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Section I. Executive Summary

The planning process was led by a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) comprised of leadership from services for individuals with disabilities, older adults, persons with limited incomes, and transportation in the area. Public input was solicited from a questionnaire, workshops, and a public meeting. The Planning Unit in Mn/DOT District 6 provided technical assistance and developed the draft sections, with input from the TAC and survey, to compile the plan. The Office of Transit provided technical assistance, project oversight and funding.

The southeastern section of Minnesota is served by the planning unit of Mn/DOT District 6 for its regional development needs. The counties within this jurisdiction are Dodge, Fillmore, Freeborn, Goodhue, Houston, Mower, Olmsted, Rice, Steele, Wabasha, and Winona. The Rochester and La Crosse/La Crescent metropolitan area is included within this planning area.

A wide variety of transportation options are available to persons in District 6, which include agency, for-hire transportation providers, shuttle services, specialized transportation services, taxi service, public transit, para-transit services and volunteer based services. However, there are still considerable unmet needs, with a willingness of these agencies to achieve better coordination to improve or increase transportation services.

According to the 2000 Census, the southeastern portion of Minnesota has seen a population increase of 9.52% since 1990, with an additional 9.5% population growth from 2000 to 2005. The racial composition of the district is 94.33% white. The female population of 50.59%, is slightly higher than the male population. The counties of Dodge, Olmsted, and Rice had a faster migration rate than the state average from 1990 to 2000 and continue to show growth.

Transportation services in areas where poverty is higher should be considered when developing coordination among agencies. The overall southeastern region average per capita income is below that for the State of Minnesota. Fillmore and Winona counties have the lowest per capita income at $17,067 and $18,077; whereas, Olmsted and Goodhue counties have the higher per capita income of $24,939 and $21,934. Median household income ranges from $36,651 in Fillmore County to $51,316 in Olmsted County. The State average is $50,750.

Another factor to consider for targeting transportation services is the age distribution of the community. Over the last decade, the statewide and national median age of the population has been steadily increasing, the trend is similar in the southeastern region. The median age in Freeborn County is at 40.4, while the median age in Rice and Winona counties is at 32.9 and 32.8, respectively. In 2000, 22.8 percent of the total population, over five years old, in the southeastern area had a disability. The age group of 21 to 64 year olds had the largest number of persons with disabilities at 34,111, or
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8.1 percent of the population. In comparisons, Olmsted and Winona counties have the greatest number of persons with disabilities within their communities.

The Public Transit – Human Services Coordination Stakeholder Workshop brought together local stakeholders in transportation to access potential gaps in Human Services and Public Transit for the elderly, persons with limited incomes, and persons with disabilities; to look at the level of coordination between transportation programs; and to identify potential strategies to improve coordination. The workshop was not intended to improve the current public transit services, but to look at coordination possibilities. Twenty-nine people attended the workshop, representing twenty-two different organizations. Three strategies were identified by the group, they were:

1. Improve communication between users and providers by ongoing involvement, planning and coordination.

2. Establish a Public Transit – Human Services Consortium Group, representing transportation providers and consumers.

3. Coordinated dispatch and advancement in technology.

Overall, the workshop, along with the results of the questionnaire, provided opportunities for networking and transportation coordination to occur. Barriers need to be resolved to allow for increased transportation services between several different agencies.
Section II. Introduction

A. Plan Background

The Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), (Pub.L. No. 109-59, August 10, 2005 requires that projects selected for funding under the Elderly Individuals and Individuals with Disabilities, Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC), and New Freedom programs be “derived from a locally developed, coordinated public transit-human services transportation plan” and that the plan be “developed through a process that includes representatives of public, private, and nonprofit transportation and human services providers and participation by the public.”

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) provides $286.4 billion in funding for federal surface transportation programs over six years through FY2009, including $52.6 billion for federal transit programs. This funding is subject to an annual appropriation by Congress. Several new programs have been created to facilitate enhanced coordination in Minnesota and one existing discretionary program has been restructured as a formula program. Each program is briefly summarized below.

Section 5316: Job Access and Reverse Commute Formula Program (JARC)
The purpose of JARC is to provide funding for local programs that offer job access and reverse commute services to provide transportation for low income individuals who may live in the city core and work in suburban locations.

The JARC program has been converted from a discretionary, competitive program to a formula program. The program, in existence for many years, has been instrumental in developing transit services to support the welfare-to-work initiatives. The main focus of the program is to allow for new or innovative services that provide work employment matching the locations of low-income workers with location of new job creation. Formula allocations are based on the number of low-income persons.

- 60% of funds go to designated recipients in areas with populations over 200,000
- 20% of funds go to States for areas under 200,000
- 20% of funds go to States for non-urbanized areas

Funds may be used for capital expenses with Federal funds provided for up to 80% of the cost of the project, or operating expenses with Federal funds provided for up to 50% of the net operating cost of the project. Appropriations for 2006 and 2007 will be combined and granted during the CY2007 application process. JARC appropriations for Minnesota for 2007 are $1.3 million, of which $425,000 will be directed to urban grants and $863,000 towards rural grants.

Section 5317: New Freedom Program
The purpose of the New Freedom Program is to encourage services and facility improvements to address the transportation needs of persons with disabilities that go
beyond those required by the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA). The program will provide additional tools to overcome barriers facing Americans with disabilities who want to participate fully in society. Provides a new formula grant program for associated capital and operating costs. Funds are allocated through a formula based upon population or persons with disabilities.

♣ 60% of funds go to designated recipients in areas with populations over 200,000
♣ 20% of funds go to States for areas under 200,000
♣ 20% of funds go to States for non-urbanized areas

While designed to be awarded to existing public transit agencies, the administrative requirements of Section 5310 apply to this program. Funds may be used for capital expenses with Federal funds provided for up to 80% of the cost of the project, or operating expenses with Federal funds provided for up to 50% of the net operating cost of the project. Appropriations for 2006 and 2007 will be combined and granted during the CY2007 application process. New Freedom appropriations for Minnesota for 2007 are $820,000, of which $245,000 will be directed to urban grants and $576,000 towards rural grants.

**Section 5310 Demonstration Program**
A limited demonstration program is authorized for seven states, in which Minnesota is one, that will permit Section 5310 funds, in Minnesota, typically limited to capital rolling stock, to be used for operating costs for public transportation projects planned, designed, and carried out to meet the special needs of elderly individuals and individuals with disabilities.

Under the provisions, Minnesota will be able to use up to 33% of the state's Section 5310 financial assistance for operating costs. Since no additional funding is expected, the cost of the demonstration will be at the expense of funds used for capital replacement.

**Section 5310 Elderly Individuals and Individuals with Disabilities** is designed to provide annual funding for states to appropriate for the purchase of vehicles and equipment to be used by nonprofit organizations or government agencies to provide transportation for elderly and disabled persons. The funds can be used for such items as; buses, radios and communication equipment, vehicle shelters, wheelchair lifts and restraints, and extended warranties. Mn/DOT has opted to use the funds primarily for the purchase of lift-equipped buses. Recipients received up to 80% federal funding, with a 20% local match and technical assistance from Mn/DOT for vehicle procurement with an approved listing of vendors to select from.
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B. Plan Purpose and Goals

Statewide
SAFETEA-LU requires that formula programs for the Elderly Individuals and Individuals with Disabilities, Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC), and New Freedom, be derived from a coordinated plan. FTA suggests that a coordinated plan should maximize the programs’ collective coverage by minimizing duplication of services. Further, a coordinated plan should be developed through a process that includes representatives of public, private and nonprofit transportation and human services providers, and participation by the public. In addition, FTA proposes that a coordinated plan should incorporate activities offered under other programs sponsored by Federal, State, and local agencies to greatly strengthen its impact.

FTA proposes that the key elements of a coordinated plan include the following:
♣ An assessment of transportation needs for individuals with disabilities, older adults, and persons with limited incomes;
♣ An inventory of available services that identifies areas of redundant service and gaps in service;
♣ Strategies to address the identified gaps in service;
♣ Identification of coordination actions to eliminate or reduce duplication in services and strategies for more efficient utilization of resources; and,
♣ Prioritization of implementation strategies.

FTA suggests that States and communities utilize the United We Ride Framework for Action when developing a coordinated plan. FTA proposes that choosing a lead agency is a local decision. FTA received comments from stakeholders that already have a local planning process in place for human services transportation coordination. FTA recognizes the importance of local flexibility in developing plans for human service transportation and strongly supports current planning processes in human service transportation conducted with stakeholders and partners. FTA notes, however, that all new Federal requirements must be met. Therefore, FTA proposes that communities modify their plans or processes as necessary to meet these requirements. FTA also encourages communities to consider inclusion of new partners, new outreach strategies, and new activities related to the targeted programs and populations.

Local
The Minnesota Department of Transportation (Mn/DOT) prepared and initiated planning guidance that meets the Federal requirements for consistent planning efforts led by Regional Development Commissions throughout the state. For those districts without commissions, namely District 3, 4, and 6, the District Transit Project Manager led the efforts.

The purpose of the plan is to assist state and community leaders and agencies involved in human service transportation and public transit services, which results in cooperation and coordination programs and action plans for putting coordinated services in place.
In communities where coordination is a priority, citizens will benefit from improved service, lower costs and easier access to transportation.

### C. Plan Work Program

The Technical Advisory Committee included public involvement throughout the process and followed the below reference work program to accomplish its goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A. Public Involvement | 1. Appoint Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)  
2. Planning Workshop  
3. Public Meeting | June, 2006  
August 21, 2006  
November 20, 2006 |
| B. Inventory Current Transportation Resources | 1. Stakeholder listing  
2. Transportation Stakeholder Questionnaire  
3. Compile Questionnaire Results | July, 2006  
August, 2006  
September, 2006 |
| C. Assessment of Current Conditions and Needs | 1. Transit Service Gap Analysis  
2. Framework For Action: Building the Fully Coordinated Transportation System | October, 2006  
August 21, 2006 |
| D. Strategies and Actions | 1. Identify and rank preferred alternatives to address the unmet needs.  
2. Identify solutions to meet the unmet needs or reduction in duplication of services. | August - October, 2006  
August – October, 2006 |
Section III. Demographic Trends

The Minnesota Department of Transportation (Mn/DOT) District 6 geographical area is comprised of the counties of Dodge, Fillmore, Freeborn, Goodhue, Houston, Mower, Olmsted, Rice, Steele, Wabasha, and Winona. Both the Rochester/Olmsted County (ROCOG) and the La Crosse/La Crescent (LAPC) Metropolitan areas are included within the planning area. Map 1 depicts the study area used for this project.

Map 1 Mn/DOT District 6 geographical area
According to the 2000 Census, the Region 10 – Southeast has a population of 460,102 an increase of 40,008 persons or 9.52% from 1990. The population has continued to see growth from 2000 Census in the region of 483,785 persons or 9.5% in 2005. The female population, of 50.59%, is slightly higher than the male population. The racial composition of the southeast is 94.33% White, 1.87% Asian, 1.21% Black or African American and 1.21% Other, .03% American Indian and Alaska Native, and the remaining at Native Hawaiian/other Pacific Islander or multi-races. Table 3.1 indicates the population trends for each county in the Southeast area.

Table 3.1: Population Trends by County in Southeast MN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dodge</td>
<td>19,596</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>17,731</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>15,731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fillmore</td>
<td>21,347</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>21,122</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>20,777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeborn</td>
<td>31,904</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
<td>32,584</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>33,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodhue</td>
<td>46,000</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>44,127</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>40,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>19,942</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>19,718</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>18,497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mower</td>
<td>38,965</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>38,603</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>37,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olmsted</td>
<td>136,526</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>124,277</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>106,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice</td>
<td>61,547</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>56,665</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>49,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steele</td>
<td>35,662</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>33,680</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>30,729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wabasha</td>
<td>22,366</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>21,610</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>19,744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winona</td>
<td>49,930</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>49,985</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>47,828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>483,785</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>460,102</td>
<td>9.52</td>
<td>420,094</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 1990 and 2000 information from the 2000 Census SF1 Profile
** 2005 information from the MN State Demographic Center, Metropolitan Council

Migration played an important role in Minnesota’s population growth between 1990 and 2000. The difference between Minnesota and its competitors is unlikely to continue at the same magnitude for the next 30 years. The counties of Dodge, Olmsted, and Rice grew at a faster rate than the state average from 1990 to 2000 and showed a pattern of moderately accelerating growth. In- and out-migration rates of these counties kept constant at 1995 to 2000 levels. The remaining counties saw a decrease of in-migration rates and an increase in out-migration rates. Table 3.2 shows the population projects for the next 30 years.
In determining transportation needs within a community it is important to analyze the land area to be served and where any concentrated population clusters may be. Table 3.3 compares each county.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.3: County Land Area and Population Density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fillmore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeborn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodhue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transportation services in areas where poverty is higher should be considered when developing coordination among agencies. Table 3.4 shows economic characteristics by county. The overall Southeastern region average per capita income is below that for the State of Minnesota. Fillmore and Winona Counties have the lowest per capita income at $17,067 and $18,077 whereas Olmsted and Goodhue Counties have the higher per capita income of $24,939 and $21,934. Median household income ranges from $36,651 in Fillmore County to $51,316 in Olmsted County. The State average is $50,750.

