

BEAR RIVER COORDINATED HUMAN SERVICE TRANSPORTATION PLAN

2015



“To sustain and improve access and mobility for transportation underserved populations in the Bear River Region.”

The Bear River Regional Access & Mobility Council

Bear River Association of Governments
170 N Main, Logan, Utah 84321
435-752-7242
PLAN AMENDED - AUGUST 2015

Bear River Regional Access & Mobility Council

To sustain and improve access and mobility for transportation underserved populations in the Bear River Region

BRAG
Bear River Association of Governments
Box Elder
Cache
Rich
Serving Utah's Bear River Region for over 40 years

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents	ii
1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1-1
OVERVIEW.....	1-1
PROCESS & OBJECTIVES.....	1-1
THE PURPOSE OF THIS PLAN.....	1-2
MAJOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS IN THE REGION.....	1-2
2 DEMOGRAPHICS.....	2-1
U.S CENSUS DEMOGRAPHICS – BOX ELDER COUNTY, UTAH	2-1
U.S CENSUS DEMOGRAPHICS – CACHE COUNTY, UTAH	2-4
U.S CENSUS DEMOGRAPHICS – RICH COUNTY, UTAH	2-6
3 AVAILABLE SERVICES/CAPITAL.....	3-1
LOCAL AREA CONDITIONS AND AVAILABLE TRANSPORTATION SERVICES	3-1
PUBLIC TRANSIT PROVIDERS	3-1
MAJOR HUMAN SERVICE TRANSPORTATION PROVIDERS.....	3-1
OTHER HUMAN SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS	3-3
4 TRANSPORTATION COORDINATION STRATEGIES	4-1
RECOMMENDED GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND TARGETS.....	4-1
GOAL 1: INCREASE THE CAPACITY OF LOCAL HUMAN SERVICE AND PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION ORGANIZATIONS TO COLLABORATIVELY MEET SHARED GOALS.....	4-1
GOAL 2: INCREASE ACCESS AND MOBILITY FOR TRANSPORTATION DISADVANTAGED POPULATIONS.....	4-2
GOAL 3: HOLD CONSTANT THE AVERAGE COST OF PROVIDING TRANSPORTATION SO THAT RESOURCES CAN BE USED AS EFFECTIVELY AS POSSIBLE	4-3
GOAL 4: CONTRIBUTE TO IMPROVEMENTS IN AIR QUALITY IN THE BEAR RIVER REGION.....	4-3
GOAL 5: MAINTAIN A HEALTHY AND SUSTAINABLE HUMAN SERVICE TRANSPORTATION NETWORK	4-3
STRATEGY 1: FORMALIZE A REGIONAL COORDINATING COUNCIL	4-3
IMPACT OF REGIONAL COORDINATING COUNCIL.....	4-4
SUPPORT FOR A BRAG MOBILITY MANAGEMENT TEAM	4-4
STRATEGY 2: INFORMATION & REFERRAL	4-5
WEBSITE AND ONLINE RESOURCE GUIDE.....	4-5
OPEN ACCESS BUSINESS ADVOCACY CAMPAIGN	4-5
CIRCUIT MOBILITY MANAGER	4-5
IMPACT OF INFORMATION & REFERRAL PROGRAM	4-6
STRATEGY 3: SUPPORT & EXPAND VOLUNTEER DRIVER PROGRAMS.....	4-6
IMPACT OF SUPPORTING AND EXPANDING VOLUNTEER DRIVER PROGRAMS	4-6
STRATEGY 4: IMPLEMENTATION OF RETIRED, SHARED VEHICLE PROGRAMS	4-7
RETIRED VEHICLE PROGRAM	4-7
AD HOC VEHICLE SHARING	4-8
STRATEGY 5: IMPLEMENTATION OF A FLEXIBLE VOUCHER PROGRAM	4-8
IMPACT OF A FLEX VOUCHER PROGRAM	4-8
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE BRAG FLEXIBLE VOUCHER PROGRAM	4-8
CASE STUDY EXAMPLES	4-9
RECOMMENDED STRUCTURE.....	4-9
FUNDING	4-11
NEXT STEPS.....	4-12
STRATEGY 6: RESOURCE SHARING AMONG ORGANIZATIONS	4-12
SPEAKING A COMMON LANGUAGE: COLLABORATIVELY DEFINING SHARED FINANCIAL RECORD KEEPING PROCEDURES	4-12

BRAG Coordinated Human Service Transportation Plan

IMPACT OF SHARED FINANCIAL RECORD KEEPING PROCEDURES.....4-12
POOLED INSURANCE.....4-13
IMPACT OF POOLED INSURANCE.....4-13
POOLED MAINTENANCE4-13
IMPACT OF POOLED MAINTENANCE4-13
COMBINED IMPACT OF RESOURCE SHARING AMONG ORGANIZATIONS4-13
STRATEGY 7: INTER-REGIONAL 5311 PROGRAM.....4-14
EXPLORE CACHE/BOX ELDER 5311 PROGRAM4-14
STRATEGY 8: CONTRIBUTE TO IMPROVED AIR QUALITY4-14
AIR QUALITY4-14
STRATEGY 9: MAINTAIN A HEALTHY/SUSTAINABLE HUMAN SERVICE TRANSPORTATION NETWORK.....4-14
MAINTAIN SERVICE & FUNDING LEVELS.....4-14

5 IMPLEMENTATION PRIORITIES/SCHEDULE..... 5-1

INTRODUCTION5-1
PHASING5-1
IMMEDIATE.....5-1
MEDIUM TERM5-2
LONG TERM5-2
IMPLEMENTATION PLAN5-2
FIVE-YEAR IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE5-2
STRATEGY 1: FORMALIZE REGIONAL COORDINATING COUNCIL, CONTINUE QUARTERLY MEETINGS AND PROJECT DEVELOPMENT
.....5-3
STRATEGY 2: INFORMATION & REFERRAL5-3
STRATEGY 3: SUPPORT & EXPAND VOLUNTEER DRIVER PROGRAMS5-3
STRATEGY 4: EXPLORE RETIRED, SHARED VEHICLE PROGRAMS5-3
STRATEGY 5: DEVELOP FLEXIBLE VOUCHER PROGRAM. IF SUCCESSFUL CONTINUE PROGRAM5-3
STRATEGY 6: RESOURCE SHARING AMONG ORGANIZATIONS.....5-3
STRATEGY 7: INTER-REGIONAL 5311 PROGRAM5-3
STRATEGY 8: AIR QUALITY.....5-3
STRATEGY 9: MAINTAIN A HEALTHY/SUSTAINABLE HUMAN SERVICE TRANSPORTATION NETWORK5-3

6 TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS AND APPLICATION SCHEDULE..... 6-1

INTRODUCTION6-1
TRANSPORTATION PROJECT LIST/APPLICATION SCHEDULE.....6-1

APPENDIX A – PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT/PROJECT PARTNERS

1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

OVERVIEW

The Bear River Region, like many areas throughout the United States, is experiencing a growing need for transportation services catering to transportation disadvantaged populations. Increasing fuel prices coupled with a half century of low density land use development have increased the cost of and need for transportation services. Economic and demographic trends including the Great Recession and aging of the Baby Boomer generation continue to increase the number of individuals who are unable to use conventional modes of transportation to access jobs, services, and education within their communities.

The Bear River Association of Governments has successfully implemented several human service transportation projects in the region thanks to the support and guidance of the Bear River Regional Access & Mobility Council. Projects of note include the implementation of a Medical Voucher Program and a Mobility Voucher Program for Families that both provide transportation reimbursement to disadvantaged populations in rural areas of the region.

These projects are the direct result of coordination and planning in the region to help fill a critical gap in transportation services for individuals living in rural areas of the region. Implementation of a flexible voucher program was the highest priority of human service agencies in the region and these services are providing critical trips for a fraction of the cost of ADA Para transit or other public/private transportation service options.

PROCESS & OBJECTIVES

Human service transportation planning and coordination is an active and ongoing pursuit. In the Bear River Region, the Bear River Access & Mobility Council is actively and consistently engaged in future planning of the region. This body of stakeholders made up of various human service agencies, transportation planners and the public, provide information regarding the current state of transportation in the region, and help identify service gaps or future projects that will continue to meet the needs of transportation disadvantaged persons in the region.

The goals of this planning group include the following:

- **Stakeholder Engagement:** Members of the council continue to identify issues and opportunities for human service transportation in the region. This provides a forum for development and review of coordinated plan goals and strategies, and allows agencies the opportunity to coordinate future projects and funding request with the Federal Transit Administration (FTA).
- **Planning:** The purpose of coordinated planning is to identify and understand the current and future transportation needs in the region. Planning allows agencies to identify new projects or opportunities in the region, or simply identify how to maintain an existing healthy human service transportation system.
- **Focusing on opportunities:** Stakeholders have experienced several years of declining funding and are operating pretty efficiently, but still see areas where coordination could achieve additional efficiencies so that service levels can remain steady or grow. The council continues to identify solutions to either service or funding gaps through coordination and recommendations for mobility management activities.
- **Implementation:** The goal of coordinated planning includes the development of different project types and includes the expected time frame of implementation for various goals and strategies.
- **Program & Project Review:** Programs should always be evaluated for their performance and whether they continue to meet the needs of intended user groups, and whether they are sustainable over time with changes in transportation policies and/or funding. The council actively engages targeted populations and identifies needs and solutions to meet the ever changing mobility needs in the region.

THE PURPOSE OF THIS PLAN

Human Service transportation planning in the Bear River Region is consistent and highly productive. Stakeholders are actively engaged in regularly scheduled meetings and continue to review and revise project goals and strategies to meet the needs of the region. For this purpose, coordinated transportation plans are a living and ever changing document. This plan provides useful demographics, goals and strategies, and detailed project lists to meet service gaps in the region. As such, it is regularly updated as new goals are identified, and/or new project needs are brought to light through planning and issue identification. However, to truly understand the state of transportation in the region, interested persons are invited to participate in the Bear River Access & Mobility Council. To find out how to become involved in human service transportation planning, please contact a representative from this group at www.bearrivermobiltiy.org

Successful planning efforts over the past several years established the groundwork for the structure of coordination in the region. All projects and strategies referenced in this plan were considered priorities by the Bear River Access and Mobility Council and formulated through several public workshops and meetings with agencies, stakeholders, local elected leaders, and the public.

Priorities are expected to change on a yearly basis in response to need and other unforeseen changes. However, all projects and strategies referenced in this plan are part of the regional goal to improve access and mobility for all who live and work in the region, with emphasis on those individuals who are transportation disadvantaged and are eligible recipients of federally funded matching programs for transportation service and coordination.

MAJOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS IN THE REGION

In early 2013, BRAG began the process of developing an innovative non-emergency medical flexible transportation voucher program specifically targeted at helping individuals who were not being served by current transportation resources in the region. The flex voucher program was developed to allow eligible participants to purchase non-emergency medical trips from a provider of their choice.

The strategy is designed to:

- Allow the participant to retain their independence and ability to choose the transportation service that best suits their needs.
- Reimburse volunteer drivers, friends, family members or neighbors for rides in private vehicles.

The general structure of the BRAG Flex Voucher Program is as follows:

- BRAG serves as the program administrator. This involves coordinating with partnering / referring organizations, participant and trip eligibility determination, issuing flex vouchers, and reimbursing trip providers.
- The customer arranges for the particular mode of travel and provides vouchers to an eligible provider or driver.
- The eligible driver accepts the voucher as payment for the rides provided and redeems the voucher for the cash value from the BRAG program administrator.

In early 2014, BRAG received a competitive grant award from the Utah Department of Workforce Services, TANF Grant. This program allows eligible participants living in Rich or Box Elder County, to receive transportation reimbursement for approved trips related to:

- Employment/Training Activities
- Job Search Activities
- Educational Activities (school or vocational training)
- Family/Personal Improvement Activities (counseling, addiction intervention, support, mentoring, financial responsibility, etc.)

