

Statewide and Regional Coordinating Councils: Research Findings

Research objectives

- 1) Systematically study the processes of coordination by statewide and regional councils in other states,
- 2) Tabulate lessons learned by individual states, and
- 3) Present scenarios for discussion about regional governance structures in Massachusetts to the Regional Coordinating Councils Work Group.

Sampling methodology

As of December 2011, there were 16 states with both statewide and regional coordinating councils in the US. The choice of states to study was a result of convenience sampling influenced by the following factors:

- 1) Availability of publications describing human service transportation coordination structures (e.g. studies by the National Conference of State Legislatures);
- 2) CTAA's recommendation as "best practice"¹ state; recommendation from former UWR Ambassador to the Mid-Atlantic Region, Rex Knowlton and Will Rodman, Principal at Nelson-Nygaard. Mrs. Knowlton and Rodman were active participants in consulting with various states as they built their coordination structures.
- 3) CTAA's e-mail to states requesting to be available for an interview with me

States (study; interview)*	NCSL/other publication	CTAA/consultant recommendation	Other**	SCC only; RCC only; both
Alaska (i)			X	SCC
Florida (s)	X			both
Idaho (s; i)	X	X	X	both
Illinois (s; i)			X	both
Iowa (s; i)	X	X		both
New Hampshire (s; i)	X	X		both
Texas (s; i)	X	X	X	RCC
Washington (s)	X			SCC
Wisconsin (s; i)	X	X		SCC

*Note: * (i) = interview with official; (s) = published study; ** As a result of CTAA's request, officials in these states identified themselves to be contacted for an interview*

Interview guide

I developed an interview guide with a series of questions. (Guide is available upon request). Since each state was different, some questions in the Guide were not relevant and others -not in the Guide – were added later. The following summary contains information in 5 major categories: 1) Statutory mandate; 2) How the statewide and regional coordination system works

through the eyes of officials 3) Role of mobility managers, 4) Funding for the coordination system, and 5) Lessons learned.

Based on the sampling technique, interview instrument and the number of individuals interviewed in each state, findings from this research cannot be generalized to all states that have both statewide and coordinating councils. However, success factors for statewide and regional councils -listed in the Appendix- from a national study reviewing all states with at least one council at any level of government may provide broader applicability. Please see the Appendix for details.

General characteristics of state and regional councils from a national study²

- Coordinating councils can operate at all levels of government
- In most states coordination between local transportation providers and human service agencies has historic roots and predates the start of the federal coordination initiative (EO 13330 - CCAM and United We Ride) in 2003
- There can be voluntary agency collaboration that works well without formally established state coordinating councils
- Legal mandate –legislation or executive order– may not guarantee stakeholder collaboration
- State and regional councils involve different stakeholders and focus on tasks that best fit their individual roles
 - Core members of statewide coordinating councils (SCCs) are mostly state agencies. They address statewide policy
 - Regional coordinating councils (RCCs) have more diverse stakeholders and focus on local service needs
 - Each region is unique in its demographics, economy, geography, transportation resources and service needs, thus RCCs can vary widely in their mandate, complexity, coverage area, membership, and activities
 - RCCs in urban areas typically perform active planning and coordination across service providers
 - RCCs in rural areas tend to provide direct transportation services where no other options exist.

The next table is a summary of lessons learned in 5 information categories collected from published resources and interviews with officials in Alaska, Florida, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, New Hampshire, Texas, Washington, and Wisconsin. The Appendix provides detailed information about each state studied.

