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Executive Summary

Background and Demographics
The Coordinated Public Transit—Human Services Plan (CPT-HSP, or Coordinated Plan), addresses transportation services for the elderly, individuals with disabilities, and individuals of low-income. The purpose of this plan is to identify the service gaps and needs of these target populations who live in the Coordinated Transit District #12 (CTD #12), which includes Butler, Harvey, and Sedgwick Counties. Projects selected by the recipient of Federal Transit Administration (FTA) funds should be derived from a locally-developed coordinated public transit—human services transportation plan.

As a region, the CTD #12 stays relatively true to the demographic trends of the U.S. and Kansas. However, each county within the District has unique target population characteristics. For example, Butler County has a well-below average low-income population, whereas Harvey County has the highest elderly population. Sedgwick County has a slightly elevated low-income population in comparison. Directly related to Sedgwick County’s population is the City of Wichita, which has a significantly higher low-income population when compared to the region and even outpaces the U.S. by a few percentage points. This demographic analysis begins to identify the need of transportation services in the region.

The next step in identifying the need for transportation services is locating where these individuals are living throughout the region. The Coordinated Plan analyzes each target population on a census tract level in order to identify specific locales where services are needed most. For
example, the following map identifies the elderly population density change from the years 2000 to 2010. A noticeable shift occurred in where the elderly population is living. A number of individuals 65 years and older moved away of the center of Wichita and out of the surrounding counties, and have laid claim to the outer fringes of the Wichita Urbanized Area. This is one of the most important pieces of information to know when planning to provide transportation services. Though not all of that population currently needs transportation services, as it continues to age, those over the age of 65 are more likely to develop some kind of disability that may require specialized transportation services. Another important question to keep in mind is how will transportation services be provided to those who are “aging in place”—those individuals living in the low-populated, outer fringes of Butler and Harvey Counties? The Coordinated Plan addresses these issues by identifying action steps aimed at meeting these needs.
Funding
The Coordinated Plan is the foundation for considering future Federal funding allocation. In recent years, Congress has updated the current transportation legislation replacing Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient, Transportation Equity Act—A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) with Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21). This new legislation rearranged certain funding programs available through the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). Two programs pertinent to the Coordinated Plan are Section 5316: Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) Program and Section 5317: New Freedom Program. Under MAP-21, the JARC Program, which focuses on providing services to low-income individuals to access jobs, was consolidated with the Urbanized and Rural Area Formula Grants (Sections 5307 & 5311). Additionally, the New Freedom Program, which focuses on services for individuals with disabilities that go above and beyond Americans with Disabilities Act requirements, was consolidated with Section 5310: Transportation for Elderly and Disabled Individuals Program.

These competitive funds are funneled down from FTA, through the Kansas Department of Transportation (KDOT), to a local organization responsible for distributing the funds to eligible projects submitted by transportation service providers. In some cases, KDOT is the organization responsible for the distribution of funds. The intent of the Coordinated Plan is to use these funds to improve transportation services in the region by implementing the action steps identified.

Public Engagement:
Public open houses for the Coordinated Plan were held in each county within the CTD #12 region to inform the public about the plan and gather input on the public transportation needs for the region. The meetings were well-attended, with over 70 members of the public coming to give their input at meetings in seven different locations.
Attendees were given an overview of the Coordinated Plan and asked to participate in a variety of visual survey techniques. Staff, steering committee, and advisory board members were available at these meetings to answer any questions people had about current services and future plans.

In addition to the public open houses, surveys were distributed to transit and paratransit provider agencies to gather input from the provider-side of the transportation system. Transit riders were also surveyed at the Wichita Transit Center over a course of two days. All of the aforementioned data was compiled and included in the final document and made available to service providers as they plan for future services in the CTD #12 region.

**Vision and Goals**

Our vision statement emphasizes collaboration and increasing awareness of transportation services in order to meet the growing needs of the region. Coordination is essential to meeting the ever-increasing demand while providing cost-effective service. Promoting awareness of available transportation services will not only ensure that patrons are receiving proper service based on their needs, but will help address funding constraints by increasing ridership.

**Goal: Advocacy**—One of the largest obstacles to overcome when providing transportation services to the general public is educating them about what options are available in the CTD #12 region. The presence of this goal from the past to the present update indicates that this is a major issue that can be continuously improved upon to increase ridership and awareness of services.

**Goal: Coordination**—This Goal can be accomplished most effectively through employing mobility management practices and providing a centralized dispatch. Coordination among providers will reduce cost overall, which in turn broadens the scope of available services to more people.

**Goal: Funding**—Transit and paratransit providers are faced with various challenges year-to-year that impact the amount of funding assistance available. Some of the challenges may include: a slow economy, changes in policies at the Federal and State levels, and uncertainty of new Federal transportation legislation. Therefore, it is important to be creative with what resources are available. These include measures to procure additional revenue for other sources and/or reducing the cost of providing services.
Vision
A unified effort among providers and stakeholders to increase coordination, promote awareness of services, and meet the growing transportation needs of the individuals in the CTD #12 region.

GOAL: ADVOCACY
Increase advocacy and awareness of transportation services available to the public.

GOAL: COORDINATION
Improve coordination of transportation services among providers.

GOAL: FUNDING
Seek creative solutions to funding constraints.

Increase OUTREACH activities to educate the public about transportation services.

Increase communication and COLLABORATION among providers.

Increase awareness of cost-saving initiatives and additional FUNDING sources.
Objectives

Outreach: This objective can be accomplished through proactive public involvement aimed at increasing public awareness of transportation services in the CTD #12 region. Additionally, public input on the quality of service will be useful in improving current services.

Collaboration: The main focus of collaboration is to minimize the amount of unnecessary duplication and overlap of services available in the CTD #12 region. This objective can be accomplished through a consorted effort among providers to share information that will facilitate the sharing of resources and the coordination of rides.

Funding: This objective can be accomplished through research and implementation of cost-saving initiatives available at the county or local levels as well as taking advantage of additional funding when it is available.

Regional Strategies

Explore providing part-time paratransit/transit service where service gaps are present.

Promote responsible use of funds by coordinating rides with other agencies in order to maximize fleet capacity and minimize trip redundancy.
Recommendations

1. Designated recipients of Federal funding programs should follow-through with routine audits of sub-recipients to ensure proper and responsible use of allocated dollars as well as that mandatory rides are being given depending of the requirements of the agency.

2. Local providers and stakeholders should advocate for an increase in a local commitment of funds.

3. Institute centralized mobility management—especially in Sedgwick County—to streamline coordination efforts among transportation service providers.

