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1 PURPOSE AND APPROACH

Stakeholders in Michigan’s Grand Traverse region have chosen to develop regional mobility management strategies under the Michigan Sustainable Communities/Smart Growth America Demonstration Project. These strategies will be designed to optimize organizational structure and service delivery for public transportation services and serve as a model for statewide service delivery. They will focus on achieving the transportation goals identified in the Grand Vision planning process for the six counties of Antrim, Benzie, Grand Traverse, Kalkaska, Leelanau and Wexford.

The purpose of this document is to present a range of approaches and mobility management strategies for consideration. The alternative approaches are based on interviews with stakeholders; independent research and analysis by the consultant team; transportation goals and objectives included in the Grand Vision Document (Mead & Hunt et al., 2009) the Grand Toolbox (Mead & Hunt, 2010); the BATA Transit Service & Coordination Study (Vlecides Shroeder Associates, Inc., 2011); and Expanding Transportation Choices in the Grand Traverse Region: Connecting Villages and Towns with Public Transit (Michigan Land Use Institute, 2009).

This is a working document to be used in the second stage of the planning process. It is meant to serve as a starting point for discussion and will be updated based on stakeholder feedback. Following a stakeholder meeting, the next step is to build an implementation plan including organizational structure, leadership, and responsibilities; financial needs and resources; reporting and performance measures; necessary policy changes; and public engagement and education strategies. The final report will summarize the full process and present a final implementation plan.

1.1 Community Vision and Goals

While the Grand Vision and other planning documents do not use the term “mobility management”, they clearly articulate a vision and goals that are consistent with mobility management concepts and that can be accomplished through mobility management approaches.

Grand Vision stakeholders are seeking to increase public transportation services between cities and villages in the region, and expand infrastructure serving pedestrians and bicyclists both in and out of town. They hope to achieve a regionally coordinated set of public and private transportation options including: public bus, public school bus, private taxis, limousines and buses, carpooling, ride-sharing, volunteer ride service, etc., and seamlessly integrate these modes into an overall multi-modal transportation system.

The BATA Transit Service & Coordination Study (Vlecides Shroeder Associates, Inc., 2011) states that one of the most important elements of the Grand Vision is that it identifies the strengthening of regional connectivity among villages and Traverse City to be of great importance both for growing housing and employment, and for preserving rural, natural, and scenic areas. The vision and goals are perhaps best articulated in a quote from Grand Vision consultant John Fregonese, included in (Michigan Land Use Institute, 2009):
“In developing the Grand Vision, the public was very clear in their support for a modern, efficient transit system that connects people in cities and villages across the region. If there is one regional public investment that can most directly influence future growth patterns, I think it will be an investment in a coordinated, efficient public transit system. And I believe that the Grand Traverse region is perfectly positioned to get this done.”

Building on these goals, participants at the first stakeholders’ meeting identified several important outcomes they would like to see from this project:

1) They want to help achieve a paradigm shift in which the public and decision-makers perceive the region’s transit providers as viable and important resources for sustaining and improving the region’s economy.

2) They want to make transit more usable. This echoes a goal articulated in the 2009 MLUI Report, which states that by creating a system that works for more riders, agencies will create a system that has more community support.

3) They want to develop strategies with outcomes that are achievable within a relatively short timeframe so they can point to initial successes and generate momentum toward the big picture goals.

4) They want to develop strategies that will position the region to receive available federal funding.

1.2 What is mobility management

Mobility management strategies offer an effective approach to optimizing the value of transportation services. Mobility management encompasses and synthesizes a broad range of complementary strategies including:

- Qualified, professional staff who coordinate public transportation and human service transportation
- Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) designed and implemented using good planning processes
- Effective marketing and convenient service
- Creative, broad-based funding strategies including public-private partnerships, and strong community support and local funding that leverages federal and state funding
- Engagement in transportation demand management and local and regional planning efforts to ensure sustainable, transit oriented community design and growth patterns

The American Public Transportation Association (APTA), defines the term as follows: “Mobility management involves creating partnerships with transportation providers in a community or region to enhance travel options, and then developing means to effectively communicate those options to the public” (American Public Transportation Association, 2013)
2 STRATEGIES AND EXAMPLES

The following section outlines four areas of opportunity in the Grand Traverse area. Within each, several potential strategies are provided. Following the strategy discussions, some sections conclude with examples from other communities that we have identified through our preliminary research.

It is important to note that we strongly support the strategy recommendations in the 2011 BATA Study, and because BATA is investing significant effort in implementing these far reaching changes the strategies alternatives in this document have been developed with two objectives in mind:

1. Create strategies that are complementary and can be integrated with the strategies in the 2011 BATA Study.
2. Focus on strategies for coordinating and improving service with the four counties that are outside of BATA’s service area.

1. Improve coordination between public and intercity transportation providers.

*Build on the work that is already being done to plan and implement the next stage of coordination with a focus on eliminating barriers for customers who need to travel across county lines.*

A. Coordinate service design to facilitate transfers.

One of the most important strategies included in the 2011 BATA Study is to reorganize County Ride services into a more efficient and cost effective system that is designed to strengthen Village Connector ridership leading into Traverse City. The plan proposes a new zone system designed to have one vehicle circulate within a designated zone, then “feed” the local Village Connector service at key locations. These locations would be clearly signed bus stops where Village Connector buses stop at regularly scheduled times. However the Village Connectors are proposed to operate as flex routes, permitting them to deviate within ½ mile of the main route to serve passenger needs.

In order to create an efficient regional public transportation network, the four counties outside BATA’s service area could feed into this redesigned BATA Village Connector system. The 2011 BATA Study recommends cooperating with neighboring transit agencies for mutual benefit by coordinating transfer at remote locations. Neighboring counties like Benzie and Antrim, as well as Wexford and Kalkaska, could benefit by minimizing mileage, fuel and time required to travel into the Hall Street transfer center, potentially enhancing their ability to increase service coverage and frequency in their basic service areas within existing budget, while BATA would realize an increase in ridership.

As is currently being implemented with the Benzie Bus, coordinating service design and timing will be essential for achieving this goal. To accomplish this, all the counties outside BATA’s service area could assess the potential to create Village Connector style flex routes that can feed into BATA’s
Village Connector services. As discussed in Strategy 1.E below, coordination with the Indian Trails intercity service offers an additional opportunity to enhance this inter-county connectivity.

For each of the four counties outside BATA’s service area a separate feasibility assessment will be necessary. The objectives of the assessments would be to determine unmet needs and demand from different populations including commuters, tourists and others. This information will be necessary to design appropriate service including aspects such as timing and frequency. These assessments may also indicate that there is not enough demand to justify Village Connector-style flex routes and that a better use of resources would be to focus on developing park and ride facilities and ridesharing programs.

**B. Explore strategies for fare coordination and fare sharing.**

Fare coordination will be a challenging aspect of creating an effective regional public transportation system. As with all mobility management strategies, the fare system needs to be designed first and foremost to meet the needs of the target customers. If a two-day pass is ideal for tourists and a monthly pass is ideal for commuters, then both options should be offered. Just as importantly, passes should be easy to purchase. For example, the providers can explore partnering with hotels to sell passes for tourists and partnering with large employers to make passes available to commuters. Ideally, an online purchasing option would also be created.