Lessons learned	What works?	What does not work?
<i>Statutory mandate</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislation that clearly defines roles and responsibilities for SCCs and/or RCCs can work in some states (NH, ID, FL, AK); • Legislation that mandates coordination but does not mandate the formation of SCC or RCCs may work as well (TX); • Legislation that leaves most autonomy for decision making in the regions is the most desirable construct for coordination; • In the absence of state leadership, coordination can rely on grass-roots efforts (WI); • Coordination to be sustainable needs a leader/champion at all levels. That role can be filled by DOT –TX, IO, ID, AK - independent organization –FL, ID, WI, IL or individuals such as RMMs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislation that is too prescriptive and constrains the autonomy of large stakeholders is counter-productive. (FL, IL); • Political pressure from the Governor to collaborate will not make stakeholders work together (IL); • Legislation that only focuses on statewide coordination but does not empower regions to participate makes coordination short lived (WA); • If DOT and HHS do not have a good working relationship, no legislative mandate can force them to cooperate (WI, IL, FL). HHS, the largest purchaser of human service transportation services, has to be part of the coordination construct.
<i>How does the system work?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No need to set up artificial boundaries for RCCs from the start. Grass-roots effort at the regional level will take care of coverage areas; • County boundaries could serve as RCC boundaries only in states where social services are delivered in a county system (FL, NH, WI, IL, IO); • Do not reinvent the wheel; use existing coordination systems –HSTP development process lead by planning organizations or DOT districts that have a history of working well together - as RCC boundaries (TX); • Provide consistent message (e.g. using the same messenger(s) about what 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forcing political boundaries on regional coordination, especially boundaries that reinforce rigidities (e.g. RTA regions) is counter-productive.

	statewide/regional coordination should look like throughout your state.	
<i>Role of mobility managers</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regional coordination can be facilitated by RMMs, lead agencies at the local level, or statewide organizations providing technical assistance to communities; • States lacking RMMs still can have effective coordination as long as other agencies fill that role. (NH, IL, WI); • RMMs who are “imbedded” in the communities can most effectively facilitate coordination (e.g. being members of local boards, committees, work groups – IO, WI); • Standard curriculum, periodic training and certification help states communicate the message of coordination more effectively (ID, WI, TX). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Type of employment contract for mobility managers and change in interpretation of how to spend federal or state grant dollars for transportation can jeopardize the MMs’ position, hence the future of regional coordination (IO).
<i>Funding</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is beneficial to have diverse sources of funding (federal, state, local) to support coordination projects and activities; • Have a designated funding source mostly from state or local revenues that can pay for feasibility studies or small-scale start-up projects to be piloted (FL, IO, TX); • Use a transparent review process for awarding coordination grants (IL, ID). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key stakeholder (e.g. Medicaid) using it power to threaten to withhold funding from transit providers if coordination does not happen is a sure way of creating enemies of collaboration (NH)

Suggestions for SCCCT/Regional Coordinating Council Work Group for Discussion

Autonomy to rest within regions

- When setting up the rules for a region's governance structure, autonomy for decision making –council membership, formal operational structure, work priorities, meeting frequency and anything related to a particular regional coordinating council- should be given to the organizations and communities that make up the RCC

Champions are imperative to guide the work of collaboration regionally

- RCC's work to be guided by vision, mission, objectives, priorities and expected outcomes. People will step forward to lead if they know what the task ahead is.
- Recognize and rely on current champions and develop new ones.

Do not reinvent the wheel! Rely on boundaries of existing collaborative efforts when establishing regional collaboration at the beginning. Setting boundaries for RCCs could be approached as follows:

- No need to set artificial geographic boundaries for RCCs in the onset but
 - Rely on organizations and their coverage areas that comprise the currently existing 7 coordination teams and expand teams with new stakeholders going forward
- If the RCC work group decides to set boundaries, an analysis of the overlapping coverage areas of major human services, veterans, workforce development, planning, elders service, HST, RTA systems should be performed before a decision is made
 - The governance structure across regions can be very different. There is no “one size fits all” model
 - Think about RCCs as facilitators of connection between major labor market areas. What bounds us all together in mobility is employment, so think about labor market area as a starting point for a collaborative RCC structure
 - Use the boundaries of planning organizations that are responsible for drawing up the coordinated human service transportation plans as a starting point for a collaborative RCC structure
 - Use a combination of boundaries outlined above.

In areas where collaboration is not common, use regional meetings as a means to bring stakeholders together to discuss the collaborative construct

- Rely on SCCCT members to suggest organizations that have a deep-rooted community presence and communication paths that could initiate the first coordination meetings per region

- MassDOT – HST to organize these regional meetings and not to piggyback on community meetings

Lead with good examples. Establishing RCCs can be a staggered process, using lessons learned in one region before work in another regions begins can be advantageous

Communication and information exchange between SCCCT and RCCs is imperative and has to be effective

- The message of collaboration should be communicated the same way in every region (e.g. SMM and HST staff to be the messengers)
- Foster a mobility management network and information sharing among mobility managers (e.g. identify MMs first and establish online network for them to start communicating)
- Continuous community outreach and strategic information dissemination is key to educate the public about statewide and regional coordination and success stories.