Table 3.4: Economic Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Median Household Income</th>
<th>Per Capita Income</th>
<th>% of Population Below Poverty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dodge</td>
<td>$47,437</td>
<td>$19,259</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fillmore</td>
<td>$36,651</td>
<td>$17,067</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeborn</td>
<td>$36,964</td>
<td>$18,325</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodhue</td>
<td>$46,972</td>
<td>$21,934</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>$40,680</td>
<td>$18,826</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mower</td>
<td>$36,654</td>
<td>$19,795</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olmsted</td>
<td>$51,316</td>
<td>$24,939</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice</td>
<td>$48,651</td>
<td>$19,695</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steele</td>
<td>$46,106</td>
<td>$20,328</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wabasha</td>
<td>$42,117</td>
<td>$19,664</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winona</td>
<td>$38,700</td>
<td>$18,077</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>$53,973</td>
<td>$19,810</td>
<td>7.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>$50,750</td>
<td>$23,198</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*2000 Census Information*
Another factor to consider is the age distribution of the community. This assists agencies in targeting services for specific age groups, such as, youth, adults, and elderly. Table 3.5 shows the breakdown of age population by county. Statewide and national median age of population has been steadily increasing, over the last decade. Overall, in the Southeastern Region the trend is similar.

### Table 3.5: 2000 Age of Population in Southeast Minnesota

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Total Population for Age Group</th>
<th>Median Age (years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Under 18 years</td>
<td>18 to 64 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodge</td>
<td>17,731</td>
<td>5,350</td>
<td>12,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fillmore</td>
<td>21,122</td>
<td>5,513</td>
<td>15,609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeborn</td>
<td>32,584</td>
<td>7,808</td>
<td>24,776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodhue</td>
<td>44,127</td>
<td>11,702</td>
<td>32,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>19,718</td>
<td>5,360</td>
<td>14,358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mower</td>
<td>38,603</td>
<td>9,690</td>
<td>28,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olmsted</td>
<td>124,277</td>
<td>33,533</td>
<td>90,744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice</td>
<td>56,665</td>
<td>14,313</td>
<td>42,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steele</td>
<td>33,680</td>
<td>9,404</td>
<td>24,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wabasha</td>
<td>21,610</td>
<td>5,854</td>
<td>15,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winona</td>
<td>49,985</td>
<td>11,393</td>
<td>38,592</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*2000 Census: County-At-Glance*
In 2000, 22.8 percent of the population over five years old in the Southeast area had a disability. The age group of 21 to 64 year olds had the largest number of persons with disabilities at 34,111 or 8.1 percent of the population. The counties with the largest number of persons with disabilities for 5 to 20 year olds were; Olmsted (2,156), Rice (1,100), and Winona (1,008). Those counties with the largest number of persons with disabilities for the 21 to 64 year olds were; Olmsted (9,079), Rice (4,167), and Winona (3,497). The age group of 65 years and above had the counties of Olmsted (4,404), Mower (2,612), and Winona (2,325) having the largest number of person with disabilities. In comparisons, Olmsted and Winona counties have the greatest number of persons with disabilities within their communities.

### Table 3.6: County Chart on Disability Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th># of 5 to 20 year olds w/ Disability</th>
<th># of 16 to 20 year olds w/disability Employed</th>
<th># of 21 to 64 year olds w/ Disability</th>
<th># of 21 to 64 year olds w/disability Employed</th>
<th># of 65 year or older w/ Disability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dodge</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1,103</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fillmore</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>1,623</td>
<td>1,357</td>
<td>1,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeborn</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>2,934</td>
<td>2,287</td>
<td>2,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodhue</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>3,335</td>
<td>2,911</td>
<td>2,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>1,441</td>
<td>1,129</td>
<td>1,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mower</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>3,008</td>
<td>2,210</td>
<td>2,612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olmsted</td>
<td>2,156</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>9,079</td>
<td>7,461</td>
<td>4,404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>4,167</td>
<td>3,772</td>
<td>2,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steele</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>2,333</td>
<td>2,003</td>
<td>1,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wabasha</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>1,591</td>
<td>1,331</td>
<td>965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winona</td>
<td>1,008</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>3,497</td>
<td>2,799</td>
<td>2,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Southeast</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,082</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,002</strong></td>
<td><strong>34,111</strong></td>
<td><strong>28,055</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,292</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 2000 Census: Employment Profiles: Sex by Age by Type of Disability for the Civilian Non-Institutionalized Population
Section IV. Public Involvement

Public involvement included three areas of concentration; formation of and working technical advisory committee, a planning workshop, and a public meeting.

A. Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)

A Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was established during the onset of the planning efforts to initiate the public involvement process and provide direction and resources for the plan. The TAC consists of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workforce Development, Inc.</td>
<td>Randy Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Agency on Aging – SEMAAA</td>
<td>Connie Bagley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olmsted County Human Services</td>
<td>Jim Behrends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability Building Center (ABC)</td>
<td>Steven Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Valley Services, Inc. (5311)</td>
<td>Garry Hart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three River Community Action (5311)</td>
<td>Amy Kuchera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPIC Enterprises, Inc. (5310)</td>
<td>Linda Hibbard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Rochester (5307)</td>
<td>Tony Knauer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Rochester (5307 Paratransit)</td>
<td>Scott Retzlaff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester-Olmsted Council Of Governments (ROCOG)</td>
<td>Dave Pesch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Crosse/La Crescent Area Planning Council (LAPC)</td>
<td>Tom Faella</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mn/DOT District 6</td>
<td>Jean Meyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mn/DOT District 6</td>
<td>Bob Hutton</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Planning Workshop

The Public Transit – Human Services Coordination Stakeholder Workshop was held on August 21, 2006 in Rochester, Minnesota. The purpose of the workshop was to bring together local stakeholders in transportation to assess any gaps in Human Services and public transit for the elderly, persons with limited incomes, and persons with disabilities; to look at the level of coordination between transportation programs; and to identify potential strategies to improve coordination. The workshop was not intended to improve the current public transit services, but to look at coordination possibilities.

A list of 175 transportation stakeholders in District 6 was developed and each received an invitation letter with an informational brochure (Exhibit 1: Letter/Brochure and Exhibit 4: Stakeholder Listing) to the workshop. Also included with the invitation to the workshop, was a Transportation Stakeholder Questionnaire (Exhibit 5: Questionnaire Summary) for each agency to complete and return. The questionnaire allowed the TAC to develop an inventory of services provided, a fleet inventory, and services needed.

The workshop was attended by 29 people representing 22 different organizations. At the beginning of the workshop, participants completed a Framework for Action: Building the Fully Coordinated Transportation System, A Self-Assessment Tool for Communities outline. A total of nine completed self assessments were returned from the participants (Exhibit 2: Framework for Action).

Once completed the participants were divided into three groups of 8-10 people to discuss what is being done well in transportation and what could be done better under the five sections of the Framework for Action. Group activity allowed participants the opportunity to brainstorm on the unmet needs and develop strategies for actions to meet the unmet needs. Key points addressed from each group on what is being done well and what could be done better is also indicated below.

Section 1: Making Things Happen by Working Together
The driving factor is that individuals and organizations are catalysts for envisioning, organizing, and sustaining a coordinated system that provides mobility and access to transportation, and for other purposes.
Respondents of the self assessment felt that this process ‘needs to begin’ to ‘needs action’. Comments suggested that the governing framework does not make coordination easy to accomplish and that each community is at a different level of coordination efforts.

Section 1: Work Group Summaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>What are we doing Well?</th>
<th>What can we do Better?</th>
<th>Prioritized Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Central Communication</td>
<td>1. Improve communication between users and providers by ongoing involvement, planning and coordination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Work group to begin focusing on this issue</td>
<td>2. Educate elected officials about transportation needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Information data base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Develop governing framework</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>ZIPS Consumer Group</td>
<td>Central information at Mn/DOT</td>
<td>1. Establish/Expand local and county consumer coordination committee (seniors, human services). Discuss consumer issues and outreach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rochester Shopper Bus</td>
<td>One-stop – particularly for regional service</td>
<td>2. For the Region – develop D6 as a clearinghouse for services within the 11 counties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>La Crosse/La Crescent can provide service in two different states</td>
<td>Mn/DOT – Public Transportation system difficult to transport across county lines or within county’s</td>
<td>1. Need a joint powers type arrangement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Some people can’t be served by public transportation because of their special needs and rules.</td>
<td>2. Having the Health System (Mayo Clinic) coordinate surrounding areas for transportation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public doesn’t understand purpose of public transportation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 2: Taking Stock of Community Needs and Moving Forward

The driving factor is a completed and regularly updated community transportation assessment process identifying assets, expenditures, services provided, duplication of services, specific mobility needs of the various target populations, and opportunities for improvement. It assesses the capacity of human service agencies to coordinate transportation services. The assessment is used for planning and action.

Respondents of the self assessment felt that this process ‘needs to begin’ to ‘needs action’. Many indicated that a comprehensive inventory would need to be developed, including agencies that are perceived to underutilize their vehicles. Improved technology would also enhance these efforts.

Section 2: Work Group Summaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>What are we doing Well?</th>
<th>What can we do Better?</th>
<th>Prioritized Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Transportation providers meet with users and provide good service to specific groups.</td>
<td>Data base pulling all others together</td>
<td>1. Improve technology to identify where needs are, so we can coordinate service on a regional level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>Each agency collects data, costs, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Mn/DOT – D6 needs to coordinate/collection information on costs/data for comparisons of service. 2. D6 develop a needs list (current planning process).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>Some transit providers give out referral information</td>
<td>People (elderly, some disabled) like to have a person to talk to – not a phone system</td>
<td>1. Clearinghouse for Information: Mn/DOT include in a directory: broader inventory of providers (human service, volunteer, taxi, etc) 2. Awareness and Marketing 3. Written plan for region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Volunteer driver service refers people and information</td>
<td>Poor communication in the broader community/region</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual communities have good communication</td>
<td>Some counties do not have county-wide transit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Public Transit – Human Services Coordination Plan**

**Section 3: Putting Customers First**
The driving factor is that customers, including people with disabilities, older adults, and low-income riders have a convenient and accessible means of accessing information about transportation services. They are regularly engaged in the evaluation of services and identification of needs.

Respondents of the self assessment felt service for persons with disabilities were great, but more outreach is needed for non-English speaking individuals and a more simplified system for fare payments.

**Section 3: Work Group Summaries**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>What are we doing Well?</th>
<th>What can we do Better?</th>
<th>Prioritized Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Transit</td>
<td>Public Transit providers regularly survey users.</td>
<td>Outreach to users – particularly to non-English speaking community</td>
<td>1. Develop technology to provide information about services that are available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Customer satisfaction is a high priority.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Increase marketing of services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>Bus passes</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. After hours, nights and weekends service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff outreach training</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Pursue one type of media fare system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Website</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>Some transit systems (DAR) very user friendly.</td>
<td>Payment systems are challenging for public transit (MA/BluePlus/UCare)</td>
<td>1. Coordinated effort to educate Legislators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Great service for people with cognitive disabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Marketing (locally and statewide efforts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Encourage DHS and Mn/DOT to loosen rules for better coordination possibilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Recording assets (inventory of what’s available).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 4: Adapting Funding for Greater Mobility
The driving factor is for innovative accounting procedures are often employed to support transportation services by combining various state, federal, and local funds. This strategy creates customer friendly payment systems while maintaining consistent reporting and accounting procedures across programs.