We do not recommend attempting to create a multi-county system based on electronic fare cards. Both the complexity and cost of such a system would be prohibitive. This is one of the more complicated technology deployments with high relative initial investment and dedicated time from staff; the cost of smart cards has been recognized in the literature as a deterrent to smart cards; and for demand response services or reservation-based services, there is little need for a smart card. It is worth noting that it took the San Francisco Bay Area multiple years to develop this type of system and, where technology sits today, the investment of time and money is generally only justified in a high ridership urban area. Rapidly changing technology can change this situation within the next few years as phones become electronic wallets.

A realistic lower-tech solution for the Grand Traverse Area would be to develop a regional pass and cost sharing mechanism. This would require negotiating consistent costs and policies between counties including offering a variety of pass options (single ride, daily, weekly, monthly, etc.). One of the complex tasks will be negotiating business rules and how to allocate revenue between the five public transportation providers, and establishing a clearinghouse to exchange funds.

Information about this topic is included in the Transit Cooperative Research Program’s (TCRP) report: "Fare Policies, Structures, and Technologies: Update (Multisystems, Inc. et.al., 2003).” The report states that the integration of card/revenue management functions from several agencies can be challenging.

“Complex partnership agreements must be developed to address responsibilities, ownership, and allocation of costs and revenues. A clearinghouse or payment settlement process can be established to manage these processes, but all participating agencies must come to agreement on revenue management policies and
procedures. The types of issues and requirements that must be considered in developing a regional fare system generally fall under the following categories:

- **Overall Policy and Business Rules.** Establishing the business structure, including the financial and governance framework and system procurement strategy; addressing customer concerns; setting fare policy for the region.
- **Technical Requirements.** Developing system architecture and technology standards; identifying effective implementation staging.
- **Administrative and Customer Support Functions.** Establishing revenue settlement and data-sharing procedures, as well as customer service functions.”

Another resource that discusses differential fare structures and automated fare media is the Caltrans Transit Wiki (Bergstein, 2012).

To address these challenges, it will be important to evaluate lessons learned from other regions of the country that have already implemented fare sharing. There are a variety of models that can be explored. One example is the North by Northwest Connector in Oregon which recently designed and implemented tourist-oriented regional fares for a five county region. Their five-year funding plan states that “inadequate information is currently available to forecast fare recovery from a regional pass program for all five agencies.” Therefore, the plan includes a follow up study “to quantify and evaluate the benefits and/or financial impacts of regional fares... An expected outcome is refinement of the regional fare policy structure to improve geographic fairness and sustainability.” This follow up study is budgeted at $300,000. (David Evans and Associates, 2012)

The intercity bus industry offers another example of fare coordination between carriers that does not rely on electronic payment media. Ticket prices are based on a per-mile cost, and any ticket agent that is part of the national ticketing system can arrange a ticket for their own carrier’s service with connections to another carrier. For example, a rider can purchase a ticket from Traverse City to Minneapolis through Indian Trails, for a standard fare of $89. The rider would start their trip on an Indian Trails bus then transfer to Greyhound. Indian Trails would retain revenue ($38.27) based on the 43% of the miles on Indian Trails; the remainder would be owed to Greyhound for their portion of the ride. At the end of the month, Indian Trails tallies up how much it owes Greyhound and posts that amount on the national clearinghouse; Greyhound does the same; the net difference is calculated, and that amount is transferred between the two organizations’ bank accounts (i.e., one company writes a check to the other for the amount owed).

A similar mileage-based system could work for the Grand Traverse region in cases where passes are sold for a single ride. However, for multi-ride passes, a mileage-based revenue-allocation system would require implementing electronic pass cards.
C. **Use a cost allocation model as a basis for developing budgets and negotiating cost and revenue allocations.**

Knowing the true cost of services is an essential starting point for negotiating the details of a coordinated regional transportation network. A cost allocation model is not only important for negotiations between public transportation providers, it also valuable for negotiating contracts with partners such as human service agencies and large employers.

In addition to allowing an agency to know the true cost of the services provided, a fully allocated cost model also allows equal comparison of costs between varying types of service, such as a commuter service that covers a longer distance at a higher average speed, and an in-town route that travels at a lower average speed with more stops. When combined with ridership, this establishes a baseline for developing a fair contract for service, or multi-agency fare structure.

The cost of providing transportation could vary between different organizations if one organization has higher overhead or driver salary costs than another. Such cost variations could result from differences in overall organizational efficiency. Any other significant difference would likely result from accounting practices that do not capture the full cost of the ride. Generally, staffing costs per hour and overhead are more significant factors than fuel efficiency.

Developing the cost allocation model requires a budget or statement of operating funds, the miles of service, and hours of service for a year. For example, the cost allocation model for a transit agency we recently worked with is summarized by the following equation from the costs and associated categories in the agency’s budget.

\[
2012 \text{ Operating Cost} = 1.45 \left( \frac{$34.90}{\text{Hours in Service}} \times \# \text{ of Hours in Service} + \frac{$0.87}{\text{Miles in Service}} \times \# \text{ of Miles in Service} \right)
\]

The cost allocation model shown above follows a standard transportation cost allocation models and includes only operating costs. Values for the cost model are calculated as follows:

\[
\text{Fixed Cost Factor} = 1 + \frac{\text{Fixed Costs}}{\text{Hour Costs} + \text{Mile Costs}} = 1 + \frac{$301,683}{$471,225 + $203,580} = 1.45
\]

\[
\text{Average Unit Cost} = \frac{\text{Hour Costs}}{\text{Vehicle Hours}} = \frac{$471,225}{13,504 \text{ hr}} = \frac{$34.90}{\text{hr}}
\]

\[
\text{Average Mile Costs} = \frac{\text{Mile Costs}}{\text{Vehicle Miles}} = \frac{$203,580}{232,764 \text{ mi}} = \frac{$0.87}{\text{mi}}
\]

The average cost per hour of service is $72.31. The average cost per mile of service is $4.20.

When the hours and miles for a special service are estimated, these numbers can be plugged into the formula to estimate cost, which in turn can be used to negotiate contracts.
D. Find or develop a method to share data between different transit providers’ demand response software.

Because of the varying needs of each transportation provider they are not all using the same dispatching software. This is a typical situation and is not a significant barrier to regional coordination as long as the region uses a good systems engineering planning process to design and invest in an Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) technology solution that allows the different systems to communicate with each other in order to share data.

As with the design of any ITS solution, we strongly recommend working with experts who have in-depth knowledge and experience with transit. One option for the Grand Traverse region would be to use software developed through Oregon’s Ride Connection, which is discussed in more detail under Examples in Section 3 below. Because there is a gap in commercially available software, Ride Connection has gotten into the business of building and sharing applications that helps them coordinate between multiple providers with differing demand response software. One module is a slimmed-down demand response software for organizations with very few vehicles. Another module is a translator between different demand response software used by different organizations. Their software is open source; instead of buying the software, you pay a developer to implement it for your geography.

E. Coordinate with Indian Trails intercity

We recommend including Indian Trails in regional coordination discussions. Intercity bus service is often neglected when communities plan transportation coordination. However, intercity bus service can play a variety of important roles. An important first step is to use the same bus stops for local and intercity buses whenever possible. Coordinating route timing to facilitate transfers is another obvious step if intercity buses stop during operating hours for local transit services.