A handbook on how to create local/regional transportation coordinating councils was published by the Colorado Interagency Coordinating Council for Transportation Access and Mobility in 2008 and is available as a step-by-step guide for RCC Work Group members to use.³

http://web1.ctaa.org/webmodules/webarticles/articlefiles/UnitedWeRideRegion8Handbook_20090217.pdf

Appendix

Florida⁴

Used to be “best practice” state; has won national awards from the FTA and CTAA; the system has fallen apart in recent years

Statutory mandate	<p>FL has the most comprehensive and specific coordination legislation with clearly defined roles and responsibilities at every level and dedicated funding source to provide services</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1989 FL law created the Commission for the Trp Disadvantaged (CTD) an independent state agency that serves as the policy development and implementation body for all transportation disadvantaged programs. I • CTD administers the Transportation Disadvantaged Trust Fund, a dedicated source of funding everything coordination in the state
How does the system work?	<p>CTD designates an MPO or local entity to be the official planning agency for a region (<i>power is delegated to regions and localities A.L</i>)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designated Official Planning Agency (DOPA) appoints a Local Coordinating Board (LCB) which serves as an de facto RCC in its service area • DOPA recommends the LCB to hire a Community Transportation Coordinator (CTC) • LCBs oversee the CTCs • CTCs are responsible for all coordination work in a region • CTCs contract with local operators for coordinated services • State agencies that fund transportation services have to buy trips directly from the CTC or are billed directly by service operators (<i>CTCs act as regional brokers, just like the HST Office in MA. This may have been the point of power struggle for Medicaid</i>) A.L
Role of mobility managers	Yes, 51 CTCs work in 67 counties. Most of them cover one county
Funding	FL has a dedicated funding source, the Transportation Disadvantaged Trust Fund to fund all coordination activities for the transportation disadvantaged

Achilles heel: The Medicaid agency pulled out of coordination 2-3 years ago. In Florida, social services are delivered on a county basis giving local Medicaid agencies a lot of bargaining power. Medicaid decided to pursue its own coordination and not be bound to CTCs when it came to purchasing transportation services, thus pulled out of the statewide construct.

Lessons learned

- The largest consumer of human service transportation (Medicaid) has to be part of the statewide coordination construct with continuous interest to participate
- Power sharing in the governance structure for coordination should not alienate key stakeholders.

Texas⁵

Another “best practice state” winning national awards from CTAA and UWR; still considered best practice state

Statutory mandate	State mandate to coordinate (2003) but <u>no mandate</u> to set up SCCs or RCCs TX DOT is in charge of coordination work across TX by state mandate
How does the system work?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5-meber governing body of TX-DOT established a Study Group which is the de facto SCC • 24 planning regions were named in line with the boundaries of councils of government as boundaries for regional coordination • Each planning region has a lead agency that directs the planning effort and all decisions happen locally/regionally • The 24 RCCs <u>utilize the human service transportation plan development process for coordination</u> in terms of stakeholder engagement, resource inventory creation, needs assessment, gap analysis, prioritization and project development. Those members participating in the HST plan development are the RCC • Each of the 24 regions has a steering committee and a PTC. Lead agency assigns role to each steering committee member
Role of mobility managers	Yes. Each DOT district has one Public Transportation Coordinator, a.k.a. RMM; they are employees of the DOT and went through TSC training in 2010
Funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tx-DOT funds the SCC (Study group) and the delivery of its primary objectives (e.g. website and information clearinghouse, TA via Texas A&M, public meetings -24 in 2 years-, presentations, information dissemination). • Tx DOT also funds local feasibility studies and training on coordination issues as needed –TSC training in 2010 • Tx-DOT provides staff time to support coordination planning in the 24 planning regions

