

# CERTIFICATION STATEMENT

## Locally Developed Coordinated Human Services Public Transportation Plan

*Title 49 U.S.C. Sections 5310, 5316 and 5317 as amended by SAFETEA-LU, requires a recipient of these funds to certify that projects selected are derived from a locally developed, coordinated public transit-human services transportation plan developed through a process that includes representatives of public, private, and non-profit transportation and human service providers, participation by the public, and representatives addressing the needs of older adults and individuals with disabilities.*

---

**I certify** that a good faith effort was made by the lead agency/ies and/or persons serving on the steering committee to identify, contact, and include organizations or persons representing the interest of persons identified in Federal Sections 5310, 5316 and 5317 Circulars which includes representatives of public, private, non-profit transportation and human services providers in the local coordinated plan development.

**I certify that the final locally developed coordinated human service public transportation plan named: Johnston County Locally Coordinated Human Service – Public Transportation Plan**

was approved on the 24 day of March 2009, by a process that was agreed upon by the steering committee and or stakeholders, and that the approval process included a requirement that the minimum plan elements identified in the respective Federal Circulars be satisfactorily addressed in the final plan.

**I certify** to my thorough review of official documents and/or my direct knowledge through my active participation on the planning steering committee and/or workshops held in the development of the above named locally developed coordinated human service public transportation plan that it is SAFETEA-LU compliant.

The plan covers geographical areas in the following county/ies,

1	Johnston County	3		5	
---	-----------------	---	--	---	--

2		4		6	
---	--	---	--	---	--

**I understand** that falsification of this certification will likely result in personnel actions being taken up to and including termination of my employment.

Name: Bill Barlow \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_3/25/09\_\_\_\_\_

Title: Mobility Development Specialist

Organization: NCDOT- PTD

**Johnston County Locally Coordinated Human Service – Public Transportation  
Plan**

APPROVED 3/24/09

## **Table of Contents**

Purpose and Background for the Public Transportation Coordination Plan  
Coordinated Planning Elements  
The Planning Process  
Johnston County Community Profile  
Identification of Transportation Service Gaps and Needs  
Sponsored Workshops  
Johnston County Locally Coordinated Workshop & Process Summary  
Cross County Coordination Opportunities  
Project Selection & Summary [Considerations](#)  
[State and Federal Funding Opportunities](#)

### **Appendix A**

Johnston County Workshop Invitation and Participant List

### **Appendix B**

Sample Survey Instrument Document

### **Appendix C**

Johnston County 2007 Operating Statistics

### **Appendix D**

Supporting statistics for pockets of older American, low income, minority and disabled populations

### **Appendix E**

Johnston County Title VI Voluntary Public Involvement

## **Purpose and Background for the Public Transportation Coordination Plan**

Community Transportation Systems and human service agencies are dependent on both state and federal funding grants to sustain their transportation administration and operations. The purpose of this plan is to provide a viable and effective public transportation service network in the Triangle Area that complies with the current federal regulatory requirements pertaining to human service public transportation coordination.

Both the Transportation Equity Act for the Twenty First Century (TEA-21) (Public Law 105-478 – 1998) and the Safe, Accountable, Flexible and Efficient Transportation Equity Act – A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU)(Public Law 109-59 – 2005) required provisions for locally developed and coordinated public transportation human service planning processes. The Triangle Area Rural Planning Organization (TARPO) and the North Carolina Department of Transportation Public Transportation Division (NCDOT) have joined with local public transportation agencies and local stakeholder agencies in scheduling local workshops and in developing a regionally coordinated service plan that conforms to the current federal regulatory requirements. These workshops were held in the four TARPO member counties during the period January 7-13, 2009. These efforts have resulted in the development of a coordinated plan that serves and qualifies the local transit providers for Federal Transit Administration (FTA) funding assistance under Section 5310 (Elderly and Disabled Transportation Assistance), Section 5316 (Job Access Reverse Commute), Section 5317 (New Freedom), and synchronizes such transport with other federal assistance programs such as FTA Section 5311 (Non-Urbanized Transit Formula Allocation), Community Action, Medicaid, Independent Living Centers, and Agency on Aging Programs. In the development of this plan, the client needs, service gaps and other issues of each local transportation provider have been considered. This coordinated plan is intended to be flexible and capable of being expanded or modified at a future date to incorporate additional efforts and initiatives to meet the needs of each local transit provider. The time horizon for this coordinated plan is three years.

### **Outreach for the workshops**

Local human services transportation planning workshops were held in (Johnston County) on January 15<sup>th</sup>. Extensive mailing lists were prepared to assemble a broad spectrum of representatives of the target population. Outreach and attendance levels were: 74 people were invited and 14 attended to Johnston County Workshop.

The local agencies that participated in the plan development included: NCDOT-PTD, , Council on Aging, Johnston County Industries, Cleveland Chamber of Commerce, Vocational Rehab, Johnston County Emergency Services, Mental Health, PFCJC, Johnston Memorial Homecare and Hospice, JCATS, JC Public Health.

**AGENDA FOR THE JOHNSTON COUNTY**

January 15, 2009 – 8:30am – 12:30pm

**LOCALLY COORDINATED HUMAN SERVICE – PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

MINUTES	TOPIC	LEADER	FOCAL POINT	Support docs
5	Purpose	Bill Barlow	RTAP – it’s been done before	An interactive process
25	Outreach and participation	Bill Barlow	Introductions	Mail out
20	Community profile	CTS - manager	Target populations	maps – transit dependant
20	Survey Results	Bill Barlow	Talking Points for further table discussions	Mail in surveys, Bill to record on flip charts
10	Break		Arrange tables	
20	Existing Service Available	CTS-manager	CTS/cross county / private providers, etc.	CTS brochures, subscription and/or service maps. DOYOU KNOW OF OTHERS??
45	Needs assessment exercise	Table Discussion	Existing barriers, new ideas (add to the list)	One MATRIX per table filled in. Each table sends someone up to the big board to create consolidated needs.
20	Strategies to meet needs	Bill Barlow	Analysis of matrix (votes)	Priority matrix prepared per group consensus
20	Gap analysis exercise	Bill Barlow	Underserved areas, times and/or groups	Participants <b>draw</b> on maps. Consolidated map prepared.
10	Break			
15	Prioritizing exercise	Bill Barlow	If you had \$100	Hand out \$100 – expanded per matrix results
20	Coordination opportunities	Open to the floor	Brokering, volunteer programs, agency owned, etc.	Mobility Management handout
5	Priority List	Bill Barlow	Tabulations of exercise	Hand out \$100 – expanded with write-ins
10	Wrap up	Bill Barlow	1 <sup>st</sup> limit expectations 2 <sup>nd</sup> adopting the plan 3 <sup>rd</sup> funding programs	Hand outs on funding programs (dual language)
245				

\*SERVICE AREA: An applicant's service area is defined in the approved coordinated public transit-human service transportation plan.

