Goals

1. Update data analysis
2. Incorporate new/old engagement into plan body
3. Revise strategies to reflect new goals
Project Timeline

- **Kickoff**: Oct 11
- **Findings Report**: Dec 13
- **MAC Approval**: Feb 14
- **RTCC / TTPC Approval**: March 14, 20
- **Call For Projects**: April 5
- **Pre-App Workshop**: April 18

- **Outreach / Engagement**
- **Data Analysis**
- **Feedback / Revision**
- **Plan Finalization**
- **Committee Approval**
Boiling it Down: What are Our Needs, and What Will We Do About Them?

Data Analysis

Best Practices & Innovations

Stories

Strategies / Priorities

5310 Program of Projects
Public Survey & Outreach Results

Fall 2017 – Spring 2018
Mid-America Regional Council
Engagement Process

- Online Public Survey
- Online Stakeholder Survey
- In-person engagement (4)
- Committee engagement
  - MAC (3 times)
  - RTCC (3 times)
  - TTPC (2 times)
Survey Results

- 274 Total Responses

**Are you ADA Eligible?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>I Don't Know</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 or older</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Do you have a Disability?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are you ADA Eligible?</th>
<th>I Don't Know</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Engagement Takeaways

User Characteristics
Older adults and individuals with disabilities disagreed with statements characterizing an ideal service network.

Older adult and disabled participants were less likely to own a smartphone or report using one for transportation.

Direction
Provide education and up-to-date information.
Facilitate better active transportation connections to transit and paratransit services.
Expand service, make infrastructure improvements, and allow for more diverse trip purposes.
Stakeholder Survey Results

• 17 Responses

• Primary Barriers:
  • Funding
  • Staffing
  • Rural area access

• Users want to get to:
  • Jobs
  • Non-medical trips
  • Opportunities to socialize with friends/family

• Providers think solutions include:
  • Expanding night/weekend service
  • Coordinating between partners (especially large/small ones)
  • More flexible, agile, creative service models
  • Truly regional service
Data Analysis Report

Fall 2017 – Spring 2018
Mid-America Regional Council
Demographics – Who/Where are they?

- Measuring quartiles for regional census tracts on demographic metrics
  - Older adults, Individuals with disabilities, Low-income populations, Veterans

![Map of Johnson County, Leavenworth County, Miami County, Platte County, Ray County, Regional Total, and other counties with demographic scores.]

![Bar chart showing the ratio of income to poverty level in the past 12 months for each county and the regional total.]

- Johnson County
- Leavenworth County
- Miami County
- Cass County
- Clay County
- Jackson County
- Platte County
- Ray County

- Total Score:
  - 5 - 7
  - 8 - 9
  - 10 - 11
  - 12 - 13
  - 14 - 15
  - 16 - 17
  - 18 - 20

- Ratio of Income to Poverty Level in the Past 12 Months:
  - Under .50
  - .50 to .99
  - 1.00 to 1.24
  - 1.25 to 1.49
  - 1.50 to 1.84
  - 1.85 to 1.99
  - 2.00 and over
Regional Mobility Services – How do they get where they want to go?

Total Rides (April 2017)

- KCATA: 25,657
- EITAS (OATS): 12,816
- OATS (Other): 12,816
- Independence (OATS): 6,629
- Liberty Access: 5,717
- Lee’s Summit (OATS): 4,128
- Blue Springs (OATS): 2,859
- Liberty Access: 1,758
- Clay Co Senior Services: 1,501
- Platte Co Senior Services: 1,424
- Pleasant Hill (OATS): 670
- JET Express: 486
- CATA: 471
- Cass Co: 219
- Johnson County: 135
- Platte County: 124
Trip Origins – Where are they coming from?
Destinations – Where do they want to go?

73% of colleges, 62% of senior centers, and 77% of hospitals and other healthcare facilities are accessible by transit.
Trip Destinations – Where did they go?
Time of Day – When did they go there?
Summary: What are the gaps?

