



**Alan M. Voorhees
Transportation
Center**

A STRATEGY FOR GETTING PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES TO WORK

Supporting New Jersey County Transportation

**Final Report
December 2012**



**A Strategy for
Getting People with Disabilities to Work:
Supporting New Jersey County Transportation**

Final Report

2012

Written by:

Andrea Lubin & Stephanie DiPetrillo
Alan M. Voorhees Transportation Center
Edward J. Bloustein School of Planning and Public Policy
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
33 Livingston Avenue, New Brunswick, New Jersey 08901

&

Steven R. Fittante
Loredo Policy Research, Inc.
556 River Road, Phillipsburg, NJ 08865

Prepared for:

New Jersey Department of Human Services
Division of Disability Services
P.O. Box 700, Trenton, New Jersey 08625

**This publication was made possible by funding from the
Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS)
Medicaid Infrastructure Grant Number CODA 93.779**

Legal Notice and Disclaimer

CMS (including its employees and agents) assumes no responsibility for consequences resulting from the use of the information herein, (or from use of the information obtained at linked Internet addresses,) or in any respect for the content of such information including (but not limited to) error or omissions, the accuracy or reasonableness of factual or scientific assumptions, studies or conclusions, the defamatory nature of statements, ownership of copyright or other intellectual property rights, and the violation of property, privacy, or personal rights of others. CMS is not responsible for, and expressly disclaims all liability for, damages of any kind arising out of use reference to, or reliance on such information. No guarantees or warranties, including (but not limited to) any express or implied warranties of merchantability or fitness for a particular use or purpose, are made by CMS with respect to such information.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors wish to extend their sincere gratitude and appreciation to those who generously shared their wealth of knowledge, experience, and insights on community transportation, which greatly contributed to the creation of this report. Specific thanks must be given to the following:

- Alan M. Voorhees Transportation Center staff including executive director Jon Carnegie, project coordinator Betsy Harvey, and recent graduate student David Nelson.
- Joseph Amoroso, director of the New Jersey Division of Disability Services, Kathy Krepcio, executive director of the John J. Heldrich Center for Workforce Development at Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, and Paula Barber of the Heldrich Center for providing support and encouragement throughout the life of the study.
- The Medicaid Infrastructure Grant nationwide transportation work group led by Nanette Relave and Gail Stefl of the Center for Workers with Disabilities, for offering a forum for states to share their successes and challenges in finding solutions to meet the transportation needs of folks with disabilities seeking employment opportunity.
- The NJ Transit Local Programs & Minibus Support department led by former Director Robert Koska, who supported this research effort by sharing their vast knowledge and data regarding New Jersey's community transportation landscape and the 21 county transportation services.
- The New Jersey Council on Special Transportation, led by President Michael M. Vieira, for sharing resources and offering enthusiastic support for this research effort.
- The New Jersey consumers with disability who participated in one of two focus group sessions convened for the study. They openly and graciously shared their experiences regarding employment travel and perspectives on county transportation services.
- The 35 individuals representing 26 stakeholder organizations who shared invaluable information through their participation in the interview sessions held for the study.
- The Community Transportation Association of America, for greatly assisting the research team with the nationwide survey distribution efforts.
- The almost 200 community transportation providers who selflessly gave their time and input through the study's online survey. Their feedback gave evidence that community transportation providers nationwide, in addition to those in New Jersey, are struggling to maintain services to benefit their transportation disadvantaged customers.

And of course, to the 21 New Jersey county transportation providers – their continued commitment to serve the transportation disadvantaged guided the authors in the documentation of the financial crisis impacts on county transportation services and their quest for feasible strategies to combat said crisis. The passion and dedication conveyed for the critical work they undertake daily is inspiring.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background

In 2005 the Alan M. Voorhees Transportation Center (VTC) at Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey under contract with the New Jersey Department of Human Services, Division of Disability Services (DDS) and with funding from the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS), developed a Five-year Transportation Plan entitled *Meeting the Employment Transportation Needs of Persons with Disabilities in New Jersey*. The main goal of the Plan was to identify barriers in transportation to work for people with disabilities in the state seeking competitive employment, and to present recommendations to address those barriers (1).

One of the Plan recommendations was a call to “*Expand the resources available to improve and enhance transportation services for people with disabilities*” (1). To advance this recommendation, the VTC research team focused efforts over a two-year period on exploring potential funding sources and other best practice coping mechanisms that could assist New Jersey’s 21 county community transportation providers, who have served an increasingly significant role in providing community-based transportation in the state since the 1980s, serving people with disabilities, the elderly, those with low-income, veterans, as well as the general public.

Unfortunately these providers have been experiencing severe economic constraints, due to factors including the nationwide recession, as well as the fact that a main state funding source for the majority of county providers – the Casino Revenue Fund’s Senior Citizen and Disabled Resident Transportation Assistance Program (SCDRTAP) – has been significantly reduced in recent years (2).

New Jersey’s county transportation providers are not alone in combating an environment with decreased funding opportunities, increased costs, and increased service demand. Nationwide, community transportation providers and larger transit agencies are all struggling to cope with the recession and to combat these financial challenges, many are taking measures that include service reduction and/or elimination, staff reduction, and trip prioritization – all of which hinder the ability of transportation disadvantaged persons to meet their trip needs (3,4).

The seven chapter report that follows shares a diverse and detailed array of findings determined from both primary and secondary research endeavors that were pursued to achieve the primary goal of improving and enhancing county community transportation options for people with disabilities in New Jersey, particularly those seeking employment opportunity. Specific emphasis was given to determining how county providers could best serve the employment trip needs of this specific population because persons with disabilities are so dramatically underrepresented in the labor market (5).

New Jersey’s County Transportation Providers: An Overview

From their earliest roots in social welfare programs of the Johnson presidential administration, community transportation in New Jersey has grown to encompass an array of transportation services in all 21 of the state’s counties. This growth arose out of several funding sources, many provided by federal agencies as well as one significant state funding source, The Senior Citizen and Disabled Resident Transportation Assistance Program (SCDRTAP).

Many of New Jersey's community transit services began in earnest in the 1970s and early 1980s and were designed to meet the mobility needs of specific populations on the local level. Several counties (including Cape May, Monmouth and Ocean), municipalities, and nonprofit/NGO organizations focused on the needs of older persons and relied on funding from federal programs such as Title III B of the Older Americans Act (Supportive Services) and Title III C of the Older Americans Act (Nutrition Services). At the same time, another funding source, Title XX of the Social Security Act (now Social Service Block Grant or SSBG), was used to address the transportation needs of low-income persons, and later, people with disabilities. Yet another federal program, the Social Security grant fund, Title XIX Medicaid, was used by Union County to fund transportation for medical purposes. Over time, consolidation of services began to occur; eventually these services were merged and bought under county operations.