4. A consorted effort among county transportation service providers to ensure accessibility to transportation is available to eligible riders while achieving efficient, cost-effective, regional transportation.
The Coordinated Public Transit—Human Services Plan (Coordinated Plan) focuses on transportation services for the elderly, individuals with disabilities, and individuals of low-income. Chapter 53 of Title 49 of the United States Code of Federal Regulations, as amended by Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21), states that the projects selected by the recipient of Federal Transit Administration (FTA) funds should be derived from a locally-developed coordinated public transit—human services transportation plan. This Coordinated Plan will address the following funding categories:

- FTA Section 5307/5311: Urbanized Area Formula Grants/Rural Formula Grants
- FTA Section 5310: Transportation for Elderly Individuals and Individuals with Disabilities Program

This Coordinated Plan includes:

- A unified, comprehensive strategy for the delivery of **public transportation** services;
- Identification of transportation needs for the elderly, individuals with disabilities, and individuals of low-income;
- Goals, objectives, and strategies for meeting those needs; and
- Formal recommendations.
The Coordinated Plan will be implemented and maintained by the Coordinated Transit District #12 (CTD #12). The CTD #12 is authorized under Statute 75-5051, Article 50 of Chapter 75 of the Kansas Statutes Annotated (KSA) for the purpose of enhancing coordination and management of State and passenger transportation funds. KSA 75-5051 was established on September 13, 1994 by a formal agreement between the Boards of Commissioners of Butler, Harvey, and Sedgwick Counties and the Paratransit Council, Inc. Administration of the CTD #12 was assigned to the Central Plains Area Agency on Agency (CPAAA) in Wichita, Kansas and is housed within the Sedgwick County Department on Aging. Appendix A provides a list of terms and definitions of the words in bold throughout this Plan.

**CTD #12 Service Area**

The State of Kansas is divided into 15 Coordinated Transit Districts (CTDs), and each one is responsible for coordinating public transportation efforts within their region. As shown in Figure 1, CTD #12 is located in south central Kansas and includes the Counties of Butler, Harvey, and Sedgwick. Within the CTD #12 boundary there is a Metropolitan Planning Organization (Wichita Area Metropolitan Planning Organization—WAMPO) and it is one of three CTDs in the State of Kansas to include an urbanized area (City of Wichita). Any CTD with an urbanized area is required to have a locally derived designated recipient for the distribution of MAP-21 funds. This is due to the urbanized area receiving its own allocation of these funds directly from the FTA.

Figure 2 is a more detailed map of the CTD #12 illustrating the Wichita Urbanized Area and the WAMPO planning boundary.
Figure 2: CTD #12 Boundary Map
**History of the CTD #12 Coordinated Plan**

The first Coordinated Plan for the region was adopted by the CTD #12 Board in 2008. The Coordinated Plan provided members of the CTD #12 Paratransit Council, Inc. and the public a formal document used to coordinate specialized transportation services—also known as paratransit services. The first update to the Coordinated Plan was adopted in June, 2010 and developed with a coordinated effort among CTD #12, Paratransit Council, Inc., local stakeholders, and the public. It expanded on the original by addressing the needs that were identified by stakeholders and identified a list of *programmable* and *illustrative* projects.

Similarly, this update will evaluate the needs addressed in the previous update and identify the growing needs of the region based on public input and the changing dynamics of the target populations. Public participation efforts were conducted during the Coordinated Plan's update and can be found on page 32, and formal recommendations will be made to form a foundation for future project implementation.
Table 1 identifies key events that have affected the Coordinated Plan since the inception of the late Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient, Transportation Equity Act—A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) until the present.

Table 1: Key Events Affecting the Coordinated Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2005 | • SAFETEA-LU is Approved  
       • SAFETEA-LU is approved as the new transportation bill. As a part of SAFETEA-LU, the requirement of a Coordinated Public Transit—Human Services Plan was made for any region seeking Job Access and Reverse Commute and/or New Freedom funds. |
| 2007 | • CTDs in Kansas Develop Coordinated Plans  
       • The University of Kansas Transportation Center completes drafts of the Coordinated Public Transit—Human Services Plan for CTDs across Kansas. |
| 2008 | • CTD #12 Adopts Coordinated Plan  
       • The CTD #12 adopts the region’s first Coordinated Public Transit—Human Services Plan. |
| 2010 | • CTD #12 Adopts Revised Coordinated Plan  
       • The CTD #12 Board approves the revised Coordinated Public Transit—Human Services Plan, which reflects changes in the priorities within the CTD #12 region. |
| 2012 | • MAP-21 is Approved  
       • MAP-21 is approved and replaces SAFETEA-LU as the new transportation bill. Certain sections were evaluated, resulting in the consolidation of Section 5316 (JARC) into Sections 5307/5311 and Section 5317 (New Freedom) into 5310. |

Specialized Transportation Responsibilities

CTD #12 is not alone in its effort to provide coordinated specialized transportation services in the region. The specialized transportation responsibilities flow chart reflected in Figure 3 identifies the various responsibilities of each partner.
Regulations
FTA is the primary organization responsible for developing and interpreting regulations that guide practices of paratransit and transit providers when Federal transportation funds are included. Regulations and circulars that apply to Chapter 53 of Title 49 of the U.S. Code of Federal Regulations can be found on the FTA website: www.fta.dot.gov. FTA is also responsible for distributing Federal transportation funds to direct recipients and designated recipients in the region to fund various administrative, capital, and operating expenses through FTA Section 5307, 5311, and 5310 programs.

Policy
The Kansas Department of Transportation (KDOT) is the lead organization regarding policy development for paratransit and transit providers throughout the State of Kansas. KDOT works in conjunction with FTA to administer Federal transit funds. Certain functions are conducted by KDOT to ensure that sub-recipients are meeting all Federal requirements. Some examples of these functions include:

- On-site reviews,
- Drug and alcohol testing,
- Driver training courses, and
- Various other activities related to paratransit and transit providers.

More information about KDOT responsibilities can be found on page 9.
Local Decision Making

The CTD #12 Board is the decision making body for specialized transportation service coordination in the CTD #12 region. It is composed of four voting members:

1. One (1) Butler County representative,
2. One (1) Harvey County representative,
3. One (1) Sedgwick County representative,
4. One (1) at-large voting member who represents the Paratransit Council, Inc.

This Board assists KDOT in project selection for state-wide funding programs through recommendations and a competitive selection process. In the past, the CTD #12 also acted as the decision making body for JARC and New Freedom grants within the Wichita Urbanized Area. Those programs have since been repealed under MAP-21 and have been consolidated under FTA Sections 5307, 5311, and 5310. More information regarding changes to FTA funding programs can be found on page 23.

Advisory

Both the Paratransit Council, Inc. and WAMPO serve in advisory roles for specialized transportation activities in the CTD #12 region.

Paratransit Council, Inc. was formed in 1984 as the Wichita/Sedgwick County Paratransit Council, Inc. Paratransit Council, Inc. is a tri-county council working to meet the challenges of coordinating local paratransit services and acts as an advisory committee to the CTD #12 Board. When topics arise that require CTD #12 input or action, the Paratransit Council, Inc. reviews the topics first. Their input is then provided to the CTD #12 Board for their consideration and action.

WAMPO provides technical assistance and guidance on transportation issues that are regionally significant and/or involve Federal transportation funds. More information regarding WAMPO’s role can be found on page 9.

