



Developing Coordinated Transportation Plans

Introduction

This brief is part of the “Promising Practices in Mobility Management” series. The series has been created for mobility management practitioners to help advance the adoption of transportation coordination and other strategies that lead to responsive, customer-centered transportation services. All briefs in the series—covering the topics of coordinated transportation planning, technology in coordination, one-call/one-click services, mobility management, and performance measurement— are available on the relevant “By Topic” page at <http://nationalcenterformobilitymanagement.org>.

It is important for the field to feel confident that a particular practice holds “promise” for achieving its desired results. When there is an objective and systematic process in place to determine whether a practice is promising, professionals in the field, who are making decisions about the relevance and value of particular practices for their own settings, will have increased confidence that a particular practice will be appropriate for their venue. It is also important for the field to examine each practice in relation to the unique characteristics of their setting.

In NCMM’s work to identify promising practices related to coordinated transportation plans, the plans and accompanying descriptive information submitted by the field was voluntary. Therefore, we thank those organizations that were willing to share their information with NCMM and are grateful for their participation in this systematic review process.

Methodology

Survey to collect coordinated planning practices. A survey was developed to collect information on coordinated transportation planning. We widely disseminated our interest in collecting this information through the NCMM website and through partner organizational newsletters, such as Easter Seals Project ACTION’s “Extra.” Over a two-month period, the field submitted a total of 79 surveys with descriptions of their coordinated plans, and in some cases, provided their actual plans. Of those plans that were submitted, the NCMM team identified those submissions that 1) provided the most comprehensive descriptions of their practices and 2) shared descriptive information about the six criteria (see below) that supported why a particular practice was promising. The external review process was then implemented.

Of the 79 surveys that were submitted, many did not have enough information to adequately or fairly review their practice. We reached out to those that submitted practice descriptions to complement the

information we had already received. Many of these practices will be included in the NCMM Mobility Management Information Practices (MMIP) database.

External review process. NCMM used an objective and systematic process to determine the promise of the practices reviewed. We solicited the advice of external reviewers who volunteered their time to review the information that was submitted to us. To assess the merits of practices related to coordinated transportation plans, we used the following procedure:

First, this process included six criteria or characteristics by which practices can be assessed to determine their promise:

1. Innovation: A practice is new or adapted or applied in a different or unique way.
2. Knowledge base: Information about the context and setting in which the practice is implemented is clearly defined. The resources needed and the conditions under which the mobility management practice is implemented are explained. The goals, implementation strategies, process and outcome measures related to why the practice is implemented are clearly articulated.
3. Stakeholder engagement: The practice is informed by a diverse group of key stakeholders – that are especially relevant and important to the mobility management system.
4. Monitoring and evaluation: Procedures are in place to continuously assess the practice.
5. Efficiency: The fiscal, personnel, and other resources required to implement the strategy are reasonable considering the impact of the strategy, and in relation to the availability of all resources.
6. Impact: The extent to which a strategy has the desired or intended effect on a mobility management need, problem, or issue over time.

Second, we developed a scoring rubric that external reviewers used to measure the degree to which a particular coordinated transportation planning practice met these criteria. Reviewers were asked to assign values to each of the six criteria using the following criterion:

- Three points (3): Practice is promising. Substantial information affirms and validates that the practice meets the criteria.
- Two (2) points: Practice is developing. Little information and limited qualitative and quantitative data is insufficient to affirm that a practice meets the criteria.
- One (1) point: Practice is launching. No information is provided to substantiate the practice's ability to meet the tenets of the criteria.

Descriptive information about each of the practices was captured by utilizing surveys and through technical assistance provided by NCMM Regional Liaisons. The field voluntarily submitted surveys that included descriptive information about a particular practice. Data also included information about the unique characteristics and impact of each practice.

Third, when information was received from the field, NCMM staff reviewed the survey information, and when necessary, followed up with those persons submitting the practice information. Finally, the practice descriptions were sent to field reviewers, who independently assessed the practices according to the criteria and scoring rubric described above. Based on these external reviews, NCMM staff synthesized this information and wrote summaries of the coordinated transportation planning practices.