Lessons learned

- Coordination can work well without legal mandate for SCCs and RCCs
- **Authority and decision making lies within each region.** Each planning agency and members of the regions knows best what coordination is needed for the people living in the communities
- **Do not reinvent artificial boundaries for the RCC’s governance! If the human service transportation planning process works well, the RCC can use the boundaries of the planning agencies –councils of government- and the planning process for its work in coordination**
- Tx-DOT provides funding for all coordination activities at the state and regional levels

Wisconsin⁶

Defunct SCC but grass roots efforts sustain coordination

Statutory mandate	2005 EO created an Interagency Council on Transportation Coordination . Required members were HHS, DOT, VA, Workforce Development and Office of Insurance. De facto SCC but it never really worked due to the fact that the relationship between HHS and DOT had always been very tenuous.
How does the system work?	<p><u>First wave</u>: Coordination at the state level started by building a system of mobility managers in 2007. WI-DOT has lead the charge:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordination grew out of a DOT supported and New Freedom grant funded mobility management workshop in 2008 • 48 mobility managers were trained in 3 days • Mobility management curriculum and core competencies were developed with by WI-DOT • After NF funds dried up, the core group of mobility managers formed the Wisconsin Association of Mobility Managers in 2010 (WAMM) • WAMM has 63 mobility managers, 21 of them are certified <p><u>Second wave</u>: In 2008, the state had a second round coordination planning initiative and developed 4 regional teams assisted by regional planning commissions. As a result, many counties updated their coordination plans but nothing much happened since</p>
Role of mobility managers	<p>Yes. The entire coordination system rests in the communities that have a board/work group/commission dealing with transportation issues. MMs are members of these groups and take guidance of these boards/groups/commissions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MMs are employed by a variety of organizations • Almost each county has a mobility manager that provide TA in coordination
Funding	<p>State requires coordination for funding to be awarded: 1) Specialized Trp Assistance Program for Counties since 1977; 2) Employment trp assistance program since 1981; 3) Tribal Elder trp program, 4) Intercity bus assistance program. All of these funds require a demonstration of local coordination to be eligible for funding.</p> <p>Federal: Sec 5310</p>

Achilles heel: Tenuous relationship between DOT and HHS prevents stakeholders to coordinate at the state level. The statewide council is defunct.

Lesson learned

- WI has a county-based social services system and a natural home for transportation coordination is at the county level.
- Most every county has a committee/board/task force/subcommittee that focuses on transportation access issues and mobility managers attend those local meeting to learn about unmet needs. These local committees provide guidance and framework for mobility management activities.
- Communities know what is best for them. Grass-roots effort can sustain collaboration.

Illinois⁷

Defunct SCC but non-profit entity keeps coordination alive

Statutory mandate	Coordination started with the “Transition from Welfare to Work” federal initiative in 2003. Public act created the Interagency Coordination Committee on Transportation (ICCT), co-chaired by the Department of Welfare & Families and DOT
How does the system work?	<p>The statewide council (ICCT) is defunct. Gov. Blagojevic’s office forced the two agencies to stay at the negotiating table and ruled with an “iron fist.” DOT did not like it, so when Blagojevic was convicted, DOT left the negotiating table.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rural Transit Assistance Center at Western Illinois University (RTAC) –the organization administering RTAP- was chosen to be an information clearinghouse and carry out the work of the ICCT in 2005 • RTAC provides technical assistance to communities via the Transportation Coordination Primer Process. • Process focuses on and teaching communities how to engage stakeholders, complete broad-based needs and resource assessment, develop an action plan and apply for funding. • Teaching process takes 2 years but by the end of the 2 years communities understand elements of coordination and the grant application process
Role of mobility managers	No MMs but staff at RTAC provide technical assistance to communities that need it
Funding	Federal – Prior to 2005, DOT discouraged application for JARC and NF funding because grants administration was considered cumbersome. Since TA has been provided by RTAC, most counties have some form of grant from FTA.

Lessons learned

- Communities do best if their autonomy is left intact in terms of figuring out the appropriate model of coordination for their own region
- Structured technical assistance process teaching communities keeps the coordination momentum alive
- Rural Mobility Index developed by RTAC is a transparent tool to determine where coordination funding should go.