Respondents of the self assessment felt that this process is ‘done well’ to ‘needs significant action’. One respondent felt that reporting is too extensive and needs to be coordinated between state and federal agencies to reduce the amount submitted.

Section 4: Work Group Summaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are we doing Well?</th>
<th>What can we do Better?</th>
<th>Prioritized Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σ Within each agency – checks and balances are in place.</td>
<td>σ Mechanism to pull all information together from all the various agencies</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σ Lots of data collecting by state and federal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σ Payment for ZIPS and Regular Route passes</td>
<td>σ</td>
<td>1. Payment system enhancement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>σ</td>
<td>σ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 5: Moving People Efficiently
The driving factor is to have multimodal and multi-provider transportation networks created that are seamless for the customer but operationally and organizationally sound for the providers.

Respondents of the self assessment felt this process ‘needs to begin’ to ‘needs significant action’. Establishing a county-wide/regional dispatching system, to assist people in obtaining a seamless transportation service, was provided. An example of a system that works well was the Mayo Clinic Employee Bus Pass program.

Section 5: Work Group Summaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>What are we doing Well?</th>
<th>What can we do Better?</th>
<th>Prioritized Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>σ In Rochester, there are seamless options for users.</td>
<td>σ Outside of Rochester, there is not much coordination or flexibility for users to move between systems.</td>
<td>1. Develop centralized dispatching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>σ</td>
<td>σ</td>
<td>1. Evaluate value of a centralized dispatch system. 2. Coordinate maintenance among providers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>σ</td>
<td>σ</td>
<td>1. Centralized dispatching to work with multiple providers, on a local level.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group Process and Presentations
Presentations, by each work group, were conducted to provide an open forum for sharing of strategies identified. Colored dots were then given to each participant to rank their top three priorities among all presented. Dots were valued at; Blue = 3 points, Yellow = 2 points, and Green = 1 point. Exhibit 5 provides an evaluation of the workshop from participants.
The top three strategies with actions were identified and discussed. They were as follows;

**Strategy #1:**
*Improve communication between users and providers by ongoing involvement, planning, and coordination.*

**Actions**
1. Asset mapping to determine providers
2. Establish a working committee, including; consumers, funding providers, and elected officials (county and city)
3. Establish a website that serves as a clearinghouse of information and resources
   a. This process should be completed by Mn/DOT as a separate priority
4. Involvement of Legislators
   a. Advocacy and action

**Strategy #2:**
*Establish a Public Transit – Human Services Consortium Group, representing transportation providers and consumers.*

**Actions**
1. Provide for a structure/oversight to a regional group that best represents transportation issues.
   a. Provide technical assistance
   b. Establish a clearinghouse of information
   c. Initiate and provide coordination activities between government, Legislation, providers and consumers.

**Strategy #3:**
*Coordinated dispatch and advancement in technology.*

**Actions**
1. Coordinated dispatching between multi-providers
   a. Different agencies working together
2. Establish a GPS system for providers

* Strategy #1 needs to come together to establish Strategy #3.
C. Public Meeting

A Public Meeting was held on November 20, 2006 in Rochester to provide the public an opportunity to review the final draft of the Public Transit – Human Services Coordination Plan. The meeting was advertised throughout the eleven counties in every daily and weekly paper.

The public meeting forum was conducted so that the public was provided the opportunity to review the Plan document, ask questions of the TAC, and provide comments on the Plan. No formal presentation was made.

Attendees were TAC committee members and staff from two different agencies. Public comment regarding the plan was minimal, however, the following bullets were questions raised as a result of the plan.

Would all coordinating agencies have to become STS certified?

Could coordinating agencies divide fleet to have some of their vehicles used with coordinated activities and some not used in coordinated activities?

Private For-Hire:
  o Would these agencies be subsidized with funding to lower their costs for transportation services?
  o Would these agencies be able to receive Federal and/or State funding?
Section V. Inventory

A. Service Inventory: Public Transit

District 6 provides transit project management and technical assistance to 3 Section 5307 Large Urban Para-transit and Fixed Route Systems and 9 Section 5311 Small Urban, Rural County and/or Rural Multi-County Public Transit Systems. Within these systems, 7 systems contract with 7 third-party operators (contract for day-to-day services).

Providers offer transit services ranging from fixed route, route deviation, subscription services, and curb-to-curb dial-a-ride. Table 5.1 below shows the seven service categories offered in Minnesota. Rural areas in Minnesota have been classified into three different system types; those operating in a non-urban area, those operating within a county and those operating within multi-counties.

Table 5.1: Performance Guideline Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Type</th>
<th>Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADA Demand Response</td>
<td>Urban Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Route</td>
<td>Urban Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Demand Response</td>
<td>Non-Urban Community, Countywide and Multi-County Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Route Deviation</td>
<td>Non-Urban Community, Countywide and Multi-County Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Urban Demand Response</td>
<td>Small Urban and Small Urban within County and Multi-County Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Urban Route Deviation</td>
<td>Small Urban and Small Urban within County and Multi-County Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transit Volunteer</td>
<td>Non-Urban Community, Countywide and Multi-County Systems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*2001 Greater MN Public Transportation Plan – Performance Guidelines

Productivity is measured in terms of how many passengers a transit system carries for each unit of service. The most common measure is passengers per hour. A productivity guideline has been set for each service type based on the number of passengers per hour as seen on Table 5.2:
Table 5.2: Passenger Productivity Guideline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Type</th>
<th>Passengers/Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADA Demand Response</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Route</td>
<td>15 to 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Demand Response</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Route Deviation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Urban Demand Response</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Urban Route Deviation</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transit Volunteer</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Public transportation programs in Minnesota are funded through a federal-state-local partnership. All public transit systems in Greater Minnesota receive state funding assistance through a fixed-share funding formula established in Minnesota Statutes. The formula sets a maximum funding share of the total Mn/DOT approved operating costs (Table 5.3). The local share of operating costs consists of a combination of revenue sources; including fare box receipts, auxiliary revenues, and local tax levies. The remainder of the operating cost is paid from state and federal sources.

Table 5.3: Mn/DOT Participation for Public Transit Operating Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System Type</th>
<th>Service Description</th>
<th>Funding Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>A geographic area with a population of less than 2,500 (Hiawathaland, AMCAT, Steele, and Semcac)</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Urban</td>
<td>A geographic area with a central city that has a population of between 2,500 and 50,000 (Albert Lea, Faribault, Northfield, Stewartville, and Winona)</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanized</td>
<td>Formula grant program provides capital, planning, and operating assistance for public transportation in urban areas within a geographic area with a central city that has a population of over 50,000 (La Crescent and Rochester)</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly and Disabled</td>
<td>Transportation service that provides curb-to-curb service for medically certified individuals in cities over 50,000 and who medically certified individuals in cities over 50,000 and who cannot use regular route public transportation (La Crescent and Rochester)</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
District 6 Transit System Providers are described as follows:

**Urban Systems**

- **City of La Crescent – Apple Express** provides fixed route, with ADA demand response deviations, for transit services in the City of La Crescent. Service to La Crosse is provided via the downtown HUB, with transfers within the La Crosse MTU system. Connections to the Onalaska, Holmen, and West Salem public transit systems are also available. The system utilizes one 22 passenger, with 2 wheelchair positions, transit bus. A bike rack is equipped on this vehicle. Service is provided Monday through Friday, 6:00 am to 10:40 am and 1:10 pm to 6:10 pm. Bus fare is $1 and .50 for elderly and disabled. One transfer is available at no charge, per trip. Riders can board or alight at any of the designated stops or call in advance to deviate from the route for pick up or drop-off. Bus shelters are available at a few of the stops. www.cityoflacrosse.org/Departments/MTU/LaCrescentAppleExpress

- **City of Rochester (ZIPS)** operates a Dial-a-Ride (ADA Demand Response) service within the City of Rochester and the Townships of Cascade, Haverhill, Rochester, and Marion. The system utilizes 5 Orion II 20 passenger buses, which provide 4 to 6 wheelchair positions each. The system also supplements with taxi and wheelchair van service. Service is provided Monday through Friday, 5:30 am to 10:00 pm and Saturday 8:00 am to 7:00 pm. The fare is $2.50. Agency fare rates are offered as well. Rides are arranged by calling ahead for any pick up or drop off within the service area. www.rochestermn.gov/publicworks/Transportation/zips

- **City of Rochester Regular Route** operates a Fixed Route system within the City of Rochester. Special fares are provided to students, Employee Programs (10% of employees in an agency), commuters, Shop and Ride, and Park and Ride consumers. The system utilizes 40 Gillig Low Floor bus models that are able to accommodate between 32 and 40 seated passengers, each. Buses are 100% accessible with 2 wheelchair positions. Service is provided Monday through Friday 5:30 am to 10:00 pm and Saturday from 8:15 am to 6:40 pm. The single base fare is $1.50 during peak hours, with reduced rates for youth and seniors at $0.75. Reduced fares ($0.75) are available on weekday bus routes between 8:15 am and 2:15 pm, all trips after 6:45 pm, and all day on Saturdays. Punch Tickets and Monthly Pass programs are available, as well as, one free transfer per trip. Riders can board or alight at any of the many designated stops. Bus shelters are available while waiting for your ride. www.rochestermn.gov/publicworks/Transportation/citylines
Small Urban Systems

Albert Lea Transit (ALT) provides Route Deviation and Demand Response (Dial-A-Ride) for residents of Albert Lea. Route Deviation is provided by picking up or dropping off anywhere along the route, with deviations up to 2 blocks. Deviations must be prescheduled 24-hours in advance. Curb-to-Curb Demand Response service is available for individuals with special needs that are not able to access the route deviation system or live beyond the 2 block route area. The system utilizes 4 medium size cut-away buses that are able to accommodate between 10 and 12 riders each. All buses are equipped with 2-3 wheelchair positions. Service is provided Monday through Friday 7:00 am to 4:30 pm. Base fare for route deviation is $1.50, with discounts for tokens, monthly passes, youth and seniors. Demand Response fares are $2.00, with discounts for token purchases. One bus is equipped with a bike rack.

City of Faribault – Faribault Flyer provides Route Deviation services within the City of Faribault. Riders can board or alight at any of the scheduled designated stops, with deviations available by calling at least two-hours in advance. The system utilizes 3 medium size cut-away buses that are able to accommodate 17 riders each. All buses are equipped with 1 wheelchair position. Service is provided Monday through Friday 6:30 am to 6:30 pm, Saturday 7:30 am to 4:30 pm, and Sunday 8:30 am to 3:30 pm. Base fare is $1.00 for a one-way trip, $9.00 for a 10-Ride Pass, or $5.00 for a monthly Youth Pass (unlimited rides).

City of Northfield provides Demand Response services within the City of Northfield. Curb-to-Curb rides are provided by calling the dispatcher for pick up and drop off times and locations, at least two hours in advance. Northfield Transit also offers dependable, pre-scheduled rides to and from your place of work and the two college institutions. Regular route demand services are provided twice daily, Monday through Friday, to the Big Steer Travel Center for connections to Jefferson Lines coach transportation. The system utilizes five medium size cut-away buses that are able to accommodate 17 riders each. All buses are equipped with 2 wheelchair positions. Service is provided Monday through Thursday 7:00 am to 7:30 pm, Friday 7:00 am to 5:30 pm, and Saturday 10:00 am to 2:00 pm. Summer hours are reduced each year. Base fare is $1.00. In addition, Summer Youth passes are offered June, July, and August and a $4.00 fare for the Jefferson Lines connection.
City of Stewartville provides Demand Response services to residents of Stewartville and to the townships of High Forest and Pleasant Grove. Curb-to-Curb rides are provided by calling the service for pick up and drop off times and locations. 24-hour advance notice is requested, but not mandatory. Rides are offered on a first-come, first-served basis. Service is also available to a single location in the City of Rochester, where riders are able to transport within Rochester on the Rochester Regular Route or ZIPS services. The system utilizes 1 medium size cut-away bus that accommodates 17 riders, with 2 wheelchair positions. Service is provided Monday through Friday 8:30 am to 5:30 pm. Base fare is $1.00 for a one-way trip within the City of Stewartville, and $5.00 for a round trip to Rochester.