The summaries of these promising practices can be used to provide the mobility management field with examples of promising programs and strategies. We wanted the field to learn from each other—from the good work that is already taking place about mobility management. Practice information will also be entered into the Mobility Management Information and Practices (MMIP), a searchable public database that will catalogue the status of mobility management in communities and states throughout the country and serve as a repository for data and descriptive information on a host of mobility management programs and practices.

The five plans selected as promising practices in coordination plan development had many common elements. All plans placed a large emphasis on building diverse groups of stakeholders, community representatives and agencies that were involved in the development of the plans. Including people with disabilities and older adults was also a common theme throughout the plans. Respondents indicated some level of positive community impact as a result of the coordination processes and plan developments. While some plans emphasized the need for coordination across modes, others indicated that method to still be in development.

The programs profiled below are listed below (hyperlinked to their place in the document for quick reference):

[Champaign County Regional Planning Commission \(CCRPC\), Urbana, Illinois](#)
[Lima/Allen County Regional Planning Commission \(LACRPC\), Lima, Ohio](#)
[Mid-Columbia Economic Development District, Columbia, Oregon](#)
[West Florida Regional Planning Council \(WFRPC\), Pensacola, Florida](#)
[WSOS Community Action Commission, Freemont, Ohio](#)
[Appendix: Community Coordinated Transportation Plan Profiles Survey Results](#)

Summary

External reviewers volunteered their time, and based on their experience, provided systematic reviews of the practice information submitted to NCMM. Our analyses of the coordinated transportation plan data submitted, affirmed that communities are at varying stages of implementation. Additionally, the submissions reflected differences in the ability of communities to articulate how their practice is innovative, the knowledge upon which the practice is based, how stakeholders are engaged, how the strategy is monitored and evaluated, the strategy's efficiency, and its overall impact. With this in mind, a product such as this, that identifies key components of coordinated transportation practices, could be a useful tool for communities to further develop and refine their practices, using objective criterion from which to build their process. This work is always a "work in progress", and understanding current work as the basis for building the future is exciting!

NCMM again wants to thank the communities that voluntarily submitted information to us about their coordinated transportation plans. Our goal was to use the work and experiences of the field to assist others to build their capacity to develop and implement coordinated transportation plans that hold promise to guide a community. Our work to review and catalogue promising practices, across various

topical areas, is ongoing, and we look to the field for your continued support, submissions, and feedback.

Reference

<http://ctb.ku.edu/en/table-of-contents/analyze/choose-and-adapt-community-interventions/criteria-for-selectinng/main>

Champaign County Regional Planning Commission (CCRPC)

Urban, Illinois

The Champaign County Regional Planning Commission covers a 12-county region and is tasked with implementing the regional transportation coordination plan across a diverse landscape of towns and communities. The first plan was developed in 2007 and is updated annually. An annual report card is published detailing the status of coordination practices outlined in the plan.

CCRPC's plan has tackled some large goals. It identified and established a Section 5311 operator for any county with rural transportation challenges. Areas of coordination were also identified that have improved maintenance of vehicles and regional maintenance centers. CCRPC's plan also networks extensively, not only with stakeholders and interested advocates, but with those who truly benefit from transportation coordination, such as local community colleges. As a result, the plan also works to reduce duplication in services and promotes joint purchase opportunities.

In addition to recognizing CCRPC's goals to address local issues, one reviewer noted that CCRPC's plan seems to have a great sense of what the community needs, and have great stride in moving its needs forward.

View the plan at <http://www.ccrpc.org/transportation/index.php>.

Lima/Allen County Regional Planning Commission (LACRPC)

Lima, Ohio

LACRPC used its coordinated transportation planning process to identify both short and long-term objectives for improving transportation throughout a two-county region. In addition to working with the Public Transit Authority and local elected officials, LACRPC partnered with 24 community groups and agencies such as schools, hospitals, employment service agencies, neighborhood associations, non-profit agencies, and transportation service providers to create its coordinated transportation plan. LACRPC's stakeholder engagement process is exemplary and has ensured ongoing support for transportation services throughout Lima and Allen counties.