### **Coordinated Plan Elements**

FTA proposed the following key elements be contained in each coordinated plan<sup>1</sup>:

- An assessment of transportation needs for individuals with disabilities, older adults, and persons with limited incomes;
- An inventory of the available services that identifies areas of redundant service and gaps in service;
- Strategies to address the identified gaps in service;
- Identification of coordination actions to eliminate or reduce duplication in services and strategies for more efficient utilization of resources; and
- Prioritization of implementation strategies.

### **The Planning Process**

The Johnston County coordinated plan will comply with the requirements of SAFETEA-LU as detailed in the March 29, 2007 Federal Register and entitled "Elderly Individuals and Individuals with Disabilities, Job Access and Reverse Commute, New Freedom Programs: Final Circulars, effective May 1, 2007. The plan development will involve the following sequential steps:

1. Conducting a survey of Community Transportation Needs, identifying specific problems and issues related to the following concerns: educational and informational, accessibility and safety, cross county trips and coordination potentials, applications and eligibilities, price, funding, community development, customer service, and other general transit issues.
2. Developing an inventory of existing transit services and assessing service related attributes and metrics.
3. Developing strategies and actions to improve transit services
4. Developing a short-term (three year) regional plan document.

The coordinated aspect of the planning process involves the assembly of representatives of a broad range of human service agencies and client groups from the rural area of Johnston County. This supplements the Locally Coordinated Human Service – Public Transportation Plan workshops done last February 2008 at the Capital Area Metropolitan Planning Organization Level to consider service measures to deliver more cost effective transit service delivery to the greater Raleigh Area. This current Locally Coordinated Human Service – Public Transportation Plan workshop provides recommendations for increased capacity to serve unmet needs of the area outside of the MPO boundaries; to improve the quality of service, to encourage greater utilization of transportation coordination and to provide services that are more convenient and readily understood by various potential users of the non-urbanized area of Johnston County.

## Johnston County Community Profile

The Johnston County Community Profile region encompasses geographical areas in the CAMPO region. There was a locally coordinated plan in March of 2007, which addressed the needs of the urbanized portions of Johnston County (see attached map). In July, 2007 the population in Johnston County was 157,437. Of this amount, 31% were urban and 69% rural. (City-Data.com)

### 2000 CENSUS DATA

<b>JOHNSTON COUNTY</b>	<b>NC</b>	<b>US</b>
------------------------	-----------	-----------

### POPULATION

	Number	Number	Number
Total population	121,965		
Square miles (land)	791.85		
Population per square mile	154.02	165.25	79.56

### AGE

	Number	Pct	Pct	Pct
--	--------	-----	-----	-----

15 or younger	27,146	22.3	20.5	21.4
16-24	14,609	12.0	13.9	13.9
25-44	41,758	34.2	31.1	30.2
45-64	26,479	21.7	22.5	22.0
65+	11,973	9.8	12.0	12.4

## RACE AND ETHNICITY

	Number	Pct	Pct	Pct
White	95,237	78.1	72.1	75.1
Black or African American	19,090	15.7	21.6	12.3
American Indian and Alaska native	494	0.4	1.2	0.9
Asian	368	0.3	1.4	3.6
Native Hawaiian and other Pacific islander	43	0.0	0.0	0.1
Some other race	5,530	4.5	2.3	5.5
Two or more races	1,203	1.0	1.3	2.4

As per standard US Census Bureau reporting, 19.3% or approximately 49,746,248 persons over the age of 4 living in the United States were classified as disabled in 2000. Approximately 21.10% or 1,540,365 persons over the age of 4 living in North Carolina were classified as disabled in 2000. (These specific metrics were reported for civilian, non-institutionalized persons over the age of 4.) The total civilian non-institutionalized population over the age of 4 reported for Johnston County was 24,361, or 20%.

In 2000, the federal poverty level was established as \$8,350 per single household adult with an additional \$2,900 per each additional household member. In the United States for the year 2000, approximately 33,899,812 persons or 12.40% of the total population was below this household based level. In North Carolina, approximately 1,292,533 or 16.10% of the total state population was below this household based level. In Johnston County 15,399 or 12.8% were below this household level.

Average unemployment levels in the year 2000 in Johnston County was 2.2%. In the year 2008 the average unemployment rate was 6.3%. (Johnston County, North Carolina Profile)

The total non-white racial population in the United States that was reported in the 2000 census was approximately 88,869,132 persons or approximately 30.90% of the total national population. In North Carolina, the total non-white racial population in 2000 was reported to be approximately 2,402,158 persons, or approximately 29.84% of the total state population. In Johnston County, total non-white racial population was 26,728 or 21.9%.

Even the rural portion of Johnston County has continued to experience population growth during the first decade of the Twenty First Century. Although specific figures are not included in this document, various media accounts have reported that significant increases in the Hispanic population have occurred in the Johnston County and other areas of central North Carolina during this decade. The proximity of the Johnston County to the Raleigh and Durham metropolitan areas has resulted in a rise of out-of-county commuters from all the Counties east of Wake County during the decade. The incursion of the Baby Boomer generation into the senior element (Age 62 plus) during this decade has caused an increased population in the aging communities throughout most of the Triangle Region.

### **Identification of Transportation Service Gaps and Needs**

A survey of community transportation needs and interests was mailed to local governmental staff, human services agency personnel and other public transportation stakeholders throughout Johnston County on December 19, 2008. This survey covered a wide variety of issues pertaining to the existing public transportation services and it provided the respondents the opportunity to note issues and needs that must be addressed immediately, those that needed improvement, those that were not critical but needed to be initiated, and those that either required too much effort or that currently lacked adequate funding. While only four responses to the survey were submitted - this feedback was reviewed and was extremely helpful in preparing a matrix analysis tool

outlining specific needs and strategies to be used in the local workshop held on January 15, 2009.