City of Winona provides Route Deviation within the cities of Winona and Goodview. Riders can board or alight at any of the scheduled designated stops, with deviations available by calling at least two-hours in advance. The system provides pulse service with routes to accommodate all age groups within the cities. Routes are designed to provide services to the secondary education institutions; St. Mary’s College, Winona State University, and Southwest Technical, as well as, meeting the demand for service to the senior high rises. In addition, Winona Transit provides routes on Saturday during the late evening hours for the Safe Ride Program. The system utilizes 7-22 passenger, with 2 wheelchair positions each, transit buses. Service is provided Monday through Friday 6:00 am to 6:15 pm and Saturday 6:30 pm to 1:55 am. Base fare is $0.50, with a $.15 charge for deviations. Winona Transit provides one free transfer and pass rates to accommodate riders from Winona County (Semcac Transportation) doing business in the City of Winona or Goodview.

Small Urban and Countywide System

Austin/Mower County Area Transit (AMCAT) provides Route Deviation and Demand Response services primarily in the City of Austin; however, services are available to all residents in Mower County. Route Deviation is provided by picking up or dropping off anywhere along the route, with deviations up to 3 blocks. Deviations must be prescheduled at least one hour in advance. Curb-to-Curb Demand Response service is available for individuals with special needs that are not able to access the route deviation system or live beyond the 3 block route area. Riders call at least 24-hours in advance to schedule their trip. Riders whose destination is on another route just let their drivers know and transfers are made, at no charge. The system utilizes 8 medium size cut-away buses that are able to accommodate up to 17 riders each. All buses are equipped with 2 wheelchair positions. Service is provided Monday through Friday 7:00 am to 5:00 pm, and Saturday 11:00 am to 3:00 pm. Base fare is $1.50 for Route Deviation and $2.50 for Demand Response, per trip.
Steele County (SCAT) provides Route Deviation and Demand Response services primarily in the City of Owatonna. Services are available to all residents in Steele County, however, runs to Blooming Prairie and points between comprise for most of the service outside of Owatonna. SCAT provides for ride guarantees that follow a designated route each day. Riders can access service by calling at least 2 hours in advance. Rides are offered on a first-come, first-serve basis. Curb-to-Curb rides are provided for demand response rides, by calling 24-hours in advance for pick-up and drop-off times and locations. The system utilizes 5 medium size cut-away buses that are able to accommodate up to 17 riders each. All buses are equipped with 2 wheelchair positions. Service is provided Monday through Friday 6:00 am to 6:00 pm, Saturday 9:00 am to 3:00 pm, and Sunday 7:30 am to 1:00 pm. Base fare is $1.50, per trip and $2.00 for trips outside of Owatonna.

Countywide and Multicounty System

Hiawathaland Transit – RIDE the BUS operates in Goodhue and Wabasha Counties providing Route Deviation and Demand Response services. City service operates in Red Wing, Cannon Falls, Elgin, Kellogg, Lake City, Plainview, and Wabasha; with surrounding townships of Featherstone, Greenfield, Lake Pepin, Leon, New Frontenac, Randolph, Reeds Landing and Stanton. The City of Zumbrota will begin with Demand Response services in January, 2007. Route Deviation is provided in the City of Red Wing; riders can board or alight at any of the scheduled designated stops, with deviations available by calling at least two-hours in advance. Shelters are located at several of the scheduled stops. Curb-to-Curb Demand Response service is available for individuals in the remaining communities by calling the dispatcher at least 2 hours in advance of your ride needs. Riders with specific time, location or lift needs should call at least 24-hours in advance of their ride. The system utilizes 10 medium size cut-away buses that accommodate up to 17 riders, with 2 wheelchair positions. Service is provided in the Red Wing service area, Monday through Saturday 6:00 am to 6:00 pm, and Wednesday through Friday 6:00 pm to 9:30 pm. The remaining service areas operate Monday through Friday for nine to ten hours each day, with hours varying between 7:30 am to 5:30 pm to 8:30 am to 5:30 pm. Base fare in Red Wing service area is $1.00 and $1.50 in the remaining service areas.

Semcac Public Transportation provides Route Deviation, Demand Response, and Subscription services to the counties of Dodge, Fillmore, Houston, and Winona (excluding the City of Winona). City zones are set-up in each county to designate service areas. Curb-to-Curb rides are provided by calling the service for pick up and drop off times and locations. 24-hour advance notice is requested, but not mandatory. Rides are offered on a first-come, first-served basis. Service is also available to a single location in the City of Winona, where riders are able to transport within Winona and Goodview on Winona Transit.
Service. Semcac Transportation is also available on a limited basis in the City of Blooming Prairie. In addition, subscription services for on-going times and locations are developed to meet the needs of riders within agencies. The system utilizes 7 medium size cut-away buses that accommodate up to 17 riders, with 2 wheelchair positions. Service is provided Monday through Friday at varied hours throughout the service areas, but typically between 7:00 am to 5:00 pm. Base fares range depending on the locations. Within a city zone, fares are $1.00; within 20 miles of the city zone, fares are 2.50; 21 miles or greater, fares are $3.50 for one-way trips.

These 12 systems provide over $1.9M annual passenger trips, traveling over 2.2M miles and logging over 167,000 service hours annually using 96 transit vehicles. The average cost per passenger is $6.68.

Table 5.4: Transit System 2005 Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provider</th>
<th># buses in Fleet</th>
<th>2005 Service Hours</th>
<th>2005 System Miles</th>
<th>2005 Passenger Trips</th>
<th>Cost/Passenger</th>
<th>Cost/ Hour</th>
<th>Total Operating Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of La Crescent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,595</td>
<td>41,202</td>
<td>13,819</td>
<td>$11.62</td>
<td>$61.89</td>
<td>$160,604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Rochester-DAR</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12,831</td>
<td>186,773</td>
<td>43,089</td>
<td>$12.12</td>
<td>$40.69</td>
<td>$522,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Rochester - RR</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>67,641</td>
<td>940,479</td>
<td>1,300,277</td>
<td>$2.66</td>
<td>$51.04</td>
<td>$3,452,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Lea Transit</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6,082</td>
<td>79,087</td>
<td>33,454</td>
<td>$6.05</td>
<td>$33.26</td>
<td>$202,306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Faribault</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3,905</td>
<td>52,317</td>
<td>22,377</td>
<td>$7.15</td>
<td>$40.98</td>
<td>$159,977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Northfield</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6,427</td>
<td>77,819</td>
<td>44,250</td>
<td>$5.84</td>
<td>$40.52</td>
<td>$239,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Stewartville</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,389</td>
<td>21,537</td>
<td>11,974</td>
<td>$5.07</td>
<td>$25.44</td>
<td>$60,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiawathaland Transit</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19,294</td>
<td>242,200</td>
<td>97,503</td>
<td>$6.85</td>
<td>$31.23</td>
<td>$603,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provider</td>
<td># buses in Fleet</td>
<td>2005 Service Hours</td>
<td>2005 System Miles</td>
<td>2005 Passenger Trips</td>
<td>Cost/Passenger</td>
<td>Cost/ Hour</td>
<td>Total Operating Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Winona</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15,567</td>
<td>186,831</td>
<td>227,876</td>
<td>$1.90</td>
<td>$27.76</td>
<td>$432,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMCAT</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13,230</td>
<td>164,529</td>
<td>47,666</td>
<td>$9.90</td>
<td>$35.65</td>
<td>$471,673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semcac</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8,382</td>
<td>91,947</td>
<td>38,295</td>
<td>$4.68</td>
<td>$21.37</td>
<td>$179,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steele County</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9,593</td>
<td>159,912</td>
<td>58,218</td>
<td>$5.95</td>
<td>$36.10</td>
<td>$346,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>System Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>96</strong></td>
<td><strong>167,933</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,244,633</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,938,798</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6.68</strong></td>
<td><strong>$37.35</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,866,252</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Service Inventory: Section 5310

SECTION 5310 PROGRAM (ELDERLY AND DISABLED TRANSPORTATION)
District 6 provides technical assistance and contract compliance oversight, facilitates coordination among agencies, conducts evaluations, and monitors project results for 16 private non-profit agencies. These agencies utilize 21 lift-equipped buses, providing over 103,000 annual passenger trips and traveling over 275,000 annual miles. These 16 private non-profit agencies log over 16,000 hours of service each year. In addition, District 6 selects local projects from competitive bus grant applications. Table 5.5 shows the District 6 current providers of the Section 5310 Program.

Table 5.5: Providers of Transportation for Elderly Person and Persons with Disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recipient / Type Agency</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th># Vehicles</th>
<th># Wheelchair Seats</th>
<th>2005 Service Hours</th>
<th>2005 Service Miles</th>
<th>2005 Passenger Trips</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability Building Center, Inc. (ABC) (DT&amp;H)</td>
<td>Rochester</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6/15</td>
<td>1,872</td>
<td>32,460</td>
<td>10,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABC Works (DT&amp;H)</td>
<td>Caledonia, La Crescent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6/16</td>
<td>1,779</td>
<td>25,673</td>
<td>20,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannon Falls Community Hospital</td>
<td>Cannon Falls</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3/15</td>
<td>706</td>
<td>23,056</td>
<td>4,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Valley Services, Inc. – Austin (DT&amp;H)</td>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2/32</td>
<td>2,024</td>
<td>20,687</td>
<td>17,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPIC Enterprises, Inc. (DAC)</td>
<td>Dundas</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5/24</td>
<td>2,174</td>
<td>43,058</td>
<td>17,776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmony Healthcare Center (N.H.)</td>
<td>Harmony</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2/5</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake City Medical Center</td>
<td>Lake City</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4/8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine Haven Care Center (N.H.)</td>
<td>Pine Island</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4/10</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>2,636</td>
<td>1,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prairie Manor Nursing Home</td>
<td>Blooming Prairie</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3/7</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1,522</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preston Good Samaritan Center(NH)</td>
<td>Preston</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3/15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14,537</td>
<td>807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ProAct – Red Wing (DT&amp;H)</td>
<td>Red Wing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1/7</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>17,424</td>
<td>4,153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Elizabeth’s Medical Center</td>
<td>Wabasha</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2/11</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>1,471</td>
<td>887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Valley Senior Living &amp; Estates (N.H.)</td>
<td>Spring Valley</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4/10</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley View Nursing Home (N.H.)</td>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3/13</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>7,766</td>
<td>1,728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winona County DAC, Inc.</td>
<td>Winona</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2/11</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>13,172</td>
<td>5,861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winona County ORC Industries, Inc.</td>
<td>Winona</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5/34</td>
<td>4,836</td>
<td>69,038</td>
<td>17,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td><strong>55/233</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,298</strong></td>
<td><strong>275,627</strong></td>
<td><strong>103,549</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The service inventory that follows is a sampling of agency’s within the eleven county area providing and/or purchasing transportation services. Those agencies’s with narratives completed the Stakeholder Questionnaire and provided the information included. The number of agencies in District 6 was far too great to obtain all within the timeframe given.

**Service Inventory: Organizations providing transportation with vehicles**

**Private Non-Profit Agency:**

- **Ability Building Center (ABC) – Rochester** provides transportation services for their clients for employment opportunities within Olmsted County area. Two vehicles in their fleet were purchased through the Section 5310 program. In addition, ABC has 1 medium size cut-away bus and 8 vans/mini-vans to conduct services with 74 passenger seating and 6 wheelchair positions. Their hours are 6:45 am to 9:00 pm, Monday through Friday and 8:00 am to 4:00 pm on Saturday.

- **ABC Works – Caledonia and La Crescent** is a branch of ABC – Rochester providing vocational rehabilitation for persons with disabilities in Houston County. This agency has 2 Section 5310 vehicles in La Crescent and 1 Section 5310 vehicle in Caledonia.

- **A.B.L.E., Inc. – Caledonia/La Crescent/Spring Grove** provides transportation services to/from work sites and appointments for their clients. ABLE utilizes 5 sedans and 27 vans/mini-vans with 148 seating capacity and 14 wheelchair positions. Hours for service are Monday through Sunday 6:00 am to 10:00 pm. ABLE coordinates with ABC Works and Semcac Transportation for transportation needs during the weekdays.

- **Cedar Valley Services, Inc. – Albert Lea** is a vocational training facility providing transportation for their clients to/from work sites with 6 vans/mini-vans and 2 Dodge Sprinters that are lift equipped. Seating capacity is for 63 passengers and 4 wheelchair positions. Service is provided Monday through Friday, 6:00 am to 12:00 pm. In addition, Cedar Valley Services – Albert Lea serves as the public transit provider within the city limits with 4 medium size cut-away buses.