Each objective identified in the plan is tracked annually and used by all coordinating agencies. While all stakeholders have not agreed to a shared accounting system, data and outcomes are shared in a collaborative manner. One of the main goals of the plan was to determine 5310 eligibility for local transportation projects. A secondary goal of the plan was to increase hours and days of service for public transit, as well as increase the service area. As a result of the coordination process, LACRPC has seen large increases in the number of trips on public transportation throughout the area. The availability of public transportation services has increased by nearly 100% and it is reported that a broader cross section of the population is better able to use existing services.

The LACRPC plan is a promising practice in coordinated transportation planning due to its sizable impact on the communities it touches. It has helped to bring about new programs and support existing

practices as well. The region's one-call/one-click program, volunteer driving program, cost-sharing program, travel training program, and veterans' transportation programs have all been created or enhanced by LACRPC's coordinated planning efforts. LACRPC also credits its plan with enabling the region to improve community outreach and marketing strategies, expand staff resources, provide for professional development opportunities, and develop new tools for urban planning concepts.

View the plan at <http://www.lacrpc.com/pdfs/Coordination%20Plan,%20December%202020,%202012--COMPLETE.pdf> – Public Transit Human Service Transportation Coordination Plan

Mid-Columbia Economic Development District

Columbia, Oregon

The Mid-Columbia Economic Development District of Columbia, Oregon has a series of innovative coordinated transportation plans that positively impact a total of five counties in rural Oregon. Dozens of agencies throughout the five-county area were involved in the development and implementation of the plans, and an emphasis on multi-modal needs was addressed throughout the process. Once goals were identified, a performance measures table was developed to address short and long-term goals that addressed transportation needs.

The implementation of these plans, as part of a broader regional picture, resulted in an allocation system that ensured that certain projects throughout the region were identified as high-priority. Those that met these criteria were supported with funding from both the state and local levels. Mid-Columbia Economic Development District did have some challenges in funding existing programs during difficult economic times, but the benefits of some coordinated projects remain.

The plan has enabled public transit providers to apply for state and federal grants in an effort to maintain safe and modern fleets of vehicles. Each county involved in the planning process also prioritized the need to hire a Mobility Manager to help coordinate services and conduct community outreach, and promote public transportation options throughout the five-county area. MCEDD also continues to go the extra mile in ensuring that people of all abilities are involved in the ongoing implementation of the plan. Each of the five counties has a Special Transportation Fund Advisory Committee that meets regularly to provide input to MCEDC. People with disabilities and older adults are always warmly invited to participate on these committees. Especially considering MCEDD is tasked with coordinating in multiple areas, this plan has exceptional stakeholder engagement. They reached out to a variety of stakeholder groups, human service agencies and community organizations to explain that stakeholder input was crucial to the development and success of a useful plan. MCEDD further explained that the funding and implementation of transportation projects and services outlined in the plan would help to address the identified needs throughout the region. MCEDD did not stop its stakeholder engagement once the plan was finalized, but instead keep stakeholders engaged through working groups, advisory committee meetings and by conducting outreach presentations to employers, county governments and other organizations in need of the benefits of coordination. MCEDD even developed a monthly newsletter for coordination update purposes.

View the plan at

<http://www.gorgetranslink.com/documents/GorgeTranslink%20coordinated%20plan.pdf>

West Florida Regional Planning Council (WFRPC)

Pensacola, Florida

The West Florida Regional Planning Council coordinates with multiple stakeholders and community members throughout western Florida in developing its coordination transportation plans. Requirements for the plans development were set by the Florida Commission for the Transportation Disadvantaged (CTD) and were reviewed and approved by local coordinating boards.

WFRPC formed a diverse group of stakeholders to help in the development and implementation of its coordination plan. Older adults, individuals with disabilities, and veterans served as advisory committee members. Organizations such as the Florida Department of Transportation, the Florida Department of Children and Families, the Florida Department of Elder Affairs and the Florida Department of Education were also valued stakeholders. Meetings are held each quarter to ensure the plan its meeting its goals and standards. These meetings are open to the public, so in addition to ensuring accountability by project stakeholders, the community can also address the plan or other transportation coordination issues.

WFRPC's plan covers seven counties and three local coordinating boards, making it one of the largest plans in terms of geographic scope. One of the goals of WFRPC's plan is to survey riders annually, a practice that one reviewer noted is a great way to gauge performance and grasp the populations being served.