CTD #12 Region’s Transportation Providers and Stakeholders

Provider Stakeholders

The CTD #12 region is composed of a variety of paratransit and transit providers. KDOT’s Policies for Public Transportation Program Grantees requires service providers to be a member of the CTD #12 and in good standing in order to be eligible to apply for Federal funds discussed in
this Plan. For more information on this, refer to the KDOT Policies for Public Transportation Program Grantees from April 1, 2013. Table 2 shows a list of organizations that are actively involved in the CTD #12 regional. **Appendix B** is a more detailed summary of each of these organizations.

**Table 2: CTD #12 Provider Stakeholders**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Type of Provider</th>
<th>Main Federal Funding Program</th>
<th>Demographic Served</th>
<th>Location of Provider</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Butler County</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler County Department on Aging</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>FTA Section 5311</td>
<td>General Public</td>
<td>Non-Urbanized CTD #12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Community Living of South Central Kansas</td>
<td>Non-Profit</td>
<td>FTA Section 5310</td>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td>Non-Urbanized CTD #12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flinthills Services, Inc.</td>
<td>Non-Profit</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td>Non-Urbanized CTD #12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Harvey County</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvey County Department on Aging</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>FTA Section 5311</td>
<td>General Public</td>
<td>Non-Urbanized CTD #12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prairie View, Inc.</td>
<td>Non-Profit</td>
<td>FTA Sections 5310 &amp; JARC</td>
<td>Disabled &amp; Low-Income</td>
<td>Non-Urbanized CTD #12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sedgwick County</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Red Cross</td>
<td>Non-Profit</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Elderly</td>
<td>Urbanized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arc of Sedgwick County</td>
<td>Non-Profit</td>
<td>FTA Section 5310</td>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td>Urbanized &amp; Non-Urbanized WAMPO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrowhead West, Inc.</td>
<td>Non-Profit</td>
<td>FTA Section 5310</td>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td>Urbanized &amp; Non-Urbanized WAMPO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breakthrough Club of Sedgwick County</td>
<td>Non-Profit</td>
<td>New Freedom</td>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td>Urbanized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Charities</td>
<td>Non-Profit</td>
<td>FTA Sections 5307 &amp; 5310</td>
<td>Elderly</td>
<td>Urbanized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerebral Palsy Research Foundation/ Timber Lines</td>
<td>Non-Profit</td>
<td>FTA Sections 5307 &amp; 5310</td>
<td>Elderly &amp; Disabled</td>
<td>Urbanized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Envision, Inc.</td>
<td>Non-Profit</td>
<td>FTA Sections 5307 &amp; 5310</td>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td>Urbanized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heartspring</td>
<td>Non-Profit</td>
<td>FTA Section 5310</td>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td>Urbanized &amp; Non-Urbanized WAMPO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas Elks Training Center for the Handicapped (KETCH)</td>
<td>Non-Profit</td>
<td>FTA Sections 5307 &amp; 5310</td>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td>Urbanized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mennonite Housing</td>
<td>Non-Profit</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Elderly &amp; Low-Income</td>
<td>Urbanized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health Association of South Central Kansas</td>
<td>Non-Profit</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td>Urbanized &amp; Non-Urbanized WAMPO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Independence, Inc. of Sedgwick County</td>
<td>Non-Profit</td>
<td>New Freedom</td>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td>Urbanized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedgwick County Department on Aging</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>FTA Sections 5307, 5311 &amp; New Freedom</td>
<td>General Public</td>
<td>Urbanized &amp; Non-Urbanized WAMPO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starkey, Inc.</td>
<td>Non-Profit</td>
<td>FTA Sections 5307, 5310, &amp; New Freedom</td>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td>Urbanized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wichita Transit</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>FTA Sections 5307 &amp; JARC</td>
<td>General Public</td>
<td>Urbanized</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Non-Provider Stakeholders

Many of the key stakeholders within the paratransit and transit community are providers. However, non-providers can also have a significant role in specialized transportation. These roles are typically tied to either funding for the paratransit providers or due to a vested interest that is affected by the services provided.

Kansas Department of Transportation (KDOT)
The Kansas Department of Transportation provides direct oversight of organizations using Federal and State transportation funds. KDOT serves as the designated recipient for FTA Sections 5310 and 5311 funds in the CTD #12 region. With the passage of MAP-21, KDOT will be the designated recipient of JARC and New-Freedom funds solely because these programs have been repealed and consolidated under the aforementioned FTA funding programs. More detail concerning FTA funding programs under MAP-21 can be found on page 23.

Wichita Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (WAMPO)
The Wichita Area Metropolitan Planning Organization is the designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Wichita Urbanized Area. An MPO is Federally required for all urbanized areas with a population of 50,000 or greater in order to use Federal transportation funds. In early 2013, the WAMPO boundary was enlarged. As shown in Figure 4, the boundary includes all of Sedgwick County, a portion of Butler County (encompassing the City of Andover, with the addition of the City of Rose Hill), and a small portion of Sumner County (encompassing the City of Mulvane).

Wichita Transit
Wichita Transit is the direct recipient of the FTA Section 5307 funds for the Wichita Urbanized Area. Therefore, they are required to provide the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) rides in this area. Wichita Transit meets these requirements by operating paratransit and transit services within the city limits of Wichita and contracts with other agencies to provide these rides to the urbanized area outside the city limits.
WAMPO provides a cooperative transportation planning forum for the region. It is responsible for providing guidance and direction on the development of Federal-aid and regionally significant transportation projects for local municipalities and transit providers. This is done through plans and programs—resulting in a stronger regional transportation network. Since the previous update to the Coordinated Plan, WAMPO was determined to be the designated recipient to administer JARC and New Freedom funds for the Wichita Urbanized Area. However, with the adoption of MAP-21, WAMPO will no longer be the designated recipient of those funds. Overall, WAMPO has continued to work with the CTD #12 in specialized transportation activities such as:

- Assisting the CTD #12 in the development of the Coordinated Public Transit—Human Services Plan.
- Ensuring that specialized transportation projects receiving Federal funds are included within the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).
- Technical assistance.
The Coordinated Plan focuses on three target populations: elderly, disabled, and low-income. Each one of these populations will be defined in greater detail further in this Plan. It is important to note that these groups are not necessarily mutually exclusive. Many individuals may fall under not only one, but potentially all three target population classifications. Figure 5 illustrates these target populations and their potential overlap.

The demographic data used in this Plan is derived from the 2010 U.S. Census. Census tract level data was used for each of the counties in the CTD #12 region to remain consistent with the WAMPO Title VI & Environmental Justice Policy.
**Total Population**

The 2010 Census indicates that approximately 600,000 people live in the CTD #12 region. Figure 6 shows the region grew in population by 10% from 2000, which is on-par with the national growth rate and significantly higher than the 6% growth rate of Kansas.