BRAG Coordinated Human Service Transportation Plan

To qualify for the MVP4F program, participants must first meet the following eligibility requirements:

- Applicant must have at least one child under 18 living at home.
- Household income must be at or below 200% of the poverty level (click [here](#) for income table).
- Applicants must reside in Box Elder, Rich or rural Cache County Utah.
- Applicants must be involved in activities to better their circumstances. This might include job searching, treatment or therapy sessions, community or college classes, bettering employment skills, and more.

Both programs are the direct result of coordinated planning in the region. Currently, vouchers are the most cost effective method of providing critical transportation services to people living in rural areas. Because participants are also responsible for locating drivers to meet their trip needs through their own network of family members, neighbors, or friends, there is no other transportation option that provides the same level of service and door-to-door assistance as that of voucher trips.

2 DEMOGRAPHICS

The BRAG area covers 7,900 square miles of northern Utah. BRAG's three member counties border Nevada, Idaho and Wyoming. Major services, such as regional hospitals and regional shopping centers, are located in Logan City (Cache County) or approximately 20 miles south of Box Elder County in Ogden. Residents living in the three-county area travel to Salt Lake City (approximately 50 miles south of Brigham City and 85 miles south of Logan) for services such as medical specialists, cultural and social events, and access to the Salt Lake International Airport.

The tables below identify key regional demographics to help identify population, race, housing, employment, and economic conditions of citizens living in Box Elder, Cache, and Rich Counties.

U.S. CENSUS DEMOGRAPHICS – BOX ELDER COUNTY, UTAH

COUNTY QUICK FACTS	BOX ELDER COUNTY, UTAH	UTAH
Population		
Population estimates, July 1, 2014, (V2014)	51,518	2,942,902
Population estimates, July 1, 2013, (V2013)	50,794	2,900,872
Population estimates base, April 1, 2010, (V2014)	49,975	2,763,885
Population estimates base, April 1, 2010, (V2013)	49,975	2,763,885
Population, percent change - April 1, 2010 (estimates base) to July 1, 2014, (V2014)	3	7
Population, percent change - April 1, 2010 (estimates base) to July 1, 2013, (V2013)	2	5
Population, Census, April 1, 2010	49,975	2,763,885
Age and Sex		
Persons under 5 years, percent, July 1, 2013, (V2013)	9	9
Persons under 5 years, percent, April 1, 2010	10	10
Persons under 18 years, percent, July 1, 2013, (V2013)	33	31
Persons under 18 years, percent, April 1, 2010	34	32
Persons 65 years and over, percent, July 1, 2013, (V2013)	12	10
Persons 65 years and over, percent, April 1, 2010	11	9
Female persons, percent, July 1, 2013, (V2013)	49	50
Female persons, percent, April 1, 2010	50	50
Race and Hispanic Origin		
White alone, percent, July 1, 2013, (V2013) (a)	95	92
White alone, percent, April 1, 2010 (a)	92	86
Black or African American alone, percent, July 1, 2013, (V2013) (a)	1	1
Black or African American alone, percent, April 1, 2010 (a)	0	1
American Indian and Alaska Native alone, percent, July 1, 2013, (V2013) (a)	1	2
American Indian and Alaska Native alone, percent, April 1, 2010 (a)	1	1
Asian alone, percent, July 1, 2013, (V2013) (a)	1	2
Asian alone, percent, April 1, 2010 (a)	1	2
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone, percent, July 1, 2013, (V2013) (a)	0	1
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone, percent, April 1, 2010 (a)	0	1
Two or More Races, percent, July 1, 2013, (V2013)	2	2
Two or More Races, percent, April 1, 2010	2	3

COUNTY QUICK FACTS	BOX ELDER	
	COUNTY,	UTAH
	UTAH	UTAH
Hispanic or Latino, percent, July 1, 2013, (V2013) (b)	9	13
Hispanic or Latino, percent, April 1, 2010 (b)	8	13
White alone, not Hispanic or Latino, percent, July 1, 2013, (V2013)	88	80
White alone, not Hispanic or Latino, percent, April 1, 2010	88	80
Population Characteristics		
Veterans, 2009-2013	2,724	143,771
Foreign born persons, percent, 2009-2013	3	8
Housing		
Housing units, July 1, 2014, (V2014)	18,097	1,022,537
Housing units, April 1, 2010	17,326	979,709
Owner-occupied housing unit rate, 2009-2013	79	70
Median value of owner-occupied housing units, 2009-2013	166,100	212,800
Median selected monthly owner costs -with a mortgage, 2009-2013	1,223	1,466
Median selected monthly owner costs -without a mortgage, 2009-2013	357	380
Median gross rent, 2009-2013	641	856
Building permits, 2014	164	17,510
Families and Living Arrangements		
Households, 2009-2013	16,207	886,770
Persons per household, 2009-2013	3	3
Living in same house 1 year ago, percent of persons age 1 year+, 2009-2013	88	83
Language other than English spoken at home, percent of persons age 5 years+, 2009-2013	7	14
Education		
High school graduate or higher, percent of persons age 25 years+, 2009-2013	92	91
Bachelor's degree or higher, percent of persons age 25 years+, 2009-2013	21	30
Health		
With a disability, under age 65 years, percent, 2009-2013	8	6
Persons without health insurance, under age 65 years, percent	13	15
Economy		
In civilian labor force, total, percent of population age 16 years+, 2009-2013	65	68
In civilian labor force, female, percent of population age 16 years+, 2009-2013	57	60
Total accommodation and food services sales, 2007 (\$1,000) (c)	36,827	3,980,570
Total health care and social assistance receipts/revenue, 2007 (\$1,000) (c)	92,952	10,860,360
Total manufacturers shipments, 2007 (\$1,000) (c)	3,150,909	42,431,657
Total merchant wholesaler sales, 2007 (\$1,000) (c)	D	25,417,368
Total retail sales, 2007 (\$1,000) (c)	447,418	36,574,240
Total retail sales per capita, 2007 (c)	9,348	13,730
Transportation		
Mean travel time to work (minutes), workers age 16 years+, 2009-2013	23	21
Income and Poverty		
Median household income (in 2013 dollars), 2009-2013	57,292	58,821
Per capita income in past 12 months (in 2013 dollars), 2009-2013	21,720	23,873

COUNTY QUICK FACTS	BOX ELDER	
	COUNTY, UTAH	UTAH
Persons in poverty, percent	10	13
Businesses	Box Elder County, Utah	Utah
Total employer establishments, 2013	982	71887(2)
Total employment, 2013	16,393	1101557(2)
Total annual payroll, 2013	760,797	45172354(2)
Total employment, percent change, 2012-2013	6	2.9(2)
Total nonemployer establishments, 2013	2,975	201,838
All firms, 2007	3,818	246,393
Men-owned firms, 2007	2,221	120,506
Women-owned firms, 2007	791	61,487
Minority-owned firms, 2007	127	16,042
Nonminority-owned firms, 2007	3,546	215,536
Veteran-owned firms, 2007	308	17,716
Nonveteran-owned firms, 2007	3,206	207,551
Geography	Box Elder County, Utah	Utah
Population per square mile, 2010	9	34
Land area in square miles, 2010	5,746	82,170
FIPS Code	"49003"	"49"

This geographic level of poverty and health estimates are not comparable to other geographic levels of these estimates. Some estimates presented here come from sample data, and thus have sampling errors that may render some apparent differences between geographies statistically indistinguishable.

The vintage year (e.g., V2014) refers to the final year of the series (2010 thru 2014). Different vintage years of estimates are not comparable.

(1) Data may be subject to publication minimums that vary by industry and geography.

(2) Includes data not distributed by county.

(a) Includes persons reporting only one race

(b) Hispanics may be of any race, so also are included in applicable race categories

(c) Economic Census - Puerto Rico data are not comparable to U.S. Economic Census data

D: Suppressed to avoid disclosure of confidential information

F: Fewer than 25 firms

FN: Footnote on this item in place of data

NA: Not available

S: Suppressed; does not meet publication standards

X: Not applicable

Z: Value greater than zero but less than half unit of measure shown

QuickFacts data are derived from: Population Estimates, American Community Survey, Census of Population and Housing, Current Population Survey, Small Area Health Insurance Estimates, Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates, State and County Housing Unit Estimates, County Business Patterns, Nonemployer Statistics, Economic Census, Survey of Business Owners, Building Permits.

U.S CENSUS DEMOGRAPHICS – CACHE COUNTY, UTAH

COUNTY QUICK FACTS	Cache County, Utah	Utah
Population		
Population estimates, July 1, 2014, (V2014)	118,343	2,942,902
Population estimates, July 1, 2013, (V2013)	116,909	2,900,872
Population estimates base, April 1, 2010, (V2014)	112,656	2,763,885
Population estimates base, April 1, 2010, (V2013)	112,656	2,763,885
Population, percent change - April 1, 2010 (estimates base) to July 1, 2014, (V2014)	5	7
Population, percent change - April 1, 2010 (estimates base) to July 1, 2013, (V2013)	4	5
Population, Census, April 1, 2010	112,656	2,763,885
Age and Sex		
Persons under 5 years, percent, July 1, 2013, (V2013)	9	9
Persons under 5 years, percent, April 1, 2010	10	10
Persons under 18 years, percent, July 1, 2013, (V2013)	31	31
Persons under 18 years, percent, April 1, 2010	32	32
Persons 65 years and over, percent, July 1, 2013, (V2013)	8	10
Persons 65 years and over, percent, April 1, 2010	8	9
Female persons, percent, July 1, 2013, (V2013)	50	50
Female persons, percent, April 1, 2010	50	50
Race and Hispanic Origin		
White alone, percent, July 1, 2013, (V2013) (a)	94	92
White alone, percent, April 1, 2010 (a)	89	86
Black or African American alone, percent, July 1, 2013, (V2013) (a)	1	1
Black or African American alone, percent, April 1, 2010 (a)	1	1
American Indian and Alaska Native alone, percent, July 1, 2013, (V2013) (a)	1	2
American Indian and Alaska Native alone, percent, April 1, 2010 (a)	1	1
Asian alone, percent, July 1, 2013, (V2013) (a)	2	2
Asian alone, percent, April 1, 2010 (a)	2	2
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone, percent, July 1, 2013, (V2013) (a)	1	1
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone, percent, April 1, 2010 (a)	0	1
Two or More Races, percent, July 1, 2013, (V2013)	2	2
Two or More Races, percent, April 1, 2010	2	3
Hispanic or Latino, percent, July 1, 2013, (V2013) (b)	10	13
Hispanic or Latino, percent, April 1, 2010 (b)	10	13
White alone, not Hispanic or Latino, percent, July 1, 2013, (V2013)	85	80
White alone, not Hispanic or Latino, percent, April 1, 2010	86	80
Population Characteristics		
Veterans, 2009-2013	4,258	143,771
Foreign born persons, percent, 2009-2013	7	8
Housing		
Housing units, July 1, 2014, (V2014)	39,368	1,022,537
Housing units, April 1, 2010	37,024	979,709
Owner-occupied housing unit rate, 2009-2013	65	70