- Wyandotte County has a high level of need
- There is duplication of services geographically in Johnson County
- There are not substantial geographic gaps in the urban core.
- Time of day, day of week, and eligibility gaps are significant in many areas
- Rural areas, especially in Kansas, see very little geographic coverage
- On-Demand trips are being used differently than traditional paratransit services
Peer Communities Report
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Mid-America Regional Council
Common Themes Across Observed Plans

- Develop and support partnerships
- Create a forum for stakeholders (i.e. MAC)
- Expand local funding sustainability
- Create and maintain One-call/One-click functionality
- Fund infrastructure supports for transit
- Provide technical/capital support for providers
  - Driver training, scheduling software, funding identification, partnership facilitation
Coordinated Plan
Strategy Discussion & Development

Fall 2017 – Spring 2018
Mid-America Regional Council
Strategy Significance

- “Federal transit law, as amended by MAP-21, requires that projects selected for funding under the Section 5310 program be ‘included in a locally developed, coordinated public transit-human services transportation plan’”

- “FTA maintains flexibility in how projects appear in the coordination plan. Projects may be identified as strategies, activities, and/or specific projects addressing an identified service gap or transportation coordination objective articulated and prioritized within the plan.”
2018 Coordinated Plan Goals (Prioritized)

1. Maintain Existing Service Levels
2. Expand service levels for mobility service users in the region
3. Improve the quality and accessibility of information available to the public
4. Bridge infrastructure gaps
Goal 1: Maintain existing service levels for mobility service users in the region

• Strategies
  • Ensure that existing service levels are maintained by:
    • Replacing vehicles past their useful life
    • Sustaining funding levels for subsidized fare programs
  • Secure sustainable funding partnerships
Goal 2: Expand service levels for mobility service users in the region

- Strategies
  - Expand...
    - Service hours into nights, early mornings, or increase service frequency and/or responsiveness
    - Days of service, including weekends
    - Level of service from curb-to-curb to door-to-door, door-through-door, or beyond
    - Types of trips that are eligible for service populations
    - Geographic coverage, particularly into environmental justice tracts or areas of need as identified in this plan
  - Leverage partnerships to reduce duplication
  - Improve cross-jurisdictional transportation through administrative efficiency
Goal 3: Improve the quality and accessibility of information to the public

• Strategies
  • Continue to improve the region’s One-Call/One-Click capabilities
  • Reduce the complexity of information being conveyed to the public
  • Publicize existing services, changes, and/or the introduction of new services
  • Engage transportation-disadvantaged populations directly
  • Utilize data to make informed decisions about enhanced mobility services
    • Establish regional service standards
    • Ensure that all service providers are equipped with data tracking capabilities
    • Ensure that service providers are coordinating with MARC staff to map, analyze, and publicize service areas, trends, and network gaps.
Goal 4: Bridge gaps in the built environment to improve network accessibility

- Strategies:
  - Construct ADA-accessible infrastructure around transit facilities
  - Integrate universal design principles into local development policies
  - Support the implementation of Smart Moves 3.0 recommendations, including mobility hubs and active transportation infrastructure
## Eligible Project Examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Eligible Project Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Maintain service levels</td>
<td>• Vehicle Replacement&lt;br&gt;• Subsidized program continuation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Expand service levels</td>
<td>• Expanding hours, days, or geography&lt;br&gt;• Improving regional travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Improve information</td>
<td>• Marketing materials&lt;br&gt;• Mobility Management&lt;br&gt;• One-Call/One-Click&lt;br&gt;• Data resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bridge infrastructure gaps</td>
<td>• ADA sidewalks, curb cuts, crosswalk signals, etc.&lt;br&gt;• Other built environment improvements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Process: How it will matter

• Each project applying for 5310 must cite a strategy which will achieve a goal, e.g…

“We are going to ensure that existing service levels are maintained by replacing vehicles past their useful life to maintain existing service levels for mobility service users in my service area.”

• Project applicants must also comply with all federal regulations as before (e.g. Environmental Justice, Title VI, Clean Air Act, etc.)

• Project applicants will also be asked to provide scalability information
Scoring Criteria

• All projects, regardless of goal/strategy, will be scored with the same scoring criteria on a high/medium/low scale:
  1. Uses data to demonstrate need
  2. Engages with service populations
  3. Demonstrates cost effectiveness
  4. Establishes partnerships
  5. Communicates services effectively
  6. Service is regional in nature

• Two ways to “Prioritize” projects according to Coordinated Plan goals
Prioritization Methods

Method 1: Quantitative (Staff-level)

- MARC Staff applies a weight to higher-priority projects’ scores
- Pros: Solid justification for funding program
- Cons: Inflexible, complex

Method 2: Qualitative (Committee-level)

- MAC programs 5310 projects, acknowledging the goals, and attempting to achieve them with available projects
- Pros: Flexible, more likely to encourage program diversity
- Cons: Ad-hoc
Feedback?

Any thoughts / questions, feel free to reach out to Drew Stiehl
dstiehl@marc.org
816-701-8247
Special MAC Meeting

- Coordinated Plan will be posted ASAP on the MAC website
  - MAC will be notified by email
- MAC will need to meet to provide feedback on the Coordinated Plan, and to vote on its approval
- March 6th, 9am, MARC Board Room