- **Laura Baker Services Association** utilizes 1 sedan and 7 vans/mini-vans, with 53 passenger seats available, to provide transportation. The agency provides residential services and supports for people with developmental disabilities and school services. Transportation is provided Monday through Friday 6:30 am to 7:00 pm, within Rice County.

- **Madonna Towers of Rochester** is a retirement facility that utilizes 1 van/mini-van and 2 medium sized buses. The mini-van has 6 passenger seat and 2 wheelchair positions. The buses have 20 passenger seats and 3 wheelchair positions. Transportation is provided Monday through Friday 8:15 am to 4:30 pm, and Saturday and Sunday, 8:15 am to 12:00 pm.

- **Opportunities Services – Kasson, Owatonna, Red Wing**

- **Pine Haven Care Center** is a nursing home facility, in Pine Island, that utilizes 1 medium size cut-away bus (Section 5310) to transport residents to medical
appointments and social outings. The bus has 10 passenger seats and 4 wheelchair positions."

PossAbilities of SE MN provides transportation services to their consumers for employment and volunteer opportunities within the Olmsted County area. The usage of city transit services – regular route and para-transit, as well as, for-hire transportation providers, such as, R & S Transport is available as needed. Over 150 consumers are served on a daily basis. PossAbilities utilizes 2 mini-vans, 5 full-size vans and 6 cut-away buses. Seating capacity for these vehicles is 91 passenger seats and 18 wheelchair positions. Plans are to purchase 2 wheelchair accessible mini-vans and 1 standard mine-van in the future. Service is provided Monday through Friday, 7:30 am to 4:00 pm and as needed for specific jobs.

Preston Good Samaritan Center is a nursing home facility that utilizes 1 medium size cut-away bus (Section 5310) to transport residents to medical appointments and social outings. The bus has 10 passenger seats and 4 wheelchair positions.

ProAct – Red Wing is an employment and support services agency for people with disabilities. All individuals served by ProAct must be provided with or arrange for transportation to and from individuals worksite, no matter the cost or location. ProAct utilizes 4 sedans, 13 vans and 5 medium size cut-away buses, with seating capacity of 177 and 14 wheelchair positions. In addition, ProAct contract transportation services with two for-profit providers and occasionally employees use their own vehicles to transport individuals. ProAct work hours are Monday and Thursday, 8:15 am to 3:15 pm and Friday, 8:15 am to 1:15 pm. Community service hours are Monday through Friday 7:00 am to 4:00 pm.

Rice County Activity Center, Inc. is a Day Training & Habilitation (DT&H) agency for developmentally disabled adults that utilize 3 vans, 2 small buses, and 3 medium sized buses. Seating capacity is 71 passenger seats and 14 wheelchair positions. Service is provided Monday through Friday, 7:00 am to 3:00 pm. Transportation is for the center’s clients only.

St. Elizabeth’s Medical Center is located in the city of Wabasha as a nursing home and assisted living apartment facility. Residents are provided with transportation for social outings and appointments Monday through Sunday, whenever a driver is available. The facility utilizes 1 van and 1 small cut-away bus, with total seating capacity of 12 and 3 wheelchair positions.

St. Isidore Health Care Center is located in Plainview and serves Wabasha, Olmsted, and Winona counties. The facility utilizes one van with 3 passenger seats and 2 wheelchair positions. In addition, transportation is provided by local for-profit agencies for additional needs.

Spring Valley Senior Living a nursing home and assisted living facility. Residents are provided with transportation for social outings and appointments Monday through Friday, 6:00 am to 5:00 pm. The facility utilizes 1 medium sized cut-away bus with 10 passenger seats and 4 wheelchair positions for social outings, medical appointments to Rochester and La Crosse, WI, and family activities.

Stewartville Care Center offers a Senior Van Service.

Straight River Enterprises is a Day Training & Habilitation (DT&H) agency for developmentally disabled adults in the service area of Rice, Steele, Hennepin, Blue Earth, Dakota, and Winona counties. The facility is located in Medford and utilizes 2
sedans, 3 vans, 1 medium sized bus and 1 large bus. Seating capacity is 46 passengers and 4 wheelchair positions. In addition, Straight River coordinates with Steele County Public Transit for transportation services beyond their capabilities. Agency service hours are Monday through Friday, 8:00 am to 3:00 pm.

Tweeten Lutheran Healthcare Center is located in Spring Grove. Residents of the nursing home utilize the 5 vans for outings and social events. Seating capacity is 15 passengers and 10 wheelchair positions. In 2002, the facility stopped providing medical transportation for the residents with the agency vehicles. Currently, residents purchase transportation from Teelwood Transport Services (mobile SNF) for medical appointments, as needed. Service must be reserved 2-3 days in advance.

Wabasha County DAC
Winona County Veterans Service Office provides transportation services to veterans.
Zumbrota Health Service provides activity rides and rides to local grocery store with their 1 small bus to assisted living tenants. Seating capacity is 10 passengers and 3 wheelchair positions. In addition, with 2 days advance notice other apartment tenants can utilize the Faith In Action volunteers for medical appointments.

Private For-Profit Agency:
Access Medical Transit out of La Crosse, WI provides non-emergency disability and medical related transportation for elderly and persons with disabilities and/or health conditions.
Caledonia Care and Rehab provides transportation services for their residents to doctors appointments and social outings in Houston and Mower County, as well as, La Crosse, WI. The facility is for long-term care and senior housing, which utilizes 1 sedan and 1 medium sized cut-away bus with 15 passenger seats and 2 wheelchair positions. Transportation services are provided Monday through Friday 8:00 am to 5:00 pm.
CAM Transportation, Inc. (dba: Rochester Transportation Systems, Inc. (RTS)) operates a taxi service- Yellow Cab and Medical Cab, and executive sedan service.
Care Tenders provides shuttle services transportation for older adults in Northfield area.
Empowerment Services of Rice County, Inc. (ESI) provides residential homes and programs in Faribault and Northfield for persons with developmental disabilities. Transportation is provided for doctor’s appointments, shopping or other outings Monday through Sunday. The agency utilizes 10 vans/mini-vans with a total of 9 passenger seats and no wheelchair positions.
Global Home Health Care, Inc. provides disability related transportation, with personal care assistants.
HandiVan - Rochester
La Crescent Health Care provides transportation services for their residents to doctors appointments and social outings within Houston County and the La Crosse area. The health care center utilizes one small van with seven seats and two
wheelchair positions. Their hours are 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday.

**Laidlaw**

*Our Homes South, Inc.* provides residential services for persons with developmental disabilities in Rice and Steele Counties. The agency utilizes 13 sedans, with 52 passenger seats, and 4 vans/mini-vans; with 28 passenger seats to provide transportation to their clients Monday through Sunday, any time of the day.

**R & S Transport** is a private for-profit agency that provides para-transit services in Olmsted, Mower, Fillmore, Dodge, and Rice Counties. The agency utilizes 49 vans/mini-vans with 141 passenger seats and 82 wheelchair positions. Transportation is provided Monday through Sunday at any time needed. All persons using this service must be certified from the state. R&S also does business as a provider for “Kids On The Go” transportation services.

**Rochester City Lines** operates charter services under several company names.

**Roots & Wings, Inc.** operates as a group home and daily living services agency, in Northfield, for 4 consumers with their non-assessable van. Seating capacity is for 6 passengers. This van is available to the consumers whenever they may for various activities and events throughout Rice County.

**St. Lucas Care Center** is a nursing home care facility located in Faribault and serving residents of Rice and Steele County’s. Transportation is provided to residents for community events and outings, appointments, dialysis, etc. Monday through Sunday, 8:00 am to 8:00 pm. The facility utilizes one small bus with 4 passenger seats and 3 wheelchair positions.

**Schmit’s Bus, Inc.** provides school bus transportation in Wabasha County. The agency utilizes 2 medium sized buses and 1 large sized bus, with 9 wheelchair positions within the buses. Service is provided to elementary through high school students during the school year.

**Schmitz Bus Service, Inc.** provides school bus transportation for the Caledonia Area, Spring Grove and Mabel-Canton School District’s in Houston and Fillmore counties. The agency utilizes 5 vans, 4 medium sized buses, and 36 large sized buses, with seating capacity at 2,399 passengers and 9 wheelchair positions. Service is provided to elementary through high school students during the school and summer school year.

**Yellow Cab of Winona, Inc.** is a taxi cab service operating 24 hours per day, 7 days per week primarily in the City of Winona. Persons requesting a ride can call 15 minutes in advance. The agency utilizes 5 sedans, 1 van, and 1 small bus with seating capacity at 31 passengers. No lift equipped vehicles are within their fleet.
Service Inventory: Organizations providing transportation through leased services and/or reimbursement

Private Non-Profit Agency:
- **Ability Building Center (ABC) - Rochester** contracts for transportation services with ZIPS
- **American Cancer Society – Rochester** utilizes volunteers for the Road to Recovery transportation program.
- **Angel Care Center** uses volunteer drivers, in Goodhue County, to transport clients in their 84 bed, Long-Term Care facility. Volunteers receive mileage reimbursement.
- **Apostolate For Older Adults** is a senior ride program.
- **Faith In Action Central Goodhue County** has 32 volunteer drivers who provided 616 round-trip rides in 2005. Volunteers are reimbursed for their mileage for door-to-door trips to medical/dental appointments, grocery shopping and church services. Trips are for persons over 60 years of age or on Medical Assistance program. Service is offered in Mazeppa area, Zumbrota, Goodhue, Bellechester, Wanamingo, and Kenyon.
- **Faith In Action Wabasha County** has 55 volunteer drivers who provide transportation to anyone who has special needs. Trips are for doctor or dentist appointments, shopping or to go the pharmacy. Passengers need to provide as much advance notice as possible for service any day or time during the week.
- **Faith In Action in Red Wing** has 37 volunteer drivers who provide door-to-door transportation with mileage reimbursement for the ACS Road to Recovery program and trips in the City of Red Wing. Trips are for persons over 60 years of age, on Medical Assistance program or others in distressed circumstances.
- **Healthy Seniors Program – Owatonna** provides volunteer drivers for trips to anyone 65 years and older who would like transportation, Monday through Friday, typically 8:00 am to 5:00 pm.
- **Home Instead Senior Care** provides a senior ride program, in Rochester.
- **Olmsted County Volunteer Driver Program** provides transportation services for medical, dental, therapy, treatments, visitations and camps. Olmsted County Social Services department makes the determination on what clients will access the transportation services, which are typically for clients who have no other transportation options available. Service is available by utilizing 24 volunteer drivers Monday through Friday from 7:00 am to 5:00 pm/
- **Opportunities Services – Kasson and Red Wing**
- **Pine Island Area Home Services (PIAHS)** utilizes 36 volunteer drivers to provide transportation to medical and dental appointments, grocery shopping or other needed appointments for persons 65 years and older or with financial situations. Service is offered Monday through Saturday, as needed. PIAHS utilizes the Pine Haven Care Center Section 5310 vehicle and reimburses the driver and agency for usage.
- **Semcac Volunteer Driver Program** utilizes volunteers in Dodge, Fillmore, Freeborn, Houston, Mower, and Winona counties. Volunteers average 79 years old and use their own personal vehicle to transport older adults and persons with disabilities to
medical appointments and like services. Senior riders offer a ‘donation’ for service provided. Semcac reimburses the volunteers for mileage, meals, and parking, if necessary.

- **Senior Resources of Freeborn County** provides volunteer mileage reimbursement for personal vehicle rides to senior citizens. Also provides vouchers to taxi cab service for rides. Oversees the **Faith in Action of Freeborn County**, also.

- **Shepherd’s Center of the Cannon Valley**, in Cannon Falls.

- **Southeastern Minnesota County Social Services Departments**: All of the county agencies in District 6 provide volunteer drivers and/or purchases transportation services from other public and private providers for individuals who participate in Human Services programs. These services are typically for medical appointments, social/recreational activities, family visits, therapy, dental care, and other treatment activities and appointments.

- **The Owatonna Healthy Seniors Program** provides a volunteer driver program for non-emergency medical appointments, senior rides, medical escorts, RIDES – volunteer transportation to the SeniorPlace, etc.