Of the three counties, Sedgwick County accounts for 83% of the region with a population of approximately 500,000, solely because of the presence of the City of Wichita. At 382,368 people, Wichita is not only the largest city in the region, but also the largest city in Kansas. Other cities in the CTD #12 region with populations that exceed 5,000 include: Derby (22,158), Newton (19,132), El Dorado (13,021), Andover (11,791), Haysville (10,826), Augusta (9,174), Park City (7,297), Valley Center (6,822), Bel Aire (6,769), and Mulvane (6,111). As Figure 7 shows, each of these cities experienced a growth rate of 8% from 2000-2010. However, some cities had a population increase of over 20%. Andover saw the greatest population gain at 76%. Other notable growth rates were seen in the City of Newton at 57% and the City of Valley Center at 40%. The previous iteration of this Plan indicated that Valley Center’s population was below 5,000. With its 40% growth rate over the last 10 years, it surpassed the cities of Bel Aire and Mulvane—both previously having populations over 5,000.
Figure 8 reflects the population density of the region by census tract—indicating the number of persons living per square mile. The more rural areas have relatively low densities, but the densities incrementally increase when moving in closer to the urban cores.
Elderly
As the national population continues to age, the proportion of the population over the age of 65 is significantly growing. This means there will be an ever-increasing demand for paratransit and transit services. As Figure 9 illustrates, a comparison of the 2000 and 2010 Census’ shows that though in the U.S. and Kansas there was a 14%-15% increase in the 65+ population, the CTD #12 region had a 10% increase. Within the CTD #12 region, all three counties had lower growth in this category versus the State or U.S. as well, with Butler County seeing the highest growth at 12%.

Figure 10: 2010 Elderly Population

The 2010 Census delineates of the total regional population, Butler County’s elderly population accounts for 13%, Harvey County’s elderly population holds the highest percentage at 17%, and Sedgwick County’s is the lowest at 11%. Overall the CTD #12 region has an elderly population of 12%, which sits slightly under the U.S. and Kansas of 13% as shown in Figure 10.

The 2010 Census also shows that the cities of Newton and Wichita both have census tracts where 20% or more of the population is classified as elderly. Because these tracts have a significant number of elderly, special attention should be made when providing transportation services. Figure 11 illustrates the 2010 elderly population density of the CTD #12 region.
In an effort to compare how the elderly population of the region has changed from 2000 to 2010, a couple methods were used to measure the changing population. The first method looks at the region’s population broken down by gender and age for each census. As Figure 12 illustrates, a noticeable “bubble” in the figure migrates up the age cohorts. As of the 2010 census, this “bubble” is not at the 65 year age cohort defining “elderly” status. However, as time goes on, and the population continues to age, this “bubble” will continue its upward movement. This figure indicates that the CTD #12 region will have a higher population of elderly individuals to serve in the near future. Therefore, preparations should be made ahead of time to ensure sufficient transportation services are in place when that “bubble” reaches the elderly age cohorts.

**Figure 12: CTD #12 Region Aging Population Comparison**

An additional method that was used was to compare the 2000 and 2010 elderly populations by census tract in the region. This method maps where the elderly population is moving to, and therefore, where transportation services may be necessary. When compared to the data from the 2000 Census, there is a noticeable difference in the elderly population density throughout the CTD #12 region. It was found that the elderly population in several census tracts in the cities of Augusta, El Dorado, and Wichita decreased below 20% in 2010. In addition, almost 70 census tracts had a reduction in the number of people 65 years or older. However, 11 census tracts (all in Sedgwick County) doubled in number of people 65 years or older. Figure 13 shows the percent change in elderly population from 2000 to 2010 for each census tract in the CTD #12 region. It is easy to see that the majority of the urban cores of Augusta, Derby, El Dorado, Newton, and Wichita all had decreases in the elderly population, while the outer edges of the Wichita Urbanized Area had a dramatic increase.
Figure 13: CTD #12 Elderly Population Change from 2000-2010

Coordinated Transit District (CTD) #12 Elderly Population Change Map
Disabled

Over the past several decades, the definition of “disabled” has changed frequently as our understanding and perception of what it means to be disabled has grown. Therefore, it is not surprising that the definition has yet again changed from since the 2000 decennial census. The International Classification of Functioning, Disability, and Health (ICF) broadly defines “disability” as the presence of impairments, activity limitations, and participation restrictions. The 2010 Census takes it a step further and breaks it down into 5 categories of difficulty: hearing, vision, cognitive, ambulatory, self-care, and independent living. The goal was to narrow the scope and not just count the population that simply had an impairment, but make note of those whose impairment actually interfered with aspects of daily life. Because of this new focus, there will be no comparative analysis between the 2000 and 2010 census data. In addition, data collected to determine disability status changed from whole population to sample data. Therefore, any whole numbers given should be taken as approximate, and the majority of the analysis will focus on percent of population with a given margin of error.

According to the 2010 American Community Survey (ACS 3-year estimates), the CTD #12 region has approximately 72,614 individuals with at least one form of a disability. As shown in Figure 14, this equates to approximately 12%, which is on-par with the national and state average of approximately 12%.
12%. Figure 15 illustrates the percent breakdown of the 5 disability identifiers. These identifiers include: hearing difficulty (4%), vision difficulty (2%), cognitive difficulty (5%), ambulatory difficulty (7%), self-care difficulty (2%), and independent-living difficulty (4%).

As individuals age, there is a greater chance that they will develop some sort of disability. Table 3 reflects the estimate percent of individuals by age who reported a form of disability during the 2010 ACS for CTD #12 region.

Table 3: CTD #12 Disabled Population by Age and Identifier

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability Identifier</th>
<th>CTD #12 Disabled Population by Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 to 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Disabled</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing Difficulty</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision Difficulty</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Difficulty</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambulatory Difficulty</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Care Difficulty</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Living Difficulty</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** Data reflects 2010 American Community Survey 3yr estimates

Although the 2010 Census does not account for the mobility requirements of a disabled individual (i.e. driving, transit, etc) this is still an indicator of specialized transportation needs in the CTD #12 region. It is also important to note that although an individual may have a disability as defined by the census, many specialized transportation providers determine disability eligibility on a case-by-case basis.

Low-Income

For the purpose of analysis of low-income in the Coordinated Plan, WAMPO is mirroring the definition of poverty as defined by the U.S. Census Bureau. As with the section on disability, the definition used to determine areas of low-income within the region has changed from 2000 to 2010. Therefore, there will be no regional comparative analysis between 2000-2010.

In order to ascertain the number of individuals below poverty level, the Census Bureau uses a series of income thresholds based on the number of individuals in a household and/or the number of children under the age of 18 living in a given household. For example, if a one-person household’s annual income is $11,139 or less, that person is considered impoverished. An example of the 2010 Poverty Thresholds table can be found in Appendix C. In addition, the Census Bureau
performs sample population data based on the poverty universe. To obtain a proper perspective as to where low-income individuals are located throughout the CTD #12 region, the data analysis is derived from individual census tracts within Butler, Harvey, and Sedgwick Counties.

According to the 2010 estimates, approximately 13% of the population in the CTD #12 region is considered low-income. This percent is lower than the State estimate of 14% and the U.S. estimate population of 15%. Figure 16 compares the counties with the CTD #12 region to the State and U.S. estimates as well. It is important to note that though Sedgwick County has a similar low-income population as Kansas, the City of Wichita’s low-income population is 16%, which surpasses even the national average.