Idaho⁸

State and regional construct works; 6 SCC members provide a link to regional coordination

Statutory mandate	Idaho has both a statewide and regional councils by statute (1992); Public Transportation Advisory Council and Interagency Working Group = statewide coordinating council; 6 regional advisory committees; follow I-DOT transit district boundaries: called District Coordinating Councils (DCC) – DCC - added to the legislation in 2009/2010 Coordination is lead by CTAI on behalf of I-DOT
How does the system work?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SCC operates by a charter and organizational guidelines • Holds quarterly meetings -4 hours long each- and forms ad-hoc work groups as needed. • SCC has a chair person who is elected by participating council members for 3 years; the Vice Chair is the administrator of public funding at I-DOT • The SCC pays a professional facilitator to lead the meetings • There are 6 advisory council representatives appointed by the I-DOT Board who are part of the SCC and sit on working groups. These people are also chairs of the District Coordinating Councils. • DCCs operate by a charter and operational guidelines • DCCs can have a maximum of 20 people • DCCs also evaluate and recommend projects for funding by I-DOT. Once recommendations are made, the recommendations go back to the 6 district chair persons for a final review before submitted to the I-DOT Board for a final funding decision.
Role of mobility managers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Idaho has 22 RMM networks – 17 rural + 5 MPO territories (small urban) but only 6 mobility managers. • The 6 full-time mobility managers are employees of CTAI, sit in the 6 districts and provide TA. Transit agencies do not have mobility managers. • Historically the 5 MPOs have done their own coordination and did not collaborate with the rural areas. This is changing now
Funding	Effective review process for funding coordination projects

Lessons learned

- District Coordinating Councils have an ability to oversee and coordinate projects for funding
- Each of the 6 DCCs integrates the local mobility plans into a statewide coordinated plan required for funding by FTA-sponsored human service transportation programs, thus the district councils coordinate with the statewide council to inform the statewide mobility plan
- Coordination starts at the local level and is led by local effort

Iowa⁹

State and regional system works; regional construct relies on RMMs

Statutory mandate	Interagency collaboration goes back to 1976 but ITCC (statewide council) was established by statute in 1992. ITCC has diverse stakeholders and staffed by Iowa DOT that leads the coordination charge in the state.
How does the system work?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I-DOT sponsored 15 mobility action planning work groups to draw up regional coordination plans in 2006; • Engaged CTAA to hold a statewide coordination institute in 2011 • ITCC holds bi-monthly meetings and staff is provided by I-DOT • SMM is the conduit of information between the ITCC and regional MMs • Statewide MM is <u>not</u> a DOT employee but a contractor. She does not have any influence on policy and her position is vulnerable to continuity of federal funding • SMM initiated the hiring of RMMs across the state
Role of mobility managers	<p>9 RMMs in Iowa; working for AAAs or transit companies. Their position is vulnerable to changes in funding and interpretation of federal directives by I-DOT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No uniform set of qualifications required for RMMs • 9+1 MMs formed a statewide network and get together monthly • MMs work with the communities by being members of various local/regional boards and work groups
Funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most funding for coordination is provided by I-DOT's state transit assistance program – goes to 35 public transit systems • \$300,000 set aside every year for special coordination projects (e.g. fund start-ups projects and pilots) • JARC, NF and other federal sources

Lessons learned

- Employment and funding structure for SMM and RMM positions make the future of coordination uncertain
- Public education and information dissemination are key to success. Set up dissemination plan from the beginning. The best way to attracting new stakeholders is by leading with success stories
- Performance has to be measured. What is measured gets done and funded.
- Political boundaries do not make sense for regional coordination. Do not set regional boundaries by RTA region. That would reinforce turf war.

