

## **SNOHOMISH COUNTY FORUM ON COORDINATION OF SPECIAL NEEDS TRANSPORTATION SERVICES**

**May 7, 2008, 10:00 A.M. – 2:00 P.M.  
Weyerhaeuser Room, Everett Station  
3201 Smith Avenue, Everett, WA**

**The Snohomish County Forum** was one of two regional forums held in May 2008 as part of the Special Needs Transportation Coordination Study sponsored by the Joint Transportation Committee (JTC) of the Washington State Legislature. A forum was also convened in Yakima on May 5, 2008. Two additional forums will be convened in September, as the project nears conclusion.

The primary goal of the two initial forums was to gather input from local stakeholders in four topic areas:

- (1) assess how well the special needs transportation system is working in their area;
- 2) identification of the greatest barriers to improved coordination in the system, both from the perspective of riders, and from the perspective of those agencies that are part of the transportation delivery network;
- (3) documentation of stakeholder ideas for overcoming these barriers; and
- (4) identification of system strengths and other ideas that could help improve special needs transportation services.

### **Agenda and Materials:**

The meeting agenda and materials were developed with input from staff representing the Snohomish County Special Needs Transportation Coalition (SNOTRAC), a coordinating council involved in special needs transportation planning in Snohomish County, as well as through discussions between the consultant team and JTC staff. These materials are included as **Attachment A**.

### **Attendees:**

The invitee list for the Snohomish meeting was also developed with the assistance of SNOTRAC. Invitations were sent to local transportation providers, city and county staff, human service agencies, school districts, advocacy groups and other stakeholders involved in planning for or delivering human service transportation. In addition, members of the Agency Council on Coordinated Transportation (ACCT) and the Community Transportation Association of America Northwest (CTAANW) were invited. Invitations were issued by e-mail to over 160 individuals on April 11, 2008, under a cover letter co-signed by Senators Mary Margaret Haugen and Representative Judy Clibborn, co-chairs of the JTC. Follow-up telephone calls were made to encourage attendance, and two reminder e-mails were also sent out. Special effort was made to invite transportation system users by contacting Everett Transit and the disAbility Resource Center in Everett.

Sixty (60) stakeholders attended the meeting, representing a broad spectrum of transportation providers, the Medicaid broker, state service agencies, local government representatives and local non-profit agencies working with persons with special needs. A

list of stakeholders attending the meeting is included as **Attachment C**. Three ACCT members as well as several state government representatives attended. Unlike Yakima County, the Snohomish Forum was also attended by representatives from Island, Skagit and King County transportation agencies. While this is reflective of important inter-county transit issues for this region, it also means that some from outside the county contributed to the forum discussions. Representatives from other counties were asked to respond to questions from the perspective of how those inter-county needs are being addressed, rather from their own jurisdictional needs.

### **Meeting Set-Up:**

As attendees signed in for the meeting, they were asked which of four categories they were best associated with: transportation riders; transportation providers; agencies serving special needs populations (other than transportation providers); and “other” (local government officials, state officials, etc.) Each attendee was then assigned to a specific table to assure that each table had a mix of participants representing different perspectives and experiences. There were eight tables of stakeholders, with six to eight stakeholders at each table. All three ACCT members in attendance were seated at a stakeholder table. State government representatives were seated at the back of the room as observers.

### **Deliberations:**

The forum facilitator, Karen Reed, (Karen Reed Consulting LLC) welcomed the group and provided an overview of the purposed of the study and the forum. All those present were then invited to introduce themselves and indicate the agency they worked for (if applicable) and their role in special needs transportation issues.

Senator Mary Margaret Haugen, Chair of the Senate Transportation Committee and Co-Chair of the JTC then gave opening remarks, focusing on the importance of special needs transportation and in effectively deploying scarce assets to meet these needs. Senator Haugen thanked the group for attending this meeting, noting that she believes it will be important in helping the State make decisions.

Connie Soper, Principal with Nelson\Nygaard Consulting and project manager for this study, gave a brief Power Point presentation to provide an overview of the purpose of the study, the goals of the four regional forums, and a “snapshot” of the special needs transportation system in Snohomish County.