- **Three Rivers Community Action** provides volunteer driver program in Rice, Goodhue, and Wabasha counties. Volunteers average 79 years old and use their own personal vehicle to transport older adults and persons with disabilities to medical appointments and like services. Senior riders offer a ‘donation’ for service provided. Three Rivers’ reimburses the volunteers for mileage, meals, and parking, if necessary.

- **Winona Workforce Center** is a employment and Training (Resource and Referal) agency that purchases bus tokens for transportation services in Winona and Goodview, Monday through Friday 6:00 am to 6:00 pm.

- **Workforce Development, Inc. – Dodge, Fillmore, Freeborn, Goodhue, Houston, Mower, Olmsted, Rice, Steele, and Wabasha** is a job training and placement service agency. The agency purchases bus tokens and/or mileage reimbursement through volunteer driver programs throughout the 10 counties. Service is purchased for Monday through Friday, 7:30 am to 5:00 pm.

### Private For-Profit Agency:

- **Pleasant Manor, Inc.** is a skilled nursing facility and Senior Independent Living Apartments in Rice County. The residents of the apartments can purchase lift-equipped bus service, Monday through Friday 8:00 am to 5:00 pm. Staff often transports clients to events or outings.

- **Laidlaw**
Service Inventory: Ride Share/VanPool/Commuter Programs

Commuter Bus Services for employees within the District 6 area is currently being provided by two for-hire vendors:

Rochester City Lines – service is provided weekday during peak hours to Rochester from Austin, Byron, Cannon Falls, Chatfield, Dexter, Dodge Center, Dover, Elgin, Eyota, Fountain, Grand Meadow, Kasson, LeRoy, Owatonna, Pine Island, Plainview, Preston, Racine, St. Charles, Spring Valley, Stewartville, and Zumbrota. Departures are set in each community, as well as return trips.

Pickwick – service is provided weekday during peak hours to Rochester from Kellogg, Lake City, Lewiston, Oak Center, Stockton, Utica, Wabasha, Winona, and Zumbro Falls.

** These two vendors are contracted with Mayo Clinic to provide the commuter service within the listed communities. All routes are open to the public, at a monthly cost, when space is available. Mayo Clinic also purchases bus passes through the City of Rochester for employees to utilize the Rochester public transit system.

Rochester Department of Public Works provides a clearinghouse of names for community residents working within or commuting to/from Rochester. Staff then connect potential program users together.

Service Inventory: Long Distance Bus Service

Jefferson Lines

Service Inventory: Nursing Home/Assisted Living Listing

The listing below is of identified Nursing Home and/or Assisted Living Facilities in each county. These agencies are known to have one or more vehicles used to transport their clients. For the purposes of this inventory vehicles were identified if known, otherwise the listing indicates the number of beds, apartments, or rooms the facility has.

Dodge County:
Chicos Board and Lodge in West Concord is an assisted living home care facility.
Circle Drive Manor in West Concord is an assisted living home care facility.
Fairview Nursing Home in Dodge Center is a county run facility with 55 beds.
Field Crest Care Center in Hayfield is a city run facility with 65 beds.
Fillmore County:
Chosen Valley Care Center in Chatfield is a non-profit skilled nursing facility and housing options for seniors with 70 beds and 15 senior apartments. Good Shepard Lutheran Home in Rushford is a non-profit skilled nursing home with 79 beds and assisted living residence, with 15 private rooms and senior apartment’s facility. Set transportation schedules are provided. Green Lea Manor Nursing Home is a for-profit corporation providing assisted living facilities with 51 beds in Mabel. Heritage Grove of Harmony provides an assisted living facility for older adults. A van is available for trips downtown and scheduled for out-of-town appointments. Ostrander Nursing Home is a for-profit corporation with 35 beds. Park Lane Estates offers senior assisted living with scheduled transportation available.

Freeborn County:
Albert Lea Good Samaritan Center is a non-profit skilled nursing facility and senior congregate housing, with 158 beds. Scheduled transportation is available for the congregate housing units. Bancroft Estates is an independent living housing apartments in Albert Lea. Brians Elder Care, in Albert Lea, is an assisted living home care and housing with services. Broadway Care Home is an assisted living and housing with services facility in Albert Lea. Oak Park Place provides assisted services to seniors in a 55 unit apartment facility in Albert Lea. St. John’s Lutheran Home is a church related non-profit nursing home with 184 beds and 48 senior studio or one-bedroom apartments at the Knutson Place. Thorne Crest Retirement Center is a non-profit 52 bed nursing home and a board and care facility, with 12 rooms available.

Goodhue County:
Fairview Seminary Home is a non-profit nursing home in Red Wing with 85 beds. Kenyon Sunset Home is a non-profit church related nursing home with 58 beds. Loving Residence, in Red Wing, is a small family-oriented assisted living care center for area seniors. Pine Haven Care Center provides a skilled nursing facility, as well as, independent and assisted living facility, in Pine Island. Transportation is provided for resident’s to doctor’s appointments and social outings within Goodhue and Olmsted County’s using a medium sized Section 5310 bus with a capacity of 10 passengers and 4 wheelchair positions. Red Wing Health Center operates as a for-profit corporation with 125 beds. St. Brigid’s at Hi-Park in Red Wing is a non-profit corporation providing a 69 bed nursing home and 51 unit assisted living apartment building. Zumbrota Care Center offers a 57 bed nursing home and 23 units (Bridges of Zumbrota) of assisted living senior housing apartments.

Houston County:
Caledonia Care & Rehab provides 50 bed nursing home facility and 14 one-and-two bedroom independent living apartments (Buckley Apartments). The for-profit agency has
one medium sized bus and several vans to provide for transportation services for outings, medical appointments and social events. 

*La Crescent Health Care* is a 58 bed for-profit corporation that provides transportation services for their residents to doctor’s appointments and social outings within Houston County and the La Crosse, WI area. The health care center utilizes one small van with seven seats and two wheelchair positions.

*Spring Grove Assisted Living (Tweeten Lutheran Health Care Center)* is a 50 bed non-profit corporation.

*Valley View Nursing Home* provides 54 beds in a skilled nursing care non-profit corporation facility. Transportation is provided for resident’s to doctor’s appointments and social outings within Houston County and La Crosse, WI area with a medium sized Section 5310 bus with a capacity of 13 passengers and 3 wheelchair positions.

**Mower County:**

*Adams Health Care Center* is a city run assisted living facility, *Cedar Court*, with 37 units and a 58 bed nursing home.

*Carlson Home* is an assisted living home care and housing with services facility in Austin. *ComForCare Good Samaritan Center* is a non-profit located in Austin. The facility has 45 beds.

*Kingsley House* is an assisted living home care and housing with services facility in Austin. *Meadow Manor* in Grand Meadow is a for-profit nursing home corporation with 45 beds and an assisted living facility called *The Meadows*.

*Our House* has two facilities in Austin, one is an assisted living building and the other is a 24 bed secured dementia care assisted living facility.

*Primrose Retirement Communities*, located in Austin, has 24 assisted living apartments. *Sacred Heart Care Center* is a 59 bed skilled nursing facility associated with the Catholic Church but accepts persons of all faiths. In addition, individual assisted living apartments are provided.

*St. Mark’s Lutheran Home* offers a 129 bed skilled nursing facility and housing in the *Kenwood Heritage Living* independent and assisted living center. *Wildwood Grove*, in LeRoy, provides for 16 assisted living apartments, 6 secured memory care apartments, and 12 independent living apartments.

**Olmsted County:**

*Arbor Gardens*, in Eyota, provides 12 independent living apartments and 22 assisted living apartments. Transportation is provided for outings.

*Charter House* in Rochester is a 32 bed skilled nursing facility and an assisted living facility for seniors.

*Garden Cottage Assisted Living* in Stewartville, provides 11 senior assisted living units. *Madonna Meadows* provides for assisted living for frail seniors and elderly in Rochester. Transportation is provided with their many small cut-away buses.

*Madonna Towers of Rochester* is a continuing care retirement community with 124 independent apartments and 18 assisted living apartments. *Maple Manor Nursing Home* is a locally owned 81 bed skilled nursing facility located in Rochester.
Meadow Lakes Senior Living offers 65 units for assisted and independent living services. Transportation is provided.

Rochester Health and Rehab East is a 140 bed skilled nursing facility and Rochester Health and Rehab West is a 54 bed skilled nursing facility.

Samaritan Bethany, Inc. a non-profit church related corporation operates skilled nursing facilities, 120 beds, an assisted living facility (Assisted Living on 8th) with 29 units, located on one floor of the nursing home, and a senior independent living housing facility (Arbor Terrace). Scheduled transportation is provided.

Shorewood Commons Assisted Living offers 74 assisted living apartments with scheduled transportation available.

Stewartville Care Center is a city owned 85 bed skilled nursing facility. In addition, Stewartville Apartments is an independent living housing complex and Root River Estates is an assisted living facility. Facility has the Stewartville Senior Van Service.

Sunrise Cottages of Rochester provides assisted living for frail seniors or persons with dementia.

The Homestead at Rochester is a senior living community with independent, assisted, and memory care apartments available.

Rice County:

Alterra Sterling House of Faribault offers an assisted living facility with private rooms.

Deaconess Tower is an assisted living facility in Faribault.

Hilltop Home in Faribault, is an assisted living home care and housing with services. Transportation to appointments is provided.

Infinia At Faribault is a for-profit corporation with 76 beds.

Keystone Communities of Faribault is a 60 unit assisted living and memory care facility.

Lindenwood in Northfield, is an assisted living facility with 43 beds. Transportation and companion services to appointments in Northfield is provided.

Northfield Care Center is a 54 bed skilled nursing facility. Other campus facilities include, Northfield ParkView, 43 assisted living apartments and 54 unit independent living apartments; and Cannon Valley Suites, 22 units of senior housing with services.

Our House in Faribault offers an assisted living plus facility with 10 private rooms and transportation to appointments.

Rison Homes, Inc. – Morristown provides 10 private bedrooms with transportation to medical appointments and weekly outings.

Three Links Care Center is a 102 skilled nursing home, in Northfield, with The Cottage West for assisted living facility and the Fellowship Residence, an assisted living facility with 5 apartments.

Steele County:

Alterra Clare Bridge of Owatonna offers an assisted living facility with private rooms.

Cedarview Nursing Home in Owatonna is a 108 bed facility.

Infinia At Owatonna is a 80 bed facility.

Park Place, located in Owatonna, has 50 semi-independent apartments and assisted living apartments.

Prairie Manor Nursing Home is a skilled nursing home facility with the Heather Haus providing senior housing with services.
The Brooks on St. Paul, in Owatonna, has 50 assisted living home care and housing with services apartments.
Senior Housing with Services Facilities include; Heather Haus, in Blooming Prairie; Kinyon Residence, rooms for 16 persons; and Westside Board and Lodge Home, both in Owatonna.

Wabasha County:
Green Prairie Place offers retirement housing with an assisted living component suites.
Lake City Medical Center – Mayo Health System is a 98 bed facility. Transportation is provided for resident’s to doctor’s appointments and social outings within Wabasha and Olmsted county’s using a medium sized Section 5310 bus with a capacity of 8 passengers and 4 wheelchair positions.
Plainview Senior Housing provides 40 assisted living housing units for elderly over age 62 and people with disabilities of any age.
St. Elizabeth’s Hospital is a 110 bed non-profit church related facility in Wabasha, offering a continuum of care through acute and tertiary care hospitals, outpatient centers, physician clinics, long-term care and assisted living facilities (St. Elizabeth’s Apartments), home health agencies, and hospices. Transportation is provided for resident’s to doctor’s appointments and social outings within Wabasha County using a medium sized Section 5310 bus with a capacity of 11 passengers and 2 wheelchair positions.
St. Isidore Health Center of Greenwood Prairie Place is a 63 bed non-profit church related retirement housing facility with an assisted living component, located in Plainview.
Senior Housing with Services Facilities include; High Street House, in Lake City, provides a small, 10-resident assisted living facility.