Figure 17 illustrates the geographic concentration of low-income census tracts in the CTD #12 region. The purpose of this map is to offer a regional perspective as to possible clientele needing specialized transportation services within the region. Though individuals living in these census tracts maybe classified as low-income by the Census Bureau, each individual specialized transportation provider develops their own threshold for determining what is considered low income. Since the American Community Survey (ACS 2010 5-year estimates) samples the population, which leaves a margin of error, a census tract was considered low-income if the margin of error caused the upper limit of that tract to be 50% or above.
Funding Sources

Although the Coordinated Plan focuses on FTA Sections 5307, 5311, and 5310 funding programs, other potential funding sources are considered as well. Many providers of transportation services within the CTD #12 region currently receive and/or are eligible to use funding provided by FTA, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), and KDOT. With uncertainties in Federal, State, and local funding, more providers within the CTD #12 region will be looking to diversify their funding resources. The following summary delineates the primary funding sources for the various providers in the CTD #12 region. It is important to note that most FTA and FHWA funds cannot be matched with other Federal funds from FTA or FHWA, but can be matched with other non-FTA/FHWA funds.

It is important for sub-recipients to recognize that most Federal transportation funding programs are competitive grants, which are reimbursement programs. Funding is rarely provided prior to the project’s activity. These programs include: FTA Sections 5307, 5311, 5310; Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds; Congestion Mitigation and Air quality (CMAQ) funds; and more.
Primary Funding Sources

FTA Section 5307: Urbanized Area Formula Grants
Section 5307 is the largest of FTA’s grant programs and provides grants to urbanized areas to support public transportation. Funding is distributed by a formula based on the level of transit service provision, population, and other factors. The approval of MAP-21 rolled former FTA Section 5316: Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) into Section 5307. Therefore, activities eligible under JARC, which focused on providing services to low-income individuals to access jobs, are now eligible under this Urbanized Area Formula program. This includes operating assistance with a 50% local match for job access and reverse commute activities. In other words, at least 50% of match is required from the paratransit/transit provider. In addition, the urbanized area formula for distributing funds now includes the number of low-income individuals as a factor. There is no floor or ceiling on the amount of funds that can be spend on job access and reverse commute activities.

MAP-21 also expanded the eligibility for using Urbanized Area Formula funds for operating expenses. Previously, only urbanized areas with a population below 200,000 were eligible to use Federal transit funding for operating expense. Now transit systems in urbanized areas over 200,000 can use their formula funding for operating expenses with restrictions on how many buses they operate. If they operate no more than 100 fixed-route buses during peak service house, Urbanized Areas over 200,000 can use 50% of their apportioned funds for operating expenses. Systems operating 75 or fewer buses in a fixed-route service during peak service hours may use up to 75% of their apportioned funds for operating expenses. Projects funded must be part of the program of projects developed by the metropolitan planning process.

FTA Section 5310: Transportation for Elderly Individuals and Individuals with Disabilities
Section 5310 program was established in 1975, prior to the creation of the Americans with Disabilities Act in 1990 (ADA). The goal of this program is to improve mobility for elderly and disabled individuals. FTA Section 5310 funds are apportioned by FTA to States by a formula based on the region’s population of elderly and disabled according to the U.S. 2010 Census data. KDOT provides additional funding through 5310 State Operating Assistance funds. KDOT distributes these funds to sub-recipients in Kansas based on a competitive selection process. One of the changes made under MAP-21 was the consolidation of former FTA Section 5317: New Freedom Program under FTA Section 5310. The New Freedom program focuses on services
provided to individuals with disabilities that go above and beyond ADA requirements. Activities eligible under New Freedom are now eligible under Section 5310. **Appendix D** documents the Section 5310 project selection criteria used when reviewed by KDOT.

With the addition of the New Freedom program under 5310, the Federal/local share has changed and depends on the type of project. A 50% local match is required for funds used for operating expenses. However, only a 20% local match is require for funds used for capital expenses. Providers should note that at least 55% of total program funds apportioned must be spend on the types of capital projects eligible under Section 5310—public transportation projects planned, designed, and carried out to meet the special needs of seniors and individuals with disabilities when public transportation is insufficient, inappropriate, or unavailable. The remaining 45% may be used for:

- public transportation projects that exceed the requirements of the ADA,
- public transportation projects that improve access to fixed-route service and decrease reliance by individuals with disabilities on complementary paratransit, or
- alternatives to public transportation that assist seniors and individuals with disabilities.

**FTA Section 5311: Rural Formula Grant**

Section 5311 provides capital, planning, and operating assistance to support public transportation in rural areas, defined as areas with fewer than 50,000 residents. Funding is based on a formula that uses land area, population, and transit service. As with Section 5307, MAP-21 has made provision for JARC eligible activities to be funded under this program. In addition, the formula now includes the number of low-income individuals as a factor. There is no floor or ceiling on the amount of funds that can be spent on the job access and reverse commute activities. The local match for this program is 10% including job access and reverse commute eligible activities. Projects funded must be part of the program of projects developed by the metropolitan planning process.
Table 4 compares the maximum Federal funding per category.

**Table 4: Maximum Federal Funding Per Category**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provider Type</th>
<th>Operating</th>
<th>Capital</th>
<th>Administrative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5307 50,000 to 200,000</td>
<td>50 max/50 min</td>
<td>90 max/10 min</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5307 200,000 and greater</td>
<td>50 max/50 min</td>
<td>90 max/10 min</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5310 Urbanized Provider</td>
<td>50 max/ 50 min</td>
<td>80 max/20 min</td>
<td>Up to 10% of the total allocation of funds, awarded amount in CTD #12 region determined by KDOT annually.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5310 Non-Urbanized WAMPO</td>
<td>50 max/ 50 min</td>
<td>80 max/ 20 min</td>
<td>Up to 10% of the total allocation of funds, awarded amount in CTD #12 region determined by KDOT annually.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5310 Non-Urbanized CTD #12</td>
<td>50 max/ 50 min</td>
<td>80 max/ 20 min</td>
<td>Up to 10% of the total allocation of funds, awarded amount in CTD #12 region determined by KDOT annually.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5311 50,000 or fewer</td>
<td>90 max/ 10 min</td>
<td>90 max/ 10 min</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funding reflects the maximum percent federal/minimum percent local split.

**Other Funding Sources**

Many providers in the CTD #12 region do not rely on one specific funding category to support their specialized transportation services. Historically, providers have had access to a variety of additional Federal funding programs to assist in financing specialized transportation services. Examples of such include, but are not limited to:

- The Department of Education,
- The Department of Health and Human Services,
- The Department of Housing and Urban Development,
- The Department of Labor, and
- The Department of Transportation.