New Hampshire¹⁰

State and regional construct works; regional collaboration relies on lead agencies, not RMMs

Statutory mandate	Regional coordination predates state statute of 2007, amended in 2010. Law clearly assigns roles and responsibilities to the SCCCT
How does the system work?	<p>Statewide council (SCCCT) has 15 members from diverse agencies (5 statutory, others appointed by Governor or Commissioners)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meet 1X month in Concord, NH • RCC members are encouraged to attend SCCCT meetings • Statewide meetings/conferences/workshops are organized periodically in various topics of interest for wider information exchange among stakeholders • SCCCT members work in work groups – state data project, volunteer driver system, managed care, communication and outreach • SCCCT approves regional councils (9) – boundaries overlap with the boundaries of the 9 statewide human service coordination plans • RCCs have much autonomy in how they work together, who their members are and what projects they work on • Each RCC has a lead agency
Role of mobility managers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RMMs have not been identified but the SCCCT wants the regions to hire regional transportation coordinators • While there is collaboration within each region, there is not much connection across regions
Funding	<p>NH does not have state money to appropriate for coordination purposes. The source of funds is federal or local.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggestion from SCCCT to state legislature: to designate a funding source for community transportation that would pay the match (20%-50%) so that applicants can receive federal funding without much financial hardship.

Lessons learned

- In the early stages of organizing RCCs, the same 2 members of the SCCCT visited the 9 regions bringing the same message of coordination to all. One of the members represented DOT, the other HHS
- Build on small successes; start with a small pilot then scale it up, if successful
- Relationship and trust building takes time but it is worth it
- HHS/Medicaid used its heavy hand in the early stages of the process and said that if transportation providers did not coordinate, their funding would not be secured for successive years. This was a sure way of creating enemies.

Washington¹¹

Statewide coordination did not create enough momentum on the ground for regions to coordinate

Statutory mandate	<p>Agency Council on Coordinated Transportation (ACCT) was created in 1998. Serves as a statewide coordinating body to provide oversight and direction into the state’s coordination agenda</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ACCT convenes work groups at the state, regional or local level to develop and implement coordination approaches • 14 members are from a variety of organizations including the Governor’s office • ACCT has a staff and budget to fund all coordination projects in Washington State <p>ACCT legislation sunset in 2011</p>
How does the system work?	<p>ACCT supports, develops and directs all coordination projects in the state; there is no regional coordination structure</p> <p>ACCT also has to create a bi-annual results focused work plan, so measuring performance is in the focus of ACCT’s work. Because ACCT was charged to do all coordination work in the communities by itself, it was not very effective, understaffed and underfunded. In 2007 an amendment was passed to create</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local coordinating coalitions to which regional transportation planning organizations are to provide staff support • Statewide work group to address federal barriers. The work group invites representatives of federal agencies to collaboratively develop consistent transportation definitions and terminology, identify barriers to collaboration and select pilot projects to test several elements of coordinated transportation
Role of mobility managers	No mobility managers in the state
Funding	ACCT had a budget to fund all coordination projects from various sources: state appropriations, FTA, CTTA TA grant, state rural mobility grant.

Lessons learned

- Statewide coordinating commission cannot foster sustainability if regions/localities are not in the center of coordination in their own neck of the woods
- According to ACCT’s website, there was not much movement since the ACCT legislation was sunset in 2011. That is, over the years, there was no seed planted by the ACCT in the communities, thus no organization left to carry the torch for coordination.

Alaska¹²

Latest effort in coordinated transportation – no tangible results yet

Statutory mandate	State law established the Alaska Community and Public Transportation Advisory Board (C-PTAB) within the AK DOT in 2012; Legislation allows for regional and local advisory committees to form but there is no regional structure
How does the system work?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First meeting of the C-PTAB was in October 2012 in conjunction with the AK Community Transit Conference • At the meeting, established Operational Guidelines (by-laws) and Work Plan • Elected a chair and vice chair • Described its purpose and function to conference participants and got feedback to the mission, vision, work plan and established priorities based on feedback from conference participants • Members work via sub-committees, teleconferences and other electronic media due to distance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Members will meet 3 times in 2013 and have 8 conference calls • All meetings are open to the public and actually will become public stakeholder forums to share information.
Role of mobility managers	No mobility managers in the state
Funding	Federal

Lessons learned

- This construct will work if each member can identify a tangible interest for his/her organization and constituency. That is, give organizations concrete incentives to work together (e.g. fuel purchase in bulk, group insurance)
- One needs clearly defined roles for the board
- C&PTAB provides long-term vision, which helps frame priorities
- Educating the public about coordination work is important.