While meeting the needs of several populations, these early efforts did not serve riders with disabilities well, as most vehicles operated by county systems were not wheelchair accessible. Advocacy by the Office of Special Programs at the NJ Department of Transportation (NJ DOT) and Tri-State Regional Planning Commission, together with the adoption of Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, raised awareness about accessibility issues. By the early 1980s, several counties, and NGO operators working with counties, began to acquire wheelchair lift-equipped vehicles through the programs made possible by the Urban Mass Transportation Act Section 16(b)(2) programs (UMTA).

The first federal transit operating funds for county systems came in the mid-1970s from the UMTA Section 147 rural demonstration program, used initially by Sussex County to organize and operate services. The success of Section 147 projects nationally led to the Surface Transportation Act of 1978, which included a formula grant program known as the Section 18 Rural Transportation program. By the mid-1980s, 15 of the 21 counties were using Section 18 to fund operations. In some counties, these funds served as a catalyst to expand services. Elsewhere, particularly in counties served only by private carrier contract, Section 18 spurred new county run programs that provided transportation services for seniors and people with disabilities.

As counties began to expand the scope of their operations, they also began to share ideas and provide support for one another. In the spring of 1981, the NJ Council on Special Transportation (NJ COST) was established. NJ COST focused its attention on securing additional operating and capital funds to support the growing demand for community transit. One revenue stream featured prominently as a potential resource for transportation services: the growing state tax revenues from Atlantic City's casinos. In January 1984, New Jersey enacted the Senior Citizen and Disabled Resident Transportation Assistance Program (SCDRTAP), which provided dedicated funding for community transportation from the state's Casino Revenue tax. SCDRTAP greatly expanded the resources available for community transportation. For example, this funding allowed counties to purchase vehicles – more than half of which were wheelchair accessible.

The July 1990 passage of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and subsequent development of the NJ TRANSIT ADA complementary paratransit service, Access Link, provided new transportation opportunities for persons with disabilities. Access Link provides public transportation comparable to the NJ TRANSIT (NJT) system to those unable to utilize the accessible bus and rail system by reason of their disability. Then in the late 1990s, FTA's Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) program (Section 5316) was included in the Surface Transportation Act Reauthorization of 1998. This program provided funding for transportation that sought to improve

access for employment in areas not adequately served by transit. In counties receiving JARC funds, increased service has been focused along reverse commute routes that connect riders to key employment centers as well as on advance reservation subscription trips that link the transit dependent to employment destinations not otherwise served by transit.

The advent of these myriad federal funding sources, coupled with increased awareness of the transportation needs of persons with disabilities, especially those seeking employment, has spurred on considerable growth in the county coordinated systems. Further, the ability of the county coordinated systems to serve all of their clientele, including transporting persons with disabilities to work, is dependent upon available funding. However, following two decades of dramatic expansion, the county coordinated systems are now in a period of retraction. Recently the county coordinated systems have experienced reductions in SCDRTAP funding that have resulted in reduced services and ridership loss. Peak SCDRTAP ridership was achieved in 2006, when nearly 1.9 million rides or 48% of all county provided rides were supported with casino funds. Since then, the number of SCDRTAP-supported rides has fallen steadily. The ongoing economic recession and the growth of casino gaming in neighboring states have adversely effected funds generated by the Casino Revenue Tax, and as a result diminished the funds available for SCDRTAP. A continuing decline in ridership is all the more likely given the ongoing reductions in SCDRTAP funding.

While many county providers have worked diligently to replace and expand funding from other sources, the adverse effects of the reduction of this once reliable funding source are beginning to be seen. SCDRTAP, once seen as a panacea for funding community transportation throughout the state, can no longer be solely relied upon to provide consistent financial backing. The county coordinated systems, many of which grew out of initial funding support from federal and other resources, and found refuge in New Jersey's unique dedicated funding source, must now look beyond SCDRTAP and expand their use of federal, state, local and non-traditional funding.

New Jersey's County Transportation Providers: Current Funding Sources

While all New Jersey county providers utilize a mix of federal, state, and local funding, there is great variety in the number and extent of programs utilized. While some counties draw upon a large number of resources, others have not yet availed themselves of multiple funding sources. For example, Middlesex County, a suburban county located in the central region of the state, draws funding from the largest number of funding agencies – a total of 15 separate funding programs in all. Essex County, home to the state's largest urban center, reports funding from only four separate sources – two federal programs, one state program, and locally raised donations.

Community transportation providers rely on federal funding sources to support capital (vehicles), administration, and transportation operation costs. Federal grants include both formula and competitive funding applications. The most commonly used federal funds come from the Department of Health and Human Services (USHHS) and the US Department of Transportation (USDOT). Four subdivisions of the USHHS account for the majority of the federal grant funding used by counties, including the 1) Administration on Aging, now part of the Administration for Community Living (ACL); 2) the Administration for Children and Families (ACF); 3) the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS); and 4) the Health Resource and Services Administration (HRSA). Funding sources from the USDOT are primarily administered by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). The Department of Housing

and Urban Development (USHUD) also provides funding for vehicle purchases through its Community Development Block Program. Federal funding, such as Title III Older Americans Act overseen by the Administration on Aging and Title XX Social Service Block Grant (SSBG) overseen by the Administration for Children and Families, provided the initial funding for some of New Jersey's county systems, dating back to the early 1970s.

Most counties draw a portion of their federal funding from four or five distinct programs. All 21 county coordinated transportation systems operating in New Jersey utilize USDOT/FTA's Section 5310, which provides funding for capital investment and mobility management activities that supports transportation for seniors and people with disabilities. All but one of 16 eligible counties make use of USDOT/FTA's Section 5311, which provides funding to community transportation providers for administration, capital, and operations to rural areas. Two of the USDOT/FTA funding sources that specifically target the needs of employment transportation and the needs of people with disabilities are Section 5316 JARC and Section 5317 New Freedom funds. To date, nine counties in the state have drawn upon JARC funding while only three counties have applied for New Freedom funding. Use of these funding resources has been limited in part to the 50 percent local match requirement for operating funds.

USDOT/FHWA Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) grant funds are currently utilized by only three counties in the state: Bergen, Middlesex, and Monmouth. While CMAQ funds require a much less onerous 25 percent local match, the three year funding limit makes these funds less popular among the county transportation providers.

New Jersey county transportation providers also rely on USHHS grants for support of administration, capital purchases, and operations. The counties overall draw largely from three programs: Title III B Older Americans Act, Title XX Social Services Block Grant, and Title XIX Medicaid grants. Another USHHS program, the Ryan White HIV grant program is used by only two counties. Fourteen counties finance administration, capital, and operational activities using Title III funding, one of the original funding sources for county transportation in New Jersey. Ten counties use Title XX SSBG funding, which can be used for transportation of individuals of any age that meet the income criteria.