COUNTY QUICK FACTS	Cache County,	
	Utah	Utah
Median value of owner-occupied housing units, 2009-2013	189,100	212,800
Median selected monthly owner costs -with a mortgage, 2009-2013	1,268	1,466
Median selected monthly owner costs -without a mortgage, 2009-2013	342	380
Median gross rent, 2009-2013	677	856
Building permits, 2014	749	17,510
<i>Families and Living Arrangements</i>		
Households, 2009-2013	35,375	886,770
Persons per household, 2009-2013	3	3
Living in same house 1 year ago, percent of persons age 1 year+, 2009-2013	78	83
Language other than English spoken at home, percent of persons age 5 years+, 2009-2013	14	14
<i>Education</i>		
High school graduate or higher, percent of persons age 25 years+, 2009-2013	93	91
Bachelor's degree or higher, percent of persons age 25 years+, 2009-2013	37	30
<i>Health</i>		
With a disability, under age 65 years, percent, 2009-2013	6	6
Persons without health insurance, under age 65 years, percent	15	15
<i>Economy</i>		
In civilian labor force, total, percent of population age 16 years+, 2009-2013	70	68
In civilian labor force, female, percent of population age 16 years+, 2009-2013	62	60
Total accommodation and food services sales, 2007 (\$1,000) (c)	95,153	3,980,570
Total health care and social assistance receipts/revenue, 2007 (\$1,000) (c)	D	10,860,360
Total manufacturers shipments, 2007 (\$1,000) (c)	D	42,431,657
Total merchant wholesaler sales, 2007 (\$1,000) (c)	361,610	25,417,368
Total retail sales, 2007 (\$1,000) (c)	1,095,090	36,574,240
Total retail sales per capita, 2007 (c)	10,079	13,730
<i>Transportation</i>		
Mean travel time to work (minutes), workers age 16 years+, 2009-2013	17	21
<i>Income and Poverty</i>		
Median household income (in 2013 dollars), 2009-2013	49,506	58,821
Per capita income in past 12 months (in 2013 dollars), 2009-2013	20,074	23,873
Persons in poverty, percent	14	13
<i>Businesses</i>		
Total employer establishments, 2013	3,041	71887(2)
Total employment, 2013	38,782	1101557(2)
Total annual payroll, 2013	1,226,024	45172354(2)
Total employment, percent change, 2012-2013	1	2.9(2)
Total nonemployer establishments, 2013	7,934	201,838
All firms, 2007	10,332	246,393
Men-owned firms, 2007	5,250	120,506
Women-owned firms, 2007	2,292	61,487
Minority-owned firms, 2007	455	16,042

COUNTY QUICK FACTS	Cache County, Utah	
	Cache County, Utah	Utah
Nonminority-owned firms, 2007	9,286	215,536
Veteran-owned firms, 2007	737	17,716
Nonveteran-owned firms, 2007	8,788	207,551
Geography	Cache County, Utah	Utah
Population per square mile, 2010	97	34
Land area in square miles, 2010	1,165	82,170
FIPS Code	"49005"	"49"

This geographic level of poverty and health estimates are not comparable to other geographic levels of these estimates. Some estimates presented here come from sample data, and thus have sampling errors that may render some apparent differences between geographies statistically indistinguishable.

The vintage year (e.g., V2014) refers to the final year of the series (2010 thru 2014). Different vintage years of estimates are not comparable.

(1) Data may be subject to publication minimums that vary by industry and geography.

(2) Includes data not distributed by county.

(a) Includes persons reporting only one race

(b) Hispanics may be of any race, so also are included in applicable race categories

(c) Economic Census - Puerto Rico data are not comparable to U.S. Economic Census data

D: Suppressed to avoid disclosure of confidential information

F: Fewer than 25 firms

FN: Footnote on this item in place of data

NA: Not available

S: Suppressed; does not meet publication standards

X: Not applicable

Z: Value greater than zero but less than half unit of measure shown

QuickFacts data are derived from: Population Estimates, American Community Survey, Census of Population and Housing, Current Population Survey, Small Area Health Insurance Estimates, Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates, State and County Housing Unit Estimates, County Business Patterns, Nonemployer Statistics, Economic Census, Survey of Business Owners, Building Permits.

U.S. CENSUS DEMOGRAPHICS – RICH COUNTY, UTAH

COUNTY QUICK FACTS	Rich County, Utah	
	Rich County, Utah	Utah
Population		
Population estimates, July 1, 2014, (V2014)	2,293	2,942,902
Population estimates, July 1, 2013, (V2013)	2,288	2,900,872
Population estimates base, April 1, 2010, (V2014)	2,264	2,763,885
Population estimates base, April 1, 2010, (V2013)	2,264	2,763,885
Population, percent change - April 1, 2010 (estimates base) to July 1, 2014, (V2014)	1	7
Population, percent change - April 1, 2010 (estimates base) to July 1, 2013, (V2013)	1	5
Population, Census, April 1, 2010	2,264	2,763,885
Age and Sex		
Persons under 5 years, percent, July 1, 2013, (V2013)	8	9
Persons under 5 years, percent, April 1, 2010	10	10
Persons under 18 years, percent, July 1, 2013, (V2013)	31	31

COUNTY QUICK FACTS	Rich County,	
	Utah	Utah
Persons under 18 years, percent, April 1, 2010	31	32
Persons 65 years and over, percent, July 1, 2013, (V2013)	17	10
Persons 65 years and over, percent, April 1, 2010	15	9
Female persons, percent, July 1, 2013, (V2013)	50	50
Female persons, percent, April 1, 2010	48	50
<i>Race and Hispanic Origin</i>		
White alone, percent, July 1, 2013, (V2013) (a)	98	92
White alone, percent, April 1, 2010 (a)	97	86
Black or African American alone, percent, July 1, 2013, (V2013) (a)	0	1
Black or African American alone, percent, April 1, 2010 (a)	0	1
American Indian and Alaska Native alone, percent, July 1, 2013, (V2013) (a)	1	2
American Indian and Alaska Native alone, percent, April 1, 2010 (a)	1	1
Asian alone, percent, July 1, 2013, (V2013) (a)	0	2
Asian alone, percent, April 1, 2010 (a)	0	2
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone, percent, July 1, 2013, (V2013) (a)	2	1
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone, percent, April 1, 2010 (a)	2	1
Two or More Races, percent, July 1, 2013, (V2013)	1	2
Two or More Races, percent, April 1, 2010	1	3
Hispanic or Latino, percent, July 1, 2013, (V2013) (b)	4	13
Hispanic or Latino, percent, April 1, 2010 (b)	4	13
White alone, not Hispanic or Latino, percent, July 1, 2013, (V2013)	94	80
White alone, not Hispanic or Latino, percent, April 1, 2010	94	80
<i>Population Characteristics</i>		
Veterans, 2009-2013	178	143,771
Foreign born persons, percent, 2009-2013	1	8
<i>Housing</i>		
Housing units, July 1, 2014, (V2014)	2,920	1,022,537
Housing units, April 1, 2010	2,834	979,709
Owner-occupied housing unit rate, 2009-2013	83	70
Median value of owner-occupied housing units, 2009-2013	156,600	212,800
Median selected monthly owner costs -with a mortgage, 2009-2013	1,128	1,466
Median selected monthly owner costs -without a mortgage, 2009-2013	316	380
Median gross rent, 2009-2013	633	856
Building permits, 2014	21	17,510
<i>Families and Living Arrangements</i>		
Households, 2009-2013	664	886,770
Persons per household, 2009-2013	3	3
Living in same house 1 year ago, percent of persons age 1 year+, 2009-2013	90	83
Language other than English spoken at home, percent of persons age 5 years+, 2009-2013	2	14
<i>Education</i>		
High school graduate or higher, percent of persons age 25 years+, 2009-2013	95	91
Bachelor's degree or higher, percent of persons age 25 years+, 2009-2013	17	30

COUNTY QUICK FACTS	Rich County, Utah	Utah
Health		
With a disability, under age 65 years, percent, 2009-2013	15	6
Persons without health insurance, under age 65 years, percent	18	15
Economy		
In civilian labor force, total, percent of population age 16 years+, 2009-2013	59	68
In civilian labor force, female, percent of population age 16 years+, 2009-2013	46	60
Total accommodation and food services sales, 2007 (\$1,000) (c)	3,732	3,980,570
Total health care and social assistance receipts/revenue, 2007 (\$1,000) (c)	D	10,860,360
Total manufacturers shipments, 2007 (\$1,000) (c)	FN(1)	42,431,657
Total merchant wholesaler sales, 2007 (\$1,000) (c)	FN(1)	25,417,368
Total retail sales, 2007 (\$1,000) (c)	11,499	36,574,240
Total retail sales per capita, 2007 (c)	5,601	13,730
Transportation		
Mean travel time to work (minutes), workers age 16 years+, 2009-2013	22	21
Income and Poverty		
Median household income (in 2013 dollars), 2009-2013	50,000	58,821
Per capita income in past 12 months (in 2013 dollars), 2009-2013	24,258	23,873
Persons in poverty, percent	11	13
Businesses		
Total employer establishments, 2013	81	71887(2)
Total employment, 2013	385	1101557(2)
Total annual payroll, 2013	12,539	45172354(2)
Total employment, percent change, 2012-2013	7	2.9(2)
Total nonemployer establishments, 2013	240	201,838
All firms, 2007	S	246,393
Men-owned firms, 2007	S	120,506
Women-owned firms, 2007	F	61,487
Minority-owned firms, 2007	F	16,042
Nonminority-owned firms, 2007	S	215,536
Veteran-owned firms, 2007	F	17,716
Nonveteran-owned firms, 2007	S	207,551
Geography		
Population per square mile, 2010	2	34
Land area in square miles, 2010	1,029	82,170
FIPS Code	"49033"	"49"

This geographic level of poverty and health estimates are not comparable to other geographic levels of these estimates. Some estimates presented here come from sample data, and thus have sampling errors that may render some apparent differences between geographies statistically indistinguishable.

The vintage year (e.g., V2014) refers to the final year of the series (2010 thru 2014). Different vintage years of estimates are not comparable.

(1) Data may be subject to publication minimums that vary by industry and geography.

(2) Includes data not distributed by county.

COUNTY QUICK FACTS

Rich County,
Utah

Utah

(a) Includes persons reporting only one race

(b) Hispanics may be of any race, so also are included in applicable race categories

(c) Economic Census - Puerto Rico data are not comparable to U.S. Economic Census data

D: Suppressed to avoid disclosure of confidential information

F: Fewer than 25 firms

FN: Footnote on this item in place of data

NA: Not available

S: Suppressed; does not meet publication standards

X: Not applicable

Z: Value greater than zero but less than half unit of measure shown

QuickFacts data are derived from: Population Estimates, American Community Survey, Census of Population and Housing, Current Population Survey, Small Area Health Insurance Estimates, Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates, State and County Housing Unit Estimates, County Business Patterns, Nonemployer Statistics, Economic Census, Survey of Business Owners, Building Permits.

3 AVAILABLE SERVICES/CAPITAL

LOCAL AREA CONDITIONS AND AVAILABLE TRANSPORTATION SERVICES

In this section, providers are divided by the type or level of service they provide in the region. The divisions for this section include: Public Transit, Major Human Service Transportation Providers, and Other Human Service Organizations. While Public Transit is easily understood or identified, the other distinctions were created by the project team to simplify the inventory of transportation assets and services. This is to help focus project time and funding towards gathering information from key partners in the region that will have the greatest impact towards the goal of transportation coordination. It is the expectation of the project team that these key partners will provide the necessary experience and leadership to foster long term partnerships with all other human service providers in the region.

PUBLIC TRANSIT PROVIDERS

In Cache County, a mix of urban and rural populations is served by the Cache Valley Transit District (CVTD). The CVTD provides fare free public transit services to the Cache Valley area including Franklin County. Fixed route and complimentary Paratransit services are available in the urban areas including Logan, North Logan, River Heights Richmond, Smithfield, Hyde Park, North Logan, Providence, Nibley, Millville and Hyrum. Commuter services are also provided to Lewiston, Utah and Preston, Idaho.

Brigham City in Box Elder County is served by two Utah Transit Authority (UTA) routes. Route 616 is the North Weber Frontrunner providing weekday service to the Ogden Station. Route 630 is the Brigham City/Ogden Commuter providing weekday and Saturday service between the Ogden Intermodal Center and 700 North & Main in Brigham City. UTA Paratransit service is provided to eligible riders whose pick up and drop off points lie within a ¼ mile boundary of a regular local fixed bus route or light rail station. This service is consistent and comparable to ADA Paratransit guidelines.