Winona County:
Adith Miller Manor, provides a residential facility with a capacity of 10. Transportation may be provided. Owned by Community Memorial Hospital, Winona.
Alterra Sterling House of Winona offers assisted living rooms. Supervised transportation is available.
Kensington, in Winona, offers one and two bedroom residential units. Free transportation available for residents to clinic appointments and grocery shopping.
Lake Winona Manor is a 160 bed non-profit corporation, located in Winona.
Lewiston Villa Nursing Home is a for-profit partnership with 50 beds.
St. Anne of Winona is a non-profit corporation with a licensed assisted living facility with 75 private apartment homes, Callista Court, with services and a 109 bed licensed skilled nursing facility.
Sauer Memorial Home is located in Winona as a non-profit corporation with 90 beds.
Whitewater Health Care Center is in St. Charles as a for-profit corporation with 62 beds.
The Watkins Manor, provides 61 assisted living apartments. Owned by Community Memorial Hospital, Winona.
Service Inventory: Hospitality Businesses

Due to the health care industry in the City of Rochester, numerous hotel, motel, extended stay hospitality facilities offer complimentary shuttle services for patrons during their stay. The following is a sampling of facilities who advertise transit services.

- AmericInn
  Shuttle to Mayo Clinic & St. Mary’s Hospital
- Best Price Inn
  Courtesy car to clinic & hospital
- Country Inn & Suites
  Van shuttle to Mayo Clinic & IBM
  Weekdays 6am – 6pm, excluding holidays
-Courtesy Inn
  Free courtesy van to clinic & hospital only
- Extended StayAmerica
  Mayo shuttle
- Microtel Inns – Suites
  Mayo Clinic shuttle service
- Ramada Hotel & Conference Center
  Free shuttle to Mayo Clinic & Apache Mall
- Red Carpet Inn
  Free courtesy van to clinic hospitals
- Sleep Inn
  Complimentary shuttle to Mayo Clinic

B. Transportation Stakeholder Questionnaire

Overview

In late July, 2006 the TAC distributed a memo and informational brochure to 175 southeastern Minnesota agencies asking for their assistance in gathering information regarding the agencies’ involvement with transportation issues. One of the efforts to obtain input from the local stakeholders was a questionnaire, submitted with the memo, for the agency to complete and return in a self addressed envelope.

Respondents ranged from Section 5310 agencies, Section 5311 and 5307 public transit systems, governmental programs, nursing home and skilled care facilities, D,T &H and DAC services, for-hire agencies and school bus providers, to volunteer driver programs and senior, low-income and persons with disabilities programs. Forty-six questionnaires were received, a 26.28% return rate.
Twenty-four agencies reported using personal staff vehicles for transportation services for their customers and thirty-three agencies reported utilizing agency owned/leased vehicles for transportation services. Of the 33 agencies utilizing owned vehicles, the fleet total was reported as 35 sedans/station wagons, 150 vans/minivans, 8 small buses, 45 medium buses, and 59 large buses. This total fleet had 3,647 ambulatory seats, 231 wheelchair/scooter positions and 113 of the 297 vehicles equipped with lift/ramp access.

Twenty-one agencies reported that they utilize 219 paid drivers to provide services and 13 agencies reported that they have over 325 volunteer drivers to provide services in their area. Of the total respondents, agencies spend an average of 60 hours per month scheduling rides for their clients.

**Coordination Issues**

Respondents were asked what issues and their greatest obstacles, if any, they had encountered in coordinating or attempting to coordinate transportation. The following responses are a highlight of the overall efforts.

- Vehicle availability – the needs are generally during the same time periods
- Qualified drivers
- Duplication of services in a particular area
- None – Agencies seem very willing to work together
- Open times – availability of bus
- Insurance coverage for multiply agency use, liability issues, driver qualifications
- Cost to provide additional services, timing of trips, length of routes, drivers wages/availability
- Lack of routes, hours, no service in rural areas
- Not available on weekends and weeknights
- Hard to fill requests for trips at the last minute (less than 24 hours)
- Lack of volunteer drivers
- MA requirements
- Cost of fuel
- Payment and billing process and procedures, liability issues, “unloaded” “empty” travel times
- Limited funding
- Adequate number of vehicles and State and Federal funding to cover the costs
- MTM in Minnesota has been a disaster
- Cost of using wheelchair accessible transportation is very costly
- Multiple and sometimes conflicting funding sources
- Outlying areas that are expensive to get to by taxi and not available by bus
- Number of busses – need more
- Human Services per diem is too little
- Public transit hours are limited, service range does not allow someone to go out of town
- Communication among different providers
- Geographic dispersion
Public Transit – Human Services Coordination Plan

Working out shared use of vehicles, convincing elderly of the value of public transportation
Funds to pay volunteer driver’s mileage
Areas are very rural with long distances between pickups
Scheduling of rides and education of public
Limited funding, results in limited number of vehicles to provide the transportation needs
Jurisdictional boundaries
Cost of running the bus

Respondents were also asked what enhancements would be most needed to improve the coordination of transportation in their service area. The following represents the majority response:

Agency collaboration, inter-agency agreements
Funding and agency collaboration
Community support/funding for transportation of disabled and elderly
Better funding of transportation services
More vehicles and funding
A thorough understanding of the resources already available, the needs, and who is willing/needs solutions and possibly funding
More routes, accessibility, affordable transportation
Available and affordable electronic transportation needs to be enhanced – allowing accessibility from miles away
Involve hospital, shared used of existing providers, like the Veterans Program, service providers and nursing homes
Funding for subsidized taxi service for elderly and bus routes
Education of elderly
Reimbursement
Agency and city collaboration

The greatest barrier or obstacle in accessing services for the agencies’ clients/consumers was existing transportation services don’t go to locations where needed services are located. The next identified barrier was existing transportation services don’t operate at the same hours as when people need transportation.
Section VI. Assessment of Current Conditions and Needs

A. Level Of Service

Service span measures the number of hours during the day and days per week the Demand Response service is available in a particular area. Unlike the similar measure for Fixed Route service that measures hours per day of service, the service span measure for Demand Response incorporates days of service in addition to hours per day. This is done because in some rural areas Demand Response service may only be provided selected days per week, or even selected days per month. Incorporation of both hours per day and days per week provides a more complete perspective on the amount of Demand Response service that is available within a community or larger area. Table 6.1 shows the matrix of hours per day and days per week.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Days Per Week</th>
<th>6 – 7</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>3 – 4</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0.5*</th>
<th>&lt; 0.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>≥ 16.0</td>
<td>LOS 1</td>
<td>LOS 2</td>
<td>LOS 4</td>
<td>LOS 5</td>
<td>LOS 6</td>
<td>LOS 7</td>
<td>LOS 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.0 – 15.9</td>
<td>LOS 2</td>
<td>LOS 3</td>
<td>LOS 4</td>
<td>LOS 5</td>
<td>LOS 6</td>
<td>LOS 7</td>
<td>LOS 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.0 – 11.9</td>
<td>LOS 3</td>
<td>LOS 4</td>
<td>LOS 4</td>
<td>LOS 6</td>
<td>LOS 6</td>
<td>LOS 7</td>
<td>LOS 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 – 8.9</td>
<td>LOS 5</td>
<td>LOS 5</td>
<td>LOS 5</td>
<td>LOS 6</td>
<td>LOS 7</td>
<td>LOS 7</td>
<td>LOS 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;4.0</td>
<td>LOS 6</td>
<td>LOS 6</td>
<td>LOS 6</td>
<td>LOS 7</td>
<td>LOS 8</td>
<td>LOS 8</td>
<td>LOS 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Market research shows that respondents asked that services be designed to serve multiple counties, operate 6:00 am to 10:00 pm, five to seven days per week. LOS 2 will meet the combined hours of operation and frequency of operation expectations.

Response time is the minimum amount of time a user needs for scheduling and accessing a trip or the minimum advance reservation time. This measure is most appropriate where most of the trips are scheduled each time that the user wants to travel. This measurement is less appropriate where most of the trips are provided on a standing-order, subscription basis, where riders are picked up on pre-scheduled days at pre-scheduled times and do not need to call in advance for each trip. Response time can be calculated for the situation when a trip request is first made. Table 6.2 provides the response time guidelines.
Table 6.2: Demand Response Availability – Response Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOS</th>
<th>Response Time</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Up to ½ hour</td>
<td>Very prompt response; similar to exclusive-ride taxi service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>More than ½ hour, and up to 2 hours</td>
<td>Prompt response; considered immediate response for Demand Response service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>More than 2 hours, but still same day service</td>
<td>Requires planning, but one can still travel the day the trip is requested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>24-hours in advance; next day service</td>
<td>Requires some advance planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>48-hours in advance</td>
<td>Requires more advance planning than next-day service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>More than 48-hours in advance, and up to 1 week</td>
<td>Requires advance planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>More than 1 week in advance, and up to 2 weeks</td>
<td>Requires considerable advance planning, but may still work for important trips needed soon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>More than 2 weeks, or not able to accommodate trip</td>
<td>Requires significant advance planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Market research indicates that persons want a prompt response. The Level Of Service (LOS) 2 would meet this customer expectation.

The presence of absence of transit service near one’s origin and destination is a key factor in one’s choice to use transit. In District 6 the Primary (Level 1) Regional Trade Centers are Rochester and La Crosse/La Crescent. Secondary (Level 2) Trade Centers are small urban cities; such as, Winona, Red Wing, Northfield, Faribault, Austin, Albert Lea, and Owatonna. These small urban trade centers typically host medical facilities. The assumption of this performance measure is that all counties, at a minimum, have access to a Level 3 Regional Trade Center, 5 days per week.
Table 6.3: Transit System Demand Response Measurements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>Service Span</th>
<th>Response Time - Service</th>
<th>Response Time - Availability</th>
<th>Regional Trade Coverage Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albert Lea Transit</td>
<td>M-F 10.5 hrs/day</td>
<td>LOS 4</td>
<td>LOS 4</td>
<td>Albert Lea - Freeborn County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Faribault</td>
<td>M – F 12 hrs/day</td>
<td>LOS 3</td>
<td>LOS 2</td>
<td>Faribault – Rice County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Northfield</td>
<td>M-Th 12.5 hrs/day</td>
<td>LOS 2</td>
<td>LOS 2</td>
<td>Northfield – Rice County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Stewartville</td>
<td>M-F 9 hrs/day</td>
<td>LOS 4</td>
<td>LOS 3</td>
<td>Rochester - Olmsted County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiawathaland Transit</td>
<td>M-Tu 12 hrs/day</td>
<td>LOS 2</td>
<td>LOS 2</td>
<td>Red Wing – Goodhue County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiawathaland Transit</td>
<td>W-F 15.5 hrs/day</td>
<td>LOS 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiawathaland Transit</td>
<td>Sa 12 hrs/day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiawathaland Transit</td>
<td>Lake City, Wabasha/Kellogg, Plainview/Elgin</td>
<td>LOS 4</td>
<td>LOS 2</td>
<td>Red Wing - Wabasha County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiawathaland Transit</td>
<td>M-F 9 hrs/day</td>
<td>LOS 4</td>
<td>LOS 2</td>
<td>Red Wing - Goodhue County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Winona</td>
<td>M-F 12.25 hrs/day</td>
<td>LOS 3</td>
<td>LOS 2</td>
<td>Winona – Winona County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMCAT</td>
<td>M-F 12 hrs/day</td>
<td>LOS 3</td>
<td>LOS 2</td>
<td>Austin – Mower County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semcac</td>
<td>Sa 8 hrs/day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steele County</td>
<td>M-F 10 hrs/day</td>
<td>LOS 4</td>
<td>LOS 3</td>
<td>La Crosse / La Crescent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semcac</td>
<td>M-F 10 hrs/day</td>
<td>LOS 4</td>
<td>LOS 3</td>
<td>La Crosse / La Crescent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steele County</td>
<td>Sa 6 hrs/day</td>
<td>LOS 3</td>
<td>LOS 2</td>
<td>Owatonna – Steele County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of La Crescent</td>
<td>M-F 9.5 hrs/day</td>
<td>LOS 4</td>
<td>LOS 3</td>
<td>La Crosse / La Crescent – Houston County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Rochester-DAR</td>
<td>M-F 14.5 hrs/day</td>
<td>LOS 2</td>
<td>LOS 4</td>
<td>Rochester – Olmsted County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Rochester-DAR</td>
<td>Sa 12 hrs/day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*To meet the combined hours of operation and frequency of operation expectations, systems would need to reach service levels at LOS 2. To meet customer expectation for prompt response, systems would need to reach LOS 2.*
VII. Strategies / Actions

A. Action Steps and Strategies

The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) shortly after the workshop was conducted to review the results and determine their policy statement and action steps.