The matrix analysis tool included the following generic needs elements:

- Increased services to fill gaps, including inter-county fixed routes and highway service corridors
- Increased local area services, including circulators, shuttles, or deviated fixed routes
- Increased time span for existing services, such as early morning, early evening or weekend services
- Broadcasting user-friendly services, such as web based or peer-to-peer services
- The provision of enhanced amenities at transit stops, such as lighting, sidewalks, benches, or audible signals
- Increased all types of services to new user or stakeholder groups
- Travel training for the transit inexperienced, elderly or language impaired
- More travel services needed to major county employment centers
- Transit services geared to long-haul commuters
- Customer service improvements
- County to county transfers and enabling agreements
- Removing physical and institutional barriers for the mobility impaired
- Local government policy issues concerning land use and transit service compatibility
- Strengthening the county transit advisory boards policies
- Policies to remove language barriers
- Policies related to emergency evacuation needs
- Other (write in) local needs

Coupled with these needs elements, the matrix analysis tool also noted the following generic strategies:

- Fixed route services
- Local circulator services
- Extended evening services
- Weekend services
- Voucher programs
- Greater utilization of volunteer drivers
- Brokered trips
- Express services
- Use of transit passes
- Auxiliary client agency operated services
- Vanpools
- Use of larger capacity vehicles (greater than 20 passengers)
- Park and ride lots
- Institution of door-to-door services
- Other (write in) local strategies

The matrix analysis exercise was used in breakout sessions to identify existing gaps and inadequacies, to identify and discuss existing barriers to adequate or efficient services,

and to identify service improvements and opportunities for coordinated services. The breakout group results were orally reported and a composite matrix was prepared for each local workshop.

**Johnston County Locally Coordinated Workshop & Process Summary**

**Inventory of Johnston County Transportation Services**

Johnston County Transportation Services (JCATS) is a one hundred per cent travel demand response and subscription transit service agency. Its staff consists of 16 full-time drivers, 5 regular part-time drivers, 5 administrative personnel. The fleet consists of 24 vehicles. There are 3 conversion vans, 9 lift equipped vans, 1 minivan, 3 - 22 ft. LTV's with lifts, 4 - 25 ft LTV's, and 4 - 25 ft. LTV's with lifts. The normal hours of operation are from 6:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M. on weekdays. There is no weekend service at present. JCATS service is curb-to-curb countywide service.

The system is averaging almost 350 passenger trips per day. As to the distribution of its 2007 service trips, approximately 6% were for the Johnston County Department of Aging clients for medical and nutrition needs; 7% were for medical, educational and employment clients eligible under the Rural General and Elderly and Disabled Persons Assistance Programs; 9% were to special needs clients served through Mental Health ; 67% were to medical and employment clients served by the Johnston County Department of Social Services; and 11% were for special needs served by Johnston County industries.

**Johnston County Historical Operating Statistics**

	2005	2006	2007	% Change 06-07
Total Service Miles	541,016	774,198	1,031,180	33.19%
Transit System Service Miles	468,598	680,932	776,755	14.07%
Total Service Hours	32,727	41,068	51,341	25.01%
Total Passenger Trips	52,051	57,680	78,722	36.48%
Total Transit System Trips	48,030	54,949	68,812	25.23%
Total Admin/Oper Revenue	\$808,960	\$1,105,853	\$1,432,936	29.58%
Total Contract Revenue	\$512,632	\$862,104	\$1,071,728	24.32%
Fare Revenue	\$13,876	\$5,251	\$9,231	75.80%
Total Admin/Oper Adj. Expense	\$803,212	\$1,046,818	\$1,447,514	38.28%
Peak Vehicles	15	17	20	17.65%
Driver FTE	15.90	17.60	16.68	-5.23%

	2005	2006	2007
Passenger Trips per Hour (M-F)	1.63	1.44	1.65
Passenger Trips per Mile (M-F)	0.10	0.07	0.08
Total Passenger Trips per Hour	1.59	1.40	1.53
Total Passenger Trips per Mile	0.10	0.07	0.08
Cost per Passenger Trip	\$15.43	\$18.15	\$18.39
Cost per Hour	\$24.54	\$25.49	\$28.19
Cost per Mile	\$1.48	\$1.35	\$1.40

Service Miles per Peak Vehicle	31,240	40,055	38,838
Trips per Driver FTE	3,021	3,122	4,126

### The Johnston County Pre-survey

In order to quickly prioritize the transportation issues that need to be addressed in the RPO portion of the County – a common list of problems was assembled from other 'local plans' developed throughout the country. This survey was sent out to 75 people with the invitation and initial information packet about the workshop. The six page survey was mailed out on December 19, 2008 and was due back on December 31, 2008. The survey questions were grouped into eight areas for improvement;

education & information	accessibility & safety	customer service
coordination & cross-county trips	service-related	applications & eligibility
customer price for service	funding	

The language that was used in the questionnaire was 'actual' statements made by participants during other workshops conducted in other counties<sup>1</sup>, with similar characteristics to those located in the greater Triangle, NC area. This eliminated the planning and operational jargon often inadvertently laced into survey forms, however it occasionally introduced some subjectivity (see sample survey instrument in Appendix B). While somewhat lengthy and difficult; the questions allowed for cross referencing many of the typical problems that rural communities and Community Transit Systems experience and gave great insight into the root of the problems, as well as, gave a measure of the urgency for addressing the problems.

Participants were asked to mark all those questions that apply to their experience as a member or representative of one of the target population groups. They entered:

<b>(I)</b>	For those that don't exist but need INITIATING
<b>(M)</b>	For those that MUST be fixed immediately
<b>(N)</b>	For those that NEED some improvement
<b>(T)</b>	For those that require TOO much effort for what you expect to get out of it
<b>(\$)</b>	For those that work but lack financing \$\$\$\$
<b>(OK)</b>	For any that operate efficiently
<b>(NA)</b>	For any that don't apply

Note: You can use more than one symbol for each statement if you want to.