Agency	Service Type	Eligibility	County	Contact
Cache Valley Transit District (CVTD)	Public Transit	Public Transit (fare free), Paratransit Services	Cache	(435) 752-2877
Utah Transit Authority	Public Transit	Public Transit (fare), Paratransit Services	Box Elder	(801) 627-3500

MAJOR HUMAN SERVICE TRANSPORTATION PROVIDERS

Some organizations in the Bear River Region provide transit services solely for human service populations. Others provide general transit for the public, but their services are available for all riders, as long there is minimal assistance needed for boarding and exiting. There are organizations that only provide transit from one central location to approved destinations, and others offer curb to curb, or in some cases door to door, services. Similarly, some providers have drivers that are trained only to drive and open doors; some are trained to help clients with wheelchairs and seating; and some are trained as Certified Nursing Assistants (CNA's), and in CPR/First Aid.

Vehicles operated by these organizations range from personal vehicles to large Paratransit buses and carry between 3 and 35+ passengers. Many of these vehicles have wheelchair lifts as well. Annual vehicle miles for these groups range from 500 miles to almost 1.5 million miles. Scheduling can range from occasionally planned trips, to fixed routes and times; some organizations require 24-48 hours of prior notice, and others are on an as needed basis.

MAJOR HUMAN SERVICE TRANSIT PROVIDERS IN THE BEAR RIVER REGION PROVIDE TRANSPORTATION FOR A VARIETY OF NEEDS FOR CLIENTS INCLUDING THE FOLLOWING:

- Day programs
- Programs at other agencies
- Medical appointments
- Employment
- Education
- Shopping and personal needs
- Field trips and recreation
- Dining out
- Others trips as needed

Not all providers transport clients to address all of these needs, and some providers are limited in the services they can provide by the amount of funding available. Many of the providers in the region agree that transportation of clients in general is very expensive, and available funding very rarely covers the cost needed to provide those services. Clientele and eligibility requirements also vary for the different organizations. Some require Medicaid, some transport senior citizens or persons with disabilities only, some serve only existing clients, some have clients referred based on physical or emotional concerns, and others require eligibility based on general public transit equipment or service usability.

Funding sources and regulatory compliance for each of these organizations also varies substantially. Sources including local, State, and Federal Government, private funding, donations, resident fees, fares, and fundraising are utilized by individual organizations.

Agency	Service Type	Eligibility	County	Contact
Bear River Valley Senior Citizen's Center	Transportation for Center Programs, Services, Meals on Wheels	Seniors	Box Elder	(435) 257-9455
BRAG Senior Companions Program	Transportation to Fulfill Clients Needs	Clients	Box Elder, Cache, Rich	(435) 752-7242
Brigham City Senior Center and Senior Transit	Transportation for Center Programs, Services	Seniors	Box Elder	(435) 723-3303
Cache County Senior Citizen Center	Transportation for Center Programs, Services	Seniors	Cache	(435) 755-1720
Cache Employment & Training Center	Transportation for Employment, Day Programs	People with Disabilities	Box Elder, Cache	(435) 752-7952
Developmental Skills Laboratory USU	Transportation for Day Programs, Services	People with Disabilities	Cache	(435) 797-8528
Options for Independence - Cache Office	Transportation for Center Programs, Services	People with Disabilities	Cache	(435) 753-5353
Options - Box Elder Satellite Office	Transportation for Center Programs, Services	People with Disabilities	Box Elder	(435) 723-2171

Agency	Service Type	Eligibility	County	Contact
Rich County Senior Citizen's Center	Transportation for Center Programs, Services	Seniors	Rich	(435) 793-2122

OTHER HUMAN SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS

There are many organizations in the Bear River Region that provide services for seniors, people with disabilities, and low-income individuals. Among them are assisted living centers, nursing and rehabilitation centers, State health and mental health agencies, family support services, training, employment, and educational facilities, migrant and refugee assistance organizations, religious organizations, food pantry's, senior centers, the Northwest Band of the Shoshone Nation, minority assistance centers, disability resource and rehabilitation centers, medical care facilities, and others.

These organizations, agencies, and service providers work constantly to make sure that basic needs are being met for human service populations. Most of these organizations are not currently providing transit services. One of the purposes of this ongoing human service transit planning process is to analyze the feasibility of coordination among organizations to see if there are ways to increase the quality and extent of service while decreasing costs.

While not all human service organizations provide organized transit for clients, they can provide crucial insight into the needs of human service populations. This list represents those human service agencies that provide some level of transportation for their clients with strict eligibility criteria, making trip coordination extremely difficult due to either cost, or the potential of resource sharing to interfere with an agency's mission, goals, or policies.

Agency	Service Type	Eligibility	County	Contact
Aggie Shuttle - Utah State University	Student Transit	On Campus Riders	USU Campus	(435) 797-3414
Bear River Valley Care Center	Transportation for Center Programs/Services	Assisted Living Clients	Box Elder	(435) 257-4400
Chrysalis	Transportation for Day Programs, Services	Clients, People with Disabilities	Cache	(435) 753-6606
Common Ground Outdoor Adventures	Transportation for Day Programs	People with Disabilities	Box Elder, Cache	(435) 713-0288
Green Valley Cab	Taxi Service	Standard Fare	Cache	(435) 890-5136
Greyhound	Inter-City Public Transit	Standard Fare	Box Elder, Cache	(435) 792-3132
Hyrum Senior Citizen's Center	Transportation for Center Programs/Services	Seniors	Cache	(435) 245-3570

BRAG Coordinated Human Service Transportation Plan

Agency	Service Type	Eligibility	County	Contact
Legacy House	Transportation for Center Programs/Services	Assisted Living Clients	Cache	(435) 755-2877
Life Skills and Independent Needs Center	Transportation for Center Programs/Services	Clients	Box Elder	(435) 723-3913
Logan Nursing and Rehabilitation Center	Transportation for Center Programs/Services	Nursing & Rehabilitation Clients	Cache	(435) 750-5501
Our House Assisted Living	Transportation for Center Programs/Services	Assisted Living Clients	Box Elder	(435) 257-5658
Pick Me Up	Non-Emergency Medical Transportation	Call for Eligibility	Box Elder, Cache	(866) 822-1048
Pioneer Care Center	Transportation for Center Programs/Services	Nursing & Rehabilitation Clients	Box Elder	(435) 723-5289
Pioneer Valley Lodge	Transportation for Center Programs/Services	Independent Living Clients	Box Elder, Cache	(435) 792-0353
Pocatello Regional Transit	Public Transit	Public Transit (fare), Paratransit Services	Limited Service to Cache & Box Elder	(208) 234-2287
Salt Lake Express	Airport Shuttle	Standard Fare	Box Elder, Cache	(800) 356-9796
Sunshine Terrace Foundation	Transportation for Center Programs, Services	Nursing & Rehabilitation Clients	Cache	(435) 752-0411
Terrace Grove Assisted Living	Transportation for Center Programs, Services	Clients	Cache	(435) 787-2855
Utah Special Olympics	Sports Training & Athletic Competition	People with Disabilities	Box Elder, Cache	(801) 363-1111
Utah Trailways	Charter Services	Call for Eligibility	Box Elder, Cache	(800) 876-5825
Williamsburg Retirement Community	Transportation for Center Programs, Services	Assisted Living Clients	Cache	(435) 753-5502

BRAG Coordinated Human Service Transportation Plan

Agency	Service Type	Eligibility	County	Contact
Willow Glen Health & Rehabilitation	Transportation for Center Programs, Services	Nursing & Rehabilitation Clients	Box Elder	(435) 723-7777

4 TRANSPORTATION COORDINATION STRATEGIES

RECOMMENDED GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND TARGETS

The goals, objectives and targets below represent several years of human service transportation planning in the Bear River Region. They were developed through several combined studies and planning efforts that accomplished several major milestones set by all those involved that include:

- The creation of a formal Regional Coordinating Council known as – **The Bear River Regional Access & Mobility Council**
- The development of a regional business/strategy plan that identified the true costs of providing human service transportation in the region – **The Bear River Region Mobility Management Business Plan.**
- The development of two rural transportation voucher programs that provide mileage reimbursement for approved trips outside of areas with public transit or ADA type service – **The BRAG Medical Voucher Program (MVP)** and **The BRAG Mobility Voucher Program for Families (MVP4F).**
- The development of a business access assessment and training program to provide education of issues faced by transportation disadvantaged when they attempt to shop and access businesses in the region – **Open Access.**
- The development of a regional website to provide human service transportation resource information to stakeholders and the general public – **www.bearrivermobility.org**
- This effort made light of several key issues in the region in trying to assess the advantages of agency and vehicle coordination in the region. First, is that agencies have been faced with decades of increasing costs and an inverse relationship in the amount of funding available to provide those transportation services to an ever increasing customer base. Second, due to the ingenuity and efficiency agencies have already implemented, there are no additional cost savings that can be made at this time through the coordination of services. In highlighted the major issues agencies face in and made recommendations for alternative forms of transportation that include rural transportation vouchers.

As shown from the update provided above, these goals and objectives continue to be implemented and adapted as changes in needs and opportunities are identified. BRAG is currently working to provide a major update of this list to highlight major accomplishments, and provide a revised list of goals and strategies that more accurately reflect the current conditions in the region. This process is currently underway and will include the development of a revised coordinated plan by early Spring 2016.

GOAL 1: INCREASE THE CAPACITY OF LOCAL HUMAN SERVICE AND PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION ORGANIZATIONS TO COLLABORATIVELY MEET SHARED GOALS

- **Objective 1A: Formalize a Regional Coordinating Council.**
 - Performance Target: Amend and adopt this coordinated Plan, including amendments to these goals, objectives and performance targets by October 2013.
- **Objective 1B: Create and adopt a common financial and performance reporting and evaluation framework among partners.**
 - Performance Target: Adopt a performance reporting framework that the majority of partners can agree to.
- **Objective 1C: Advocate for policy changes** that support the shared goals of RCC members.
 - Performance Target: Establish a policy sub-committee to work with other coordinating councils, state agencies, state advocacy organizations, and other relevant groups.
- **Objective 1D: Support innovative initiatives** and ad hoc coordination activities of RCC members.

- Performance Target: No specific target set. The RCC should remain flexible to identify new projects such as the idea for a business advocacy campaign to identify and promote mobility-friendly businesses that was raised during the July 11 meeting. Performance targets should be set for each new project of the RCC.

GOAL 2: INCREASE ACCESS AND MOBILITY FOR TRANSPORTATION DISADVANTAGED POPULATIONS

- **Objective 2A:** Support and seek to implement a **travel voucher pilot program** serving individuals who do not have access to other forms of transportation at the times or locations when needed.
 - Performance Target: Establish a pilot program to provide passenger trips via travel vouchers for eligible customers. Eligibility will be identified by the Access & Mobility Council and included in the voucher manual developed for the pilot program.
 - Performance Target: Identify an average cost/trip from Objective 1B (above) and seek to provide voucher trips at a cost less than the current system average.
 - Performance Target: Develop a customer satisfaction survey prior to implementation of the voucher pilot program. Conduct survey at end of pilot program to determine customer satisfaction and identify potential program changes/improvements prior to successive use of vouchers following the pilot program.
- **Objective 2B:** Support and seek to expand **volunteer driver programs** within organizations that serve seniors, people with disabilities, low income job seekers and wage earners, and veterans.
 - Performance Target: Identify a baseline goal to provide passenger trips utilizing volunteer drivers.
 - Performance Target: Identify an average cost/trip from Objective 1B (above) and seek to provide volunteer driver trips at a cost less than half the current system average.
 - Performance Target: Seek to develop a customer satisfaction survey prior to implementation of the volunteer driver program. Conduct survey after at least six months of implementation to determine customer satisfaction and identify potential program changes/improvements prior to successive use of volunteer drivers following survey evaluation.
- **Objective 2C:** Support a **circuit Mobility Manager**
 - Performance Target: Submit application to Easter Seals Accessible Transportation Technical Support (ATTS) Project to develop resource directory and trip training manual.
 - Performance Target: Provide mobility coaching/workshops at the request of agencies to help provide clients with transportation resources and trip scheduling.
- **Objective 2D:** Implement planned **website updates** for a dynamic resource directory
 - Performance Target: Launch dynamic resource directory
 - Performance Target: Identify ways to assess use of online resource directory. Consider surveys to identify ways of improving site and user experience online.
- **Objective 2E:** Partner with UDOT to study a **rural 5311** funded transit system in Box Elder County.
 - Performance Target: Determine unmet inter-county travel needs of transportation disadvantaged living in Box Elder and Cache Counties.
 - Performance Target: Identify stakeholders and potential project partners if public outreach and data collection determine significant need for an inter-county connection between Box Elder and Cache Counties.
- **Objective 2F:** Implement a business advocacy campaign to identify and promote mobility-friendly businesses
 - Performance Target: Train business site assessment volunteers to conduct on-site review and training of access and mobility related concerns to business owners and staff
 - Performance Target: Issue program stickers to approved businesses to be displayed in windows or in store.
 - Performance Target: Conduct follow up assessment/visit to businesses working to make improvements or changes to increase access and mobility.