Public Transit – Human Services Policy Statement
Mn/DOT District 6 supports and encourages coordination of transportation services between transportation operators and Human Services agencies to the extent of providing technical assistance and resources available to accomplish this task.

Goals:
1. To provide and promote coordination of transportation services.
2. To provide and promote communication among transportation service providers.

Strategies:
1. Establish a District 6 Transportation Operators and Human Service Provider Coordinating Committee
2. Develop an Inventory of Transportation Providers
   a. Transportation Services (private, public, not-profit)
   b. Fleet Inventory
   c. Eligibility Requirements
3. Establish a Directory of Transportation Services
   a. Printed, web-based, and telephone listing
   b. Distribute or publicize
   c. Develop a process for maintaining
4. Identify and Quantify unmet transportation needs.
5. Develop a Best Practices method for unmet transportation needs
6. Review transportation agency plans
Public Transit – Human Service Coordination

Stakeholder Workshop

Mn/DOT Rochester Building
Monday, August 21, 2006
10:00 am – 3:00 pm

AGENDA

10:00 a.m. Introduction
Jean Meyer, Mn/DOT
  • Welcome/Introductions
  • Purpose

10:30 a.m. Coordination in Minnesota
Noel Shughart, Mn/DOT
  • History
  • Coordination success stories: Jean Meyer
    o Public transit/Section 5310
    o Section 5310/non-profit
    o Public transit/Human Services
    o Public transit/DT&H/Health Care

11:15 a.m. Work Team Discussions (participants will be divided into groups for a facilitated activity):
  • Assessment Tool for Communities
  • Brainstorm solutions for each Framework for Action category
  • Summaries

12:15 p.m. Lunch (provided)

12:45 p.m. Develop an action plan for improving and sustaining coordination in the future by identifying:
  • top priorities;
  • strategies for success;
  • initial steps to coordinate transportation services.

2:00 p.m. Closing Remarks
  • Evaluation forms
  • Next steps

2:30 p.m. Adjourn
9 completed assessments were returned

FRAMEWORK FOR ACTION
BUILDING THE FULLY COORDINATED TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

A Self Assessment Tool for Communities

MnDOT selected United We Ride’s Framework for Action as one of the resources that will be used by all RDCs and MPOs, as they prepare transit plans for MnDOT under SAFETEA-LU (Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users). The 2005 bill authorizes funds for federal-aid highways, highway safety programs, and transit programs, and for other purposes.

Section 1: Making Things Happen by Working Together

Driving Factor - Individuals and organizations are catalysts for envisioning, organizing, and sustaining a coordinated system that provides mobility and access to transportation for all.

- Have leaders and organizations defined the need for change and articulated a new vision for the delivery of coordinated transportation services?
- Is a governing framework in place that brings together providers, agencies, and consumers? Are there clear guidelines that all embrace?
- Does the governing framework cover the entire community and maintain strong relationships with neighboring communities and state agencies?
- Is there sustained support for coordinated transportation planning among elected officials, agency administrators, and other community leaders?
- Is there positive momentum? Is there growing interest in and commitment to coordinate human service transportation trips and maximize resources?

Section 1 Evaluation - After reviewing the questions and assessing our progress, my overall evaluation of how we’re doing in the area of Making Things Happen by Working Together is (check one)

- Needs to Begin
- Needs Action
- Significant Action
- Needs
- Done
- Well

Notes:
- Governing framework does not make coordination easy to accomplish. No easy way to pay for services across jurisdictional boundaries.
- Some key providers are not at the meeting
- Need to cross county lines – need joint powers committee crossing county lines
- Our system developed a new system and implemented in 2005. Further coordination is needed with others
- Cities do not bring together providers & agencies. Not aware of anything within region or county.
- Establish a commission/association that meets 4-6 times/year to problem solve, give guidance to counties to make improvements
- Every community is at a different place
• Providers, agencies and consumers have been brought together within subgroups: Aging, Disabilities, Public assistance, but subgroups have not come together.
• Improved communication between users and providers – involvement
• Educate public officials – require their participation
Section 2: Taking Stock of Community Needs and Moving Forward

Driving Factor - A completed and regularly updated community transportation assessment process identifies assets, expenditures, services provided, duplication of services, specific mobility needs of the various target populations, and opportunities for improvement. It assesses the capacity of human service agencies to coordinate transportation services. The assessment is used for planning and action.

- Is there an inventory of community transportation resources and programs that fund transportation services?
- Is there a process for identifying duplication of services, underused assets, and service gaps?
- Are the specific transportation needs of various target populations well documented?
- Has the use of technology in the transportation system been assessed to determine whether investment in transportation technology may improve services and/or reduce costs?
- Are transportation line items included in the annual budgets for all human service programs that provide transportation services?
- Have transportation users and other stakeholders participated in the community transportation assessment process?
- Is there a strategic plan with a clear mission and goals? Are the assessment results used to develop a set of realistic actions that improve coordination?
- Is clear data systematically gathered on core performance issues such as cost per delivered trip, ridership, and on-time performance? Is the data systematically analyzed to determine how costs can be lowered and performance improved?
- Is the plan for human services transportation coordination linked to and supported by other plans such as the Regional Transportation Plan, State Transportation Improvement Plan, human service program plans, and other state and local plans?
- Is data being collected on the benefits of coordination? Are the results communicated strategically?

Section 2 Evaluation - After reviewing the questions and assessing our progress, my overall evaluation of how we’re doing in the area of Taking Stock of Community Needs and Moving Forward is (check one)

- Needs to Begin
- Needs Action
- Significant Action
- Needs
- Done

Notes:
- Need overall report and need to involve all agencies who provide transportation – including non-profits
- Does Mayo provide money for rides?
• Have never seen an inventory of transportation providers
• Not aware of this being done
• There are numerous inventories
• There are a lot of underused assets in Nursing Homes
• Very little technology in use
• There are community efforts to coordinate but not a regional basis
• Aging program costs, service delivery, customer service are evaluated. Within other systems this holds true, however not shared regionally
• Improved technology – state database for everyone to access to find transportation – hosted by Mn/DOT
• Use today’s technology to coordinate transportation – GPS system
Section 3: Putting Customers First

Driving Factor - Customers including people with disabilities, older adults, and low-income riders have a convenient and accessible means of accessing information about transportation services. They are regularly engaged in the evaluation of services and identification of needs.

- Does the transportation system have an array of user-friendly and accessible information sources?
- Are travel training and consumer education programs available on an ongoing basis?
- Is there a seamless payment system that supports user-friendly services and promotes customer choice of the most cost-effective service?
- Are customer ideas and concerns gathered at each step of the coordination process? Is customer satisfaction data collected regularly?
- Are marketing and communications programs used to build awareness and encourage greater use of the services?

Section 3 Evaluation - After reviewing the questions and assessing our progress, my overall evaluation of how we’re doing in the area of **Putting Customers First** is (check one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Needs to Begin</th>
<th>Needs Action</th>
<th>Significant Action</th>
<th>Done Well</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- Lack of consistent reports on RIDES (ridership, hours, miles, deliveries, cost, etc)
- Mn/DOT and DHS --- tell Legislators
- Northfield DAR seems user friendly
- Tokens are more simplified
- Great service for people with cognitive disabilities
- Many ride who wouldn’t in a larger community
- From the clients who I work with seems to be a need for much greater information out of the public
- Need for after hours service: nights and weekends
- Is it realistic to pursue one fare system?
- More technology: there are separate systems. Within each, I believe there would be an accessible information
- Outreach to users that are non-English speaking
- Increase marketing of all transportation: database that allows advertising/improved directories supported by all participants.
Section 4: Adapting Funding for Greater Mobility

Driving Factor - Innovative accounting procedures are often employed to support transportation services by combining various state, federal, and local funds. This strategy creates customer friendly payment systems while maintaining consistent reporting and accounting procedures across programs.

- Is there a strategy for systematic tracking of financial data across programs?
- Is there an automated billing system in place that supports the seamless payment system and other contracting mechanisms?

Section 4 Evaluation - After reviewing the questions and assessing our progress, my overall evaluation of how we’re doing in the area of Adapting Funding for Greater Mobility is (check one)

Needs to Begin
Needs
Needs Action
Done

0
1
3
5

Notes:
- Believe financial and data is reported to death – State and Federal level needs to get together and agree on a method of putting information together.
Section 5: Moving People Efficiently

Driving Factors - Multimodal and multi-provider transportation networks are being created that are seamless for the customer but operationally and organizationally sound for the providers.

- Has an arrangement among diverse transportation providers been created to offer flexible services that are seamless to customers?
- Are support services coordinated to lower costs and ease management burdens?
- Is there a centralized dispatch system to handle requests for transportation services from agencies and individuals?
- Have facilities been located to promote safe, seamless, and cost-effective transportation services?

Section 5 Evaluation - After reviewing the questions and assessing our progress, my overall evaluation of how we’re doing in the area of Moving People Efficiently is (check one)

- Needs to Begin
- Needs Significant Action
- Needs Action
- Done Well

Notes:
- An example would be the Mayo Clinic Commuter system that allows transfers within downtown Rochester
- Look for opportunities to use a focal point or centralized dispatch system (for example: one dispatcher for all Semcac transportation)
- Establish county-wide dispatcher or one dispatcher for similar providers. (i.e. transportation providers who support persons with disabilities or one for all volunteer driver programs)
Public Transit – Human Services Coordination Workshop Evaluation

Date: 8/21/2006

For each item below, please circle the number/response that best expresses your opinion.

**20 surveys were distributed, of that, 17 were returned (85% response).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The exercises, group discussions, examples, and explanations made the information covered understandable.</td>
<td>0 2 5 5 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>88% agree to strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The meeting provided a good forum for communication about public/human services transportation coordination.</td>
<td>0 2 3 4 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>88% agree to strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Participants at the meeting were from a broad stakeholder group.</td>
<td>0 1 4 7 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>94% agree to strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The Framework For Action: Community Assessment Tool facilitated a meaningful discussion of the region’s status on public/human services transportation coordination.</td>
<td>0 3 7 5 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>82% agree to strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The region’s prioritized action plan is comprehensive and the actions realistic.</td>
<td>1 5 5 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64% strongly disagree to agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The region currently has a viable coordination process</td>
<td>2 9 3 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>82% strongly disagree to agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Developing the prioritized action plan was meaningful and valuable.</td>
<td>0 2 7 3 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>88% agree to strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I feel the coordination process in the region will be improved based on the assessment, action plan and priorities</td>
<td>0 4 5 2 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64% agree to strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The time allotted for the meeting was: too much about right not enough</td>
<td>2 14 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. List three key points/issues presented during the meeting that were the most valuable or useful.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Public Transit – Human Services Coordination Plan

- Clearer understanding of current programs/limitations
- Good contacts made
- Viable plan of action made
- Data base needs to be implemented
- Hearing points made by others, that was new to me
- Considering number of volunteer driver trips
- Importance of joint powers
- Knowledge of lack of coordinated central info – county to county and within counties
- Hearing of federal funded system constraints
- Consensus on challenges – resource development for volunteer transportation
- Decisions on priorities – gave insight on problem
- Ideas of some funding help from Mayo
- Provider coordination is started
- Mn/DOT as clearing house
- Regional coordination/discussion
- Convene an ongoing commission
- Develop statewide website for access to information
- Develop technology using GRS to add to coordination within counties
- Strong coordinated efforts to plan & coordinate transportation services at a regional level
- Centralized dispatching
- Improve communication between providers and clients
- Getting elected officials involved
- Many do not apply

11. List any information or meeting content you felt was omitted or needed further clarification.
   - This topic demands at least one more meeting to bring together a direction or plan
   - Whole process is very complex & convoluted. Will require a high degree of cooperation, planning & discussion.
   - The assessment tool seemed contrived
   - It hopefully will come out in the wash

The Facilitator

12. The facilitator was knowledgeable about the meeting process and Framework for Action tool. 0 2 3 4 7
    82% agree to strongly agree

13. The information was presented in a clear, logical format. 1 2 3 6 5
    82% agree to strongly agree

14. Other Comments:
   - Representation from Mayo and elected officials will help
   - Need more elected people
   - Priorities could easily be established through a nominal group process
   - Good job on keeping things rolling!