The Grand Traverse region is served by an Indian Trails intercity bus route that operates seven days a week, with one trip north and one trip south every day serving the communities of Cadillac and Manton in Wexford County; Kingsley and Traverse City in Grand Traverse County; and Charlevoix in Antrim County. This service can benefit from connectivity both within and outside the region for needs such as business trips, medical trips and tourist trips. However, the greatest benefits would be achieved with higher frequency and by ensuring a high quality experience that includes safe, attractive bus stops;

F. Coordinate with the tribe

The Grand Traverse Band of Ottawa and Chippewa Indians is a key coordination partner as one of the largest employers in the area, the operator of key tourism destinations, an organization whose members need transportation, a potential funder, and a potential transportation operator. Coordination could begin with a tribal-local government partnership to explore the potential for integrating their services, resources and needs into the strategies the region chooses to implement. Among the key opportunities are the following:

• The tribe operates the Turtle Creek Casino & Hotel, the Leelanau Sands Casino & Lodge, and Grand Traverse Resort and Spa. According to the tribe, the Grand Traverse Resort and Spa is
the Midwest’s largest full service year round resort and conference center (Grand Traverse Band, 2012).

- Twice a year the tribe distributes 2% of its gaming revenues, worth about $2 million per year, for impacts associated with the existence and location of tribal casinos. About half the applicants receive funds (Grand Traverse County, 2013).
- The tribe does not operate public transportation utilizing FTA funds but would be eligible for the Tribal Transit Program Section 5311(c) as well as any other FTA program open to governments serving rural areas. The Tribal Transit Program (TTP) provides direct funding to federally-recognized Indian tribes for the purpose of providing public transportation service on and around Indian reservations in rural areas. Eligible projects include capital, operating, and planning studies. Funding is available at 100% federal share, although FTA is interested in the Tribe’s financial commitment to proposed projects and the ability to leverage other funding. Funds are competitively allocated (Federal Transit Administration, 2012).

**Example: North by Northwest**

A regional coordination model that potentially has much to offer the Grand Traverse area is Oregon’s North by Northwest Connector. This effort was initiated by a partnership of public transportation providers serving five largely rural counties along the Oregon coast and along the Hood River, west and northwest of Portland. The effort was launched in 2010 with a special grant from the US Department of Energy (USDOE) General Innovation Fund. The grant allowed the transit alliance to launch a pilot program of regional strategies aimed at increasing transit use by commuters and visitors, and decreasing community dependence on fossil fuels. The grant also allowed the partners to develop and test strategies for improving the sustainability of current funding streams, and potentially generate new revenues for transit. This program is primarily focused on fixed route service.

The five partners are implementing the following actions to foster collaboration, improve transit connections between communities, and share resources to improve the cost effectiveness of their services and programs. The following information is taken from their recently published Northwest Oregon Transit Alliance Funding Plan. Our contact with the North by Northwest Connector is the Executive Director of Sunset Empire Transportation District and Northwest Ride Center who has offered to share as much info as he can about the project.

**Branding of a Regional Transit System**

“North by Northwest Connector” along with a logo and the slogan “Be Driven” is the brand the partnership created to unify and market their collective identity and services. The partners refer to themselves as the Northwest Oregon Transit Alliance (NWOTA) or sometimes as the “Connector Alliance”.

**Centralized Website**

As shown above, they have created a centralized website with a regional trip planner and links to each individual service’s website along with other information.
Leadership
NWOTA has established a Coordinating Committee to improve inter-agency coordination. The partnership’s top priority for the next one to two years is to continue administrative support for this committee. They are considering a part time contracted position to staff this effort. The estimated cost is $20,000 potentially funded through state mobility management funding. Their Funding Plan states that, “Transit agency staffs have many competing demands on their time and little extra time available to take on oversight of large regional projects. In some cases, the Alliance may wish to retain an independent representative to oversee technical work prepared by contractors and ensure NWOTA’s funding responsibilities are met. Depending on the type of project, this could be done by temporarily increasing the scope of NWOTA’s administrative support contract, or by retaining another representative to assist.”

Non-Profit 501(c)(3) Foundation
In addition to the Coordinating Committee, the partnership has created the North by Northwest Transportation Foundation, a non-profit 501(c)(3) organization that will serve as a “friends of transit” group assisting with fundraising for multi-modal transportation projects and programs within the five-county area. The foundation is governed by a board of community members representing businesses, higher education and other civic interests in all five counties. The partnership’s Funding Plan states that, “A close partnership between the Foundation and the transit alliance Coordinating Committee is essential for the continued success and sustainability of the CONNECTOR system. As the transit alliance identifies needs that the Foundation might be able to help fund, a formal request to the Foundation should be made for each individual project or activity.”

Creation of this foundation is part of a long term goal of overhauling the current grant-dependent funding model for transit and achieving true sustainability through a departure from dependence on unsecure revenue sources and the creation of reliable funding streams.

Sharing Capital Assets
Each of the five counties retains their current ownership, authorities and responsibilities for their own physical assets, but cooperates with the others to share assets (such as the shared use of transit stop facilities) when appropriate.

Operational Coordination
Each transit agency is responsible for transit operations within their own service area, but cooperates with the others to improve the cost effectiveness and convenience of regional transit travel. This includes not only coordinating schedules and transfer locations, but in some cases sharing staff resources to tap the collective expertise available in all five counties.

Regional Passes
The transit alliance will be implementing a regional pass program for visitors. A 3-day and a 7-day pass will be offered which will allow one round trip to/from the I-5 corridor and unlimited travel within the three coastal counties while the pass is valid.

City-Sponsored Hotel/Motel Programs
The partnership has identified hotel/motel programs as a potential funding source for individual agencies. One of the partner agencies (Lincoln County Transit) currently has an informal agreement
with the City of Newport to provide bus service to hotels and motels concentrated along the beach. The City reimburses LCT $90,000 annually for this service. The City also prints the transit passes and distributes them to the hotels and motels. The hotel clerk writes the name of the hotel on the pass, and the bus driver accepts the pass as payment. As passengers disembark, the driver gives them tokens to use as transfers for the remainder of the day. Any city hotels or motels can participate in the program and as of December 13, 2011 31 hotels and motels were participating. The lodging establishments are enthusiastic about the passes because they alleviate parking problems and represent a perk that the hotels and motels provide to their customers free of charge.

**Human Service Agency Partnerships**

One of the partner agencies (Sunset Empire Transportation District) is the NEMT provider for three of the counties in the transit alliance and reports that, “It works great because it provides administrative cost support to their district, as well as providing some contract revenue to the three participating county districts.”

**Tribal Partnerships**

Currently one of the partner agencies (LCT) has an excellent partnership with the Siletz Tribe, which provides federal tribal transit dollars for transit service. Discussions are underway with another tribe in the region.

**Example: Shoreline Explorer, Maine**

![Shoreline Explorer, Maine](https://www.shorelineexplorer.com/)

**Figure 1:** Shoreline Explorer, Maine
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Another regional coordination model that could be researched further is Maine’s Shoreline Explorer. This service is a public-private partnership between a regional public transit service, intercity bus, Amtrak and three private trolley services. It features unified branding, a centralized website, coordinated schedules and mobility management by a non-profit human services agency.

The Shoreline Explorer connects the coastal communities in York County, Maine and is operated by the York County Community Action Corporation (YCCAC). YCCAC delivers a range of transportation services including trolley, demand-response, and deviated fixed-routes (flex routes). YCCAC also relies on a large volunteer driver system to fill gaps in service. The Shoreline Explorer serves key area tourist destinations in coastal communities, and also includes coordinated connections with local and regional private transportation providers, along with Amtrak’s Downeaster trains between Portland and Boston. The service is provided with six trolley buses, and began operations in 2006.