View the plan at <http://www.wfrpc.org/transportation-planning>

WSOS Community Action Commission

Freemont, Ohio

The WSOS Community Action Commission, which represents Wood, Sandusky, Ottawa and Seneca counties in Ohio, is involved in the implementation of the coordinated transportation plan that impacts Wood County and Sandusky County, Ohio. A host of fields were represented in the plan's development, including employment services, health departments, planning commissions, departments of developmental disabilities, universities, rural transit providers, public taxis, and community health services. Elected officials and citizens of the region were also involved. This plan is evaluated on an annual basis under an innovative process that involves members of the aforementioned groups. The combined knowledge of all involved agencies should result in ongoing community impact. Due to the amount of elected officials and public agencies that were involved in crafting and implementing this plan, there is a high degree of emphasis placed on monitoring outcomes. The plan is accountable to these people and agencies and is continuously looking to measure impact and conduct evaluations.

In Sandusky County, this plan has improved paratransit services and helped to coordinate with case managers in solving transportation issues for individuals with disabilities. In Wood County, the coordination process helped create community dialogues around vitally important transportation topics. Stakeholders in Wood County are actively engaged in the beginning steps of creating a framework for action to solve transportation barriers throughout the county. The Wood County group applied to and was accepted as an Accessible Transportation Technical Support (ATTS) team through Easter Seals Project ACTION. The team will work with Project ACTION for a year in the implementation of the goals set forth from the coordination process.

View the 2014 Wood County Locally Coordinated Public and Human Service Transportation Plan Update at <http://www.wsos.org/mobility/WoodCo/Wood%20County%20LCHSTP%202014.pdf> and the Sandusky County Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan Update at <http://www.wsos.org/mobility/2014SCPHSTP.pdf>.

Appendix: Community Coordinated Transportation Plan Profiles Survey Results

Champaign County Regional Planning Commission (CCRPC), Urbana, IL

Section 1: General Information

Organization or Agency Affiliation: Champaign County Regional Planning Commission

Agency Type: Local government, transportation

Zip code: 61802

Section 2: Plan Development

What stakeholders, groups or organizations were involved in the development of the plan? All local human service agencies and policy members. A list of these can be found online at www.ecihstp.org. Basically, any organization representative of people with low incomes, people with disabilities and older adults. We had a strong showing from the local medical provider community as well. CCRPC covers a 12 county region.

In what ways did you involve stakeholders, groups or organizations contribute to the development of the plan? From its inception – they assisted to develop, implement, and update the plan continually dating back to 2007.

Section 3: Funding and Administration

Who administers the plan? The Illinois Department of Transportation, County Governments, Community Care Agencies, Regional Planning Commission and the local Metropolitan Planning Organization.

What are your sources of funding? MAP21 Funding, State DOT Funding

How do you communicate information from performance measures to stakeholder groups? Primarily through the report card and annual updates of the plan.

In what ways have you utilized your plan? Implementation of coordination strategies identified in the plan. The first major goal was to identify and establish a Section 5311 operator for any county currently without rural public transportation. Then we identified areas of coordination – such as maintenance of the vehicles, regional maintenance centers. We also coordinated with local community colleges, developed joint purchase opportunities, and established services contracts to reduce duplications. Lastly, we coordinated with local emergency management agencies.

How often is your coordinated transportation plan updated, and by whom? Once a year – the last large overhaul took two years because of the delayed Census update. The ACS just came out, so the next update of our plan will be in July 2014. We time the update to coincide with the state fiscal year since many of the program grants run on that cycle.

What benefit or impact has your plan had on the community? We have all counties covered and receiving public transportation. The reduction of duplication and cost savings have been seen. More of our grant applications are awarded now than they were prior to the plan's implementation, even though state and federal funding for Section 5310 application have dwindled.

Section 4: Plan Implementation

How are representatives at the federal, local or community level involved in implementation of the plan? We primarily rely on local level representatives to help us implement the plan. The state oversees the process and adopts the plans. The feds provide us with information and rely on us to speak up about new projects or needs we are seeing on the local level.

How do people with disabilities and older adults participate in the plan or its activities? The most active are those associated with Centers for Independent Living. We have tried to collect information from certain groups with varying success. Getting individual community members involved and attending the meetings has been difficult due to the reality of rural transportation and life in general.