Four counties use Title XIX Medicaid for ambulatory medical transportation for individuals meeting the income eligibility. Since 2009, Title XIX Medicaid funded transportation has been managed by the statewide broker, LogistiCare. The transition of Title XIX Medicaid transportation administration to a brokered service has in the short run reduced the number of counties that utilize Medicaid as a source of revenue for their operations. However, this program presents the opportunity for all counties to bring in new revenues and increase efficiencies by covering some of the costs of existing medical trips for non-Medicaid customers by filling empty seats with Medicaid passengers.

Finally, transportation funding provided by USHUD's Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) provides funds for only one county in the state, Burlington County.

Community transportation providers also rely on state funding sources to support administration, capital, and operation costs provided by a number of state agencies including the NJ Department of Human Services (NJ DHS), the NJ Department of Labor and Workforce Development (NJLWD), the NJ Department of Military and Veterans Affairs (DMAVA), NJ TRANSIT (NJT) and the NJ Department of Transportation (NJDOT). The definition of state funding utilized in this report

encompasses New Jersey state agency funding, which may also include pass-through federal funding that is administered by any given department.

All of New Jersey's county coordinated systems rely on the funding provided by the SCDRTAP program administered by NJ TRANSIT while making relatively little use of funds provided by most other state agencies. Generally counties utilize funding from two or three state funding opportunities in addition to SCDRTAP, though usage ranges from a high of five separate state funders used by Middlesex County to a low of one in Essex County, where SCDRTAP is the county provider's only source of state funding. Dependency on SCDRTAP funds range from 90% of the budget in Essex County to 12% of the budget in Somerset County. As such, all counties are experiencing the effects of declining SCDRTAP funding and must look to other revenue sources to meet gaps.

Sixteen county providers use funding provided by the NJ Department of Military and Veteran Affairs for transportation to Veteran Administration clinics and hospitals. Seven counties currently receive Work First/TANF funds for the provision of transportation to education, training, and employment activities so as to allow transition from public support to self-sufficiency.

Two other funding programs offered by the NJ Department of Labor and Workforce Development are focused on transportation to employment: Sheltered Workshop and Supported Employment Transportation offered by the NJDVRs and funds from the Workforce Investment Boards (WIB). Four counties, Camden, Hunterdon, Middlesex, and Monmouth, support transportation to supportive employment locations with funding from the former, while Burlington is the only county making use of WIB funding.

Four counties use funding from DMHS's Peer Grouping program, which provides operating funds for transportation to mental health centers. Two counties, Middlesex and Sussex, use funds from the NJ Courts' Drug Court program, which provides reimbursement for transportation-dependent persons required to attend court counseling sessions. Two counties use NJDHS Division of Developmental Disabilities (DDD) funding for transportation service provision – Middlesex County to subsidize sheltered workshop transportation for eligible individuals with developmental disabilities and Monmouth County for transportation to day programs for residents with developmental disabilities. Only Bergen County makes use of NJDH Senior Services' Safe Housing funding, which can be used for transportation for seniors living in congregate housing.

Finally, community transportation providers rely upon three forms of "local" funding: 1) funds raised through their own fare and donation programs; 2) funding provided by municipalities; and 3) resources provided by NGOs that advocate for people with disabilities, including The Arc and Easter Seals.

Self-generated revenue in the form of fares and/or donations is one viable means to raise funds that finance transportation. While fares/donations alone are insufficient to finance transportation, funds collected from passengers should be part of the overall funding equation for community transportation providers. Eleven counties currently collect fares, at least for some trips and include: Burlington, Camden, Hunterdon, Middlesex, Monmouth, Morris, Ocean, Somerset, Sussex, Union, and Warren. Warren County only charges a fare for competitive employment trips. Many more, a total of 17 in all, collect donations/suggested fares. Eight counties collect both fares and donations, differentiating their fare vs. donation policy by trip purpose and/or population served. Only Cape

May and Hudson counties collect neither fares nor donations. In 2011 revenue from non-grant sources totaled more than \$2.3 million among all of New Jersey's counties, a significant increase from the \$1.7 collected in 2008.

The receipt of funding from municipal sources is limited to six counties: Camden, Middlesex, Monmouth, Passaic, Somerset, and Sussex.

Funding provided by NGOs is more limited than that raised through fares and/or donations. Only four counties in the state receive funding from The Arc: Hunterdon, Monmouth, Somerset, and Warren counties. Both Passaic and Sussex County receive funds from Easter Seals, which is used for transportation for non-competitive employment and very limited competitive employment trip purposes. Easter Seals facilities are located within both counties. Ocean County is the sole recipient in the state of the 21 Plus program, which addresses the needs of students with disabilities transitioning from school-based transportation and entering the workforce. This type of funding source, as provided by NGOs such as Abilities, Inc. and other developers of housing and supports for adults with disabilities, need to be pursued by all counties in order to expand the delivery of mobility to people with disabilities unable to directly access existing transit services.

As demonstrated, New Jersey's county coordinated system providers rely on a variety of federal, state, and local sources to finance the administration, capital, and operational costs of providing transportation. While well provided for in the past by Casino Revenue funds, i.e. SCDRTAP, reliance on this one funding source is no longer a viable option. Some counties have responded to the challenge and have availed themselves of a large number of grant funding options from all levels of government and nonprofit sources. Others have been more reluctant or less skilled at accessing these other revenue sources. In this period of reduced funding and increasing need, it behooves the county providers to consider all possible sources of funding and to replicate the efforts of their peers who have successfully been able to secure funding from additional sources.

In Their Own Words: Interviews with New Jersey's Community Transportation Stakeholders

The research team conducted a series of eight structured interview sessions with 35 stakeholders from 26 organizations related to the New Jersey community transportation field, including the 21 county community transportation system providers. The overall intent of the sessions was to discuss transportation funding opportunities for county transportation agencies as well as other innovations that agencies could pursue to maintain and/or expand their level of service, particularly for New Jersey residents with disabilities seeking employment.

The interviews convened with the 21 county providers sought information on their services, details of the financial challenges faced by each, and how they endeavored to overcome them. The sessions also served to document the effects of funding reductions and afforded participants the opportunity to discuss the unique regional and local issues they experienced in the current restricted economic environment.

It should be emphasized that all counties interviewed expressed interest, dedication, and commitment to trying to offer employment trips to person with disability and other transportation disadvantaged populations. All 21 providers reported offering a mix of competitive and non-competitive employment trips for residents with disability. Interviewees explained that most

employment trips were provided by subscription. Depending on the county, some of these employment trips were provided via deviated fixed route shuttles and others via demand response service. Not surprisingly, those counties with deviated fixed routes seem to be able to offer more employment trips for this targeted population compared to those counties that must rely on demand response service.

Some counties discussed coordinating with other entities to provide employment trips. In terms of unmet needs related to employment trips, limited service hours were discussed. Commuters often do not have a viable return trip at the conclusion of their work day and/or cannot access employment on weekends. Some providers noted that particular employment sectors, such as retail, pose unique challenges because retail work typically requires evening and weekend work hours. County providers also reported employment trips for shift workers as an unmet need.