- Performance Target: Display business names (with consent) on the Mobility Management website.

GOAL 3: HOLD CONSTANT THE AVERAGE COST OF PROVIDING TRANSPORTATION SO THAT RESOURCES CAN BE USED AS EFFECTIVELY AS POSSIBLE

- **Objective 3A:** Investigate opportunities for **pooling insurance**.
 - Performance Target: Meet with the underwriters and risk management staff of relevant organizations to identify opportunities for cost savings through pooled insurance.
 - Performance Target: If a pooled insurance program is deemed feasible, organize RCC efforts to support implementation.
- **Objective 3B:** Investigate opportunities for **pooling maintenance**.
 - Performance Target: Meet with USU and Cache County motor pool staff to identify opportunities for cost savings through pooled maintenance.
 - Performance Target: If a pooled maintenance program is deemed feasible, organize RCC efforts to support implementation.

GOAL 4: CONTRIBUTE TO IMPROVEMENTS IN AIR QUALITY IN THE BEAR RIVER REGION

- **Objective 4A:** Identify current agency efforts that contribute to improved air quality or reduced carbon emissions.
 - Performance Target: Identify what agencies are currently doing to address poor air quality or carbon emissions in the region through strategies such as group transportation, vehicle maintenance and replacement, route/trip planning or other means.
- **Objective 4B:** As vehicles wear out, encourage replacement of current paratransit vehicles with vehicles utilizing proven, cleaner air technologies that are safe and cost effective.
 - Performance Target: Identify ways to address concerns regarding air quality in the region. Where feasible, encourage agencies to seek vehicle replacements utilizing clean air technology while also considering operational costs and vehicle safety.

GOAL 5: MAINTAIN A HEALTHY AND SUSTAINABLE HUMAN SERVICE TRANSPORTATION NETWORK

- **Objective 5A:** Work to maintain a healthy human service transportation network through coordination and advocacy efforts with local, state, and federal agencies.
 - Performance Target: Work to ensure continued support of human service transportation funding and grant matching programs in the region.
 - Performance Target: Work with RCC members to identify performance metrics/standards to ensure positive service delivery of transportation services in the region.
 - Performance Target: Work to maintain a current list of goals and strategies for human service transportation service delivery. Gather input from partner organizations and help identify short and long-term program/funding needs.

STRATEGY 1: FORMALIZE A REGIONAL COORDINATING COUNCIL

A regional coordinating council is a formalized working group of stakeholders involved in coordinating transportation services. Formation of an RCC is a best practice recommended by Nelson\Nygaard and TransitPlus that enables organizations to work as a team while fulfilling critical functions needed to support effective coordination. A regional coordination council serves the following purposes:

BRAG Coordinated Human Service Transportation Plan

- Help develop, implement, and provide guidance to the coordination of community transportation services and information within the region so that (1) seniors, persons with disabilities, and persons with low income can better access local and regional transportation services; and (2) operators, funders and purchasers of community transportation services can more effectively utilize and leverage funding in order to expand services to address unmet needs;
- Help guide, assist, and monitor the efforts of a regional mobility manager/team who will have the day-to-day responsibility for encouraging, planning, evaluating, and in some cases, implementing and managing, coordinated efforts, services and information in the region;
- Work together with other regional coordinating councils and the Utah Urban Rural Specialized Transportation Association (URSTA) to help promote coordination and develop solutions to inter-regional community transportation needs; and
- Provide feedback to governmental agencies and other organizations that fund/sponsor community transportation relative to policies and practices that successfully foster and that adversely affect the coordination of community transportation services and information.

IMPACT OF REGIONAL COORDINATING COUNCIL

It is assumed the regional coordinating council will meet quarterly with more frequent subcommittee meetings occurring on a monthly basis for a smaller number of participating organizations. For the cost/benefit analysis it is assumed all organizations will contribute an average of 10 labor hours each quarter.

SUPPORT FOR A BRAG MOBILITY MANAGEMENT TEAM

The functions served by a mobility manager are critical to the success of implementing coordination strategies. Given that BRAG's current mobility manager is working off-site and certain functions require an on-site presence, it will be necessary – at least until a long-term mobility manager role is defined – to divide some of the mobility manager functions so that they can be undertaken by several staff. Members of the BRAG mobility management team would continue to work in their current positions, but would have additional mobility management responsibilities.

As a guide, the functions typically performed by a mobility manager include:

- **Planning, Advocacy, Outreach & Policy** – Mobility managers are advocates for transportation disadvantaged populations. In this role, mobility managers work to educate local leaders about the needs of the community and the role of coordination in solving problems. This role includes advocacy for supportive policies at the local, regional and state level.
- **Training and Technical Assistance** – Mobility managers help distribute information about best practices, successful models and technical resources to implement mobility management strategies. This function requires technical acumen and expertise and excellent communication and interpersonal skills.
- **Strategy Implementation**– Mobility managers work with local partners to implement mobility management strategies. This role takes on a wide range of multi-disciplinary functions including development of resource sharing agreements and cost allocation plans in collaboration with professional staff, budgeting and contracting, procurement of goods and services, as well as creation and operation of new mobility programs.
- **Information & Referral** – Mobility managers serve as a knowledge base for the community. In this capacity mobility managers provide information systems scaled to the needs of the community. These can include dynamic resource directories, printed information booklets or a range of hands-on trip planning and travel training services.
- **Serving as staff to RCC** – Traditionally a mobility manager serves as staff to a regional coordinating council. This function often intersects with the functions described above.

STRATEGY 2: INFORMATION & REFERRAL

The information and referral program envisioned for the Bear River region consists of a website and online resource guide and a circuit mobility manager.

WEBSITE AND ONLINE RESOURCE GUIDE

Bear River Association of Governments has already initiated development of an online resource guide. The information and referral program will build on this asset by actively promoting the resource guide to customers and to other organizations who perform information and referral services. A portion of the mobility manager's time should be dedicated to maintaining the database of available transportation services and proactively communicating with partner agencies about the availability of the resource guide.

While the mobility manager should maintain a telephone number that is widely distributed among community partners, a one-call strategy of promoting a single telephone number for transportation services is not recommended at this time. This recommendation is based on the lack of infrastructure for a one-call center. There is no obvious call center operation that could house such a service and 211 is not widely used in the Bear River region. Instead, the mobility manager should focus on keeping the online resource guide up to date and promoting the guide to existing information and referral services. This approach often referred to as a "no wrong door" approach will ensure that regardless of what number an individual calls, they will be able to access the most reliable information about available transportation services.

The Utah Department of Transportation, the Utah Urban Rural Specialized Transportation Association, and statewide mobility managers have met with 211 to discuss the statewide program. There is general consensus between planners and 211 program managers that the service is underutilized and could be a more useful resource if promoted properly.

OPEN ACCESS BUSINESS ADVOCACY CAMPAIGN

The purpose of this program is to promote access and mobility friendly businesses in the Bear River Region. The program is completely voluntary, and recognizes the effort or commitment of businesses to become more bike, transit, mobility, and service friendly. Through the use of local volunteers, the program hopes to accomplish the following:

1. To help businesses become more aware of access and mobility best practices for their business and its employees.
2. To provide information and resources to businesses committed to becoming more accessible for customers of all abilities.
3. To promote access and mobility friendly businesses to the public by recognizing their efforts online and through window stickers awarded to businesses that are committed to improving access and mobility for all current and future patrons.

Volunteers will be trained by BRAG staff to conduct on-site assessments based on a checklist (shown in Appendix C). Following the assessment and a short review process, businesses are awarded stickers either based on compliance with the checklists, or if they are making good faith efforts to provide better access for business patrons.

CIRCUIT MOBILITY MANAGER

The circuit mobility manager concept is the idea of rotating the mobility manager to conduct travel training and other workshops/training as necessary. The primary function served by the circuit mobility manager is to provide travel coaching and assistance.

The mobility manager will work with community partners on-site at senior centers, independent living centers, community centers, food pantries, churches, and other local community-based service providers to help people find rides. This goes beyond basic information and referral and includes hands-on assistance finding and arranging rides. In

areas with fixed-route transit service (urban Cache County and Brigham City), this could also include travel training. The mobility manager's assistance will range from performing route searches using Google maps transit trip planner, to assisting eligible customers in registering for ADA paratransit service, to assisting with accessing Medicaid NEMT services.

IMPACT OF INFORMATION & REFERRAL PROGRAM

An information and referral program helps to simplify access to transportation services and is targeted primarily to meet the needs of riders. The net impact of an effective information and referral program is an increase in service quantity and service quality.

While this strategy is not intended to serve as a cost savings measure, if implemented as part of a robust, multi-faceted mobility management program, unit costs should decrease compared to a no-action alternative. This marginal cost savings is the result of the cost savings effect of other strategies including volunteer drivers, flex vouchers, and shared supports that would drive down the unit costs of services available through the information and referral network.

From a long-term perspective, an information and referral program can help pave the way toward future consolidation of scheduling and dispatch functions. While not anticipated to reduce costs at this time, future consolidation of scheduling and dispatch may reduce unit costs if capacity can be more efficiently utilized as a result of coordination at the intake level.

STRATEGY 3: SUPPORT & EXPAND VOLUNTEER DRIVER PROGRAMS

Volunteer driver programs can be very effective at increasing the availability of transportation service, improving service quality, and reducing unit costs. As evidence of their success, volunteer driver programs form the majority of senior transportation programs and have been around for over 20 years. In a survey of 236 senior transportation programs, nearly 40 percent were identified as being staffed by only volunteer drivers while an additional 22 percent utilize both volunteers and paid drivers. Furthermore, according to the survey, over 90 of the surveyed transportation programs have been in existence since before 1990.¹

Several volunteer driver programs already exist in the Bear River region: The Senior Companion Program and RSPV provide a valuable service to the community. A volunteer driver program in the Bear River region should be designed to support and expand existing volunteer driver programs by establishing a series of support services that strengthen the resources that already exist.

The recommended format is to provide support for existing volunteer driver programs, while also making volunteers available to organizations that have an interest/need to utilize volunteer drivers to meet their transportation needs. This would be facilitated by the mobility manager who would work with existing community-based volunteer organizations in the Bear River region (such as the Cache Valley Volunteer Center) to recruit volunteers who are interested in driving. The mobility manager could provide driver screening (DMV record screening, criminal background checks), driver training (sensitivity training, defensive driving, etc.), and administrative support for record keeping (volunteer hours, reimbursement, etc.). Organizations with existing volunteer driver programs can choose whether or not to utilize the Mobility Manager for these functions.

