
The Coordination Dilemma

Interagency Committee on Transit Coordination

September 22, 2005

Hal Freshley
Minnesota Board on Aging

Transportation Coordination

Transportation consistently ranks as one of the top service “gaps” in MN

2001 Service Gaps

1. Transportation
2. Respite
3. Chore

2003 Service Gaps

1. Transportation
2. Chore
3. Respite

Transportation Coordination

Admiring the problem . . .

- ✓ Different “systems” (e.g., public transit, special transit)
- ✓ Different goals (e.g., work commute, medical appointments, social integration)
- ✓ Different target groups (e.g., elderly, developmentally delayed, children, poor)
- ✓ Different standards (.e.g., training, safety, vehicle design)

Transportation Coordination



What “feels wrong” at the local level...

- ✓ Despite local transportation system, “you can’t get there from here”
- ✓ Spectre of bigger demand in the future
- ✓ Local elected official sees vans go by empty, or publicly subsidized vehicles “sitting idle”
- ✓ Health care provider pays \$23 round trip, bus would cost \$3

Transportation Coordination

Why “coordination”?

- ✓ Economies of scale—not enough money to run separate systems for very small target groups
- ✓ Get more rides out of existing vehicles—less down time
- ✓ More efficient dispatching—get more people on each vehicle
- ✓ Provide rides across county lines, from one “area” to another
- ✓ MORE ...

Transportation Coordination



CURRENT INITIATIVES . . .

- ✓ Federal: *United We Ride* initiative to promote transportation coordination, especially between Public Transportation and Human Services transportation
- ✓ State: Mn/DOT, DHS, Center for Transportation Studies -- various initiatives to research and demonstrate feasible models
- ✓ Local: Individual Transportation Coordination Projects all across the state