Regarding funding issues, interviewees reiterated that in addition to being negatively impacted by the general nationwide economic recession, almost all county providers reported they rely heavily on New Jersey casino revenue funding via the SCDRTAP program, which has experienced significant reductions due to factors including neighboring state gambling competition. As one interviewee opined, the historic county transportation provider business model of relying on New Jersey casino revenue funds to support county transportation is broken.

County providers have responded to funding reductions in a variety of ways. The most frequently cited actions include service reduction and prioritization – particularly with regard to destinations, hours, trip purposes and service categories; staff reduction; proliferation of waiting lists for trips, including those for dialysis and employment; and trip denials. Reduced ability to secure match funds often required for grant programs was also highlighted, as was delayed capital replacements. State MPO and NJ TRANSIT interviewees also noted a reduction in applications received for grant programs requiring match funds.

County providers uniformly concurred they must pursue new and diversified funding opportunities. It was agreed among all that no single strategy would completely alleviate the economic duress county providers have experienced; instead, it was acknowledged success would only be realized by pursuing multiple coping strategies. Nine specific strategies were brought up for discussion by the research team and several others were suggested by interviewees. Some key thoughts shared on each follow:

- Bus advertising – generally agreed by interviewees this was an option worth considering. Middlesex County reported success in using bus advertising to generate additional revenue, earning more than \$60,000 from lucrative bus wraps in 2011-12. However, it was acknowledged that bus advertising was not appropriate in all locations, as it is more difficult to interest advertisers in more rural areas that lack a dense population base. Market saturation in a given locale can also impact successful pursuit of this strategy.
- Purchase of Bus and Rail Tickets/Passes – Some county providers have opted to purchase and distribute transit tickets to their customers to encourage public transit system usage, including Monmouth and Middlesex counties. For counties with limited or no NJ TRANSIT bus and/or rail service, purchasing and distributing transit tickets to county customers is not a viable option. However for those counties with access to NJT services, it was emphasized

that promoting this approach is feasible as the NJT system is very accessible for persons with disabilities.

- Fares and Donations – In many cases county freeholders have been reluctant to permit fares due to a concern that such action would anger older residents who utilize the service. However, many acknowledged that county residents appreciate and value the service and are often willing to pay. Only two NJ county providers reported not utilizing a fare or donation program, with most utilizing some combination of donation/fare or donation only policy. Overall, county providers have had success with their fare and/or donation programs and several suggestions were discussed regarding how to pursue a successful fare and/or donation program, including applying the same fare to all customers.
- New Funding Sources – All counties acknowledged the need to identify new funding sources and most indicated they have focused their efforts to do so. Several interviewees cited the main concern when seeking new funding was that grants most often request the creation of a new service and the counties need to focus on maintaining their existing services. Some counties reported seeking new funding from private funding sources, such as nonprofits. NJ TRANSIT explained that counties that are not connected to their local Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO) are often not aware of how to pursue federal funding opportunities such as the CMAQ program. Other non-traditional funding sources have also been sought include corporate community support from local food stores and area businesses that either serve as employers of county residents and/or benefit from county customers patronizing their business.
- Partnering with Other Agencies – Many interviewees emphasized the potential obstacles and issues to be resolved when partnering, particularly in vehicle sharing. The scale of a given operation was also discussed as a significant factor in promoting or inhibiting coordination efforts. Due to these potential obstacles one interviewee suggested that pursuing a coordination effort as a pilot study is a smart approach. Despite evidence of the inherent difficulties in coordination, interviewees did share some success stories of partnering with their fellow county providers to reduce duplicate trips and create new efficiencies.
- Service Contracts – Some counties reported maintaining purchase of service contracts with various state agencies/departments. Several counties also stated they were either under contract to provide services for the statewide Medicaid brokerage system, LogistiCare, or were interested in exploring how doing so could yield revenue.
- Volunteer Drivers – Several interviewees discussed the use of volunteer drivers and NJ TRANSIT interviewees remarked on the benefit of volunteer drivers for ride matching programs and also cited potential cost savings associated with use of their service. Potential obstacles mentioned included determining the appropriate and necessary insurance coverage needed for volunteer drivers.
- Improve Efficiencies – One strategy discussed to achieve improved efficiencies focused on embracing technology by means including standardization of one's vehicle fleet and using tools such as GPS, routing and scheduling software, mobile data computers, and in-vehicle video surveillance. Other strategies to improve efficiencies that were discussed included eliminating all non-essential spending; reducing driver overtime; serving as mobility

managers to their customer base, and implementing or enforcing their current no-show policies.

- Transit Feeder Service – Discussed as a valuable option to pursue in counties with transit service. It was noted that travel training for the customer base is needed, however, if this approach is to succeed.
- Deviated Fixed Routes/Shuttles – Discussed as an excellent way to serve important local and regional trip generators, including employment sites, and can contribute to reduced costs. All county providers in the central region reported using deviated fixed route shuttle services and experiencing success with this type of service. Several counties in the southern and northern regions also use deviated fixed routes/shuttles. One interviewee emphasized that a key factor in creating a successful deviated fixed route service is premised upon a well- conceived route planning process.
- Other Suggestions – A variety of other coping strategies were suggested by interviewees including but not limited to: continue the communication and coordination effort that was initiated through the United We Ride process; investigate how to offer more travel training opportunities to consumers, as travel training offers an excellent approach to teach transportation disadvantaged persons how to safely use transit without fear; consider regionalization of services as a means to maximize capacity and to address the county border dilemma; consider entering into purchasing consortiums for expenses; and eliminate the county border as an artificial service boundary.

In total, all of the findings shared through the interview process were extremely useful in the development of the policy recommendations included in Chapter 7.

National Provider Survey Findings & Best Practice Innovators

The research team developed and administered a confidential, online survey that was fielded to a nationwide sample of community paratransit providers. In total, 186 respondents completed the survey. The survey was designed to capture the experiences, insights, and strategies used by respondent organizations to maintain and enhance services for the transportation disadvantaged, including people with disabilities. A main goal of the effort was to identify innovative strategies employed by these organizations.

Respondent agencies represented a diverse range of public and private community transportation providers. The majority operated at least in part in rural settings (68%), while 44% of agencies provided some of their service in urban settings, and about a quarter of agencies operated in suburban settings (23%). Most respondents reported their agency served people with disabilities and the elderly. Most also transported the general public or welfare recipients/low-income persons. Nearly all agencies received some form of compensation from their riders. Most respondents (79%) reported they charged a fare for services while only 20% requested a rider donation in lieu of fare.

Over 85% of survey respondents reported providing transportation to employment for persons with disabilities and employment trips were cited as the second most requested trip purpose. While providing a large number of trips to employment locations, agencies also stated they had not satisfied the needs that exist for employment trips. Agencies named employment trips (and/or job

training) as their largest unmet need that they would like to fulfill, with nearly four in ten survey respondents indicating that employment trips were their largest unmet need.