Located on the southern end of Maine the county and is home to approximately 197,000 residents with small towns, widely separated from each other, many of which do not have a grocery store, bank, or other basic services. Tourism is a major driver for the local economy, however the service workers tend to live in inland communities with high unemployment. The YCCAC, in collaboration with the chambers of commerce and other stakeholders, created the Shoreline Explorer with the goal of providing a transportation option that would help residents get to work and connect the various communities together. Their goal was not only to increase access to jobs for residents, but also to contribute to the economic viability of local businesses. They focused on creating mobility for three target groups: tourists, workers, and local residents with children, who needed a way to go shopping, visit the beach, or go to the museum. (Reconnecting America and Community Transportation Association of America, 2012)

2. Incorporate infrastructure elements into mobility management implementation.

G. Use the development of each transfer facility, park-and-ride and bus stop as a place-making and economic development opportunity.

Section 3.6 of the 2011 BATA Study includes good recommendations for designing and siting transfer facilities. The four counties outside BATA’s service area should consider these recommendations for transfer and park and ride facilities they develop. For place-making and economic development, particularly important siting considerations include bicycle and pedestrian accessibility and adjacent land uses. Ideally these facilities would be incorporated into commercial nodes with complementary businesses such as grocery stores, pharmacies, restaurants or tourist oriented shops if a route is likely to be used by tourists. These commercial nodes should be safely accessible for bicyclists and pedestrians travelling from residential areas and/or from lodging facilities.

Place-making at bus stop is important on many levels. Attractive bus stops are a very effective marketing tool, increasing awareness of the service and conveying a sense that public transportation is an essential part of the community. By offering riders convenience and comfort high quality bus stops can significantly increase ridership. To achieve these goals, bus stops should include street
furniture (benches and shelters), good signage, lighting, and an ADA accessible concrete pad. Complete sidewalks, safe bicycle access, and bike racks are also important components.

H. Work with MDOT to identify barriers and solutions to siting bus stops on state highways. Michigan DOT and the Federal Highway Administration provide road design guidance with enough flexibility to build and maintain state highways that also serve as community arterials and places where community buses can safely stop and pick up passengers. Concerns primarily relate to the safe recovery zone for motorists who veer off the road, also known as the clear zone; a secondary concern is the safe stopping of the bus and re-entry into the traffic flow.

Transportation engineers are tasked with designing safe roads; when on federally funded roads, they use the design guidelines of the Michigan Road Design Manual (Michigan Department of Transportation, 2013). Derived from national guidelines including the Roadside Design Guide (American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, 2011) the manual includes roadside clear zone guides based on the principle of providing a safe recovery area for motorists. The goal is to place roadside infrastructure as far as is feasible from the travel way.

To avoid stops on state highways, often transit agencies will place stops on side roads or in parking lots. This has the negative side effect of increasing travel time of the bus, and often it can lead to pedestrian conflicts within the parking lots. The best option is for road design to accommodate a bus stop on the road, and for site design to accommodate safe pedestrian access from the road to the building.

Applicable bus stop infrastructure guidance can be interpreted from Section 9 of the Michigan Road Design Manual as it relates to the placement of utility poles. In a Central Business District where speed limits are under 35 mph and there are curbs and sidewalks, benches and shelters can be places as little as 2 feet from the curb. Where the speed limit exceeds 35 mph, the suggested clear zone distance varies from 18 to 30 feet from the edge of travel way, depending on design speed. Standards from other states such as Florida, Delaware, and Oregon more explicitly address bus stops following this same clear zone principle.

Michigan guidance does not address buses stopping in the travel lane, on the shoulder, or in a bus pull-out, but other state design guides such as Oregon DOT suggest bus bays on roads with speed limits above 35 mph.

As stated and reinforced in FHWA guidelines relating to context sensitive design, complete streets, and flexibility in highway design, the AASHTO Green Book and the Michigan Road Design Manual are guidelines, not standards:

“It should be recognized that this is a guideline and that individual cases may arise which require special treatment such as: traffic signal installations; locations demonstrating fixed-object accident patterns; and locations with unique design problems, sight distance restrictions, high pedestrian activity, or unique environmental conditions. Departmental review procedures will take these factors into account.” (Michigan Department of Transportation, 2013, Section 9.03.01A)
When travel speeds are below 35 mph local transit operators could have few problems working with MDOT to accommodate on-street bus stops. Where design speeds are at 35 mph and above local representatives could work with MDOT to explore options including:

- Traffic calming tactics to lower speeds below 35 mph such as road diets, curb bulbs, or narrower lanes,
- Using shoulders or bus bays to accommodate bus stops while placing benches and shelters outside of the clear zone,
- Using a breakaway design within the clear zone,
- Applying another special treatment to accommodate bus stops.

I. **Explore the potential to share resources between counties and intercity bus to develop transit stations.**

Creative resource sharing may play an important role in creating a high quality regional transportation network. Attractive, well-sited transfer facilities will be important for gaining ridership by commuters and tourists. Siting decisions should be made based on benefit and convenience for riders, not based on whether a facility will benefit one county or another. Developing a high quality transfer facility may require investment from one or more adjacent counties in addition to the county in which the facility is located.

J. **Actively participate in planning efforts at all levels to ensure that opportunities to install bus stop and bicycle/pedestrian infrastructure are not missed.**

In many communities, opportunities to install bicycle/pedestrian and bus stop infrastructure are routinely missed because these facilities are left out of planning documents as well as the development review process. Public transportation and bicycle/pedestrian needs can be, at best, an afterthought if they are considered at all when important plans and decisions are being made – such as facility siting decisions.

We have worked in communities where transit needs are acknowledged in planning documents, but no standards or requirements have been codified. As a result, many opportunities are missed – especially for construction of bus stop infrastructure. For example, in a community where we recently worked, planners and engineers were frustrated that they could not require installation of a bus pull-out with a shelter and lighting when a large commercial development was proposed at an important intersection. They felt their hands were tied because the transit operator did not participate in the development review process, there were no regulations in the city codes nor any engineering standards for installing such infrastructure, and the bus stop was not included in any plans for the street even though buses are currently stopping there by pulling onto the shoulder in 45 mph traffic.

To prevent a similar scenario in the Grand Traverse region will require a multi-stage process implemented over a number of years:

**Develop infrastructure plans and engineering standards** – The first step is to develop detailed plans for desired bicycle/pedestrian connections (sidewalks, paths and bike lanes) and bus stop locations and get these plans adopted by the appropriate government bodies. Engineering standards for paved trails, bike lanes and bus stop infrastructure are also important to codify.
Embed infrastructure plans in other planning documents – Over time, work to embed the infrastructure plans in as many other community planning documents as possible – from regional growth plans to neighborhood plans. Don’t assume that because you’ve already written a plan and gotten it adopted it will be automatically or adequately considered in other planning efforts.

Actively track and participate in development review processes – Whenever a development or a road project is proposed that includes an important infrastructure element it is important to participate in the development review process starting at the earliest stage possible. That later in the process you get involved the more difficult it will be to have your infrastructure element included in the process. In many cases it may be possible to get the infrastructure element included without having to find additional funding. For example, a hotel developer may be happy to have a bus stop in front of their hotel because it will be an asset to their business, and they may be willing to pay to install it as long as the idea is suggested early in the design process. While this step is more effective once the first two steps have been completed, that should not stop bicycle, pedestrian and transit advocates from beginning to implement this step immediately. Much can often be accomplished just by participating in the process.

In combination, over time, these three steps will achieve a paradigm shift through which mobility management stakeholders can gradually change organizational cultures so that whenever there is a relevant public discussion, there will be an assumption that public transportation and bicycle/pedestrian needs will be part of the discussion and that representatives of these interests should be at the table. Consistent, constructive participation in these processes is also a great way to develop relationships with decision-makers and business community leaders.