### **First group exercise: *Assessing how well the system works today***

The entire group was asked to consider ten (10) characteristics of the special needs transportation system in Snohomish County, and to rate the condition of these characteristics by show of hands. The purpose of this exercise was to create a real-time group assessment of how the special needs transportation system is working in Snohomish County.

The ten (10) characteristics were divided into two sets. The first focused on how well the system is working for riders. The second focused on how well the system is working as a system. Ratings were requested on a scale of 1 through 5, with “1” being the lowest rating and “5” being the highest. “Don’t Know” was also a possible response.

The entire group was asked to consider ten (10) characteristics of the special needs transportation system in Snohomish County, and to rate the condition of these characteristics by show of hands. The purpose of this exercise was to create a real-time group assessment of how the special needs transportation system is working in Snohomish County. As noted above, since many attendees worked for transit or transportation agencies from adjacent counties, they were asked to tune their responses to this question from the perspective of how well they think the inter-county needs of riders (from their County to Snohomish County, or vice versa) are being met.

Results of the exercise are included as **Attachment B**, and are summarized below.

- Generally, the group rated the current special needs system *as it works for riders, below-average to average* (most ratings in the 2 and 3 range).
- The weakest ratings were for the availability of rides *where they are needed*, and for understanding of ride eligibility rules.
- The group rated the transportation system *as a system below average to somewhat above average* (most ratings in the 2 to 3 range).
- Inter-agency communication was rated highest of the four items.
- However, a large percentage of attendees voted “Don’t Know” to all four of the system issues, suggesting a need for ongoing stakeholder coordination and communication efforts.
- Approximately half the attendees indicated they are members of SNOTRAC.

### **Second group exercise: *Table Discussion and Report Out***

Each table was assigned to answer one of two questions, and given approximately 40 minutes to work through the question. Supporting worksheets were provided for both questions to assist in the tables in their deliberations (see **Attachment B**). The two questions posed were as follows:

**Question 1: What are the greatest barriers to effectiveness of the system from the perspective of riders? What are some ways to address these barriers?**

**Question 2: What are the greatest barriers to coordination within the transportation system? What are some ways to address these barriers?**

Each group selected a table captain to keep track of the deliberations of the group and report out at the end of the exercise. Groups were asked first to identify **three of the greatest barriers** relative to their specific question (*i.e.* barriers from the perspective of riders, *or* barriers to coordination within the system); they then selected one of these identified barriers and **posed three solutions** that could help alleviate or otherwise address this barrier. At the end of 40 minutes, table captains were asked to report out, limiting their remarks to 5 minutes or less.

Of the eight stakeholder tables, five were assigned to Question 1; three were assigned to Question 2. Results as reported out by the table captains are described below. Note that a few tables chose to identify more than three barriers and three solutions.

**Question 1: Most Significant Barriers to Riders**

*(Number of tables reporting: 5)*

| # of tables | Barrier   |
|-------------|---|
| 5           | Availability of service when and where needed. Specific concerns included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ADA eligibility geographic gaps</li> <li>• inter-county connections are cumbersome</li> <li>• trips take too long to complete, in part because multiple systems are involved, or because of the need to schedule multiple para-transit riders on a single trip</li> <li>• lack of funding for routes</li> <li>• lack of drivers</li> <li>• needs of shiftworkers</li> <li>• needs of rural residents</li> </ul> |
| 3           | System eligibility. The complexity of the system is overwhelming to riders; there are eligibility gaps, and the rules are confusing.  |
| 1           | Fares are too expensive   |
| 1           | Housing and services are not located close to transit routes  |
| 1           | Homelessness impacts on transit agencies - challenges of serving homeless families and children, esp. under McKinney Vento Act requirements.  |
| 1           | Information exchange between stakeholders is hindered by the lack of a global view about the needs of riders (of both the public and agencies).   |
| 1           | Some human services agencies resist offers of help with transportation training for clients.  |