More than half of respondent agencies stated that the rides they provided to employment served both competitive and non-competitive work locations equally. Also, almost all survey respondents who provided employment transportation for persons with disabilities reported they provided weekday service, while only slightly more than half offered these services on weekends.

Like New Jersey County community transportation providers, survey respondents also reported experiencing funding declines and associated consequences, such as having to reduce or eliminate services due to economic constraints. Federal programs provided the majority of operating funds for nearly half of all respondent agencies, with fewer relying on state and local funding for the majority of their operating fund. The three most frequently cited federal funding sources used by respondents were Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5307 (rural program); FTA Section 5316 (Job Access Reverse Commute); and FTA Section 5317 (New Freedom). A significant challenge to pursuing federal funding is the need to match this support with local sourced funds. Nearly two-thirds of respondent agencies stated a lack of matching funds limited their ability to apply for grants at least some of the time.

Coping strategies pursued to address funding issues included conventional options such as reducing overtime, service hours, and staff. However, many also reported pursuing some of the ten innovative coping strategies posed in the survey, such as coordination among agencies to share services and/or vehicles (58%), sale of advertising space (47%), and pursuit of foundation or charitable support (37%). In contrast, respondents were least likely to offer feeder service to traditional transit (21%), use volunteer drivers (20%), or purchase public/private carrier bus or rail tickets (12%). Chapter 5 provides detail on some of the obstacles respondents reported they encountered in pursuing these innovative strategies.

From the universe of 186 survey respondents, the research team also identified five programs as best practice models that represented a cross-section of innovation in terms of funding, technology, and service design. Some of the actions pursued by these innovators included: forming public/private partnerships and coordination strategies; combining funding sources; using existing vehicles to provide shared service between counties; utilizing volunteer drivers; implementation of a point deviation/reservation model; and pursuing innovative dedicated funding sources, such as a transportation utility fee. More detail on each of the five best practice programs identified is included in Chapter 5.

In their Own Words: Focus Groups with Consumers with Disabilities Seeking Employment

Two focus groups were convened for this study, with a total of 23 participants who identified themselves as persons with disabilities seeking employment. These sessions were designed to elicit input on unmet employment-related transportation needs of persons with disability in New Jersey.

Discussion at each focus group session centered on participant usage and experiences related to community (county) transportation. Most participants reported they used a variety of transportation modes to meet their diverse travel needs and most of those who identified themselves as employed reported they used different modes to and from work. The majority of participants in both sessions

reported using county community transit for at least one segment of their work and/or other trips. Factors including limited service hours/days and frequency were the most commonly cited reasons for this reliance on multiple transit modes, limited ability to combine work trips with other travel purposes, and overall difficulty in meeting transportation needs.

Suggestions for needed improvements to facilitate employment trips using county transportation focused primarily on the need to increase the span of service availability (e.g. earlier morning and later evening service options), frequency, and geographic coverage. Most participants, including those with experience using public transit, also reported they would be interested in taking a travel training class if it was made available. Numerous participants explained they have had difficulties in planning public transit trips due to confusion regarding understanding schedules/maps and determining the best ways to navigate a given transit station.

Concluding Recommendations

New Jersey county transportation providers are the backbone of the state's community transportation landscape and support the diverse needs of the transportation disadvantaged population by providing life enhancing, and in many cases, life sustaining services. These community transit providers are currently facing tremendous financial difficulties due to the nationwide economic recession and reductions in a main state funding source for the majority of county providers – SCDRTAP. The resultant consequence of these financial difficulties is that providers are struggling to maintain existing services for clients, including those with disabilities seeking to access employment.

The research team pursued a variety of primary and secondary research to determine strategies that could help alleviate the financial burdens New Jersey's county providers and many of their peers nationwide are facing so they can continue to meet the needs of the transportation disadvantaged, the research team pursued a variety of primary and secondary research. Recommendations for moving forward were determined using the information gathered from the various tasks conducted for this study, including the consumer focus groups, key stakeholder informant interviews, nationwide community paratransit provider survey, and from the other best practice research undertaken.

No one single solution will alleviate the current financial crisis affecting New Jersey's county transportation provider community and providers cannot afford to depend on the revitalization of once previously stable sources of funding. As a group, county providers must be open to pursuing some of the innovative and newer strategies discussed in Chapter 7 if they are to not only survive, but thrive into the future.

Recommendations are presented in this report in six broad categories. Overview information on each category follows. For more detail refer to Chapter 7.

Pursue Program Evaluation

Each of New Jersey's 21 county transportation providers should undertake an effort to initiate and/or strengthen their program evaluation efforts in order to determine the economic costs, benefits, and social impacts of the services they provide. Sharing those findings through an educational outreach effort will serve to better inform stakeholders at both the grassroots and

political levels of the critical role county community transit services provide in the state. An informed public and political network can serve as invaluable allies to county providers as they seek to document, publicize, and determine strategies to combat their financial plight. Documentation of the benefits derived from their services will also aid any and all efforts to pursue policies and legislation supportive of county transportation services and would be valuable information to convey when pursuing grant opportunities. Suggested strategies for documenting costs and benefits are presented in Chapter 7.

Pursue Additional Grant Funding Opportunities

New Jersey's county community providers need to commit to actively pursuing both new and underutilized grant opportunities and must continue to envision this component of their work as vital to supporting the family of services they offer the transportation disadvantaged community. In this climate of fiscal restraint, the ability to find expanded funding to subsidize transportation will be challenging. However, there are always new opportunities that can be considered for possible grant funding support, some of which result from truly new funding initiatives, while others could be the result of a given funding program's reorganization (e.g. MAP-21).

Examples of newer and/or atypically pursued federal grant opportunities that should be explored include the Federal Transit Administration's (FTA) Bus and Bus Facilities Livability program and the Self-Sufficiency grant initiative available through the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). To successfully acquire new funding, optimum connectivity between those knowledgeable about funding opportunities and the county transportation provider community needs to be established. For example, county providers should collectively meet with the Community Transportation Association of America's Institute for Transportation Coordination to discuss new funding opportunities and strategies pursued by other states. Counties must stay connected with their local Transportation Management Association, Metropolitan Planning Organization, and NJ TRANSIT's Office of Community Mobility. All of these entities can provide assistance and direction in the quest for new funding opportunities, as well as offer vital information on how to secure match funds and innovative match strategies.

Counties should continue to seek grant opportunities with and from nonprofit entities. Many nonprofit organizations that support transportation disadvantaged populations recognize the critical role transportation has in the lives of their clients and some offer funding support for transportation, including the Henry H. Kessler Foundation in New Jersey.

To assist county providers in their quest for grant funds, a grant seeking and writing course targeted to this population should be developed and consideration should also be given to creating a resource guide for county providers that includes valuable information on how to pursue new and/or alternative revenue options.