How did you garner support for the development and implementation of your plan? How do you keep stakeholders engaged? Workshops where they determine what the plan is and how things are implemented. Outreach and trying to provide resources and still get them the information they need.

What mobility management categories have been positively impacted by the implementation of your coordinated transportation plan? One call-one click, Mobility Management Program, Travel Training, Community Accessibility, Performance Measures, Transportation for people with disabilities, older adults or veterans, and community outreach and marketing.

What additional resources have you acquired as a result of your plan in action? Additional funding, additional vehicles and additional personnel.

Lima/Allen County Regional Planning Commission (LACRPC), Lima, Ohio

Section 1: General Information

Organization or Agency Affiliation: Lima/Allen County Regional Planning Commission
Agency Type: Local government, metropolitan planning organization
Zip code: 45801

Section 2: Plan Development

What stakeholders, groups or organizations were involved in the development of the plan? Local elected officials, public transit authority, governmental health & human service agencies non-profit social service agencies, for-profit transportation service providers, hospitals, schools, employment service agencies, neighborhood associations, MPO, and advocacy groups for the protected classes.

In what ways did you involve stakeholders, groups or organizations contribute to the development of the plan?

1. Problem Identification
2. Data Collection & Analyses using Agency, Ridership & Public surveys
3. Focus Group Assessments
4. Budget Analyses
5. Vehicle Manifests, Vehicle Logs, Vehicle Inventories and Ridership Profile Assessments
6. Alternatives Analyses
7. Policy Analyses
8. Plan Recommendations to Transit Board, MPO and County Commissioners

Section 3: Funding and Administration

Who administers the plan? The state mandates that the plan be administered and the county government adopts it. LACRPC, the local MPO, and the County Planning Commission administer the plan.

What are your sources of funding?

JARC Funding, New Freedom Funding, Non-profit community funding sources, State DOT Funding, Public-Private Partnerships, MAP21 Funding, ARRA Grants. PL monies were used to develop the plan. FTA 5310, 5316 and 5317 monies were used to support increased transit services. Area Agency on Aging and County Board of Developmental Disabilities also did some heavy lifting.

How do you communicate information from performance measures to stakeholder groups? Annual Assessments are prepared by the MPO posted to membership and elected officials and sent to Ohio DOT.

In what ways have you utilized your plan? We supported the institution of additional hours of service, days of service and a larger service area for public transit. We also used the plan to determine FTA 5310 project eligibility, and provide justification for ARRA, FTA 5316 and 5317 funding. We also instituted the concept of coordinated fueling, maintenance and dispatching services. In addition to the activities listed above, we also have organized joint training opportunities with like-minded agencies.

How often is your coordinated transportation plan updated, and by whom? At least annually by the MPO.

What benefit or impact has your plan had on the community? A huge increase in the number of trips have been experienced since the Coordination Plan was instituted. The availability of public transit services has increased by nearly 100% in the larger service area and with a broader cross section of the population able to use the existing services.

Section 4: Plan Implementation

How are representatives at the federal, local or community level involved in implementation of the plan? No FTA, FHWA or Ohio DOT officials are involved in the plan implementation. Local community service agency directors work with AAA, RTA and MPO personnel to affect change. Ohio DOT hosts regional roundtables to exchange information. Ohio DOT conducts annual reviews of MPO/RTA activities and coordination efforts. Ohio DOT has been generous with funding for additional and replacement vehicles, with funding for supporting a mobility manager at AAA.

How do people with disabilities and older adults participate in the plan or its activities? People with disabilities, older adults and their advocates serve on the MPO and Transit Authority boards and committees charged with implementing the plan.

How did you garner support for the development and implementation of your plan? How do you keep stakeholders engaged? The MPO, AAA and RTA control access and support for transportation services in the community. Stakeholder participation is expected.

