic growth council and how to incorporate transit. She said that this committee is also carrying forward recommendations because this is a statewide issue and they also want to include health and human services as they look to change transportation whether they receive federal or state funds.

Ms. Gayle continued that the department is updating its own California transportation plan which is their statewide plan through FTA and to which she provides input. She said that there are many recent initiatives with money attached, including the state of good repair program, a liabilities initiative and a strategic growth for new starts program. She said that there are many things happening and they will continue to keep members updated until the next meeting in September at the California Department of Aging. She asked committee members to provide any comments to Judith Norman.

Lynn Daucher said that states moving forward in this area have a similar internal administrative coordinating council like the MAP PAC and continuing with this structure will give a large push forward before the next administration. She thanked Ms. Gayle for awarding CPA a New Freedom grant which she views as a model of what can happen in the state. She said that there will be pressure on the Department of Aging to make this work and agencies who are becoming transportation experts like Mr. Willis and Mr. Kempf can provide transportation with strong input from the human service side. She said that this grant has the potential to implement what has been discussed here. She said that she will call on members for their support and she believes that this committee will have a long lasting legacy in terms of what will happen in California.

Jane Perez said that although she has been involved from a distance she sees the excitement in their arrival at a great milestone in the project after all their hard work. She said that their efforts show and she wishes the project the very best.

Floyd Willis thanked the project managers for their leadership.

Linda Deavens said that she is thrilled that they have made it this far but she reminded the committee that they are not yet finished.

Kimberly Gayle offered another thanks to Judith Norman and JNTC for their help on the MAP PAC project. She said that if there is any way to secure funding they would like to continue with JNTC; however, if funding is unavailable the committee will be coordinated through her Caltrans office. She asked for flexibility in the future due to the current California climate. Ms. Gayle thanked the committee and said that they will receive a formal notice after the summer regarding the next meeting.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 1:50 p.m.

Attachment A

**MAP PAC Meeting Attendees
Wednesday, June 16, 2010**

In-Person Meeting Attendees

Kimberly Gayle, Chair
Lynn Daucher, Co-Chair
David J. Cyra
Todd Allen
Linda Deavens
Tracey Frost
Clay Kempf
Jane Perez
Cherie Phoenix
Phil McGuire
Maureen Powers

Telephone Meeting Attendees

David Ball
Bill Doyle
Jean Foletta
Katie Heatly
Beth Kranda
Heather Menninger
Pat Piras
David Wilder
Roger Sanchez
Jennifer Yeamans
Brian Travis
Gordon Arruta
Lisa Laforet-Favilla
Dan Levy
Pam Couch
Floyd Willis
Gordon Arruda
Paul Branson
Melody Goodman
Frances Jacobs

MAP PAC Study Consultants

Judith Norman
Ray Clay
CJ Smith