A typical provider will have a very complex and varied stream of income that may include Federal, State, and local sources; donation; fares; grants; contracts with other agencies; etc.
Historic Funding

Projections are made by KDOT on the future availability of Federal transit funds for the coming years in order to give each CTD an opportunity to plan for projects expected to occur a year or more in the future. These projections are based on current transportation legislation. The funding awarded to each CTD varies from year to year and is calculated based on funds available to the various urbanized and non-urbanized areas discussed below. Only a portion of those funds is awarded to the CTD as Section 5310 funds are competitive within each population category. At the writing of this Coordinated Plan, historic funding numbers are based off of SAFETEA-LU and current projections are based off of the MAP-21 legislation. Due to the uncertainty of funding levels for many FTA programs, funding levels are assumed to be at or below the levels of FFY 2013.

Table 5 shows the projected FTA Section 5310 funds for FFY 2014 under MAP-21. This figure represents the projected funds specifically allocated to the Wichita Urbanized Area (Urbanized Area 200,000 or greater), the competitive funds available for urbanized areas within the State of Kansas with a population between 50,000 and 199,999, as well as the competitive funds available for the non-urbanized areas statewide.

Table 5: Historic & Projected 5310 Apportionment per Population Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Urbanized Area 200K+</th>
<th>Urbanized 50K-199K</th>
<th>Non-Urbanized Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$200,000*</td>
<td>$216,000*</td>
<td>$383,000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$191,940</td>
<td>$216,682</td>
<td>$383,064</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Approximate funding amounts. Subject to change throughout 2014 fiscal year due changes in legislation

Table 6 identifies historic funding levels for the FTA Section 5310 program. This figure reflects the amount of total FTA Section 5310 funding that is available to the State of Kansas. FTA did not keep record of the funding of funding apportionments per population category prior to 2013.

Table 6: Historic 5310 Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>State of Kansas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$1,272,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$1,267,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$1,269,778</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7 and Figure 18 identify historic funding levels for the former FTA Section 5316 JARC Program. This figure is reflective of JARC program funds awarded to urbanized providers and non-urbanized providers (WAMPO and CTD #12). Though there are slight fluctuations from year to year, the funds in each category remain relatively stable and consistent over a 4-year trend.

Table 7: Historic JARC Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Urbanized Area</th>
<th>Non-Urbanized Area (CTD #12 &amp; WAMPO)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$243,817</td>
<td>$524,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$233,117</td>
<td>$501,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$232,767</td>
<td>$501,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$234,990</td>
<td>$505,893</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 18: Historic JARC Funding
Table 8 and Figure 19 identify historic funding levels for the former FTA Section 5317 New Freedom Program. This figure is reflective of New Freedom program funds awarded to urbanized and non-urbanized providers (WAMPO and CTD #12). Though there are slight fluctuations from year to year, the funds in each category remain relatively stable and consistent over a 4-year trend.

Table 8: Historic New Freedom Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Urbanized Area</th>
<th>Non-Urbanized Area (CTD #12 &amp; WAMPO)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$147,286</td>
<td>$294,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$144,552</td>
<td>$289,298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$145,299</td>
<td>$290,792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$146,988</td>
<td>$294,172</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 19: Historic New Freedom Funding
**Funding Restrictions and Criteria**

Providers in the CTD #12 region face many obstacles in regards to Federal transportation funding that most other CTD’s in the State of Kansas do not. The presence of these obstacles is primarily due to the region being made up of 3 different service area categories. The Coordinated Plan separates CTD #12 providers into the following categories based on their service area: Urbanized, Non-Urbanized WAMPO, and Non-Urbanized CTD #12. Each category has unique funding opportunities for the respective geographical area.

**Urbanized Provider**

This category has the most funding options available. These include: FTA Section 5307 Urbanized Area Formula Program, FTA Section 5309 Capital Investment Program, Section 5310 Transportation for Elderly Individuals and Individuals with Disabilities Program, Section 5311 Rural Formal Program, JARC, New Freedom, CMAQ, and STP. Many of these funds have direct allocations to specific geographic areas on an annual basis, which includes the urbanized area. Competitive selection processes are held by the designated recipient, and in most cases providers are competing for funds against other providers within an urbanized area.

Providers in the urbanized area also compete for CMAQ and STP funds through WAMPO. CMAQ and STP funds, however, are typically more competitive than other funding avenues since they are not exclusive to any one mode of transportation.

**Non-Urbanized WAMPO Provider**

This category includes any provider located within the WAMPO planning area, but outside of the urbanized area. For review, the WAMPO planning area includes all of Sedgwick County, the portion of Butler County encompassing Andover and Rose Hill, and portion of Sumner County encompassing Mulvane. Therefore, a non-urbanized WAMPO provider provides services to the remainder of Sedgwick County that is not included in the urbanized area. Both the cities of Andover and Mulvane are in the urbanized area. (See WAMPO boundary map on page 10.)

The options for funding are less extensive than the urbanized category. However, they are more extensive than the non-urbanized CTD #12 category to be discussed further. The non-urbanized WAMPO provider has the following funding options available: FTA Section 5310 Transportation for Elderly Individuals and Individuals with Disabilities Program, Section 5311 Rural Formula...
Program, JARC, New Freedom, CMAQ, and STP. All funding options are awarded through a competitive selection process conducted by KDOT. Just as in the urbanized category, paratransit and transit providers can apply for CMAQ and STP funds; however, they are typically more competitive than other funding avenues since they are not exclusive to any one mode of transportation.

**Non-Urbanized CTD #12**

This category includes all the providers within the CTD #12 region, but located outside of the Wichita Urbanized Area and the WAMPO planning region. The non-urbanized CTD #12 area consists of Harvey County and most of Butler County (excluding the City of Andover and portions surrounding portions included in the urbanized area).

Providers in the non-urbanized CTD #12 category can compete for the following funding: FTA Section 5310 Transportation for Elderly Individuals and individuals with Disabilities Program, Section 5311 Rural Formula Program, JARC, and New Freedom. These funds are awarded through a statewide competitive selection process conducted by KDOT. Providers across Kansas compete for these funds on an annual basis.
“What’s the Big Idea?”

The theme behind the public outreach campaign for this update to the Coordinated Plan was “What’s the Big Idea?” The reasoning behind this question was to get the public, and other stakeholders, to think about why pursuing coordinating transportation services is important. In addition, it set the platform for answering the thought-provoking statement, “A perfect transit system would include…”—an open-ended activity the public and stakeholders had an opportunity to answer. In addition to this activity, the public was given the opportunity indicate on a regional map where they needed transportation and indicate when they needed such services. The public was also given the opportunity to attend any of the Paratransit Council, Inc. meetings, the CTD #12 meetings, and the Steering Committee meetings.
Surveys
Various methods were employed to engage the public in order to gain insight on the service gaps and needs of transportation services in the CTD #12 region. WAMPO staff provided the Rider/User Survey to service providers for them to distribute to their riders. The Rider/User Survey primarily addressed paratransit services. Therefore, WAMPO staff spent 2 days in June 2013 at the Wichita Transit Center distributing the Transit Survey to individuals who ride the fixed-route bus system. This data was tabulated and summarized to generate conclusions based on each aspect of the transportation services. Examples of both surveys as well as complete summaries are available in Appendix E and Appendix F.