An entire page was devoted to adding any additional problems and list any known locations/agencies/times or places the problems/inefficiencies occur.

The results of the four surveys submitted back to the RPO gave the facilitator a starting point for opening up the discussion on 'identified needs'. Prior to the workshop the facilitator had summarized the surveys and listed the needs on a flip chart; thereby fully prepared to expand those needs at the appropriate point on the agenda. The actual tabulations are listed below but were not presented to the audience, so as to avoid the discussion focusing on the low response rate rather than allowing the group to validate the identified needs then moving on to adding to the needs list.

<sup>1</sup> Pinnacle County, Florida, did an excellent job of capturing citizen comments.

### Tabulated Survey Results

Transportation Issue	intensity	frequency	1	2	3	4	comments
Increase service to fill gaps - inter-county fixed route or service corridors (N-S, E-W)	immediate	4	1	1	1	1	
Evening Hours	immediate	4	1	1	1	1	
Broadcast user friendly education - eligibility, better web site, etc.	immediate	4	1	1	1	1	web, new groups etc.
Amenities - bus stops, lighting, benches, audible signs, sidewalks - safe locations	need \$	3	1		1	1	not all central - i.e. 10 bus stops
Remove Language barriers	need	3		1	1	1	
Increase all types of service to all user groups, esp. door-to-door	immediate	3	1	1		1	difficult, expensive
Better connections/coordinated service	immediate	3	1		1	1	hook up to Express
Make land use and transit work together	need	3		1	1	1	housing clients
Trips need to serve <b>employment</b> centers/commuters/late night	immediate	3		1	1	1	difficult, expensive
Mobility Management - Clearinghouse	need	3	1	1		1	
Emergency evacuation	need	3	1	1		1	
Travel training for: elderly, special needs, those who lack confidence	need	2	1	1	1		fear of unknown
Weekends	immediate	2	1		1		
Customer service improvements	need	2			1	1	
Invigorate and Empower the TAB	need	2	1	1			Add limited language
Disabled are denied trips	need	2		1	1		
Express bus service for commuters	immediate	1			1		
Need separate or special dialysis program	need	1		1			difficult, expensive
Better pass/voucher program	need	0					
<b>items consistently highlighted in survey =</b>			<b>11</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>12</b>	

The flip chart listed the following non-prioritized "SURVEY RESULTS" as:

- Amenities at the bus stops, i.e. audible signs
- Regular routes and/or deviated fixed services – corridors/loops
- More extensive local service to fill in gaps
  - Evening service
  - Weekend Service
- Employment transportation
- Recreation transportation
- Customer service improvements
  - Broadcast "user friendly" info on eligibility, improve internet website
  - Remove language barriers

- Travel training for those who hesitate to use transit
- Better coordination of existing and future services –
  - Clearing house for information
  - Cross County Coordination

### **The Johnston County ‘matrix’ exercise**

The group worked as one team to conduct the ‘matrix’ exercise. The ‘matrix’ exercise is actually a combination of two assessments: 1) a needs assessment, with a focus on the needs of;

- Older Adults
- Persons with Disabilities and,
- Low income households and/or those without vehicles;

and an assessment of the various transportation strategies that may be relevant to serve the needs.

The participants added several issues to the needs based on their representation of the client base – the final agreed to list of needs highlighted:

- Land use density policies to support transit
- Mobility management
- Emergency evacuation, and;
- Enhancing the Transportation Advisory Board,

The NCDOT Mobility Development Specialist then shared several other worthy issues to be considered during the Johnston County matrix evaluation. The **expanded list** became the ‘needs’ column on the ‘matrix’ form. Several blanks were left for the workshop participants to add any new ‘needs’ that were identified in the pursuant discussion. Participants were also encouraged to eliminate any ‘needs’ from the list that were not relevant to Johnston County. The final list can be viewed in the far left hand column of the completed ‘matrix’ located on the following page.

Finally the NCDOT Mobility Development Specialist listed an extensive array of possible strategies that might be applicable to serve the agreed upon Johnston County transportation ‘needs’. Participants added to this array as they explored each need, i.e. more extensive local service via circulators, amenities at the bus stops, land use incentives, mobility manager, emergency medical transportation, childcare transportation and non-medical were introduced to the matrix and were later added to the priority exercise that followed the matrix exercise.



### **The Johnston County Geographic Gap Analysis**

This exercise focused on the groups input as to where some priority service locations would be for the specific target groups in the RPO portion of the County; concentrations of five target groups: low income, those over 62 years old, those without vehicles, those with reported disabilities and racial minorities. The working group was encouraged to add points of interest and draw the types of connections that may be needed to link the pockets of highest needs to their probable destinations. Corridors, systems, inter-connections, and barriers were all discussed. It should be noted that Rural General Public service, e.g. non-subscription came up in every discussion and is included in the coordinated recommendations.

### **The Johnston County ranking exercise**

Near the conclusion of the workshop, the participants were invited to rank the strategies they individually found most appropriate for their clients or the interest they represented. This was done by asking the participants to allocate \$100 spread over the strategies they had recommended in the prior 'matrix' exercise. The results of that distribution are listed in the table below.

<b>RANK</b>	<b>SHOPPING LIST</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
1	Fixed Routes	\$180
2	Evenings service	\$100
3	Increased visibility of existing program	\$95
4	Land use incentives	\$94
5	Amenities at the bus stops	\$90
6	Vouchers program	\$63
7	Weekends service	\$63
8	Mobility Manager	\$59
9	Express service	\$50
10	Park & Ride program	\$49
11	Transit Pass program	\$47
12	Childcare	\$40
13	Vanpools program	\$34
14	Broker trips to others	\$30
15	Agency operates own vans	\$28
16	Evacuation Planning	\$27
17	Door to Door	\$25
18	Expanded Local - circulator	\$20
19	Non-medical	\$6
	11 participants =	\$1,100

### **Strategies for Johnston County's immediate coordination needs**

It was notable that fixed route ranked highest amongst the priorities and amenities at the stops along such a corridor service ranked 5<sup>th</sup>. The high ranking of land use incentives is consistent with a dense corridor of service. A feasibility of the viability of the extent of service these destinations could support is certainly warranted and should be programmed in the upcoming five year plan. Very careful marketing may be necessary to determine exactly what hour to start, whether a noon trip is warranted and exactly when the night trips should end. While this strategy ranked highest amongst the

possibilities, it is estimated this service may not be warranted in the most rural portion of the county until the later years, of the three year horizon of the 'Local Coordinated Plan'.