What mobility management categories have been positively impacted by the implementation of your coordinated transportation plan? Professional Development, Staff Resources, Social Media Strategies, Community Outreach and Marketing, Transportation for People with Disabilities, Older Adults or Veterans, Urban Planning Tools, Community Accessibility, Travel Training, Mobility Management Program, Vehicle Sharing Program, Cost-Sharing Program, Volunteer Driver Program, One-call - One-Click

What additional resources have you acquired as a result of your plan in action? Additional funding, personnel and vehicles

Mid-Columbia Economic Development District, Columbia, Oregon

Section 1: General Information

Organization or Agency Affiliation: Mid-Columbia Economic Development District

Agency Type: Economic development district, rural area

Zip code: 97058

Section 2: Plan Development

What stakeholders, groups or organizations were involved in the development of the plan? Each county within our region has its own Human Services Coordinated Transportation Plan, which involved public transit providers, private transportation providers, the Oregon Department of Human Services, Washington Department of Social and Health Services, local hospitals and Medicaid transportation brokerages, Mid-Columbia Housing Authority, Mid-Columbia Community Action Council, Area Agency on Aging, Center for Living, Next Door, Inc., workforce development organizations, The Arc of the Mid-Columbia, senior assisted living communities, senior and community centers, Eastern Oregon Support Services, local employers, local government representatives, area chambers of commerce, Mid-Columbia Economic Development District, Human Services Council, and members of the general public.

In what ways did you involve stakeholders, groups or organizations contribute to the development of the plan? Stakeholders attended public meetings and participated in a survey to provide information about transportation needs and potential strategies to address needs in each county in our five-county region.

Section 3: Funding and Administration

Who administers the plan? In Skamania and Klickitat counties in Washington, the Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council administers the plan, while in Hood River, Wasco, and

Sherman counties in Oregon, the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) contracts with the Association of Oregon Counties (AOC) which subcontracts with Mid-Columbia Economic Development District (MCEDD) to administer the plan.

What are your sources of funding? Federal 5310 grants through Oregon Dept. of Transportation and Washington State Dept. of Transportation, along with local match contributions from WSDOT, MCEDD, and local public transportation providers, funds MCEDD's Mobility Manager project.

How do you communicate information from performance measures to stakeholder groups? The plans are posted on a public website, www.gorgetranslink.com and MCEDD's Mobility Manager makes periodic presentations to stakeholders and community groups.

In what ways have you utilized your plan? The projects identified as high priority in each county's plan have been supported with funding at the state and federal level. The plans have also informed efforts to coordinate between county public transit providers on ITS research and procurement efforts, specifically regarding computer-aided scheduling/dispatch software, mobile data terminals, and integrated fare structure systems. The public transit providers in the region have also applied for federal and state funding for projects listed in their respective county's plan that are not the top priority, but would address significant transportation needs in the region - however, especially during the economic recession of the past several years, such projects were not successfully funded.

How often is your coordinated transportation plan updated, and by whom? The plans for each county in our region are updated every three to four years by the Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council and ODOT which contracts with AOC which contracts with MCEDD.

What benefit or impact has your plan had on the community? The plan has enabled public transit providers to apply for state and federal grants to maintain and augment services and vehicles in the region. In addition to maintaining a safe and modern fleet and existing services, providers have been able to obtain grants to support ITS projects that are listed in the plans to increase communication and coordination between providers with regards to scheduling and dispatch, thereby increasing the potential for shared rides, more efficient services through optimized trip schedules and routes via mobile data terminals, and increased access for customers via online trip booking tools. Each county plan also lists the Gorge TransLink Mobility Manager project as a priority, which has helped that project receive federal funds over the past four years to help coordinate the Gorge TransLink Alliance and conduct outreach to employers and the general public to promote transit and transportation options in the Mid-Columbia Gorge region.

Section 4: Plan Implementation

How are representatives at the federal, local or community level involved in implementation of the plan? Local government bodies, such as county commissions or courts, must approve the final iteration of each county plan. Beyond that, city and county government can support efforts to fund projects listed in the plans via letters of support for grants and some cases providing local match for transportation and mobility management projects. In Sherman and Wasco counties in Oregon, local government representatives stay involved by participating in the local Area Commission on Transportation, which provides input on project priorities for statewide plans and funding opportunities for all modes.

How do people with disabilities and older adults participate in the plan or its activities? Each county has a Special Transportation Fund Advisory Committee which includes people with disabilities, older adults, and representatives of organizations that work with such individuals and communities when available. The STF Advisory Committee reviews the draft Human Services Coordinated Transportation Plan and provides input and comments for inclusion in the final plan. In addition to the STF Advisory Committee, people with disabilities and older adults are invited to participate as stakeholders in the plan's public involvement process, namely to take part in the public meetings and surveys.