**Question 2: Most Significant Barriers to System Coordination**

*(Number of tables reporting: 3)*

| # of tables | Priority Barriers  |
|-------------|--|
| 3           | Existence of multiple competing and overlapping transportation systems. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increases overhead costs at the expense of dollars available for services</li> <li>• Geographic boundaries between systems create both gaps and overlaps, resulting in public and private sector “turf issues”, making it harder to coordinate services.</li> <li>• System has too many rules and guidelines are too complicated for users</li> </ul> |
| 3           | Scarce resources: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “We need ‘more of everything’”—buses, routes, drivers, etc.</li> <li>• Lack of funding makes it difficult for agencies to reduce fares</li> <li>• Lack of funds makes it difficult to direct resources to underserved areas</li> </ul>  |
| 1           |  |

| # of tables | Priority Barriers  |
|-------------|--|
|             | Siting decisions for education and health facilities do not adequately account for transit needs of the clients of those facilities. |

**Table A** summarizes the response to the second part of each Question (1 and 2), in which tables were asked to *select a barrier and pose three ideas to address that barrier*.

**TABLE A: Ideas to Address Priority Barriers**

| <b>Question 1: Barriers to effectiveness of the system <u>from the perspective of riders</u></b> |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Table 1</b>   | <b><i>Barrier addressed: Eligibility and System Not Well Understood by Riders</i></b>  |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use caseworkers to assist with information exchange</li> <li>• Train the trainers and caseworkers to better understand transportation options and eligibility</li> <li>• Develop public awareness of options—place information on buses, vans; secure state funding for outreach; use billboards</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Table 2</b>   | <b><i>Barrier addressed: Eligibility Rules Not Well Understood by Riders</i></b>   |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase flexibility of federal dollars by securing waivers of federal rules</li> <li>• Create a central information point for riders and agencies—a regional “mobility manager”</li> <li>• Use coalitions such as SNOTRAC as a clearinghouse for data</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Table 3</b>   | <b><i>Barrier addressed: Increase System Capacity</i></b>  |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide more flexible funding to address multiple needs, support additional routes and additional drivers</li> <li>• Work to understand customer needs and how they differ in each county</li> <li>• Hold public forums to learn about public needs and then respond to what is learned</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Table 4</b>   | <b><i>Barrier addressed: Multiple Systems Required to Complete Trips</i></b>   |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transportation training should be included in AARP defensive driving classes.</li> <li>• Caseworkers should be trained in transportation issues—make it easy for them as they have little time; a challenge here is the caseworkers are funded through human services budgets, not transportation budgets.</li> <li>• Mimic Portland’s “umbrella system” with multiple transportation entities under a single umbrella coordinator agency.</li> </ul> |
| <b>Table 5</b>   | <b><i>Barrier addressed: Trips Take Too Long</i></b>   |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Merge transportation systems.</li> <li>• Make systems seamless—borders shouldn’t be barriers</li> <li>• Create a regional bus system should be so operators aren’t overly focused on one jurisdiction or another.</li> <li>• Improve siting decisions to ensure affordable housing and needed services have good transit access</li> </ul>  |

| <b>Question 2: Barriers to coordination <u>within</u> the transportation system</b> |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Table 6</b>  | <b><i>Barrier addressed: Need for better Geographic Coordination between System Operators</i></b>   |
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Educate the community generally, as well as agencies and riders, as to who can assist in coordinating between areas and who can help plan inter-county trips</li> <li>• Manage expectations of riders, especially as to Medicaid eligible riders and the paratransit system.</li> <li>• Convene small meetings with groups of special needs riders with similar needs for focused outreach and training. This would be a more productive and beneficial use of rider time. The coordinating agency (SNOTRAC) should host these meetings.</li> <li>• Provide travel ambassadors with instruction on the fixed route system</li> <li>• Fund special mobility caseworkers.</li> </ul> |
| <b>Table 7</b>  | <b><i>Barrier addressed: Need More Resources</i></b>  |
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State and federal government must fund mandates associated with transportation</li> <li>• Provide agencies with incentives to coordinate</li> <li>• Provide riders with incentives to use transit –this will increase system sustainability.</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Table 8</b>  | <b><i>Barrier addressed: Need for Better Information Sharing, System Coordination Generally</i></b>   |
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expand the capacity of the 211 system to provide transportation information</li> <li>• Create venues for transportation agencies and human service providers to meet together to solve problems</li> <li>• Make it easier to agencies to share riders –both public and private agencies and public and private dollars: cooperative payment agreements are needed</li> <li>• Expand the SNOTRAC website to facilitate interagency communication and ideas, and serve as a clearinghouse for information.</li> <li>• Educate the public and clients through multiple formats</li> <li>• Fund a “transportation ombudsman”</li> </ul>  |