K. Increase capacity to serve bicyclists.
Accommodating bicycles is important for many riders, especially on routes serving tourist destinations. The high quality paved trails in the Grand Traverse area likely generate increased demand from bicyclists. Including bike racks at bus stops is an important component of transit oriented place-making. However, as noted in the first stakeholders’ meeting, the biggest obstacle is accommodating more than three bikes on buses. Our preliminary research indicates that there are examples from other communities such as the two below that can be explored further. Decisions should be made on a case by case basis for every route weighing the benefits of transporting more than three bikes against the delays that will result from loading and unloading bicycles.

Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (California) has shuttle buses which take two bikes in the front in a conventional style and another 5 or 6 in the rear hanging vertically.
San Luis Obispo County (California) Regional Transit Authority’s fixed route buses have bike racks for 6 bikes – three in front and three in back:  http://www.slorta.org/information/rideguide

3. **Develop multi-modal trip planning resources to serve all target populations.**

High quality trip planning resources are essential for effective mobility management. The mobility management vision is to provide customer centered service that makes it easy for customers to find the ride that best meets their needs, whether that ride is provided by public transportation, a private operator, a human service agency or a ridesharing program. Ideally find-a-ride services should also provide information about bicycle-pedestrian options.

Find-a-ride resources should address all stages of trip planning. For example, the first stage of trip planning could be a tourist planning their trip several weeks in advance and searching the web to
determine whether they can combine public transportation with a bike ride they would like to do; Or it could be a commuter who is researching whether it would work to try the bus for the first time. The final stage of trip planning would be the tourist or commuter standing at a bus stop and using their smart phone to determine when the bus will arrive. For demand-response services, an important middle stage of trip planning is calling to reserve a ride.

**The One Call – One Click Vision**

As illustrated in Figure 3 below, and as described by CTAA in its One Call-One Click Toolkit, the goal of a one-call or one-click service is to simplify access for customers and match their varied needs with appropriate options. It can also help communities build a team approach to using their resources, resulting in more mobility.

---

**Figure 3: One Call – One Click**

---

**L. Provide high quality web-based Find-a-Ride information on all transportation provider websites.**

The web – accessed from either a computer or a mobile device – is generally the first source where people will look for transportation information. The first priority for transportation providers is to provide complete, up-to-date, easy-to-use, information about their services. This information should include a GTFS-based interactive trip planner for all fixed routes and real time tracking information for all services as discussed in Strategy Q below.
An important second priority should be to include links to other providers in the region. These links should include any one-stop-shop web resources as well as the regional rideshare website: http://old.nwm.org/nmride.asp.

The 2011 BATA Study includes a number of good recommendations, many of which are likely being implemented as part of BATA’s new website.

For example, the Benzie Bus Routes and Schedule page does include information about BATA, however it is in a small print footnote and the BATA website is only provided as text, not as an active link. On the Cadillac/Wexford Transit Authority home page, information and a link for the Indian Trails intercity bus is prominently featured, but there is nothing comparable for BATA. As with the Benzie Bus website, BATA is included and contact information is provided CWTA’s Schedule webpage, but there is no active link to the BATA website. As the region’s public transportation providers move toward a more closely coordinated regional system, all relevant websites should include about how to make transit connections throughout the region. This could take the form of a “regional connections” webpage on each partner website and/or a centralized website similar to the North by Northwest Connector website in Oregon.

**M. Explore the possibility of creating a regional “one-stop-shop” website.**

A one-stop-shop website appears to be an obvious and very promising strategy for achieving many of the Grand Vision transportation goals. As discussed in the examples below, as well as the North by Northwest Connector and Shoreline Explorer examples under Strategy Error! Reference source not found. above, it is a strategy that has already been implemented in Upper Peninsula and by other regions around the country. The goal would be to create an attractive website where residents and visitors can either directly access the transportation information they need, or be directed to another website (such as BATA) where that information is available.

Web-based information can be supplemented with hard copy resources. Washington, Oregon, and coastal northern California offer printed (and PDF) public transportation directories, for example the *Washington State Public Transportation Directory* (Washington State Department of Transportation, 2013).

**N. Support and promote updated 211 service.**

Regardless of whether a regional website is created for Grand Traverse, it will be important for all the region’s transportation providers to support and promote the statewide upgrade of the 2-1-1 website. This is an effort to create a web-based, one-stop-shop for human service transportation information being implemented by the statewide Veteran’s Transportation Initiative, Michigan 2-1-1, United Way, and the Information and Referral Service. It will be important to for the region’s five public transportation providers to work with human service agencies to develop a long-term plan to provide accurate, up-to-date information to this service. This could be done through the inventory and database recommended in Strategy 4b. It will be equally important to make it easy to find this website. There should be links to it from the public transportation websites, all human services websites and possibly other stakeholder websites as well. This link should also be included on hard copy materials such as public transportation schedules.
O. Effectively integrate bicycle and pedestrian information

Explore different options for making bicycle-pedestrian transportation information available to the public, and for integrating this information with information about other transportation modes. Web based information as well as hard copy material and signage should all be considered. Where relevant this could include information about trails that are good transportation options and/or recreational destinations. For bus stops and transfer locations information about sidewalk and bike lane access would be important to provide. For some areas it may be equally important to highlight significant gaps in safe bicycle/pedestrian connectivity. While it may only be possible to provide this information using static maps and text, capabilities are currently evolving for incorporating this information into automated trip planning. In particular, pathways can now be entered into Google Maps.

P. Determine the level of staffing that will be provided for find-a-ride services.

At one end of the spectrum, staffing could be limited to maintaining a website. At the other end of the spectrum it could include answering calls from customers and helping them navigate various transportation options. An even more staffing-intensive alternative is to broker riders for customers.

Q. Invest in on-board GPS units that allow real-time transit information

Within the next five to ten years we anticipate that riders (especially younger riders) will expect to have access to actual arrival times for any transportation provider regardless of size. Appropriate technology is currently available at a cost of $30 to $60 per bus per month. Any of these real-time traveler information systems will allow access to real-time bus arrival times by web and text message. For high-volume bus stops and other strategic locations, departure times can be displayed on monitors or LED displays.

In addition to the obvious customer service benefits of these systems, another significant reason for making this investment is that these systems generate large amounts of valuable system performance and ridership data that can greatly improve transit management and planning capabilities.

Finally, in the near future, we expect real-time information to be integrated into GTFS-based trip planning capabilities on Google Maps. Google has already released a Google-real-time data feed.

Example: Get Around the Western U.P.

Serving five counties in Michigan’s Western Upper Peninsula, the “Get Around the Western U.P.” website appears to be a good model for the Grand Traverse region. Unlike many one call – one click resources, it is not primarily focused on human services transportation and offers a homepage that appears welcoming and relevant for tourists and commuters as well as seniors and people with disabilities.