How did you garner support for the development and implementation of your plan? How do you keep stakeholders engaged? Outreach to stakeholder groups and agencies with the explanation that their input was crucial to the development of a useful plan that would lead to the funding and implementation of transportation projects and services that would address the needs they identify. Stakeholders are kept engaged through STF Advisory Committee meetings, Gorge TransLink Alliance meetings, Mobility Manager presentations to county boards of commissioners, employers, and related agencies/organizations throughout the region, and monthly transportation updates sent out with the MCEDD e-newsletter.

What mobility management categories have been positively impacted by the implementation of your coordinated transportation plan? Community Outreach and Marketing, Transportation for People with Disabilities, Older Adults or Veterans, Performance Measures, Community Accessibility, Mobility Management Program. The plan has also enabled us to improve our ITS scheduling/dispatch software and mobile data terminals for public transit providers.

What additional resources have you acquired as a result of your plan in action? Some of the county public transit providers may have added vehicles, but they have all certainly been able to consistently obtain replacement vehicles to maintain a safe, reliable fleet.

Would you like to share any additional information about your plan? MCEDD is a five-county economic development district, which provides a Mobility Manager to help coordinate the public transit providers in each of the five counties. Thus, there is not a single plan covering our entire region, although the needs and strategies included in each county's plan are similar and point to common needs to be addressed at the regional level.

West Florida Regional Planning Commission – Pensacola, FL

Section 1: General Information

Organization or Agency Affiliation: West Florida Regional Planning Commission

Agency Type: State Government

Zip code: 32514

Section 2: Plan Development

What stakeholders, groups or organizations were involved in the development of the plan?

Designated Official Planning Agency (DOPA) in coordination with the Local Coordinating Board (LCB) and a Community Transportation Coordinator (CTC). Represented on the LCB are people with disabilities, older adults, citizen advocates/users, children at risk, community action members,

public education providers, FDOT, the FL Department of Children and Families, the FL Department of Elder Affairs, the FL Department of Education, the FL Department of Health Care Administration, the workforce, veterans services programs, mass transit, the transportation industry, and the local medical community.

In what ways did you involve stakeholders, groups or organizations contribute to the development of the plan? The Local Coordinating Board (LCB) reviews the plan for adoption annually.

Section 3: Funding and Administration

Who administers the plan? The West Florida Regional Planning Council and the Transportation Planning Organization

What are your sources of funding? The Florida Transportation Disadvantaged Trust Fund

How do you communicate information from performance measures to stakeholder groups? During quarterly Local Coordinating Board (LCB) meetings.

In what ways have you utilized your plan? As a reference for people inquiring about services, and to promote community transportation.

How often is your coordinated transportation plan updated, and by whom? In Florida, the plan is updated annually by the Designated Official Planning Agency (DOPA) in coordination with the Local Coordinating Board (LCB) and the Community Transportation Coordinator (CTC).

What benefit or impact has your plan had on the community? The plan has become a handy reference for inquiries regarding services and other transportation information. All of the information related to coordinated services are together in one document instead of in multiple places to be pieced together.

Section 4: Plan Implementation

How are representatives at the federal, local or community level involved in implementation of the plan? Representatives at the state and local level are represented on the Local Coordinating Board (LCB) and review and approve the plan. Representatives have opportunities to raise questions and concerns at each quarterly meeting.

How do people with disabilities and older adults participate in the plan or its activities? The Local Coordinating Board (LCB) meetings are advertised and are open to the public. For those using the coordinated transportation service, they have an opportunity to fill out a rider survey each year. The results of those rider surveys are included in the plan.

How did you garner support for the development and implementation of your plan? How do you keep stakeholders engaged? The development and implementation are required by the state. We garner support through the Local Coordinating Board (LCB). The stakeholders are engaged because the plan is tied to funding.

What mobility management categories have been positively impacted by the implementation of your coordinated transportation plan? Community Accessibility, Performance Measures, Transportation for people with disabilities, older adults or veterans, and Professional Development.

What additional resources have you acquired as a result of your plan in action? Additional funding and vehicles.