Synthesis from a National Study¹³

Success factors for state and regional councils

State councils

- Have leaders at all levels of government who embrace coordinated transportation and are willing motivate others to take action
- Build awareness about the benefits of coordinated transportation via constant communication and information dissemination

Regional councils:

- Build broad-based community support by the reputation of effective and efficient services
- Clearly define goals and objectives, action plans, and timelines for your work
- Carefully select coordination partners and have the right decision makers at the table
- Be flexible and open to new members and changing services; react to a loss of funding by shifting focus
- Create formal governance structure for operation
- Have strong leadership
- Build institutional commitment to coordination and do not over-rely on one champion
- Have incentive grants to help start coordination activity
- Take time and effort to build trusting relationships, address concerns and engage in ongoing communication
- Hold council meetings regularly
- Have an incremental/phased approach to implementing coordination
- Create an inventory of resources, programs and services in the council's area
- Share resources to avoid duplication
- Focus on customers and make services as accessible and user-friendly as possible
- Building on and lead with early, small, and concrete successes

¹ "Best practice" is not used here in its scientific meaning; rather it refers to observations by national experts about whether a state/regional coordination system produces desired outcomes.

² National Conference of State Legislatures, *Regional Human Service Transportation Coordinating Councils: Synthesis, Case Studies and Directory*, January 2012. This study based its findings on all states that had at least one coordinating council at any level of government.

³ The Colorado Interagency Coordinating Council for Transportation Access and Mobility, *Handbook for Creating Local Transportation Coordinating Councils in Colorado*, December 2008 available at http://web1.ctaa.org/webmodules/webarticles/articlefiles/UnitedWeRideRegion8Handbook_20090217.pdf

⁴ Ibid. and interview with Rex Knowlton, former UWR Ambassador for the Mid-Atlantic region

⁵ National Conference of State Legislatures, *Regional Human Service Transportation Coordinating Councils: Texas*, March 2012; Texas Department of Transportation, *Review of Texas' Regionally Coordinated Transportation Plans*, July 2012; Interview with Meredith Highsmith, Transit Mobility Institute at Texas A&M University; material posted at www.regionalserviceplanning.org.

⁶ National Conference of State Legislatures, *Regional Human Service Transportation Coordinating Councils: Wisconsin*, November 2010; Interview with Carry Porter, Statewide Mobility Manager, Wisconsin Association of Mobility Managers; material posted at www.dot.wisconsin.gov.

⁷ Interview with Ed Heflin, Statewide Mobility Manager, Rural Assistance Center, Institute for Rural Affairs at Western Illinois University; information posted about the statewide and regional coordination system at www.iira.org.

⁸ Interview with Heather Wheeler, Executive Director of Community Transportation Association of Idaho; Local Mobility Management Network 3C Mobility Plan, September 2009; material posted at www.i-way.org

⁹ National Conference of State Legislatures, *Regional Human Service Transportation Coordinating Councils: Iowa*, October 2011; Interview with Angie O'Brian, Statewide Mobility Manager, contracts with Iowa DOT; material posted at <http://www.iowadot.gov/iowamobilitymanagement/coordinators.html>.

¹⁰ State Coordinating Council on Community Transportation, 5th Annual Report to the Governor and Legislature, November 2012; Interview with Barbara Brill, Executive Director of Community Alliance of Human Services, Newport, NH; lead of Region 4 RCC in Sullivan County, NH; Interview with Will Rodman, Principal at Nelson-Nygaard, Boston, MA

¹¹ National Conference of State Legislatures, *Regional Human Service Transportation Coordinating Councils: Washington*, August 2010; Interview with Rex Knowlton former UWR Ambassador for the Mid-Atlantic region

¹² Interview with David Levy, Executive Director, Alaska Mobility Coalition and material posted at <http://www.dot.state.ak.us/stwdplng/cptab/>, <http://www.legis.state.ak.us/PDF/27/Bills/HB0131Z.PDF>.

¹³ National Conference of State Legislatures, *Regional Human Service Transportation Coordinating Councils: Synthesis, Case Studies and Directory*, January 2012