*Note: Table numbers above do not correlate to the numbers assigned individual tables at the meeting.*

As illustrated in **Table A**, themes that emerged from this exercise include:

- The need for more service and more resources to provide those services.
- The need for greater understanding of transportation systems by riders, the public, and agencies –options, eligibility rules, routes.
- The importance of the role of human services agencies in connecting transportation systems to special needs riders.

- The need to increase coordination of systems. The idea of consolidating multiple transportation systems into a single agency came up frequently as an idea to address coordination.

During the reporting out for this agenda item, there were two extended discussions by the group. The first related to **challenges related to the siting of affordable and special needs housing and needed services away from fixed-route transit access**. It was noted that there are many situations where affordable housing, special needs housing, employment, medical services, shopping services or educational facilities are sited in places not close to transit routes. Among the ideas identified were:

- Requiring major developers to meet with transit planners in advance of permitting;
- Taking steps to increase the linkage between facility planning and transit route planning;
- Having local government complete (in advance of development) studies on transportation needs associated with various geographies and special needs populations in order to expedite permitting.

There was also an extended discussion about the **challenges of getting transportation information to clients of human services agencies**. It was noted that this was often seen as a “non-core” task for human services agencies that simply added to caseworker workloads without resources to accomplish the task. The question was generally posed: **how can we engage human services agencies better?** Suggestions included:

- Require transportation agencies to include human services agencies in their budget planning
- Create opportunities for cross-discipline discussions between transit and human services agencies
- Train special “transportation case-workers” to be available to individual clients
  - in response to this idea, one attendee, an individual with special transportation needs, noted that this idea would put a greater burden on the client who would then have to deal with multiple case workers.
- Make transportation information more easily available to caseworkers and clients alike through the 211 system or other means
- Improve the SNOTRAC website to create a “moving blog” to identify and track issues and solutions
- Educate legislators about the need to consider transportation when thinking about human services
- Use the Community Transit CD/video on “how to ride the bus”
- Explain “what’s in it for them” (the caseworker) to learn about the transportation options.

### **Closing Discussion: *Open Forum***

The final 30 minutes of the meeting were dedicated to an “open forum.” Attendees were asked to focus their responses on two questions:

- **Because it is often helpful to improve a system by building on its strengths: what is one thing which works well now in Snohomish County’s special needs transportation system?**
- **What is one change you think could make a substantial improvement in the way transportation for people with special needs is provided in Snohomish County?**

There were many interesting responses from attendees; they are grouped below by: (a) ideas about ACCT; (b) ideas about things that are working well in Snohomish County and neighboring counties, (c) ideas that could make a substantial improvement in the transportation system in the Snohomish region, and (d) other.

#### Ideas about ACCT:

1. How can ACCT be more relevant? It would be helpful to do more forums around the state like this, not just meet in Olympia.
2. ACCT has done a very good job, given limited resources and the continual expansion of their role by the legislature. They should be given additional funding.
3. ACCT isn’t effective because it is not locally connected to issues. The state should put authority and money back in local hands to increase the speed and effectiveness to which the money can be applied.