Would you like to share any additional information about your plan?

The West Florida Regional Planning Council (WFRPC), staff to three TPOs, prepares plans for seven counties in Northwest Florida.

WSOS Community Action Commission, Fremont, Ohio

Section 1: General Information

Organization or Agency Affiliation: WSOS Community Action Commission

Agency Type: Human services, transportation, rural area

Zip code: 43420

Section 2: Plan Development

What stakeholders, groups or organizations were involved in the development of the plan? Wood County and Sandusky County Ohio agencies including but not limited to: Department of Job & Family Services, Council of Agencies, United Way, Health Department, Mental Health Board, Commissioner Office, Planning Commission, Department of Developmental Disabilities, Private Taxi, Rural Transit Provider, Bowling Green State University faculty and students, City Officials, Mayors, Chamber of Commerce, Economic Development Corporation, Hospital, Community Health Services, Users of transportation service, public.

In what ways did you involve stakeholders, groups or organizations contribute to the development of the plan? Provided content for inventory, participated in planning meetings, defined needs, developed strategies, advocated with local politicians to adopt.

Section 3: Funding and Administration

Who administers the plan? The Regional Transit Authority in Wood County

What are your sources of funding? JARC Funding, New Freedom Funding, Non-profit or community funding sources, State DOT Funding, Public-Private Partnerships, ARRA Grants

How do you communicate information from performance measures to stakeholder groups? Monthly, annually, and as needed as we make progress on the goals outlined in the plan.

In what ways have you utilized your plan? To meet community needs that are outlined in the plan. Several actions have been taken that were listed in the plans. Services have been either initiated for the first time, or improved. More services have been provided.

How often is your coordinated transportation plan updated, and by whom? We have an annual review of the plan, and we rewrite it every 5 years.

What benefit or impact has your plan had on the community? Sandusky County: after hours transportation to work and school, improved service with passenger care attendants, case management approach to problem solving transportation issues for individuals.

Wood County: The plan was just adopted. The process in and of itself has created a passion and dialogue in the community at every turn. Instead of transportation being named as an allusive barrier to accessing services, Stakeholders are actively engaged in finding solutions. The process has literally provided a framework for action.

Section 4: Plan Implementation

How are representatives at the federal, local or community level involved in implementation of the plan? Federal Level: The Wood County process is a National Easter Seals Project Action technical assistance project. State Level: Ohio DOT provided contacts and background information on best practice models. Local Level: Counties are actively involved in planning process, support for grant applications, etc.

How do people with disabilities and older adults participate in the plan or its activities? Both counties have people with disabilities on the planning committee and in stakeholder groups. Both target groups that receive services based on plan activities.

How did you garner support for the development and implementation of your plan? How do you keep stakeholders engaged? We started by identifying the key stakeholders that should be involved in the development of our plan, and after doing so, we set up a steering committee. We worked with the steering committee to address the political issues that we found at each and every decision point. We created an atmosphere of inclusiveness and transparency in the development of our plan. We also shared best practices that specifically connected to our committee and discussed many possibilities for moving forward. We then continued to speak about coordination as a continuum of services, not an all or nothing proposition, and that really seemed to ease some territorial fears. Above all else, we wanted people to feel involved, and we knew anyone who felt involved would want to help contribute if the topic was relevant to them and their work.

What mobility management categories have been positively impacted by the implementation of your coordinated transportation plan? Professional Development, Staff Resources, Community Outreach and Marketing, Transportation for People with Disabilities, Older Adults or Veterans, Performance Measures, Community Accessibility, Mobility Management Program, and Transportation for low-income individuals.

What additional resources have you acquired as a result of your plan in action? Additional personnel and funding.

The National Center for Mobility Management (NCMM; www.nationalcenterformobilitymanagement.org) is a national technical assistance center created to facilitate communities in adopting mobility management strategies. The NCMM is funded through a cooperative agreement with the Federal Transit Administration, and is operated through a consortium of three national organizations – the American Public Transportation Association, the Community Transportation Association of America, and the Eastern Seals Transportation Group. Content in this document is disseminated by NCMM in the interest of information exchange. Neither the NCMM nor the U.S. DOT, FTA assumes liability for its contents or use. 2014.