This concept of limited fixed route service could be supported with vans staying within separate zones – i.e. MPO and RPO service areas. This suggests a dispersed distribution of vans rather than basing all the vans out of Selma. Drivers who live in remote areas of the County might even drive the vans home in order to provide limited service to these destinations.

A mobility manager could broker trips to JCATS and/or other providers via an assortment of voucher and transit pass programs. This strategy would group many of the priorities that ranked in the ranked fairly high on the priority list. The benefits of a pass program should not be underestimated. The passes may need to be redeemable by providers other than JCATS and a manager may need to be in place to see that the most convenient yet cost effective option for each trip is used.

JCATS currently runs several 'routes' that can run improved hours of service - provided operating money is available. While these 'routes' are open to the general public on a seats available basis via subscription, they should also be tested to serve the general public on a non-appointment/standby basis. Private business should also be encouraged to provide funds and or other resources to help their employees, potential employees and customers to ride the JCATS 'routes' and connect to Triangle Transit Express Services.

A huge information campaign, which also uses a peer based dissemination of information, must be provided. A well advertised set of policies and programs needs to be assembled to give the public full disclosure of what options are available to them. Funding would need to come from several sources to pull together a comprehensive human service - public transportation package. A brokerage approach attempts to serve this need.

Park and Ride facilities need to be strategically located so as to prove a cost benefit to those willing to get out of their cars and share their commute. Carpools and vanpools are equally valid modes as is the bus at Park and Ride facilities and should be accommodated with appropriate comforts and amenities.

Johnston County is in a prime location to benefit from County-to-County transfer agreement with Wake, Wilson and Wayne Counties. This could seriously reduce JCATS out-of-county travel costs and bring hundreds of service hours back into the community.

The remaining transportation issues will likely find their way into the upcoming Johnston County Transportation System updated five year plan. Most of the NC Community Transportation Systems are due for a five year development plan, which will lay out a rolling plan for transit system improvements. Other needs identified in during the January 15<sup>th</sup>, 2009 workshop could be addressed by regional initiatives (i.e. park and rides, express service, and universal transit pass) or may even be stand alone projects - should the funding opportunity arise. The 'needs' mentioned in this document should be seen as opportunities for: public bodies, civic groups, private providers, agencies and the Community Transit System to apply for government funds to meet these Johnston Counties mobility needs. Read more about the funding programs that are listed at the end of the report.

## **A REGIONAL PERSPECTIVE**

### **Cross County Coordination Opportunities**

The workshop identified the need for improved cross county line travel coordination and for the need to improve travel services along the major transportation corridors (HOV lanes were suggested). In the long term the Highway Corridor concept offers an excellent opportunity for consolidation of services with Wayne and Wake Counties. The workshops identified increased work related travel needs across all socio-economic and demographic categories for major employment centers located in Wake, and Durham Counties. A coordinated Job Access Reverse Commute (JARC) application is warranted, logically this effort should be coordinated with the designated 5307 – Urban Transit Systems, e.g. Triangle Transit. The strategic location of Park and Ride facilities should also be a regional decision. Improved coordination and utilization of ‘seat available’ transportation to major medical centers in Durham and Wake Counties was cited – county-to-county agreements need to be formally established. The acquisition of automatic vehicle location technology and enhanced real-time scheduling software were cited as a significant potential improvement that would enhance utilization and coordination of services. The participants recognized that the establishment of ‘highly visible’ transit hub would enhance intra-county and inter-county travel planning and coordination. Finally the mobility manager could become a active participant in coordination efforts with the various neighboring counties and regular attendee at the MPO meetings thereby paving the path for future county-to-county and or consolidation discussions.

### **Project Selection and Evaluation**

The matrix evaluation process has revealed that there are long lists of project needs in Johnston County, even for the near term. Projects must be selected that will address current needs, that will likely produce favorable impacts, and that will tackle core issues with broad service implications. This will help eliminate replications, redundancies and inefficiencies and will provide the greatest returns for the limited funds that are available. Projects must also be selected that bring not only immediate benefits and improvements but will also contribute to favorable results beyond an initial three-year period. The most helpful resources in identifying and confirming the most needed projects to be funded in any of the county organizations will include the American Public Transportation Association, the Community Transportation Association of America, the Transit Cooperative Research Program of the Transportation Research Board, peer transit agencies, and professional consultants and experts.

The following factors should be considered in selecting and evaluating the merits of individual projects:

1. Maintaining a healthy balance between operating assistance projects with capital projects. Operating assistance projects should be maximized based on match funds from locally available resources to meet the greatest number of needs and to provide the greatest degree of service flexibility. Capital projects may be advantageous in the near-term along travel corridors and in areas where the service demands are greatest and will help build service capacities in later years.

2. Projects that support and optimize schedule adherence for fixed route deviated and demand response services will enhance benefit-cost for the agency and will support further expansion of services.
3. Projects that will serve districts that are being developed based on smart growth and mixed-use principles will provide favorable returns and will actually provide a wider array of services to adjoining areas. The application of smart growth principles in land use will adequately serve much employment and medical travel needs.
4. The Triangle Region will continue to need enhanced, expanded and reliable employment travel services to major urban centers like Goldsboro, Raleigh, Durham and the Research Triangle Park. In some instances, it may be advantageous to consider the pooling of funds and resources to initiate these services until satisfactory ridership levels are established along specific travel corridors.

## **Federal and State Transportation Programs for Rural Areas<sup>2</sup>**

### **NON-URBANIZED AREA FORMULA PROGRAM (FTA Section 5311)**

*Funding Source:* Federal

*Purposes:* Funds capital, operating and administrative purposes. Maximum federal participation is 80% for administrative and capital costs. NCDOT matches 5% state funds for administrative costs and 10% for capital costs. Small urban fixed route systems and regional community transportation systems are eligible to apply for up to 50% of the net operating costs associated with general public routes.