#### Things that are working particularly well in Snohomish County and neighboring counties:

4. The current coordinating council—SNOTRAC, is well funded and a committed group. This is a positive for the County.
5. Volunteer transportation programs are working well, filling important gaps in service. They could be further supported with additional money for driver retention.
6. The Island County transit “Fare Free” program eliminates barriers between systems and is a model that other counties may want to look at.
7. The Medicaid Broker in Snohomish County is working well; we could expand their services to cover other areas such as information technology or monitoring activity.
8. Community Transit’s bus rider training is a good tool that we can use in Snohomish County.
9. SNOTRAC is a success: we should keep funding it.

#### Ideas that could significantly improve transportation in Snohomish County:

10. Restore demonstration project funding.
11. Increasing demand for McKinney-Vento services: we need additional funding for homeless student transit.
12. We should strive to share trips where appropriate, but be sensitive to the needs and issues of individual riders.
13. SNOTRAC ambassadors could be transportation caseworkers.
14. Para-transit riders and veterans should be able to ride fixed route services for free.
15. Develop a shared trip cost model to enhance hared ride use.
16. Increase integration of program rules—CTR, employers, van pools—how can we use these programs and assets for persons with special needs?

17. DART should use card cash meters.
18. The Enhanced Washington ID card should be augmented to indicate ride program eligibility.

Other:

19. Forty percent of Snohomish County's population fits the definition of persons with special needs.
20. Funding for transportation should be proportionate to the populations served.
21. Consider mental health issues and how these clients need transportation services (Mental Health trips are the largest user of the Medicaid System –21% of 3.2 million trips).
22. Recruitment and retention of drivers is a common issue here.
23. Para-transit services have helped me live independently and stay employed in this County.

### **Closing Remarks**

Karen thanked the group for their time and input today. Attendees were encouraged to complete the meeting survey forms provided.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

### **Attachments:**

- A. Agenda and Materials**
- B. Group Ratings of Transportation System: Results**
- C. Meeting Attendees**

**ATTACHMENT A: MEETING AGENDA AND MATERIALS**

**Regional Forum on Coordination of Special Needs Transportation Services**

**May 7, 2008  
10:00 A.M. – 2:00 P.M.  
Weyerhaeuser Room  
Everett Station, Everett, WA**

**AGENDA**

- 1. Welcome and Introductions, Opening Comments (20 minutes)**
- 2. Presentation: Overview of Special Needs Transportation Services in Snohomish County (15 minutes)**
- 3. General Ratings from Attendees: Assessing how well the special needs transportation system works today (40 minutes)**
- 4. Table Discussion and Report Out (1 hour 45 minutes, including lunch)**
  - a. What are the greatest barriers to effectiveness of the system from the perspective of people who depend on the system? What are some ways to address these barriers?***
  - b. What are the greatest barriers to coordination within the transportation system? What are some ways to address these barriers?***
- 5. Open Forum: Tell us what you think we should know about making the system work better (30 minutes)**
- 6. Wrap up and Closing Comments (10 minutes)**

## REGIONAL FORUM ON COORDINATION OF SPECIAL NEEDS TRANSPORTATION SERVICES

Snohomish, WA, May 7, 2008

### DISCUSSION GUIDE

1. **Welcome and Introductions. Opening Comments** (20 minutes)
2. **Presentation: Overview of Special Needs Transportation Services in Snohomish County.** (15 minutes)
3. **Assessing how well the system works today** (40 minutes)

**Part 1:** How well do transportation services in Snohomish County meet the mobility needs of older adults, youth, persons with disabilities, and those with limited incomes?

Instructions: By show of hands, rate each item 1-5, with 5 being highest (i.e., you agree strongly with this statement) (“don’t know” is also a possible response)

- a. Rides are available when they are needed
- b. Rides are available where they are needed
- c. Riders know how to get information they need to plan for, schedule and make a trip
- d. The system is responsive to complaints, questions and suggestions from riders with special needs
- e. Eligibility for transportation programs is well understood by riders and those assisting them
- f. Connections between systems (bus, van, commuter rail, ferries, inter-county) are efficient.

**Part 2:** How well do agencies and programs within the special needs transportation system work together in Snohomish County?