IMPACT OF SUPPORTING AND EXPANDING VOLUNTEER DRIVER PROGRAMS

The impact of a volunteer driver program depends on the supply of available drivers, the utilization rate of those drivers, and the administrative overhead associated with running a volunteer driver program. An agency that replaces a paid driver with a large pool of volunteer drivers will save more than an agency that uses volunteers for occasional service. Also, there is an art to running an effective volunteer driver program. The process of recruiting and motivating

¹ The Beverly Foundation, (2002). *Supplemental Transportation Programs for Seniors*. <http://www.aaafoundation.org/pdf/stp.pdf>. Accessed August 1, 2012.

volunteers requires a level of dedication, enthusiasm and passion. Finding the right talent to run a volunteer driver program can make the difference between success and failure.

As a resource, CTA provides an excellent overview of the advantages and disadvantages of volunteer driver programs: http://web1.ctaa.org/webmodules/webarticles/articlefiles/rtap_volunteers.pdf

STRATEGY 4: IMPLEMENTATION OF RETIRED, SHARED VEHICLE PROGRAMS

Vehicle sharing has been promoted by the Federal Transit Administration and United We Ride as one of the key strategies for coordinating human service transit programs². Two popular approaches to vehicle sharing were presented during earlier stages of the project. The first model is used by transit agencies to increase available transportation options while also reducing demand for costly ADA paratransit services. The second model is loosely defined as an ad hoc vehicle sharing model in which individual agencies make their vehicles available for “chunks of time” to other organizations.

For the Bear River Region, a retired vehicle sharing program that includes aspects of both a retired vehicle sharing program and an ad hoc vehicle sharing program is recommended. It is also recommended that the vehicle sharing program have tie-ins with a coordinated grant writing program to support a coordinated approach to purchasing new vehicles within the region.

RETIRED VEHICLE PROGRAM

Retired vehicle sharing programs exist in a number of communities throughout the United States. The concept involves the local transit agency giving retired paratransit vehicles that have met the FTA defined useful life criteria, but are still relatively useful and have between 30,000 – 50,000 miles remaining before a full overhaul is required. These vehicles are then donated to local human service agencies and non-profit organizations to provide transportation to their customers within the community. Some versions of the retired vehicle sharing program involve requiring the vehicle recipient to provide a minimum number of trips for ADA eligible customers. It is important to note that the trips provided on these vehicles are not considered ADA trips. Instead, the availability of service to ADA eligible customers is expected to reduce demand for traditional ADA service. These kinds of vehicle sharing programs tend to be more popular in areas where ADA paratransit costs have become problematic for the local transit agency and strategies are needed to control raising costs.

As an example, depending on the structure of the program, an agency such as Cache Valley Transit District could consult with FTA to make retired vehicles available to local organizations that agree to provide a minimum number of trips to ADA eligible customers. If an ADA trip threshold is included, the vehicle recipient would then report on a monthly basis to CVTD or the Mobility Manager to document trips for ADA eligible customers.

In two examples of a similarly structured vehicle sharing program (King County, Washington and Contra Costa County, California), the transit agency provides a maintenance stipend to incentivize a proactive approach to providing trips for ADA eligible customers. The incentive for the transit agency can be a significant reduction in demand for ADA trips if the partner agency is able to provide more convenient service for ADA eligible customers. The disadvantage of requiring an ADA trip threshold is that it can be difficult to measure and tends to muddy the waters in terms of the objective of the vehicle sharing program. Ride Connection in Portland Oregon prefers to place vehicles directly with partner agencies to enable them to provide service that would otherwise not be available. Rigorous documentation of offsetting ADA service is not required. Instead, ridership on the new service is reported as a net increase in the total number of trips provided in the region, which is viewed as sufficient justification for placement of the retired vehicle.

To view the cost benefit analysis and potential impact of a retired vehicle program, view the Bear River Mobility Management Plan online at www.bearrivermobility.org.

² Federal Interagency Coordinating Council on Access and Mobility (2006) *Vehicle Resource Sharing Final Policy Statement*. http://www.unitedweride.gov/1_1165_ENG_HTML.htm. Accessed July 31, 2012

AD HOC VEHICLE SHARING

The ad hoc vehicle sharing model expands what organizations are already doing to comply with UDOT coordination requirements by introducing a more proactive approach to identifying agencies with available capacity that can be utilized by another organization. This is accomplished through active involvement by the mobility manager who assists in developing vehicle sharing agreements and matching available capacity with unmet needs in the community. This involves working with interested agencies to establish a compensation rate based on fully allocated costs or some other equitable rate structure, and establishing driver training standards, insurance requirements, maintenance requirements and safety standards.

To view the cost benefit analysis and potential impact of ad hoc vehicle sharing, view the Bear River Mobility Management Plan online at www.bearrivermobility.org.

STRATEGY 5: IMPLEMENTATION OF A FLEXIBLE VOUCHER PROGRAM

Flex voucher programs, particularly those that may be used with similarly regulated types of service could help fill temporal and geographic gaps in fixed-route and demand-response service for older adults and persons with disabilities. Voucher programs could also offer a means of employment transportation for individuals requiring access to jobs in areas not served by public transportation or during hours when those services are not in operation. Transportation vouchers can be issued or sold to eligible individuals and used to purchase trips from public or private transportation providers, or to reimburse volunteer drivers. Typically, sponsoring agencies subsidize the cost of the trips, so that riders are able to receive service at a reduced cost. Eligibility can be based on age, disability, income criteria, or the need for a specific type of trip, such as employment transportation.

The crucial requirement of a voucher program is a source of funding to back the value of the voucher. Fifty percent matching grants are available through several Federal Transit Administration programs and are intended to be matched against other local and non-transportation Federal program funds.

IMPACT OF A FLEX VOUCHER PROGRAM

The impact of a voucher program depends on the amount of funding invested into it and the policies set forth to govern the program. An advantage of flex voucher programs is their highly scalable nature. A voucher program can work well with a minimum investment of just a few thousand dollars (assuming low startup costs) to a much larger program exceeding six figures. Participation rates reflect a mix of reinvestment of savings from other programs and direct cash investments. For example, it is assumed that the dollars saved from using volunteer drivers at Cache and Brigham City senior centers is invested into travel vouchers. Three other agencies each invest \$5,000. Assuming a 25 percent administrative cost and a cost per trip of \$10, the following calculation is made to estimate the total impact:

▪ Partners 1 & 2 (reinvested savings from volunteer driver program)	\$10,550
▪ Partners 3, 4, and 5 (\$5,000 investments, each)	\$15,000
▪ Grant (50 Percent matching grant)	\$25,550
▪ Total	\$51,100
▪ Admin Cost (25% of total)	\$12,775
▪ Cash available for Vouchers (total minus admin cost)	\$38,325

Assuming a subsidy per trip of \$10, a voucher program comprised of these elements would provide a total of: 3,832 trips. Total cost per trip is \$13.33.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE BRAG FLEXIBLE VOUCHER PROGRAM

As of September 2013, the Bear River Access & Mobility Council is working with Nelson Nygaard to develop a flexible voucher program for the region. To date, consultants have conducted case study research of current voucher programs that can be used to inform the recommendations for a voucher program in the BRAG region.

Case studies were chosen that meet the following guidelines: (1) they are generally small in size and funding (or started out as small programs), (2) they allow for various types of transportation providers and trip types, and (3) they each have a different funding source. Additionally, each of these programs has a different voucher reimbursement process and fraud control measures, which will allow BRAG to pick and choose the best of these methods.

CASE STUDY EXAMPLES

- **Weber County Human Services Voucher Program** is operated in Utah with a \$10,000 one-time budget. Rides are provided for a very limited number of seniors who have no other options for medical trips only with private operators or friends and family members. A case manager works closely with the small group of participants and mails out a voucher to the client in advance of an upcoming trip. Fraud prevention is limited because of the small number of participants.
- **The Dallas Area Agency on Aging Voucher Program** in Texas operates on a \$3,500 per year budget. The small program serves 10 clients who receive \$300 each to use for any type of trip with a transportation provider the customer chooses (except taxis). Vouchers are sent directly to the private transportation provider (or to the customer in cases when friends or family members are driving). Fraud prevention is limited because the mobility manager works very closely with each participant as part of the larger AAA program.
- **WILR Transportation Check Program** is a state-wide voucher program that started as a regional \$10,000 per year pilot project. Eligible participants are people with a disability who are not able to drive and do not have access to the limited senior transportation options. The program follows the APRIL traveler's checks model using a system of mileage allocation for people using a personal vehicle and dollars for all other modes. Participants are allowed to use vouchers for any type of trips. Mobility managers will regularly call participants and service providers to ensure that trips were taken in an effort to avoid fraud.
- **Cobb County Transit Voucher program in Georgia** has a program budget of \$893,190 annually and serves approximately 170 clients per year. Eligible clients are seniors or people with disabilities who do not live within the paratransit service area. Each participant is allowed \$2,400 per year to receive rides from a list of prequalified local private transportation providers. The program has many fraud control measures that are focused on a multi-step voucher processing procedure.

In the early stages of developing the BRAG voucher program model, it was thought that using the "travel checks model" was the most applicable structure to follow; however, after further examination of projects similar in funding, size, and scope to the proposed BRAG program, it is recommended that a simpler structure should be implemented.

The main reason why the travel checks model is not ideal for BRAG is due to the staff time and administration required. The travel checks model requires additional staff time to work one-on-one with a client to develop a trip diary, transportation plan, and mileage allowance. Programs that use an annual dollar amount instead of a mileage allowances generally have lower administration requirements and therefore spend less money on staff time and more money on providing vouchers to clients.

Therefore it is recommended that the BRAG program be structured as simply as possible to ensure that funds are used primarily for providing rides and not for paying for staff time spent on administrative duties. The type of structure recommended is based loosely on the "scrips model" as explained during the conference call on June 27, 2013.

RECOMMENDED STRUCTURE

****NOTE:** *This recommended structure is a snapshot of the program as it is being developed. There will likely be several changes and revisions to this structure prior to implementation. However, the information provided here is useful for agencies or project partners interested in implementing a voucher program and what considerations must be made throughout the planning process.*

- Each voucher may have a face value with varying denominations (\$1, \$5, \$10). These vouchers will be sold in books of \$100. For example, such books could be made up of six \$10 vouchers, six \$5 vouchers, and ten \$1 vouchers. These \$100 books would be sold to each participant at 10% of the total value or \$10. This creates a level of ownership for the participant and helps to defray a portion of the program costs.
- The program should allow participants to use the vouchers for any type of trip they choose. This allows participants to decide if they want to save vouchers for medical trips only or use them for other personal trips. Although most customers use vouchers for medical trips, they appreciate the option to use them for trips that are most important to them.
 - Exception: if the sponsoring entity requires that vouchers be used only for a certain type of trip then BRAG will need to implement trip type restrictions. However, if a sponsor (funding 10% of the budget) requires that their funds be used only for a certain trip type (such as medical trips), this does not restrict the remaining 90% of funds. BRAG would need to develop a system for separating out the sponsors funds to ensure they are only used for that specific trip type, such as color coding sponsored vouchers.
- During the intake process the client will be asked to provide a list of friends/family who will typically be driving them and then will need to submit copies of these individual's drivers license and liability insurance. It is required that the participant submit this information prior to being reimbursed. This will be written on the vouchers as a reminder to participants that they will not be reimbursed until these items are on file.
- Depending on the amount of funding obtained, each participant should be allocated a certain annual amount. For example: if the budget is \$5,000 and 10 participants are deemed eligible, each participant should be allocated approximately \$400 per year (\$4,000), which will leave room in the budget for allocating additional funds to certain clients for special circumstances. This will also allow additional participants to join mid-year if necessary.
- Once a participant has used their entire \$100 booklet they can request to be sent another booklet (up to the amount they are allocated per year). If the program manager should so choose, these could also be allocated on a quarterly basis, to ensure that a participant doesn't use up a year's worth of voucher in a short period of time, noting that intense short-term needs should be discussed.
- The amount of annual funding procured will dictate the number of clients allowed per year. Eligibility restrictions will be determined once the funding is obtained. In the case that the funding source is a sponsoring entity that requires additional eligibility requirements (for example: a private foundation focused on persons with disability), these requirements can be determined at a later time.
- After a participant is deemed eligible, the BRAG mobility manager will provide a short training session that will teach each participant how to:
 - Use the transportation provider list to schedule trips with partnering providers
 - Negotiate a flat rate with friends and family members
 - Fill out the voucher after a trip
 - Instruct providers to resubmit vouchers for reimbursement
- The vouchers themselves should be a three-page carbon copy with one yellow copy, one pink copy and one white copy. The yellow copy is retained by the participant. The white copy is returned by the participant to the BRAG mobility manager. The yellow copy is returned to BRAG by the transportation provider in order to receive payment. Payment should not be sent out to the transportation provider until the customer submits their own

BRAG Coordinated Human Service Transportation Plan

copy. Once both copies have been submitted, payment will be made to the provider within 30 days. If both copies of the voucher are not returned within a 30 day period, the mobility manager will initiate calls to both the customer and the transportation provider to check up on the reason for delinquency. The multiple copies will prevent the transportation provider or a customer from submitting a false voucher.