We believe the Grand Traverse area could make a number of improvements on this model. Most significantly, Get Around the Western U.P. lacks true trip planning capabilities for fixed routes and ideally should connect with Google Maps trip planning capabilities. Other improvements could include a stronger, more explicit tourist/visitor emphasis; eliminating the large amounts of wordy text on some pages; and providing maps that are easier to use online. Additionally, it would be easier to use if it incorporated data elements such as those included in Oregon’s TripCheck described below.
Example: Oregon TripCheck

Oregon’s Trip Check was among the first in the country to take on regional trip planning including human service transportation. As described in a 2003 planning document,

“The long term goal is to develop a system that will allow anyone wishing to take a trip within the region to log on to an internet site, access a kiosk, or from their PDA and easily get information on multiple travel options, plan the trip itinerary, and reserve/pay for that trip. In the event that no public transit services are available or the user is interested in other available options, the system will be able to provide rideshare, carpool or shuttle/taxi choices.”
TripCheck has been developed in stages. The first stage was a web-based clearinghouse. As stated in its System Recommendations document, it included:

- Interactive tools to locate appropriate service provider:
  - Map based interface to identify a list of transit service providers by clicking on a map of the state
  - Zone-to-zone intercity carrier identification based on the trip origin and destination (trip origins/destinations can be selected via a map or through a pick list of cities)
  - Map based interface to identify demand responsive/dial-a-ride service providers through a map of service area boundaries

- List of all public/private transit service providers within the State of Oregon, organized by sub-regions, including:
  - Heavy rail
  - Long distance bus service
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- Local public fixed route service providers (IntraCity)
- Private fixed route intercity providers
- Demand responsive services
- Special need brokerages
- Shuttle/taxi services
- Web-based rideshare or service planning services offered by partner agencies
- Links to sites with useful content
- Comprehensive transit data for each of the transit providers
- Announcements/holiday schedules
- General service area map and description
- Contact information, service hours, etc.
- Routes, schedules, stops, time points, fare structures, connection points
- Maps of routes/patterns
- Maps of stop locations
- Ticket sale locations
- Interactive GIS maps and tools
- Service area boundaries for all transportation providers
- Bike maps and trails
- Key landmarks and activity locations.

For a website like this, the data collection and database design is essential for the ultimate vision to be reached. One of the lessons learned from the implementation of this project was that ODOT identified the importance of using automated tools for importing and maintaining the data.

The second phase of TripCheck’s trip planning capabilities allowed the traveler to automatically generate a trip from their origin to their destination. This capability included trips using multiple providers. (Kamm 2003)

This was made more feasible by Google Transit coming onto the scene in 2007. Oregon assisted all of its transit providers in developing a GTFS feed by putting together a contract for developing those feeds; northern California and Idaho also put together contracts for this data development. As a result, more west coast transit systems have GTFS feeds than anywhere else in the country. According to City go Round, as of April 23, 2013, 62 of 128 California transit agencies have open GTFS data; 30 of 39 Oregon transit agencies have open data; 14 of 30 Washington agencies have open data; all Idaho transit agencies use GTFS but none have open data.

We recommend that transit services be described with data elements that match those that are used by Oregon Trip Check human service providers, and that all fixed routes are put into GTFS.

The following example shows TripCheck’s trip planning capability for options within or near Bend. Options for travelling between cities look similar to those within a city but include a trip planner and links to the transportation options within the communities where the trip begins and ends. Public transportation options between cities utilize the Google trip planner. If the option is Greyhound or Amtrak, Trip Check links to their trip planners.
Example: Ride Connection

Ride Connection out of Portland, Oregon offers one of the best models in the country for a one call – one click resource with a strong emphasis on human service needs. Ride Connection is a non-profit that works with community partners to provide and coordinate transportation options primarily for older adults and people with disabilities. The key to Ride Connection’s success has been a customer focus, and high quality service. They also work hard to avoid acting in a silo.

Figure 6: Oregon Trip Check search and results for transportation options within a community
Ride Connection started as a volunteer driving program more than 30 years ago as Tri Met, Portland’s public transportation service was considering options for managing paratransit. It has now evolved into a quasi-brokerage that connects various human service transportation providers.

Ride Connection offers a high quality demand response trip planning through the web interface shown below.
Figure 8: Ride Connection interface for requesting a ride

Example: San Francisco Bay Area 511 Traveler Information System

The San Francisco Bay Area was among the first areas in the country to implement the 511 traveler information system. It remains at the cutting edge of traveler information. By phone or web, people in the Bay Area can access planning and real-time information about all modes of transportation and parking.
Figure 9: 511 transit trip planner for the San Francisco Bay Area

Example: Michigan MI Commute Website

MI Commute is Michigan’s statewide trip planning one call – one click resource. It includes good educational content. However, it’s effectiveness for helping people find rides is dependent on the quality of the local websites it links to.
Example: Mobility Management Center for Santa Clara County

The Mobility Management Center for Santa Clara County has produced a document summarizing mobility management capabilities for the rural part of the county:

http://www.outreach1.org/public/OutreachMobilityManagementPlanningStudy.pdf. This document is among the most thorough we have seen as it relates to the functionality of a mobility management center. It describes the relationship to 2-1-1, 511, and mobility management. It is important to note that although this area is considered “rural” it is very different from the Grand Traverse area – it covers the area in and around Gilroy, population 90,000, which is within 20 minutes of the 10th largest city in the country.

Example: Glacier National Park and National Park Service

Glacier National Park (and other national parks) offer some of the best models for a tourist-oriented service seeking to integrate traveler information and interpretive information. In 2007, Glacier’s Dave Restivo received a national award from NPS for his interpretive work related to the shuttle. He and his team created a series of innovative interpretive exhibits for the park’s Going-to-the-Sun Road that convey trip planning information while also providing visitors with information about things to and
experience at each stop. Following is an example of the type of information provided on the Glacier web site regarding bus stops – information that could also be included in a brochure or at visitor center kiosks. Each bus stop also includes an activity for kids (e.g., how many different types of plants can you see from here), and a footprint of a Glacier animal.

### The Loop

The Loop represents a very significant location on the Going-to-the-Sun Road. This is the only switchback on the Going-to-the-Sun Road and contains many architectural features. The Trapper Fire of 2003 swept through this area and opened up vistas of distant mountains. Heavens Peak dominates the landscape and a hiking trail at this spot maps the course to hikers to the historic Granite Park Chalet.

**Specific Location:**
Next to the restrooms.

**Restrooms:**
Yes

**Drinking Water:**
No - please plan accordingly and bring plenty of water with you to this destination.

**Day Hikes (one-way):**
Granite Park Chalet - 4.0 mi. (one-way)
Logan Pass via The Loop and Highline Trails - 11.6 mi. Catch another shuttle at Logan Pass.

Besides the signs, the Glacier project incorporated technology in a variety of ways – some of which would be more realistic for Grand Traverse than others. For each stop they developed an iTunes podcast and the main transit center include interactive computer kiosks and flat-panel LCD screens.

The picture below shows the shelter at the main transit center on the west side of Glacier. Instead of separate benches, seating is built into the structure. Interpretive displays provide enough information to keep riders occupied while waiting for the next bus. Next bus departure signs were installed but are not always functioning due to factors that would not apply in the Grand Traverse region – such as the need to run off radio signals in an area with complex topography that creates dead zones.
4. Coordinate and integrate human services transportation into a broader mobility management effort.

Achieve efficiencies and serve unmet needs – especially to maintain independence for the rapidly growing demographic of seniors with transportation challenges.

In many communities mobility management is primarily focused on human services coordination, and mobility management leadership often comes from within the human services community. In contrast, in Grand Traverse the human services community has not been a primary focus of community planning and visioning. Because transportation disadvantaged populations make up an important portion of public transportation ridership, it is important to fully involve the human services community to ensure the success of any transit changes, and to ensure that transit continues to meet the needs of these vulnerable populations if services are modified to better serve choice riders. There will always be a need for specialized demand-response service to meet some of the needs of transportation disadvantaged populations. However the cost per ride of these services is typically more than twice the cost per ride of fixed route service. The most cost effective approach for delivering transportation services is to create a community-wide system that, to the extent possible, is designed to provide fixed route service that meets the needs of choice riders and the general public while also meeting many of the needs of transportation disadvantaged populations.