Instructions: Again, by show of hands, rate each item 1-5, with 5 being the highest—i.e. you agree strongly with this statement. (don’t know” is a possible response)

- a. Agencies providing general services for special needs riders work well with transportation agencies.
- b. Transportation providers effectively share assets and information with each other to maximize services and minimize duplication.
- c. Federal and state transportation funding can be flexibly applied where it is most needed.
- d. There is common agreement between agencies that are part of the system as to the biggest challenges facing the system, and how to address these challenges.

#### **4. Table Discussion and Report Out**

(1 hour 45 minutes, including lunch)

**Question 1: What are the greatest barriers to effectiveness of the system from the perspective of riders? What are some ways to address these barriers?**

**Question 2: What are the greatest barriers to coordination within the transportation system? What are some ways to address these barriers?**

Instructions: Each table will be assigned either Question 1 or 2. You will have 40 minutes total for discussion at the table, then each table will report out.

Step 1. **Select a volunteer to serve as table captain.** He or she will track your table's discussions, writing down conclusions on the form provided, and be the spokesperson for the table for reporting out. It may also be helpful to have a timekeeper.

Step 2. Working with others at your table, **identify the three (3) most significant barriers** for your Question topic. (20 minute for this part of the discussion).

- If your table is assigned to Question 1—see page 4 for some ideas of system effectiveness barriers. Your group may choose to highlight other barriers.
- If your table is assigned Question 2—see page 5 for some ideas of system coordination barriers. Your group may choose to highlight other barriers.

Step 3. Working with those at your table, **pick one (1) barrier and identify three (3) potential solutions** to address this barrier (20 minutes).

Step 4. When you are done identifying solutions, pick up your lunch, and we will start with table reporting out (5 minutes maximum per table)

**5. Open Forum: Tell us what you think we should know about making the system work better** (30 Minutes—3 minute maximum per speaker)

**We are asking for feedback on one or both of the following questions:**

- ***Because it is often helpful to improve a system by building on its strengths: what is one thing which works well now in Snohomish County's special needs transportation system?***
- ***What is one change you think could make a substantial improvement in the way transportation for people with special needs is provided in Snohomish County?***

**6: Wrap up and Closing Comments** (10 minutes)

**Question 1: BARRIERS FOR RIDERS**

| #  | Item   | Rating: <b>High / Medium / Low</b> – <i>how important is addressing this barrier to improving the system?</i> |
|----|--|---|
| 1  | People don't know how to access the system                                       |   |
| 2  | Rides don't take people where they need to go                                    |   |
| 3  | Service is not available when it is needed                                       |   |
| 4  | Rural riders are under-served  |   |
| 5  | Inter-County connections are weak  |   |
| 6  | Intra-County connections between suburban areas are weak                         |   |
| 7  | Multiple systems must be used to get to where people want to go                  |   |
| 8  | Housing is located away from transit service                                     |   |
| 9  | Housing is located where there are no sidewalks or pedestrian friendly amenities |   |
| 10 | Needed services—medical or other—are not located close to transit routes         |   |
| 11 | Bus shelters do not accommodate needs of riders                                  |   |
| 12 | Users are afraid to ride the bus   |   |
| 13 | Program eligibility rules are confusing  |   |
| 14 | Users twill not use the bus if they can get a personal trip service              |   |
|    | OTHER:   |   |

**Selected Barrier for further discussion:**

---

—

**Ideas for removing or diminishing this barrier:**

1.

2.

3.

**Question 2: BARRIERS INSIDE THE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM**

| # | Item   | Rating: <b>High / Medium / Low</b> – <i>how important is addressing this barrier to improving the system?</i> |
|---|--|---|
| 1 | Service providers are unaware of how to better share their assets when under-utilized                    |   |
| 2 | Service providers are unwilling to share under-utilized assets   |   |
| 3 | More transportation vehicles are needed  |   |
| 4 | Providers can't find skilled drivers   |   |
| 5 | Providers sometimes can't insure skilled drivers or potential volunteers                                 |   |
| 6 | Funding is too constrained to target gaps and problems as they arise                                     |   |
| 7 | There is a disconnect or distrust between human services agencies and transportation service providers   |   |
| 8 | Special needs housing and services siting decisions are disconnected from transportation system planning |   |
| 9 | There is no inventory of system assets and expertise to call on for problem solving or other purposes    |   |
|   | OTHER:   |   |

**Selected Barrier for further discussion:**

---

–

**Ideas for removing or diminishing this barrier:**

- 1.
  