- Vouchers should be numbered to prevent duplicates/fraud. The voucher will also require a signature from the customer and a signature from the provider.
- Vouchers will also contain information about what type of trips are taken, such as medical, social, education, employment, and other. This information will provide information on how participants are choosing to use their vouchers.
- Each participant will have a file at BRAG that will contain the following:
 - The participant’s application and training paperwork
 - Completed transportation vouchers (the white and pink copies)
 - Spreadsheet with each trip origin and destination, date, amount spent, transportation provider used, annual amount remaining, and any other pertinent information
 - Information for individual drivers: copies of driver’s license and liability insurance
- The BRAG mobility manager will administer the program including: advertisement and recruiting, partnering with transportation providers, eligibility determination, training participants on how to use vouchers, distributing voucher booklets, processing returned vouchers. Another BRAG staff member (perhaps the Executive Director) will review each reimbursement and sign the checks to be sent to transportation providers. Payment will be provided through an online bank bill pay feature to save time and money on postage.
- FTA funding does not require that programs advertise programs publicly, which means that the BRAG can choose participants for the voucher pilot program as they choose. Eligibility will be determined by BRAG and the RCC at a later date.
- The BRAG mobility manager will provide quarterly calls with each client (if the client took a trip that quarter) to inquire about trips and receive feedback about transportation providers and the voucher program. The information collected will be used for an evaluation completed at the end of the pilot period that will identify any changes needed to make the program more effective for participants.
- Optional: It may be appropriate to restrict participants to using the program for a limited period of time (e.g. one year) for two reasons: (1) funding could dry up at any point and participants should be always looking for a more permanent options, and (2) it allows additional people who may be eligible for the program but not allowed due to funding to participate. Especially because the program is only a pilot at this point, participants need to be aware that there is only one year of guaranteed funding.

FUNDING

BRAG has funding set aside for the pilot program through its FTA 5310 and 5311 grants, but the 50% local match funding will need to be found. 10% of this funding is covered by the participant, and it is also recommended that BRAG should search for funding for the other 40% across all sources, including:

- Private businesses, doctor’s offices, etc. Sell it to them as buying 10 trips for a person in need.
- Private foundations
- State transportation funds
- Title IIIB Older Americans Act funding
- 5311 Rural Transportation/5310 Persons with Disabilities federal transportation funds

NEXT STEPS

There are several elements of the program that have yet to be determined. These questions will be answered in future meetings of the Access and Mobility Council prior to implementation in 2014. Some of these future questions/concerns include:

- How do we determine eligibility requirements?
- Who are the prospective participants?
- What is the program budget?
- What is the service area for the project?

STRATEGY 6: RESOURCE SHARING AMONG ORGANIZATIONS

Sharing resources is a low-cost, potentially high-impact approach to implementing coordination of transportation services. Agencies are able to collaborate on relatively low-risk efforts that build trust and generate meaningful progress toward shared objectives. These early successes help build momentum toward implementation of more complex coordination arrangements including future consolidation.

Three specific opportunities have been identified for sharing resources, including: (1) collaboratively defining shared financial record keeping procedures, (2) Pooled Insurance, and (3) Pooled Maintenance. Other shared resources such as driver training or joint fuel purchasing were also explored during the feasibility study but were not high priorities for inclusion in this business plan. Their absence from this plan does not mean that shared driver training and fuel purchasing were not high priorities for the stakeholders. Rather, shared driver training and fuel purchasing are strategies that stakeholders felt could be implemented without the guidance of a business plan.

SPEAKING A COMMON LANGUAGE: COLLABORATIVELY DEFINING SHARED FINANCIAL RECORD KEEPING PROCEDURES

During this feasibility study nearly a dozen local providers of public and human service transportation were interviewed to provide information about the cost and performance of local transportation programs. During these interviews it became apparent that (1) there is limited uniformity in financial data reporting for transportation programs and (2) there is a desire among local stakeholders to improve reporting of transportation costs and outcomes. Indeed, the Director of the Bear River Area Agency on Aging stated during the second project meeting that feedback and guidance on how to report financial data for transportation programs would be a very helpful outcome of this project. This was reiterated during the July 11, 2012 meeting of stakeholders during which participants identified a shared assessment of financial reporting as one of the highest early action priorities for the Regional Coordinating Council.

As such, it is recommended the Regional Coordinating Council assemble a subcommittee of interested organizations to review existing financial reporting requirements and develop a uniform system that enables better decision making and performance measurement of transportation services in the Bear River region. As a starting point for this effort, the Appendix includes a recommended list of accounts that could form the basis of the future reporting framework.

It is recommended the subcommittee be structured as a self-organized working group with the ability to meet outside of regular RCC meetings. The committee will need to involve fiscal staff from each organization, which may necessitate flexibility in how the subcommittee operates.

IMPACT OF SHARED FINANCIAL RECORD KEEPING PROCEDURES

This strategy will not have a direct impact on any of the three performance measures. Instead, it will increase the capacity of each of the participating agencies in identifying shared goals while also supporting implementation of the other strategies identified in this plan. Implementing a mobility management program without a common language among partners regarding desired outcomes, financial reporting, and performance evaluation would be akin to starting a diet without a scale or without any idea about one's weight. As such, this strategy should be viewed as a tool. Just as a

scale helps a dieter know when they are on track to lose weight, a common language for financial record keeping will help the RCC know if it is on track in achieving its goals.

The mobility manager should serve as a repository for cost data reported on an annual basis. The mobility manager should review and use this information to measure performance toward the shared goals of the RCC members. The information will also be useful in setting cost-sharing agreements between agencies for vehicle sharing and other shared-cost services.

POOLED INSURANCE

During the costs analysis several major differences in insurance costs were discovered. Whereas two agencies (DSL and Cache Senior Center) each pay between \$100 and \$150 per vehicle per year for insurance, others (CVTD and CETC) pay as much as \$3,000 per vehicle per year. Although the underlying risks are likely different among these providers, the disparity between the prices paid by the four organizations signals an opportunity for further investigation.

The resource sharing subcommittee should meet with representatives of these organizations to further investigate whether savings could be achieved through pooling of insurance.

IMPACT OF POOLED INSURANCE

Based on a fleet size of 8 vehicles at CVTD and 10 vehicles at CETC, assuming CVTD and CETC are able to each reduce annual insurance costs by \$1,000 per vehicle (i.e. going from an annual premium of \$3,000 per vehicle per year to \$2,000 per vehicle per year), the impact of pooled insurance on these two organizations would amount to an annual savings of \$18,000.

POOLED MAINTENANCE

Similar to the experience with insurance, the cost analysis revealed stark differences in the unit costs of maintenance. Whereas the regional average for vehicle maintenance is between \$0.20 and \$0.40 per mile, DSL achieves an annual maintenance cost of approximately \$0.07 cents per mile. DSL achieves this low rate through the combined effect of frugal operating procedures (which may not be appropriate for larger organizations) and low-cost maintenance services provided through the Utah State University motor pool.

USU's Aggie Shuttle program has traditionally been an active member of the statewide transit association and would likely be a good coordination partner to approach in the spirit of investigating potential opportunities for collaboration.

The resource sharing subcommittee should meet with representatives of USU and potentially also local county motor pools to further investigate whether savings could be achieved through pooling of maintenance.

IMPACT OF POOLED MAINTENANCE

Assuming participation from two agencies (Cache Senior Center and Options for Independence are used in this example) and assuming these agencies are able to achieve an average annual maintenance cost of \$0.15 per mile, the total impact of a pooled maintenance program could save these agencies a combined total of approximately \$6,375 (based on estimates of 30,000 annual miles for Cache Senior Center and 12,500 annual miles for Options for Independence).

COMBINED IMPACT OF RESOURCE SHARING AMONG ORGANIZATIONS

An allocation of one-fifth of the Mobility Manager's time is budgeted to support these efforts. This amounts to a total annual labor cost of \$13,000. Deducting this amount from the total savings generated from the pooled insurance and maintenance strategies yields a net cost savings of \$11,375 (\$18,000 savings from pooled insurance + \$6,375 savings from pooled maintenance – \$13,000 for mobility manager labor).

STRATEGY 7: INTER-REGIONAL 5311 PROGRAM

EXPLORE CACHE/BOX ELDER 5311 PROGRAM

In the beginning of this project, several stakeholders identified a significant need for transportation services between Box Elder and Cache Counties. This unmet need pertained specifically to transportation disadvantaged populations living in Box Elder County needing access to services provided in the Logan-Cache area. Agencies described several requests a month for transportation to medical specialists and treatment centers at Logan Regional Hospital and the Huntsman-Intermountain Cancer Center. One agency also described the high proportion of individuals living in Box Elder County needing to make regularly scheduled trips to Logan for dialysis treatment.

The project team spoke early on with Hospital staff that is happy to make accommodations for a group of patients coming from Box Elder to Logan for a scheduled block of time to receive treatment. This would enable the group of patients to coordinate this trip together with a van or vanpool to ensure that each patient was receiving his or her treatment, and not having to worry about finding a trip among their network of neighbors, friends and family members.

As we continued to discuss this issue at regular meetings, it became the desire of the project team and those stakeholders involved, to seek the possibility of a new 5311 route from Tremonton to Logan. While there is likely a significant amount of planning or feasibility analysis for this to happen, it is the desire of the group to pursue this option with the staff at UDOT's Public Transit Team.

STRATEGY 8: CONTRIBUTE TO IMPROVED AIR QUALITY

AIR QUALITY

It is a growing concern of local citizens and elected officials to address poor air quality in the region. Currently, several transportation providers in the region are promoting cleaner air through group transportation or alternative energy vehicles. This reduces the number of individual trips or harmful emissions while traveling to day programs or places of employment and is an important first step already being taken by member organizations. The RCC and its members will continue to acknowledge air quality concerns through coordination, planning, and new technologies that contribute to this complex issue.

STRATEGY 9: MAINTAIN A HEALTHY/SUSTAINABLE HUMAN SERVICE TRANSPORTATION NETWORK

MAINTAIN SERVICE & FUNDING LEVELS

Several agencies in the Bear River Region utilize federally funded matching programs for capital purchases and operating expenses. In the past, these programs included formula grants authorized under the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient, Transportation Equity Act (SAFETEA-LU). This act expired on September 30, 2012 leading to the new Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21). With this new act also come changes to the eligible programs agencies will have access to for future capital and operating expenses to support human service transportation in the region.

As vehicles are utilized and wear out, it is expected that agencies will seek federal programs for capital purchase of vehicles. There are also agencies seeking to provide a safer in-transit experience for their clients and passengers where there are known behavioral concerns. All of these opportunities help to provide transportation services to areas where there is no public transit available and to maintain at a minimum, current transportation service levels to the remote and rural areas of the Bear River Region.