To address the dilemma of securing match support, county community transportation providers should be aware that federal funds from other programs such as HUD's Community Development Block Grants, the U.S. Department of Health and Senior Services Community Services Block Grants, and funding from Area Agencies on Aging and the Older Americans Act may be eligible as match sources for various FTA grant programs (6). Pursuing in-kind matches is another avenue New Jersey county community transportation providers should explore as a means to meet federal and other grant match requirements. In-kind matches are typically non-cash contributions provided by non-

federal parties. A variety of U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB) circulars provide guidance on in-kind matches including OMB Circulars A-87, A-102 and A-133 (7). Through the best practice scan, it was determined that other states report regularly using in-kind matches to help meet federal match requirements.

Another area of potential regarding match support lies in Transportation Development Credits or Toll Credits (TCs). TCs are permitted by federal law and allow states to use toll credits earned from qualifying toll facility expenditures to serve as a non-federal match for capital transit projects (8,9). Many states including Texas, Florida, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and New Jersey use TCs. NJ TRANSIT uses TCs as a match for some capital funding requirements. New Jersey is in a prime position to explore expanded usage of TCs as a source of match support for federal grants due its numerous toll-road miles.

Pursue Non-grant Funding Opportunities

Pursuing non-grant funding is as important as seeking grant funding opportunities. New Jersey's 21 county community transportation providers should be pursuing all of the strategies highlighted below to the extent possible, as each offers its own unique advantages.

- **Bus advertising** - Although successfully securing bus advertising will not be achieved by all, it is a worthwhile strategy for providers to investigate as a means to supplement existing revenue. On-vehicle advertising revenue is also an eligible source of matching funds for FTA grants. Almost half of the VTC national survey respondents reported pursuing the sale of bus advertising rights and several New Jersey county providers have done so as well.
- **Donation and fares** - To better cope with the existing economic environment, a uniform mandatory fare program should be considered for implementation by New Jersey's county community transportation providers. As determined by the VTC national survey, New Jersey's county providers are not utilizing fare programs as prolifically as their peer organizations in other states. Pursuing a uniform mandatory fare program across all counties will diminish the local political concerns associated with instituting a fare. To alleviate equity concerns associated with a mandatory fare, a uniform reduced fare could be offered to customers with disability and the elderly. For this recommendation to succeed, support may be needed from the State Legislature.
- **Volunteer drivers** - Volunteers in the United States are a valuable commodity and several New Jersey community transportation providers are successfully using volunteer drivers to support their programs. VTC national survey respondents who indicated they experienced difficulty implementing a volunteer driver program reported that the top two reasons were lack of potential volunteer response and insurance issues. New Jersey faces these same issues with volunteer driver programs. The research team recommends the New Jersey Legislature address the insurance barriers for volunteer drivers, which would help increase the viability of volunteer driver programs in the state. These volunteer driver programs can increase transportation options, as well as offer cost savings to county transportation providers who opt to use volunteer drivers, even in a limited capacity.
- **Private sector support** - Pursuing financial support from private sector entities located in the community was a strategy mentioned by several survey respondents and stakeholder

interviewees. Shopping/retail facilities were discussed as potential sources of this type of funding support. In addition to pursuing support from the shopping/retail sector who benefit from the customers county community transportation providers bring to their facilities to shop, private support could also be sought from corporate partners who need their employees to have a reliable mode to reach their work site.

- **Service contracts** - Many county providers have instituted service contracts with both public and private partners, including their local Arc and other nonprofits, adult day centers, and municipalities. Other county providers should consider adopting this strategy. When developing service contracts with municipalities, Camden County described the benefits of such action as a “win-win” strategy because the arrangement provides needed revenue to the county while helping municipalities meet the transportation needs of their residents without having to purchase and maintain costly vehicles.

All counties should consider the benefits of service contracts with public entities, such as the NJ Department of Vocational Rehabilitation Services (DVRS) and the NJ Department of Military and Veterans Affairs (DMVA) and seek guidance from counties who have experience with these relationships. In addition, discussion with state government entities such as DMVA is needed to renegotiate the existing payment structure as it fails to cover a significant portion of service costs.

More county transportation providers should establish service contracts with the state’s non-emergency Medicaid transportation broker, LogistiCare. Some New Jersey providers expressed reluctance to partner with LogistiCare because they are not satisfied with the reimbursement rate offered by the latter. Despite the reimbursement rate issue, partnering with LogistiCare offers county providers the opportunity to add Medicaid trips to existing vehicle runs serving non-Medicaid customers traveling to the same destination at least several days per week, such as subscription trips to kidney dialysis centers. This action allows county providers to increase their productivity per hour, while earning revenue with minimal additional costs incurred (10).

Pursue Legislative & Regulatory Opportunities

A variety of legislative and regulatory opportunities exist that could help to alleviate the economic difficulties experienced by county community transportation providers.

- **Federal anti-kickback legislation** - As discussed above, county community transportation providers should seek funding support from private entities, including local businesses that benefit either directly or indirectly from the services county community paratransit providers offer community residents. Dialysis facilities are one type of private entity county providers should pursue for financial support. All county providers interviewed discussed the increased demand for medical and dialysis trips among their respective customer bases. Financial support from dialysis centers would greatly aid the ability of county community transportation providers to continue meeting the growing dialysis service demand but centers have refused such support due to their interpretation of The Medicare and Medicaid Patient Protection Act of 1987, also known as the anti-kickback statute. The Office of the Inspector General (OIG) has developed a variety of safe harbor provisions to protect legitimate business interests from criminal prosecution under the statute (11). Going

forward, it would be useful for CMS to provide a written interpretation of the safe harbor provisions with regard to private dialysis center support for local transportation services.

- ***New Jersey Department of Transportation (DOT) autobus regulations*** - In 1992 New Jersey passed legislation exempting vehicles of paratransit operators serving people with disabilities, persons age 60 and older, and clients of social service agencies from the state DOT's autobus designation, regardless of whether a fare or donation policy was in place. This law prevented paratransit operators from having to undergo costly vehicle retrofitting and incur other costs that would have been required to meet DOT autobus regulations.

Since 1992 however, county community transportation providers have expanded their services to include customers from the general public due to grant opportunities presented through New Freedom and JARC grants, among others. As they are no longer providing service only to people with disabilities and the elderly, county providers are once again potentially subject to DOT autobus operator regulations if they elect to charge a mandatory fare. Legislation to address this issue was introduced in the NJ Assembly in 2012 and Passage of such legislation to extend the exemption of county community transportation vehicles from DOT autobus regulations, regardless of their customers served, is an action that will not only yield cost savings to county providers but also meets federal United We Ride goals of promoting shared services and coordination and the elimination of operating silos based on customer characteristics.