- 2.
  
- 3.

**ATTACHMENT B: Group Ratings of Transportation System in Snohomish County: Results**

Matrixes below show responses of attendees, by show of hands. A rating of “5” is the highest/most positive rating. Shaded cells show the 2 largest number of respondents for each question.

**Part 1: How well do transportation services in Snohomish County meet the mobility needs of older adults, youth, persons with disabilities and those with limited incomes?**

| RATING:  | 1 | 2  | 3  | 4 | 5 | Don't Know |
|--|---|----|----|---|---|------------|
| <b>Rides available <i>when</i> needed</b>                  | 0 | 14 | 18 | 4 | 1 | 8          |
| <b>Rides available <i>where</i> needed</b>                 | 3 | 20 | 15 | 1 | 1 | 7          |
| <b>Riders know how to get information needed to travel</b> | 2 | 19 | 15 | 2 | 2 | 8          |
| <b>System is responsive to rider input</b>                 | 1 | 15 | 15 | 6 | 0 | 13         |
| <b>Eligibility well understood</b>                         | 9 | 21 | 9  | 0 | 2 | 8          |
| <b>Connections between systems are efficient</b>           | 9 | 17 | 11 | 7 | 0 | 5          |

**Part 2: How well do agencies and programs within the special needs transportation system work together in Snohomish County?**

| RATING:   | 1 | 2  | 3  | 4 | 5 | Don't Know |
|---|---|----|----|---|---|------------|
| <b>Service agencies work well with transportation agencies</b>                              | 1 | 4  | 21 | 7 | 0 | 13         |
| <b>Providers share assets and information to maximize services and minimize duplication</b> | 1 | 13 | 15 | 3 | 1 | 16         |
| <b>Federal and state funding can be flexibly applied as needed</b>                          | 6 | 20 | 2  | 1 | 1 | 16         |
| <b>Agreement on biggest challenges and how to address them</b>                              | 3 | 13 | 12 | 5 | 0 | 16         |

ATTACHMENT C: MEETING ATTENDEES

Snohomish County Forum      May 7, 2008

| <u>Name</u>                  | <u>Agency</u>             | <u>E mail</u>                       |
|------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Kristi Duggen                | Island Transit            | duggen@islandtransit.org            |
| Steve Parker                 | Lake Stevens SD           | Stephen.Parker@lkstevens.wednet.edu |
| Margaret Fowler              | Paratransit Rider         | ladybugfowler@yahoo.com             |
| Senator Mary Margaret Haugen | State Senate              |                                     |
| Cathy Dilina                 | WSDOT                     |                                     |
| John Dierke                  | Paratransit rider         | johnmphoto@verizon.net              |
| PAUL MOURY                   | OSHS MEDICAID             | MEURITA@OSHS.WA.GOV                 |
| KATHRYN LEATHERS             | HOUSE TRANSPORTATION      | leathers.kathryn@leg.wa.gov         |
| Coey Gilletland              | Stillaguamish Tribe       | coeyll@comcast.net                  |
| Margaret Casey               | Aging & Disability Serv.  | margaret.casey@seattleu.org         |
| Lee Schopler                 | Community Transit         | lees@schopler.com                   |
| Judy Abernethy               | Service Alternatives      | joab@STARCWA.COM                    |
| B.D. Smith                   | Everett Transit           | bsmith@ci.everett.com               |
| Cheryl Jones                 | SNOTRAL                   | cjones@voaww.org                    |
| Andy Stallsworth             | OSHS Evt. CSO             | Stallmed@oshs.wa.gov                |
| Dorothy Spinet               | EV Transit                |                                     |
| Michael Miller               | Sound Transit             | michael.miller@soundtransit.org     |
| Mary Jane Wynn               | WDCSC                     | maryjane.brell@duke.edu             |
| Marilynn Fiscus              | Skagit Transit            | mfiscus@skagittransit.org           |
| Jim Seeks                    | Northshore Sr Ctr Transp. | jims@seniorservices.org             |
| Anna Esquivel                | OSPI                      | aesquivel@esd189.org                |
| Lindsey Legaspi              | Snoh. Cty H.S.            | lindsey.legaspi@snco.org            |
| Joe Barron                   |                           |                                     |
| Jaymie Carpenter             |                           |                                     |
| Robert Knight                | St. Cloud Senior Agency   | RKNTD@earthlink.net                 |
| Mary Pat Lawlor              | PSRC                      | mlawlor@psrc.org                    |