Despite the need to increase or expand service delivery in certain areas, there is also an important an often overlooked need to maintain existing transportation networks through fleet replacements or continued program support. Many

BRAG Coordinated Human Service Transportation Plan

agencies currently operate at maximum efficiency and rely on a minimum level of program support to maintain a healthy transportation network. Without the existing support of various public, private, and non-profit programs and contributors, agencies would not have the necessary resources to provide the level of safe, efficient, and quality service they currently provide to the transportation disadvantaged in the region.

BRAG will continue to work with the RCC and its members to implement the goals and strategies contained in this plan. Any necessary revisions or updates to this plan will be coordinated through RCC members, the public, and BRAG to ensure that agency goals and strategies are up-to-date and identified in any necessary future versions of the coordinated plan. BRAG will work to revise this plan annually and to conduct a major update every 3 to 5 years or as needed.

5 IMPLEMENTATION PRIORITIES/SCHEDULE

INTRODUCTION

This chapter contains a recommended phasing and a performance-based plan for Year 1 of the implementation process. This list was developed early in 2013 towards the end of the business plan planning process. Since its inception, the RCC and BRAG staff has utilized staff and resources for a number of projects that have already been implemented or are currently underway.

Despite the phasing recommendations, BRAG and the RCC continue to shift and re-prioritize projects in the schedule upon receiving input and recommendations from agencies, local leaders, and the public. The list below is what project participants and the project team developed in early 2013. In addition to the list, the project team has highlighted those projects that are being implemented with notes of their progress to date under the “Update” tabs.

PHASING

IMMEDIATE

In the 1 – 2 year timeframe it is recommended BRAG and the RCC:

- Formalize a Regional Coordinating Council
 - **UPDATE:** The RCC formed in August 2012 and is called the Bear River Regional Access & Mobility Council. This includes a Memorandum of Understanding, Bylaws, and various committees and leadership roles. This group holds regular quarterly meetings to address the goals and strategies of this plan and identify any new opportunities or priorities for the region.
- Establish a BRAG Mobility Management program
 - **UPDATE:** The program currently utilizes BRAG staff to accomplish tasks equivalent to at least 1 FTE position towards Mobility Management in the tri-county area.
- Implement planned website updates for a dynamic resource directory
 - **UPDATE:** The RCC website launched in early 2013 at www.bearrivermobility.org and continues to be updated and restructured as the program continues to grow and accomplish the goals and strategies of this plan.
- Support a circuit Mobility Manager
- Implement a business advocacy campaign to identify and promote mobility-friendly businesses
 - **UPDATE:** This program, termed OPEN ACCESS, was developed by BRAG staff and the RCC in early 2013 and was implemented beginning in spring 2013. A complete description of this program can be found in Appendix C and also online at www.bearrivermobility.org.
- Implementation of a flexible travel voucher program
 - **UPDATE:** Nelson Nygaard is completing work on the BRAG Voucher Program and is expected to be implemented in 2014 as a pilot project in the region.
- Create a common financial and performance reporting framework among partners
 - **UPDATE:** The Projects committee of the RCC is currently working on an outline for agencies to track all financial aspects of transportation programs in the region.
- Investigate pooled maintenance & insurance opportunities
 - **UPDATE:** The RCC held a special meeting to hear from other planners in the state, as well as representatives from the Utah League of Governments Trust (ULGT) to discuss the opportunities of an insurance pool for

agencies in the Bear River Region. The RCC continues to research this strategy and will be more relevant when the RCC establishes a volunteer driver program.

- Support ad-hoc vehicle sharing
 - **UPDATE:** Some agencies in the region already support ad-hoc vehicle sharing with established policies and guidelines for use of their vehicles. The RCC will continue work to develop a vehicle sharing program to include more agencies and increase the number of transportation disadvantaged individuals served by ad-hoc vehicle sharing.
- Advocate for policy changes that support access and mobility
 - **UPDATE:** The Advocacy & Outreach Committee of the RCC meets monthly and is currently working with state legislators and the Department of Services for People with Disabilities to explore and advocate an increase in the Motor Transportation Payment (MTP) rate for DSPD clients.
- Partner with UDOT to study a rural 5311 funded transit system in Box Elder County.
 - **UPDATE:** The RCC and members of the Projects Committee began identifying the current unmet need of transportation disadvantaged persons that would benefit from a Box Elder to Cache transit connection. Currently, the area of most critical need involves those individuals who live in Box Elder County needing transportation services to Cache County for dialysis and other medical treatment/services.
- Support current, new, or expanded service and transportation needs of human service agencies in the region. Explore existing or new funding opportunities to support a healthy, sustainable, transportation network in the region.

MEDIUM TERM

As the interest and capacity of the RCC permits – meaning, as soon as the RCC is ready – additional efforts should be pursued including:

- Implementation of a retired vehicle sharing program
- Collaborative grant-writing
 - **UPDATE:** BRAG staff continues to assist agencies with grants and other funding opportunities for transportation.
- Development of supports for and expansion of volunteer driver programs
- Create new or expand existing travel training programs

LONG TERM

In the 3 – 5 year timeframe, the following strategies are recommended:

- Implementation of a Rural Public Transit service between Tremonton and Logan
 - **UPDATE:** Members of the RCC Projects Committee are identifying potential project partners and assessing the potential ridership for an intercity service between Box Elder and Cache County. The route would begin as a once to twice a week route that could be used to build support and identify the true need for a more established, long term route.
- Revise coordination plan, re-visit consolidation

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

FIVE-YEAR IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE

The following table outlines a five-year schedule for the mobility management program. The schedule is an illustrative road map for how the strategies could be implemented. This is not a hard and fast rule about the timing of

BRAG Coordinated Human Service Transportation Plan

implementation. Instead, it conveys a rationale for how the RCC and mobility management team might structure its activities over the next five-year period.

IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE STRATEGIES	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
STRATEGY 1: FORMALIZE REGIONAL COORDINATING COUNCIL, CONTINUE QUARTERLY MEETINGS AND PROJECT DEVELOPMENT	■	■	■	■	■
STRATEGY 2: INFORMATION & REFERRAL	■	■	■	■	■
STRATEGY 3: SUPPORT & EXPAND VOLUNTEER DRIVER PROGRAMS		■	■		
STRATEGY 4: EXPLORE RETIRED, SHARED VEHICLE PROGRAMS			■		
STRATEGY 5: DEVELOP FLEXIBLE VOUCHER PROGRAM. IF SUCCESSFUL CONTINUE PROGRAM	■	■			
STRATEGY 6: RESOURCE SHARING AMONG ORGANIZATIONS	■	■	■	■	■
STRATEGY 7: INTER-REGIONAL 5311 PROGRAM	■	■			
STRATEGY 8: AIR QUALITY	■	■	■	■	■
STRATEGY 9: MAINTAIN A HEALTHY/SUSTAINABLE HUMAN SERVICE TRANSPORTATION NETWORK	■	■	■	■	■

**Note: The RCC will continue to update this table as new strategies/priorities are identified and revisions are made to this plan and the mobility management team schedule.*

6 TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS AND APPLICATION SCHEDULE

INTRODUCTION

This section identifies projects in the Bear River Region that will utilize federally funded MAP-21 Formula Programs for capital or operations expenses beginning in 2014. Projects are aimed at addressing the goals and strategies identified in this plan that were developed to help meet the needs of transportation underserved in the region. These projects are developed locally and derived from regular planning and quarterly meetings held by the Bear River Access & Mobility Council.

This project list was added to the 2013 Bear River Coordinated Human Service Transportation Plan in September 2014 as a plan amendment. A more complete list will be developed in conjunction with a transportation coordination plan update to be completed in 2015. The updated list will include anticipated human service agency transportation projects seeking federal funding assistance for capital and operations expenses over the next three to five years.

TRANSPORTATION PROJECT LIST/APPLICATION SCHEDULE

AGENCY NAME	PROJECT	2014	2015	2016	2017
Cache Employment & Training	(2) 22' Paratransit vans to replace aging vehicles and maintain existing services for people with disabilities in Box Elder and Cache Counties.	✓	✓	✓	✓
Cache Employment & Training	Operations assistance for drivers, ride-along-assistants, dispatch, transportation software, gas, insurance, repairs, etc.	✓	✓	✓	✓
Developmental Skills Laboratory	(1) ADA van to replace an aging vehicle and maintain existing services for people with disabilities in Cache County.	-	-	-	✓
Bear River Association of Governments	BRAG Flex Voucher Program. Operations assistance for mileage reimbursement of approved voucher trips.	✓	✓	✓	✓
Bear River Association of Governments	BRAG Mobility Management	✓	✓	✓	✓
Options for Independence	(1) ADA van to replace an aging vehicle and maintain existing services for people with disabilities in Cache County.	-	✓	-	-

**Note: This list will be updated in 2015 and is considered current and complete for projects seeking funding in 2014. The RCC will continue to update this table as new strategies/priorities are identified and revisions are made to this plan.*

APPENDIX A – PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT/PROJECT PARTNERS

Aggie Shuttle - Utah State University
Avalon Health Care Group - Pioneer Care Center
Avalon Health Care Group - Willow Glen Health & Rehabilitation
Bear Lake Convention and Visitor's Bureau
Bear Lake Manor
Bear Lake Memorial Skilled Nursing Facility
Bear Lake Regional Commission
Bear River Association of Governments
Bear River Head Start
Bear River Health Department Logan City
Bear River House
Bear River Mental Health
Bear River Valley Care Center
Bear River Valley Senior Citizen's Center
Bee Hive Homes
Box Elder Community Pantry
Box Elder County
Box Elder Family Support
Boys & Girls Club
BRAG Senior Companions Program
Bridgerland Applied Technology College (BATC) Logan Campus
Bridgerland Cab
Bridgerland Literacy
Brigham City
Brigham City Clubhouse
Brigham City Senior Center and Senior Transit
Cache County
Cache County Red Cross
Cache County Senior Citizen Center
Cache Employment & Training Center
Cache Metropolitan Planning Organization
Cache Valley Adult Day Center
Cache Valley Assisted Living
Cache Valley Bank
Cache Valley Community Health Center
Cache Valley Transit District (CVTD)
Cache Valley Volunteer Center
CAPSA
Centro de Familia de Utah (Providence)
Centro de Familia Head Start (Box Elder)
Centro de Familia Head Start (Providence)
Centro De La Familia Migrant and Seasonal Headstart
Child & Family Support
Chrysalis
Common Ground
Community Action Partnership
Community Nursing Services
Community Trans. Assoc. of Idaho - District 5
Country Lane Assisted Living Center - Bldg #2
Deseret Industries
Disability Law Center
Family Info & Resource Center
Family to Family Network
Food Pantry
Garden City
Green Valley Cab
Greyhound
Hyrum Senior Citizen's Center
Intermountain Homecare Hospice
LDS Employment
Legacy House
Life Skills and Individual Needs Center
Logan Nursing and Rehabilitation Center
Logan Parks & Recreation
Logan Regional Hospital
Multi-Cultural Center of Cache Valley
NAMI Cache Valley Affiliate
New Discoveries Clubhouse
Northwest Band of the Shoshone
Oneida County School District, Curlew Valley Community Center
Options for Independence
Our House Assisted Living
Pioneer Care & Rehabilitation - Avalon Health Care Group
Pocatello Regional Transit
Retired Senior Volunteer Program (RSVP)
Rich County
Rich County Senior Citizen's Center
Rocky Mountain Care
Salt Lake Express
Smithfield Senior Center
Stevens Henager College
Sunshine Terrace Foundation
Terrace Grove Assisted Living
Tremonton City
Tremonton Taxi Shuttle and Courier
UDOT - Systems Planning and Programming
United Way Cache Valley
USU Access & Diversity Center
USU Center for Persons with Disabilities
USU Developmental Skills Lab
USU Disability Resource Center
USU LAEP Dept.
USU SAAVI (Sexual Assault and Anti-Violence Information)
UTA
Utah Department of Workforce Services - Logan Center
Utah Special Olympics
Utah Trailways
Veteran's Hospital Transport
Williamsburg Retirement Community
Willow Glen Health & Rehabilitation - Avalon Health Care Group