- ***Determination of a new dedicated funding source*** - A new dedicated funding source should be determined for New Jersey's county community transportation providers, as SCDRTAP funding and other frequently relied upon funding programs and strategies can no longer adequately help county providers meet the increasing demand and related costs of service. Many states and local governments have pursued a variety of dedicated funding sources to support transportation including lottery proceeds and sales, property, and fuel taxes (12). To determine the most appropriate dedicated funding source to benefit New Jersey's county community transit providers, an ad hoc advisory committee should be convened comprised of key stakeholders including but not limited to the county providers, NJ COST, NJ TRANSIT, as well as a representative from the New Jersey Department of the Treasury – Division of Taxation. The group should seek data from states imposing similar taxes to those under consideration in New Jersey and should fully examine equity issues associated with pursuit of any consumer tax approach. Recommendations should be determined and disseminated widely so implementation strategies can be pursued.
- ***Match issues: A dialogue with FTA*** – Due to the numerous concerns expressed by New Jersey county community transportation providers regarding their inability to meet FTA match requirements, particularly the 50% operation match requirements, it is recommended New Jersey stakeholders enter into a dialogue with FTA on these concerns. While results are likely to be long term, documenting these concerns with FTA is a critical step toward achieving the end goal of more desirable policy and legislation regarding match funding. Two prevalent match issues to discuss are: expanding sources of local match to include fare box revenue and reducing the requisite 50% operations matching fund support for various FTA programs.

Pursue Operational Efficiencies

Promoting operational efficiencies and measures is an important recommendation and is one that each of New Jersey's county providers has been pursuing and should continue to pursue. The focus of the following recommendations is optimization of existing resources so as to yield much needed cost savings. Specific measures to achieve this recommendation include:

- **Using technology** - There are efficiency-related benefits of using technological tools and applications including GPS, mobile data computers, routing and scheduling software, and in-vehicle video surveillance. Thus, to the extent county providers determine their usage will yield improved efficiencies, their utilization should be considered.
- **Coordination** - Potential benefits of coordination include generation of additional revenue, enhanced mobility, increased efficiency and productivity, improved service quality, as well as other economic and management benefits (13). However, there are challenges to achieving coordination that must be considered and addressed, such as resistance to coordinate, difficulty establishing a workable cost sharing agreement, and insurance issues.

To increase the likelihood of successful coordination, early and frequent communication among partners is needed. To combat the abstract and elusive nature of coordination, potential partners should strategize and plan specific and tangible strategies to be pursued. If services are to be coordinated, a mapping effort that addresses detail on vehicle fleets, service hours in use, service territory covered, etc. should be undertaken. Issues including respective fare policies, as well as other service components such as trip type (e.g. curb-to-curb, door-to-door, etc.) must also be discussed. Also, pursuing a coordination effort as a pilot study is a wise strategy to consider, since pilot efforts are typically time limited and generally impose fewer obstacles in securing funding support. Finally, to enable more robust and consistent coordination efforts among the county providers, NJ TRANSIT and the counties should seek funding support to secure two to three regional mobility managers who will work with county providers to implement coordination solutions among counties and other local transportation services.

- **Service diversity** - A key strategy to creating economies of scale lies in offering a diverse array of service options, which can reduce reliance on costly single occupant trips. Specific means of achieving this goal include developing deviated fixed route and fixed route services, implementing feeder service to other transit options, and developing central transfer points. All New Jersey county providers interviewed either offer feeder service or support the institution of such service if demand warrants. Those counties employing transit feeder service agreed this approach offers a valuable means to expand service areas and options for customers while providing cost efficiencies to service providers. With regard to deviated fixed routes/fixed routes, again county providers interviewed strongly supported this strategy and acknowledged it provides an excellent way to serve important local and regional trip generators, including employment sites, and often contributes to reduced costs. As county providers seek to continue implementing this type of service, they should devote significant attention to the route planning process so they can proactively plan to meet the trip needs of their targeted customer base.

- ***Other efficiency inducing measures*** - Several other efficiency measures were identified through the interviews and national survey effort and should continue to be considered by New Jersey's county providers. It should be noted some of these strategies are solely focused on cost savings. They include: eliminating non-essential spending, including driver overtime; strive to function as a mobility manager to customers, effectively helping them determine the best strategies to reach desired destinations, which may include mass transit; create and/or enforce customer no show policies, which can contribute to service efficiency and yield cost savings; examine existing grant funding sources to determine if efficiencies can be generated by shifting targeted services under specific funding sources; purchase NJ TRANSIT or private carrier bus/rail tickets/passes to encourage public transit usage and familiarity, the use of which can yield cost savings for county providers; support travel training efforts – a critical means to encourage persons to safely and independently utilize public transit; and consider creating purchasing consortiums among counties for expenses including fuel, vehicles, and insurance.

Pursue Employment-focused Services for Persons with Disability

While the recommendations presented in this report were developed with the goal of supporting all county community transportation providers and their transportation disadvantaged customers, specific emphasis throughout the report is on how county community transportation services can continue to meet the transportation needs of persons with disabilities seeking employment transportation. It must be noted that for any of these specific recommendations to be achieved by the New Jersey county community transportation provider community, the difficult financial circumstances under which they are currently operating needs to be remedied.

Specific actions by the county transportation provider community that would most benefit persons with disability seeking employment need to focus on expanded hours and days of service to better meet employment travel needs. Study focus group participants explained that limited service hours was a main reason they need to use multiple travel modes to access employment. Also non-traditional work hours, including nights and weekends, are typical in many employment fields including the sales, food, and service sectors. If county community transportation does not offer service during non-traditional hours, the likelihood of meeting the employment travel needs of persons with disabilities will remain significantly impaired.

Also, county providers and other community transit services need to consider how to better serve "first and last mile" trip needs, which can cover the gap in services that often exists between one's home, the transit station/stop, and workplace. County providers must consider the locations of major employment generators when planning deviated fixed route services so they can adequately provide service to those locations and alleviate any hindrances customers experience while traveling the "first or last mile."

Finally, many of the obstacles county community providers encounter in meeting service demand among persons with disability seeking work and other transportation disadvantaged customers are due to land use and planning conditions, not only the current economic environment. The state of New Jersey has a vested interest in promoting job and housing development at sites accessible to public transportation. Going forward, New Jersey needs to support efforts to improve existing land

use patterns so that the transportation disadvantaged have more, not fewer, viable transportation options.

Moving Forward

As noted management consultant and educator Peter Drucker stated, "The greatest danger in times of turbulence is not the turbulence; it is to act with yesterday's logic."

As demonstrated in this report, New Jersey county transportation providers, as well as their peers nationwide, are experiencing tremendous turbulence due primarily to challenging economic conditions. Moving forward, these critical players in the transportation landscape – many of whom provide life enhancing and sustaining services to the most transportation disadvantaged in society – need to look beyond the funding mechanisms that supported their respective services in the past. Instead, they must proactively pursue new and in some cases, bold strategies to maintain and enhance their critical services.

Exploring and pursuing the diverse recommendations presented in this report will necessitate the cooperation and involvement of the vast array of community transportation stakeholders, including the transportation disadvantaged customers who are served by community transit. To assist with this task, a matrix tool appears below that includes each of the report recommendations and identifies potential leadership and supporting partners who may be able to facilitate implementation of said recommendations.