| <u>Name</u>           | <u>Agency</u>                       | <u>E-mail</u>                       |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Alyllis Brett         | Island Transit                      | brette@islandtransit.org            |
| Michael Shephard      | Lake Stevens School Dist            | Mike_Shephard@lkschools.wa.us       |
| Andrew Le             | DSHS-DVR                            | lea@dshs.wa.gov                     |
| Marge Tully           | Pierce County C.S.                  | mtully@co.pierce.wa.us              |
| Sandy Rubini          | Island Transit                      | <del>sas@islandtransit.org</del>    |
| Michelle Johnson      | Stanwood Comm. Center               | sas@islandtransit.org               |
| MANC AUNI             | Center                              | m.johnson@stanwoodcenter.org        |
| MANC AUNI             | EAST COUNTY SENIOR CENTER           | mancauni@eastcountyseniorcenter.org |
| KELLY SIMPSON         | SENIOR TRANS. COMM.                 | Simpson.Kelly@ey.wa.gov             |
| Karl Stern            | Lake Stevens SD                     | Karl_stern@lkschools.wa.us          |
| Mariannette Henderson | DART                                | grandmotherhouse@msn.com            |
| Nicole Mack           | CCS                                 | nicolemack@ccsw.org                 |
| Ann MARDAN            | Disability Resources                | annm@dreamline.net                  |
| Gene Baxstrom         | JTC                                 | baxstrom_ge@ly.wa.gov               |
| Shirley Allen         | Mercy Transportation                | Shirley@mercytransportation.net     |
| Sandy Scherman        | SNOTRAC / VOAWW                     | SSCHURMAN@ronaw.org                 |
| Stetanie Novacek      | Sno County LTCA                     | s.novacek@co.snohomish.wa.us        |
| Katie Kuciemba        | Sno County Exec. Office             | Katie.Kuciemba@snocounty.gov        |
| Meg Strong            | Sno. Co. Developmental Disabilities | meg_strong@snohomish.wa.us          |
| Peter Thein           | WA. State Transit Assoc.            | Peter@wastatransit.com              |
| Rhonda Rinn           | DSHS Snokey PTCSO                   | rinnr@dshs.wa.gov                   |
| Sue Dedrick           | Everett Public Schools              | sdedrick@everettsd.edu              |
| Jessy Stevens         | Stillegomish T.S. / SNOTRAC         | jessy.stevens@hotmail.com           |
| BILL MAHAN            | PARATRANSIT SERVICES                | BILLMAHANC@hotmail.com              |
| Lynn Moody            | Hopelink                            | lmoody@hope-link.org                |
| Teresa Williams       | Paratransit Services                | tjw@paratransit.net                 |

| <u>Name</u>            | <u>Agency</u>         | <u>Email</u>                  |
|------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------|
| Marilyn Mason-Blunkett | Hopelink              | marilynmpe@hope-link.org      |
| Marion Davis           | Snocty Em. Management | MDavis@co.snohomish.wa.us     |
| Janet Davis            | SnoCount Worksource   | jdavis@esd.wa.gov             |
| Lev ARON               | LWTC                  | leonard.aron@lwtc.edu         |
| Mike Manley            | Snohomish Co.         | m.manley@co.snohomish.wa.us   |
| Walaya Sharple         | Mukilton SD           | sharplewm@mukilton.wednet.edu |