R. Identify leadership for the process and identify someone who can fulfill the role of mobility manager.

Leadership can take the form of a working group or an executive committee, but there should be one individual or group that serves as the main point of contact and organization. The leadership structure may evolve over time, possibly with different iterations for each stage of the process. Ideally, a primary leadership objective would be to identify someone who can take on the role of mobility manager (MM) long term. The MM could be hired, or be assigned to someone who already is involved, and can be
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identified at any point in the process. The MM could be appointed at the completion of the process and be primarily tasked with implementation, or they could be appointed at the beginning to staff the coordination of the process, then transition to implementation.

Good leadership is essential for positioning the community to receive available federal funding. Mobility management leadership roles should include ensuring the development of compelling plans and proposals that will compete well for limited federal funds, and ensuring the collection of performance measure data that is becoming increasingly important for federal funding.

More details about mobility management can be found in the State of the Practice memorandum.

S. Complete a coordination plan, transportation inventory, and assess unmet needs.
The Grand Traverse area does not have a coordination plan because MDOT does not require such plans for areas that receive FTA funding for rural general public transportation (5311 funding), but we recommend developing a plan as a key component of mobility management. Human service providers are an essential piece of the transportation puzzle in all communities. These providers have detailed grassroots knowledge of the transportation needs of the populations who are most dependent on public transportation and other forms of transportation assistance. Additionally, the human services community potentially has access to mobility management funding that is not available to other players.

In our review of existing conditions and through the discussion at the first working group meeting, we identified many human service providers that fund and/or provide transportation services in the Grand Traverse area. However, we also found that there is limited coordination between these providers.

An inventory would include human services agencies who do not have the resources to provide transportation assistance, but whose clients have significant transportation needs. A next step is to compile an inventory of funding amounts, vehicles and specific services provided by the various human services agencies. Government and non-profit agencies should both be included, along with any private transportation providers who are paid or contracted to provide rides.

To assess the area’s unmet human service transportation needs, useful tools include interviews, surveys and group discussions. It will be important to include the Sault Tribe in this process.

The coordination plan should have three broad areas of focus:

- Improving cost effective transportation service delivery through combining resources, partnering to pursue new funding opportunities, and minimizing duplication of services.
- Developing strategies to address unmet needs.
- Coordinating and improving communications and marketing.

T. Explore opportunities to work with non-emergency medical transportation (NEMT) and human service organizations to streamline funding and expand service for all customers.
Many human services agencies use significant amounts of funding for providing and/or purchasing transportation for their clients. Efficiencies can be achieved, and opportunities to leverage new funding can be identified through coordination among these agencies and between human services and public
transportation. However this is a complex task that requires developing detailed knowledge of both the region’s human services agencies and their funding sources. The connection is a primary reason that mobility management staffing is often focused on human service needs.

The Federal Transportation Service Matrix in Appendix A is a useful resource for quickly identifying how different types of federal funding can be used. However, effectively using this information requires a sophisticated understanding of these different federal programs and their regulations. Developing this understanding requires researching the barriers to coordination that may be connected to different funding sources. Barriers fall into three categories:

- Barriers to pooling resources and developing contracts for service.
- Barriers to steering human service and NEMT riders toward public transportation if appropriate.
- Barriers to using a funding source as match for FTA funding.

Addressing these barriers would require a combination of surveying and interviewing human service agencies, and communicating with federal officials at the regional and federal levels.

As discussed in the North by Northwest Connector and Shoreline Explorer examples under Strategy Error! Reference source not found. above, partnerships with human service providers can help to fund transit services that benefit disadvantaged populations as well as the general public. To identify specific opportunities for the Grand Traverse region, it would first be necessary to complete an inventory and assessment of human service providers and human service needs.
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APPENDIX A: NON-FTA FEDERAL PROGRAMS

Sixty-two federal programs fund transportation. The following table lists the possible uses for these programs according to United We Ride.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health and Human Services</th>
<th>Reimbursed Costs (Fares, Gas, Bus Pass, etc.)</th>
<th>Mobility Mgt/Travel Training/O and M</th>
<th>Operate Vehicles (Direct or Contract)</th>
<th>Purchase Vehicles (public/nonprofit)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration for Children and Families</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Service Block Grant</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care and Development Block Grant</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Start</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee and Entrant Assistant Discretionary Grants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee and Entrant Asst. State Administered Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee and Entrant Targeted Assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee and Entrant Asst. Voluntary Agency Programs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Developmental Disabilities Council and Protection &amp; Advocacy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Assist to Needy Families</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Services Block Grant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting Safe and Stable Families</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration on Aging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants for Supportive Services and Senior Centers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs for American Indian, Alaskan Native and Native Hawaiian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centers for Medicaid and Medicare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Health Insurance Program</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home and Community Based Waiver</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Resources and Services Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Health Centers</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Communities Program</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV Care Formula</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal and Child Health Block Grant</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Health Care Network</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Health Care Outreach Program</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Start Initiative</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan White Care Act Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Mental Health Services Block Grant</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention and Texas Block Grant</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary Public School Choice</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centers for Independent Living</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Living for Older Individuals Who are Blind</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Living State Grants</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Rehab Grants</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Labor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bureau of Indian Affairs</th>
<th>Reimbursed Costs (Fares, Gas, Bus Pass, etc.)</th>
<th>Mobility Mgt/ Travel Training/ O and M</th>
<th>Operate Vehicles (Direct or Contract)</th>
<th>Purchase Vehicles (public/nonprofit)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indian Employment Training and Related Services</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Employment Services</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and Training Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Corps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant and Seasonal Farm Worker</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American Employment and Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade Adjustment Assistance for Workers</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare to Work Grants for Tribes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare to Work for States and Locals</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Incentive Grants</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce Investment Act Adult Services Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce Investment Act Adult Dislocated Worker Program</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce Investment Act Youth Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans Employment Program</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless Vet Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

| Elderly and Persons with Disability | X | | | |
| Job Access Reverse Commute | X | X | | |
| Non-Urbanized Formula (rural) | | X | X | |
| Urbanized Formula | | | | |
| New Freedom Program | | | | |
| Capital Discretionary Program | | | | |

**HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT**

| Community Planning and Development | | | | |
| Community Development Block Grant | | X | X | |
| Housing for Ind. w/AIDS | X | X | X | |
| Supportive Housing Programs | | | | |
| Principal and Interest | | | | |
| Revitalization of Severely Distressed Housing | X | | | |
| Veteran Affairs | | | | |
| Homeless Provider Grants | | | | |
| Medical Care Benefits | X | X | X | |
| Social Security Administration | | | | |
| Ticket to Work Program | X | | | |
| U.S. Department of Agriculture | | | | |
| Food stamp and Employment Training Program | | | | |

| Source: (United We Ride, 2007) | | | | |
APPENDIX B: MOBILITY MANAGEMENT & COORDINATION PARTNERS

Effective mobility management requires coordinating not just transportation providers but all the organizations that are stakeholders in addressing the area’s transportation needs – including needs that are currently unmet. This section provides information about a wide range of potential coordination partners who may not directly provide transportation. As we communicate with these stakeholders over the course of this project, we expect to identify opportunities to improve service and increase funding.

Grand Vision Transit Focus Group List

NWMCOG provided the team with their Grand Vision Transit Focus Group List. Organizations are listed below. The list appears robust for the purpose of a regional discussion of mobility management, but it is possible that we will also want to involve some of the stakeholders listed in other Grand Vision efforts and not included in this list.