*Eligible Recipients:* State and local governments, nonprofit organizations (including Indian tribes and groups) and public transit operators in non-urbanized areas are eligible sub-recipients.

### **RURAL CAPITAL PROGRAM**

*Funding Source:* Federal and State

*Purposes:* Provides up to 90% federal and/or state participation. Funds are for the purchase of vehicles, communications equipment and related capital equipment; the purchase or upgrade of computer equipment, file servers, software, printers, telephone systems, mobile data terminals, automatic vehicle locators and other technologies; and the purchase or renovation of facilities for administrative and/or operating use. Funds cover up to 90% of feasibility plan preparation, land acquisitions, design and construction costs.

*Eligible Recipients:* Community transportation system grantees including local governments and nonprofit organizations (including Indian tribes and groups) in non-urbanized areas and in urbanized area counties where there is not a consolidated urban/rural transportation system.

### **HUMAN SERVICE TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT PROGRAM**

*Funding Source:* State

*Purposes:* Funds the administrative costs associated with the transportation of consolidated human service transportation systems and systems operating in urbanized area counties where a consolidated countywide transit system does not exist. The grant provides up to 85% of eligible costs.

---

<sup>2</sup> As listed on the NCDOT-PTD website in November 2008

*Eligible Recipients:* Consolidated human service and community transportation systems operating in urbanized area counties where a consolidated countywide transit system does not exist. Grantees include local governments and nonprofit organizations.

#### ELDERLY AND DISABLED INDIVIDUALS TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM (FTA 5310)

*Funding Source:* Federal

*Purposes:* Funds capital projects. Most funds are used to purchase vehicles, but acquisition of transportation services under contract, lease or other arrangements and state program administration are also eligible expenses. Prior to SAFETEA-LU, NCDOT transferred funds annually to the Section 5311 program. North Carolina can use up to one-third of funds through 2009 for operating costs to serve elderly and disabled in regional systems.

*Eligible Recipients:* State and local governments, nonprofit organizations (including Indian tribes and groups) and public transit operators in non-urbanized areas.

#### REGIONAL AND INTERCITY PROGRAM

*Funding Source:* State and Federal

*Purposes:* Funds intercity bus service in underserved areas of North Carolina that connect to the national intercity network. Also provides state funds for Travelers' Aid programs that assist homeless, stranded or indigent travelers with their intercity transportation needs through the purchase of bus tickets. The grant provides up to 50% of the net operating costs. Section 5311(f) funds used to support portion of NCDOT share.

*Eligible Recipients:* Community transportation systems; other public, private nonprofit and private for-profit transportation providers; public transportation authorities; intercity bus providers; local public bodies including counties and municipalities; Indian tribes and regional or local planning organizations.

#### RURAL OPERATING ASSISTANCE PROGRAM (ROAP)<sup>3</sup>

Part 1; Elderly and Disabled Transportation Assistance Program (EDTAP)

*Funding Source:* State

*Purposes:* Provides operating assistance for the transportation of the state's elderly and disabled citizens. The grant funds up to 100% of cost of service.

*Eligible Recipients:* County governments.

Part 2: Rural General Public Program

*Funding Source:* State

*Purposes:* Funds community transportation systems that serve the general public in the state's rural area. The grant provides up to 90% of cost of service.

*Eligible Recipients:* County governments

Part 3: Employment Transportation Assistance Program

*Funding Source:* State

*Purposes:* Funds transportation service to employment for low-income individuals. Also supports the N.C. Rural Vanpool Program. Provides up to 100% of cost of service.

*Eligible Recipients:* County governments

#### RURAL PLANNING PROGRAM

*Funding Source:* Federal and State

*Purposes:* Funds the updating of local community transportation plans, regional transportation feasibility studies and special studies. Provides up to 100% of cost of

---

<sup>3</sup> Composed of three separate funding sources, allowing for one application

regional feasibility studies (90% of implementation plan) and 90% of local planning studies.

*Eligible Recipients:* Lead transportation agencies including local governments, transportation authorities, nonprofit organizations and Indian tribes.

#### RURAL TRANSIT ASSISTANCE PROGRAM (RTAP) (FTA SECTION 5311 (B)(2))

*Funding Source:* Federal

*Purposes:* Funds training, technical assistance, research and related support activities. The grant provides maximum of 100% federal participation.

*Eligible Recipients:* NCDOT is the grant recipient; however, funds can be contracted or passed through to other entities.

#### JOB ACCESS AND REVERSE COMMUTE (JARC) PROGRAM (FTA Section 5316)

*Funding Source:* Federal

*Purposes:* Funds new transit service to assist welfare recipients and low-income individuals with transportation to jobs, training and child care.

*Eligible Recipients:* Local governments and nonprofit organizations.

#### NEW FREEDOM PROGRAM (FTA Section 5317)

*Funding Source:* Federal

*Purposes:* Funds new transportation services and public transportation alternatives beyond those required by ADA to assist persons with disabilities in both urban and rural areas.

*Eligible Recipients:* Local governments and nonprofit organizations.

#### PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION GRANT PROGRAM

*Funding Source:* State

*Purposes:* Matches NCDOT statewide grants and local federal capital and planning grants. Also funds the Apprentice and Intern Programs and the Transportation Demand Management Program. Program funds short-term demonstration projects and those ineligible for federal funding.

*Eligible Recipients:* Local governments, nonprofit organizations, community transportation systems, transportation authorities and institutions of higher education.

#### APPRENTICE AND INTERN PROGRAMS

*Funding Source:* State

*Purposes:* Funds the work experience for selected recent graduates and graduate students in public transportation. Apprentices, who are recent graduates, work full time for a 12-month period. Interns, who are graduate students, work approximately 12 weeks full time during the summer between their two years of graduate school and approximately 10 hours a week during the fall and spring semesters of their second year. It funds up to 90% of eligible costs.

*Eligible Recipients:* All state transit systems are eligible to receive reimbursement of project costs for salary, benefits and travel within specified guidelines.

#### TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT (TDM) PROGRAM

*Funding Source:* State and Federal (Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality)

*Purposes:* This program is Urban by its' very nature. It funds programs that encourage ridesharing arrangements such as carpools and vanpools and the use of public transit and other alternative transportation in an effort to reduce congestion and vehicle emissions. State funds are matched dollar-for-dollar by local funds.