Public Open Houses
Public open houses for the Coordinated Public Transit—Human Services Plan were held each county within the CTD #12 region. Their purpose was to inform the public about the plan and seek input on the public transportation needs for the region. Below is a summary of the dates, locations, and topics discussed at each county open house.
Butler County

In an effort to bolster greater participation in Butler County, WAMPO partnered with the Butler County Department on Aging—which provides county-wide public transportation—and held 3 open houses in the Cities of Andover, Augusta, and El Dorado. Figure 20 is an example of the flyers given to the Department on Aging for distribution to their riders. This approach was more aggressive than the previous update, which only had one open house with very little participation. This approach was rewarded with more than double the participation in Butler County.

- **Andover Senior Center**: July 15, 2013
  410 Lioba Drive
  Andover, Kansas

- **Augusta: The Point Event Center**: July 15, 2013
  2101 Dearborn Street
  Augusta, Kansas

- **El Dorado Senior Center**: July 18, 2013
  210 E. 2nd Street
  El Dorado, Kansas

Overall topics discussed that are pertinent to Butler County transportation included:

- Exploring the feasibility of county transfers to connect Butler County riders to medical services in Newton, KS and Sedgwick County transportation services. An example was transferring Butler County riders to Wichita Transit at the Towne East Mall.

- Ideas of how to boost ridership in Andover, KS in order to justify increased service. One specific idea was providing service during the annual Andover Days festival as a means to reduce or eliminate the perception that the services are only available to seniors and/or disabled individuals.
Harvey County

As with the previous update to the Coordinated Plan, only one open house was held in Harvey County. This meeting was held in Newton, KS. The reason behind this is because of the primarily rural nature of the county, but more significantly, Newton and the suburb of North Newton comprise 64% of the total county population. Therefore, the majority of the population needing transportation services is located in these 2 cities. The one thing that did change from the previous update was the location of the open house. In partnership with the Harvey County Department on Aging—which provides county-wide public transportation—it was determined that hosting the open house in the lobby a public housing apartment building which houses a high concentration of patrons would give the best opportunity for public input. Overall attendance of this public meeting was more than double that of the previous update. Figure 21 is an example of the flyer distributed in Harvey County.

- Newton: Midtown Towers: July 22, 2013
  115 9th Street
  Newton, Kansas

Overall topics discussed that are pertinent to Harvey County transportation included:

- The feasibility of expanding public transportation options in Harvey County.
- Providing weekly shopping trips via Harvey County Interurban from highly concentrated pockets of target populations.
- Coordination with the local taxi to promote increased availability of services.
- Fostering partnerships with local agencies to advocate for and increase awareness of transportation services in Harvey County.

Figure 21: Harvey County Flyer
Sedgwick County

Since Sedgwick County is the most populated area in the CTD #12 region, multiple open houses were necessary. Due to time constraints, only 3 open houses were feasible to host. Special care was taken when considering the locations of the meetings as well as the promotion of the meetings. Flyers were distributed to various transportation stakeholders and local advertising was launched through networks such as Channel 7 Public Access Television and the Wichita Eagle. Partnerships for these meetings included Derby Dash, Sedgwick County Department on Aging, and Wichita Transit. As with the previous two counties, attendance for the Sedgwick County meetings was higher than previous attempts. Overall it was determined that additional meetings need to be held in other portions of the Wichita metropolitan area to gain a broader scope of local issues that certain areas are facing. Figure 22 is an example of the flyer distributed in Sedgwick County.

- Park City City Hall: July 29, 2013
  6110 N. Hydraulic
  Park City, Kansas

- Derby Public Library: July 30, 2013
  1600 Walnut Grove Drive
  Derby, Kansas

- Wichita Transit Center: August 5, 2013
  214 S. Topeka Street
  Wichita, Kansas

Overall topics discussed that are pertinent to Sedgwick County transportation included:

- Coordinating service among agencies to provide service from unincorporated areas around Derby to inside the city limits and vice versa.
- Long and short-term improvements for Wichita Transit.
- Mobility Management.
- Regional transit service.
- Increasing awareness of transportation services available to the public.
- Alternative energy vehicles.
CTD #12 Board Meetings

The CTD #12 Board meets on a quarterly basis and serves as the decision making body for specialized transportation in the CTD #12 region. The Coordinated Public Transit—Human Services Plan was brought to this group on an as needed basis.

Paratransit Council, Inc.

The Paratransit Council, Inc. consists of a variety of specialized transportation providers and organizations that play a vital role in providing specialized transportation in the CTD #12 region. This group met on a monthly basis and discussed items related to the Coordinated Public Transit—Human Services Plan on an as needed basis.

Steering Committee

The Steering Committee consists of the 12 member JARC and New Freedom Advisory Group. Many members of this advisory group are members of Paratransit Council, Inc. The group met on a monthly basis prior to the Paratransit Council, Inc. meetings and served as the advisory group for the development of the Coordinated Public Transit—Human Services Plan.

Strengths and Weaknesses

Members of the Steering Committee were asked in May 2013 meeting to list 3 strengths and 3 weaknesses of transportation services in the CTD #12 region. Below is a summary of the exercise. A record of each response can be found in Appendix G. Each response was considered and three general trends were identified for both the strengths and weaknesses. This information was used in addition to the information gathered from the public in the formulation of the goals, objectives, and strategies of the Coordinated Plan.

**Strengths:**

1. **Advocacy**- determined to meet the needs and improve service throughout the region.
2. **Awareness**- more agencies/providers are becoming aware of opportunities for funding and collaboration.
3. **Support**- Federal, State, and local coordination to improve service in the region.
Weaknesses

1. **Funding**- insufficient funds for a growing number of competing applicants.
2. **Coordination**- no formal collaboration between providers/agencies to increase regional efficiency.
3. **Service Gaps**- pockets of population underserved throughout the region.

Public Comment Period

A draft of the Coordinated Plan was available for public comment from August 21, 2013 to September 4, 2013. Copies of the draft were available at the following locations and during the public open house meeting in each of the three counties.

- WAMPO office: Wichita City Hall, 455 N. Main, Wichita, Kansas.
- Butler County Department on Aging, 2101 Dearborn St., Augusta, Kansas.
- Harvey County Department on Aging, 800 N. Main St., Newton, Kansas.
- WAMPO website: [www.wampoks.org](http://www.wampoks.org)

Notifications of the public comment period were made through and email and media blast, flyers distributed to riders in each county, and a press release in the Wichita Eagle.
Although coordination of paratransit and transit services offer many potential benefits, there are numerous institutional, legal, and practical barriers that can limit collaboration. These barriers may be unique at the local level. However, they are not unique to the CTD #12 region. Though the sharing of resources and coordination operations may seem like the best solution, the actual manifestation of such is rare. The barriers to coordinated services must first be identified and mitigated.

**Program Disparity**

Programs that provide specialized human service transportation have distinct requirements, such as eligibility standards; specific requirements for passengers, driver (including certifications), and vehicles; as well as insurance. Additionally, Federal, State, or internal rules and regulations may restrict the provider’s ability to effectively coordinate their service with other agencies.