Recommendations Matrix

NOTE: * = potential leadership partner † = potential supporting partner

RECOMMENDATIONS	COUNTIES	NJ TRANSIT	NJ COST	MPOs	TMA s	OTHERS
PROGRAM EVALUATION						
Initiate and/or strengthen program evaluation efforts to determine the economic costs, benefits, and social impacts of the services provided by county transportation providers	*	*	*	†	†	CTAA †
GRANT FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES						
Pursue new and/or atypical federal funding opportunities	*	†		†		
Seek out grant opportunities with and from nonprofit entities	*	†		†		
Establish optimum connectivity between those knowledgeable about new funding opportunities and the county transportation provider community	*	*	*	*	†	NJ DOT †
Meet with CTAA's Institute for Transportation Coordination to discuss new funding opportunities and strategies pursued by other states	†	*	†			CTAA †
Develop a grant seeking & writing course for county paratransit providers		*				NTI *
Create a resource guide on pursuing new or alternative funding strategies for county paratransit providers		*	*			
Explore potential sources of public match support not often used by county paratransit providers	*	*		*		
Explore feasibility of using Toll Credits (TCs) as match support for eligible federal projects		*	*	*		NJ DOT * FTA Regional Office 2 †
Pursue in-kind match support	*	†		*		
NON-GRANT FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES						
Pursue bus advertising to supplement revenue as feasible	*	†				
Institute a uniform mandatory fare program across all counties	*	†	†			NJ Legislature *
Address the vehicle insurance barriers that affect volunteer driver recruitment	†		†			NJ Legislature * Nonprofits †
Supplement paid drivers with volunteer drivers	*	†			†	
Seek private sector support including that of area retailers and large employers	*	†		†		
Initiate service contracts with public and private partners, including LogistiCare	*	†	†	†		
Renegotiate payment rates with public and private partners as needed to more fully cover county provider service costs	*	*		†		

NOTE: * = potential leadership partner † = potential supporting partner

RECOMMENDATIONS	COUNTIES	NJ/TRANSIT	NJ COST	MPOs	TMA's	OTHERS
LEGISLATION & REGULATORY OPPORTUNITIES						
Obtain CMS and/or OIG formal interpretation of the safe harbor provisions to determine if funding support can be sought from dialysis centers		*				NJ Department of Human Services *
Seek continued exemption of county paratransit provider vehicles from DOT autobus regulations		*	*			NJ Legislature *
Establish an ad hoc advisory committee to determine new dedicated funding source	†	*	†	†		New Jersey Department of the Treasury – Division of Taxation †
Foster a dialogue with FTA on match issues	*	*	*	†		CTAA †
OPERATIONAL EFFICIENCIES						
Utilize new and existing technologies	*					
Seek out coordination opportunities to generate economic benefits and service efficiencies	*	†		†	†	Nonprofits †
Secure full time regional mobility managers to facilitate coordination efforts for and among the county providers	*	*				NJDOT *
Implement services that promote economies of scale including modified fixed routes, feeder service, and central transfer points	*	†		†	†	
Eliminate non-essential spending, including driver overtime	*					
Create or enforce customer no show policies	*					
Maximize external funding by matching each grant funded program to optimal funding source	*	†		†		FTA Regional Office 2 †
Purchase NJ Transit or private carrier bus/rail tickets/passes	*	†				
Support travel training for customers	*	†				NJ TIP, Inc. †
Create county purchasing consortiums for fuel, vehicles, and insurance, etc.	*	†				
EMPLOYMENT FOCUSED FOR PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES						
Expand county paratransit service hours and days to better meet the employment travel needs of persons with disabilities	*					
Explore how to better meet “last mile” service needs	*	†			†	
Support efforts to improve existing land use patterns so that the transportation disadvantaged have more viable transportation options						NJ Department of State – Office of Planning Advocacy *

REFERENCES

1. Alan M. Voorhees Transportation Center. 2005. *Meeting the Employment Transportation Needs of People with Disabilities in New Jersey*. New Brunswick, NJ: Edward J. Bloustein School of Planning and Public Policy, Rutgers University.
http://policy.rutgers.edu/vtc/documents/TransEq.DDS_Final_Report.pdf
2. New Jersey Council on Special Transportation. 2012. *Stranded in New Jersey: Community Transportation...A Service in Crisis*. Manville, NJ: New Jersey Council of Special Transportation.
<http://www.njcost.com/2012%20info/2012%20NJ%20White%20Paper%202nd.pdf>.
3. American Public Transportation Association. 2011. *Impacts of the Recession on Public Transportation Agencies Survey Results*. Washington, DC: APTA.
http://www.apta.com/resources/reportsandpublications/Documents/Impacts_of_Recession_March_2010.pdf.
4. Schlosser, Nicole. 2011. "Paratransit Operators Cite Ever Higher Demand." *METRO Magazine*, August. <http://www.metro-magazine.com/article/story/2011/08/paratransit-operators-cite-ever-higher-demand.aspx>.
5. Wu, Sen-Yuan. 2012. "New Jerseyans and Disabilities." *NJ Labor Market Views*, April 19.
<http://lwd.dol.state.nj.us/labor/lpa/pub/lmv/lmv19.pdf>.
6. Dudley, Kris, and Sheila Holbrook-White. 2011. "Putting the 'Mo' In Mobility: Increasing Transportation Options for Persons with Disabilities." Online presentation to Medicaid Infrastructure Grant Work Group, September 20.
7. The White House, Office of Management and Budget. 2012. "Circulars." Accessed July 12.
http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/circulars_default#numerical
8. "Highways." 2000. U.S. Code. Title 23, sec. 120(j). <http://epw.senate.gov/title23.pdf>.
9. *Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act*. P.L. 109 – 59. sec. 1905. *U.S. Statutes at Large*. 2005. 119 Stat. 1144. <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/PLAW-109publ59/pdf/PLAW-109publ59.pdf>.
10. Fittante, Steve. 2011. "Medicaid Brokerage: The Opportunities and Challenges for Community Transit." *Community Transportation Digital*.
http://web1.ctaa.org/webmodules/webarticles/articlefiles/Summer_11_Medicaid_Transportation.pdf.
11. Office of the Inspector General and the Department of Health and Human Services. 1999. "Medicare and State Health Care Programs: Fraud and Abuse; Clarification of the Initial OIG Safe Harbor Provisions and Establishment of Additional Safe Harbor Provisions Under the Anti-Kickback Statute." *Federal Register* 64, no. 223, November 19. <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-1999-11-19/pdf/99-29989.pdf>.
12. Jones, Kim A., Robert C. Mock, Jr., and Sarah T. Cearley. 2006. "Report from an interdisciplinary case study on a public transit system in crisis." *Journal of Public Transportation* 4: 23-33.
13. Burkhardt, Jon E. 2004. "Economic Benefits of Coordinating Human Service Transportation and Transit Services." *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board* 1887:55-61.