*Eligible Recipients:* Public bodies responsible for promotion of TDM activities that may provide services such as carpool/vanpool matching and vehicles for use in vanpooling. It is the intent of the program to fund only one organization per region with the temporary exception of the Triangle area but requiring that certain program components, such as marketing activities, be coordinated in one regional marketing program.

#### TECHNOLOGY GRANT

The North Carolina Department of Transportation Public Transportation Division (PTD) encourages North Carolina's Community Transportation systems to employ advanced technologies to foster increased efficiencies in the state by providing grants for qualifying transportation systems. Technologies that may be eligible for this grant include:

- Advanced Scheduling Software
- Maintenance Software
- Mobile Data Computers/Automatic Vehicle Locators (MDC/AVL)
- Integrated Voice Response Systems (IVR)

First, the Community Transit System must be identified as eligible for the technology in the Technology Implementation Plan. Next, the business practices and policies of the transit system must be reviewed and adapted where necessary.

Appendix A

**Johnston County January 15, 2009 LCHSTP Workshop Invitation List and Attendee List**

## Appendix B

### Coordinated Public Transit - Human Service Transportation Planning

#### A survey of community transportation needs

In order to quickly prioritize the transportation issues that need to be addressed in your community – a common list of problems has been assembled from other ‘plans’ developed throughout the country. Please mark all those that apply to your experience. Enter:

<b>(I)</b>	For those that don't exist but need INITIATING
<b>(M)</b>	For those that MUST be fixed immediately
<b>(N)</b>	For those that NEED some improvement
<b>(T)</b>	For those that require TOO much effort for what you expect to get out of it
<b>(\$)</b>	For those that work but lack \$\$\$\$
<b>(OK)</b>	For any that operate efficiently
<b>(NA)</b>	For any that don't apply

Note: You can use more than one symbol for each statement if you want to.

#### "Typical Problems"

##### EDUCATION & INFORMATION

	There is a need for education on available services, various programs, and eligibility requirements (to both clients and the general public). There should be an emphasis on providing this education to the elderly.
	Travel training programs exist, but are limited and have long waiting lists in order to access them.
	Travel training is needed where there is less experience with public transportation.
	There is a need for a basic information telephone line for all public transit services.
	There needs to be a transportation information clearinghouse.
	There are issues with communication, e.g., websites are poor quality and/or difficult to find; the ‘call center’ is not as informed as it should be and does not address cross-county needs; and the transportation agencies are inconsistent in interpreting eligibility requirements.
	There is a need for more non-traditional public outreach efforts in order to achieve greater public participation during the planning process for transit services.
	There needs to be advertising of the various services to the elderly, low income, and general public
	Use of acronyms and lack of understanding of specific terms creates a language barrier between transportation agencies and the public and also with agency to agency coordination.
	Staff, information, and the ability to understand transit services when an individual does not speak English create a language barrier.
	Need to market/increase participation on the Transportation Advisory Board (TAB).
	The staff of assisted living facilities needs to become more knowledgeable about the actual transportation needs of the residents for whom they are caring.
	User notification of any changes in services needs to be improved.
	For the elderly population, there is fear/reluctance to learn about and actually use the fixed route public transportation system.

##### ACCESSIBILITY & SAFETY

	Bus stop locations are not accessible to the disabled, elderly, and general populations due to the lack of sidewalks and gaps between sidewalks and lack of proximity to services.
	There is a concern for safety on transit service. Lighting around stops is needed to help with the passenger feeling of security.
	Traffic near bus stop locations is a problem and often makes it difficult for pedestrians to

	get to the vehicle.
	There is a need for shelters and benches to protect passengers from weather conditions and make utilizing transit more appealing.
	All vehicles providing service for the disabled need to be made wheelchair accessible; includes taxis, vanpool vans, and all buses in the fleet.
	Audible signs are also needed.
	There is a lack of confidence among users to utilize the services.
	Those who really need the services are disenfranchised.

### **CROSS-COUNTY TRIPS & COORDINATION**

	There is a need for inter-county travel for fixed route and paratransit trips.
	The coordination of transportation providers needs to occur.
	There are too many funding sources and too many entities with which to coordinate.
	Private paratransit trip providers need to coordinate better with the CTS.
	There is a lack of transit connectivity between North/South/East and West

### **APPLICATIONS & ELIGIBILITY**

	Users of the various services must be willing and prepared to provide detailed personal information so that eligibility determinations for services can be made.
	The disabled are being denied trips.
	A large percentage of applications for employment trips are rejected
	The applications for service are long, complicated, and difficult to fill out.
	There is a lack of knowledge of the eligibility requirements among agencies. (Agencies do not always know where to send people for service if they do not qualify for a particular program.)
	There is a challenge with fast-tracking applications.
	There are difficulties with ADA service in that the trips take too long, it is a long process to be eligible for service, and sometimes users are only offered a one-way trip.
	The eligibility applications for paratransit service need to be more readily accessible, e.g., on the web, in the case manager's office.

### **SERVICE-RELATED (GENERAL)**

	In general, there is not enough public transportation service available.
	There are many areas without service – poor coverage.
	There are gaps in service.
	The system is too fragmented.
	More routes are needed and existing routes need to be extended.
	The span of bus service is too short.
	There are not enough transportation alternatives/services to permit true independence for the users.
	There needs to be more fixed stop locations along routes and at certain uses.
	There is a need for door-to-door service for the user and possibly the user's escort.
	Paratransit service needs to be more responsive and more flexible for all paratransit trip needs and for all persons with disabilities.
	There is a lack of flexibility within the system.
	Too much advanced planning is required in order to get transportation.
	There are too many transfers on public transit routes.
	There are too many "drops" from taxi service.
	Shared taxi is not appropriate.
	Connections are not designed well.
	There is no service on main roads.
	There is no paratransit service outside of the ¼ mile corridor.
	For the elderly population, door to door service is needed.
	Transit service is too infrequent on most routes.
	People have to wait too long for a ride.
	There is a need to improve the efficiency of scheduling to reduce the amount of vehicle idle time between trips.
	There are some overlaps in county services.
	Existing feeder transit service is not in sync with bus schedules and is inflexible.
	There is no linkage from local service to express service.