Table 1: Grand Traverse Transit Focus Group Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bay Area Transportation Authority</td>
<td>BATA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadillac-Wexford Transportation Authority</td>
<td>CWTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antrim County Transportation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalkaska Public Transit Authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benzie Bus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodwill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GT County Collaborative</td>
<td>Human Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antrim/Kalkaska Collaborative</td>
<td>Human Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leelanau County Family Coordination Council</td>
<td>Human Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traverse Bay Area Intermediate School District</td>
<td>TBAISD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other districts?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traverse City Chamber</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munson Medical Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Dept. of Transportation</td>
<td>MDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Traverse County Road Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leelanau County Road Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benzie County Road Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wexford County Road Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalkaska County Road Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antrim County Road Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traverse City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadillac</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suttons Bay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingsley Village</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalkaska Village</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acme Township</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interlochen/Green Lake Township</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckley Village</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Land Use Institute</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Network</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traverse Area Recreational Trails</td>
<td>TART</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern Michigan College</td>
<td>NMC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traverse City Downtown Development Authority</td>
<td>TC-DDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Reduction Initiative</td>
<td>PRI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Agency on Aging</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traverse City Area Public Schools</td>
<td>TCAPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherry Capital Cab</td>
<td>Cab Companies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traverse Area Association of Realtors</td>
<td>TAAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Traverse County Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Traverse Band of Ottawa and Chippewa Indians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Traverse Band of Ottawa and Chippewa Indians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brickways</td>
<td>Independent Living Centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Lakes Community Mental Health</td>
<td>Protection agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GV Housing Solutions</td>
<td>Housing Agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherry Capital Airport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grand Vision Regional Planning Partners**

For FY 2011 a HUD Sustainable Communities Regional Planning grant pre-application was submitted for the “Grand Vision to Grand Action: Regional Plan for Sustainable Development”. This document includes a list of regional partner organizations with brief organizational descriptions. The following organizations included in that list appear to be important mobility management partners or potential partners. We have moved NWMCOG and MLUI to the top of the list as both are lead partners who are already playing important mobility management roles.
A. **Northwest Michigan Council of Governments**
The Northwest Michigan Council of Governments (NWMCOG) is a regional organization serving units of government, businesses, non-profits, community organizations, and individuals in a ten county region of northwest Michigan. The primary service categories are: regional planning and community development; workforce development; business and economic development; and community safety with particular emphasis on partnerships, economy of scale, and leveraging resources to address common concerns among multiple organizations or across sectors. The regional planning and community development division includes housing, transportation, land use, environmental, economic development, and energy planning and implementation programs and projects.

U. **Michigan Land Use Institute**
The Michigan Land Use Institute (MLUI) works with citizens, officials, and other organizations to build a prosperous new economy in Michigan, one that expands opportunity by improving our health and environment. Specifically, we promote people-friendly, regional planning; healthy food from local farms; and Michigan's leadership in the new green-energy and clean-water economy.

V. **Northwest Michigan WORKS!**
As the workforce development arm of the Northwest Michigan Council of Governments, Northwest Michigan WORKS! provides a wide variety of services to every sector of our economy. These services include: business services, job seeker services, learning labs, youth services.

W. **Grand Traverse Band of Ottawa and Chippewa Indians**
On May 27, 1980 the Tribe was re-recognized by the federal government as the Grand Traverse Band of Ottawa and Chippewa Indians. The Tribe has developed Tribal programs to serve the membership and established an Economic Development Corporation.

Tribal members living in their six county service area on reservation lands and non-reservation land will provide valuable input.

X. **Traverse Bay Economic Development Corporation**
The Traverse Bay Economic Development Corporation (Traverse Bay EDC) serves as the economic division of the Traverse City Area Chamber of Commerce and exists to promote and bolster the regional economy of Benzie, Grand Traverse, Kalkaska, and Leelanau Counties. The Traverse Bay EDC is a voice of encouragement for the expansion of existing industry, attracting new businesses to the region, and assisting communities with job-producing and tax-broadening projects.

Y. **Northern Lakes Economic Alliance**
The Northern Lakes Economic Alliance is a public/private non-profit organization serving Antrim, Charlevoix, Cheboygan and Emmet Counties in Michigan. Established in 1984,
the NLEA mission is to serve as a resource to local communities and businesses to retain and create jobs.

**Z. SEEDS Inc.**
SEEDS provides after school programming at select school in northwest Michigan that provides learning opportunities and access to healthy role models, mentors, and community advisors. Programs are designed specifically to supplement the school day making learning hands-on and fun.

**AA. Northwestern Michigan College**
NMC has become a source of education in the largest sense, - a source of meaningful new knowledge, skills and experiences. Their mission is to “provide lifelong learning opportunities to our communities.”

Northwestern Michigan College  
(231) 941-2324  
https://www.nmc.edu/about/maps/public-transportation.html

Four main campus stops on BATA’s Tom’s East Bay fixed route and one at the Traverse City Senior Center, next door to the Great Lakes Campus. Students are eligible for reduced fares.

**BB. NorthSky**
NorthSky is a nonprofit program of Rotary Charities of Traverse City that assists northern Michigan nonprofit organizations strengthen their capabilities through capacity building and sustainability support. It provides a wide range of services and resources to help nonprofit organizations deliver programs effectively and efficiently. It also serves as an advocate—securing state and national support and technical and financial resources, bringing them home to the nonprofits in its region.

**CC. Traverse Bay Poverty Reduction Initiative (PRI)**
Citizens from Antrim, Benzie, Grand Traverse, Kalkaska and Leelanau counties have created a response to poverty in their midst. After analyzing data and defining priorities, this group identified six issues for further study and action: jobs and economy; education and training; affordable housing; health care; social attitudes; early childhood development. PRI seeks to link and support regional activities related to poverty and not to duplicate existing programs.

**DD. Disability Network**
The Disability Network serves people with disabilities, their families, and the northwest Lower Michigan community. The staff provides information, referrals, and support to people with a wide variety of disabilities. They also work on a larger scale, helping governments, businesses, and other organizations make changes that improve life for everyone in the community. Their mission: To promote personal empowerment and positive social change for persons with disabilities.
**EE. Human Services Collaborative Boards**
Boards exist in Antrim, Kalkaska, Grand Traverse, Leelanau, Benzie, and Wexford Counties.

**FF. Veterans’ Services**
Transportation to and from veterans’ medical facilities can be through VA programs or through public transportation options. Two facilities are within the Grand Traverse region, and veterans with specialized needs must travel to regional facilities.

Cadillac VA Community Based Outpatient Clinic  
1909 N. Mitchell St. Cadillac, MI 49601  
1-888-838-6446  
http://www.saginaw.va.gov/visitors/Cadillac.asp

Clare VA Community Based Outpatient Clinic  
11775 N. Isabella Rd Clare, MI 48617  
1-800-649-4812  
http://www.saginaw.va.gov/visitors/Clare.asp

The above clinics provide community-based outpatient service. The U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs webpage for this clinic gives driving directions but no information about public transportation or other transportation assistance/options.

The parent facility is Aleda E. Lutz VA Medical Center, Saginaw, Michigan, approximately 60 miles away. Oscar G. Johnson VA Medical Center serves veterans from a 32-county area in the upper peninsula of Michigan and northeastern Wisconsin.¹

Transportation assistance is available to and from scheduled appointments through the Center Transportation Coordinator at 1-800-215-8262 or 906-774-3300, ext. 33849.

¹ [http://www.ironmountain.va.gov/services/](http://www.ironmountain.va.gov/services/)