**SERVICE-RELATED (SPECIFIC)**

	Transportation services are too limited in the evening hours and on weekends.
	There needs to be service for workers working the second and third shifts.
	There is a need for shopping, recreational, and employment paratransit trips.
	There is a need for public transportation service (both fixed route and paratransit) focused specifically on getting people to jobs.
	Service needs to connect workers with employment and there needs to be “after hours” service to provide transportation for late shifts.
	The large percentage of trips used for dialysis purposes uses too much of the funding available for paratransit trips.
	For secondary school age children with disabilities, there is little availability of service in rural areas.
	There needs to be more buses to provide holiday services and to provide more service for the rural counties which receive much less service than other areas.
	There is not enough express bus service.
	The public transportation system needs to be utilized to provide emergency evacuation services.
	Limitation prevents opportunities for persons with disabilities to access employment, education, training, volunteer opportunities, recreation, and housing.

**CUSTOMER SERVICE**

	There is some dissatisfaction with the service times for door-to-door service due to the “time window” on each end of the trip and with the handling of "no shows".
	It difficult to provide many trips due to the emphasis on “on-time” service.
	The current system is set up to accommodate those who administer the services as opposed to being geared towards those who will use the services.
	Service providers need to be more “consumer friendly.”
	Transit passes wear out and/or often have difficulty being read.
	Users cannot make reservations for service after business hours.
	Agencies that do not have a paratransit driver policy regarding the assistance of passengers when boarding and exiting the vehicle (help with baggage, or walking to the door etc. especially an issue with curb to curb service).
	Some agencies do not have a paratransit policy to address fees and service for companion riders.
	There needs to be a central transit customer service hub that spans the boundaries of the planning area.
	Agency staffs are too small to handle the number and complexity of issues that arise.

**CUSTOMER PRICE FOR SERVICE**

	The system needs to be more cost effective and provide more affordable services.
	The customer price for services is too high especially for the elderly population.
	Some pass issues are related to availability.
	Discounts should be offered for bulk purchases of passes.

**FUNDING**

	There is a general lack of funding for public transportation.
	Transportation funding needs to be divided much more equitably between roads and public transportation with more funding for public transportation.
	No one is in charge of seeing that the cheapest trip option is utilized – no trip broker
	Limited funding causes prioritization of paratransit trips with those trips going to serving elderly and medical needs.
	ADA paratransit service is constrained by funding only the 3/4 mile service area.
	The funding for the Locally Coordinated Human Services Transportation Plan is extremely limited

**DEVELOPMENT- RELATED**

	How do public transportation agencies provide service in lower density areas?
	Caseworkers that obtain housing for clients do not ensure that the transit dependant people are housed near existing transit routes.



**Appendix C -**

JOHNSTON COUNTY FY2007 OPSTATS REPORT FORM										
1	<b>CTP Grantee's Legal Name</b>		Johnston County Council on Aging Inc.							
2	<b>Transit Contact Person</b>		Lynn Bermingham							
9	How Many Volunteer Drivers?		0	How many personal vehicles in service?				0		
FY 2007 ANNUAL OPERATING STATISTICS										
10	Total operational vehicles		22	Administrative Employees employed by system						
11	Total seating capacity of operational vehicles		302	How many	6	Tot hrs paid	9,950	FTE	4.78	37
12	Total ADA accessible vehicles		11	Drivers employed by system						
13	Total vehicles in peak service		20	How many	28	Tot hrs paid	34,693	FTE	16.68	38
				Maintenance Employees employed by system						
14	Annual # of Operating Days - Monday-Friday		258	How many	0	Tot hrs paid	0	FTE	0.00	39
15	Annual # of Operating Days - Saturdays		52	Other Operational Employees employed by system						
16	Annual # of Operating Days - Sundays		44	How many	0	Tot hrs paid	0	FTE	0.00	40
	Total Operating Days		354	Total Employee FTE			21.46	41		
	<b>Monday to Friday Annual Service</b>	<b>Transit System</b>	<b>Other Providers</b>	<b>Other CT Systems</b>	<b>Volunteers</b>		<b>Total</b>			
17	Vehicle Service Hours (M-F)	40,087	6,766				46,853			
18	Vehicle Service Miles (M-F)	776,755	226,546				1,003,301			
19	Vehicle Revenue Miles (M-F)	572,184	162,252				734,436			
20	Passenger Trips (M-F)	68,812	8,698				77,510			
	<b>Saturday and Sunday Annual Service</b>	<b>Transit System</b>	<b>Other Providers</b>	<b>Other CT Systems</b>	<b>Volunteers</b>		<b>Total</b>			
21	Vehicle Service Hours (Sat-Sun)		4,488				4,488			
22	Vehicle Service Miles (Sat-Sun)		27,879				27,879			
23	Vehicle Revenue Miles (Sat-Sun)		19,814				19,814			
24	Passenger Trips (Sat-Sun)		1,212				1,212			
	<b>Total Annual Operations Data</b>			<b>Total Annual Service Statistics</b>						
25	Number of denials		277	Total Vehicle Service Hours			51,341	42		
26	Number of no-shows		2,697	Total Vehicle Service Miles			1,031,180	43		
27	Number of in-service breakdowns of vehicles		5	Total Revenue Miles			754,250	44		
28	Number of mobility impaired passenger trips		3,069	Total Passenger Trips			78,722	45		
29	Number of out-of-county passenger trips		4,496							
	<b>Service Mode</b>	<b>Service Miles</b>	<b>Service Hours</b>	<b>Non-Contract Trips</b>	<b>Medicaid Trips</b>		<b>Other Contract Human Service Agency Trips</b>			
30	Fixed Route									
31	Deviated Fixed Route									
32	Demand Response/Subscription	1,031,180	11,255	7,394	28,547		42,781			
33	<b>SUBTOTAL</b>			7,394	28,547		42,781			
34	Taxi Trips									
35	<b>TOTAL</b>			7,394	28,547		42,781			
	<b>TOTAL Trips</b>						<b>78,722</b>			

**Appendix D – Statistical data**

**Appendix E**

**Voluntary Title VI Public Involvement – Forms attached**