**Vulnerable Populations**

Since certain transportation service providers offer rides specifically to one type of vulnerable population (such as individuals with cognitive disabilities) some organizations could be reluctant to
mix different vulnerable populations in a coordinated transportation system. A mixing of population could diminish the overall use of paratransit services for these populations. If an organization does try to coordinate services with more than one type of demographic, special considerations should be made to ensure potential conflicts do not impede services provided.

**Lack of Incentives**

Another obstacle to coordination is a lack of incentives. Coordination may not be an effective strategy in every Coordinated Transit District. In small or rural communities, those who cannot effectively transport themselves may have partial or no access to paratransit services, and coordination of these limited services provides little to no benefit.
This section will discuss the specific actions steps this Plan will implement outlined by the vision, goals, objectives, and strategies. WAMPO staff revisited these steps developed in the previous Coordinated Plan update and made necessary adjustments based on current conditions in the CTD #12 region. The new action steps were derived primarily from the Transit Survey and Rider/User Survey administered by WAMPO and transportation service providers. Additional information used in their development was gathered from the public meetings in each county. The vision statement, goals, objectives, and strategies were brought before the Steering Committee for their input and approval.

Any project that is applying for or receives Federal transportation funding from FTA Section 5307, 5311, or 5310 programs should address the intent of this Plan in order to bridge service gaps in order to improve coordinated public transportation services in the CTD #12 region.

Figure 23 illustrated the relationship between the vision statement, goals, and objectives for the CTD #12 region.
Vision
A unified effort among providers and stakeholders to increase coordination, promote awareness of services, and meet the growing transportation needs of the individuals in the CTD #12 region.

Goal: Advocacy
Increase advocacy and awareness of transportation services available to the public.

Goal: Coordination
Improve coordination of transportation services among providers.

Goal: Funding
Seek creative solutions to funding constraints.

Increase awareness of cost-saving initiatives and additional funding sources.

Figure 23: Vision, Goals, and Objectives

Vision Statement
The vision statement for the Coordinated Plan emphasized collaboration and increasing awareness of transportation services in order to meet the growing needs of the region. Coordination is essential to meeting the ever-increasing demand while providing cost-effective service. Promoting awareness of available transportation services will not only ensure that patrons are receiving proper service based on their needs, but will help address funding constraints by increasing ridership.

Vision
A unified effort among providers and stakeholders to increase coordination, promote awareness of services, and meet the growing transportation needs of individuals in the CTD #12 region.
Goals

The Steering Committee focused on developing three attainable goals for the Coordinated Plan. Two of the three goals remained the same since the last update: Advocacy and Coordination. The objective regarding Funding was revised to emphasize being creative with the resources available.

One of the largest obstacles to overcome when providing transportation services to the general public is educating the public about what options are available in the CTD #12 region. The presence of this goal from the past to the present update indicates that this is a major issue that can be continuously improved upon to increase ridership and awareness of services.

This objective can be accomplished most effectively through employing mobility management practices and providing a centralized dispatch. Coordination among providers will reduce cost overall, which in turn broadens the scope of available services to more people.

Transit and paratransit providers are faced with various challenges year to year that impact the amount of funding assistance available. Some of the challenges may include: a slow economy, changes in policies at the Federal and State levels, and uncertainty of new Federal transportation legislation. Therefore, it is important to be creative with what resources are available. These include measures to procure additional revenue for other sources and/or reducing the cost of providing services.
Objectives
Objectives are measurable steps that can be taken to achieve a goal. Three objectives were developed in order to meet one or more goals of the Coordinated Plan.

This objective can be accomplished through proactive public involvement aimed at increasing public awareness of transportation services in the CTD #12 region. Additionally, public input on the quality of service will be useful in improving current services.

The main focus of collaboration is to minimize the amount of unnecessary duplication and overlap of services available in the CTD #12 region. This objective can be accomplished through a concerted effort among providers to share information that will facilitate the sharing of resources and the coordination of rides.

This objective can be accomplished through research and implementation of cost-saving initiatives available at the county or local levels as well as taking advantage of additional funding when it is available.
Strategies

During the public participation process of the Coordinated Plan update, it was determined that strategies used to accomplish the objectives should not only be developed for the CTD #12 region as a whole, but county specific strategies should be developed aimed at addressing local issues. The strategies developed for the region as a whole are based on issues all three counties are facing. The following section outlines these strategies for the entire region as well as on the county level.

- Figure 24 illustrates the relationship between the specific strategies pertinent to the CTD #12 region and a whole and which objective(s) they address.
- Figure 25 illustrates the relationship between the specific strategies pertinent to Butler County and which objective(s) they address.
- Figure 26 illustrates the relationship between the specific strategies pertinent to Harvey County and which objective(s) they address.
- Figure 27 illustrates the relationship between the specific strategies pertinent to Sedgwick County and which objective(s) they address.

A detailed explanation of each strategy follows the graphic illustration of that specific strategy category. Strategies are listed either as “high priority” or “priority,” though within each prioritized category, there is no hierarchy among the strategies.
Explore providing part-time paratransit/transit service where service gaps are present.

Promote responsible use of funds by coordinating rides with other agencies in order to maximize fleet capacity and minimize trip redundancy.

Encourage mobility management practices when feasible.

Study the feasibility of county/municipal transfer points/locations.
Establish partnerships with nursing homes, assisted living centers, etc.

Expand awareness of county volunteer programs in transportation services.

Study the feasibility of promotional opportunities that promote transit riding culture.

Study the cost vs. benefit for alternate energy vehicles promoting cost-effective fleet replacement.
CTD #12 Region

High Priority

- **Explore providing part-time paratransit/transit service where service gaps are present:**
  During the public participation portion of the Coordinated Plan update, it was discovered that many 2\textsuperscript{nd} and 3\textsuperscript{rd} shift workers need transportation services, but services stop prior to their shifts beginning or end. Therefore, providers are encouraged to explore the possibility of momentarily suspending service during the evening hours, but then again provide limited service in order to accommodate 2\textsuperscript{nd} and 3\textsuperscript{rd} shift workers. Understanding this may not be cost-effective for all providers, agencies should collaborate with each other to ensure their riders are provided for.

- **Promote responsible use of funds by coordinating rides with other agencies to maximize fleet capacity and minimize trip redundancy:**
  The amount of Federal funding available for distribution among providers is unlikely to increase in the future. One area that is considered wasteful is when multiple agencies provide rides to the same location with few passengers in each vehicle. Providers are encouraged to coordinate rides to popular destinations (and stops along the way) in order to maximize the efficiency of the regional fleet, reducing the amount of Federal dollars used on duplicate trips. Therefore, funds saved can be designated for alternative uses to improve services in other areas.

- **Encourage mobility management practices when feasible:**
  Overall, transportation service providers should seek coordination with one another both in providing rides and well as implementing other mobility management practices such as **travel training**. This will promote efficiency region-wide, reduce cost to providers, and increase ridership. Mobility management encourages travel training and trip planning as means of removing barriers that prevent individuals from using transportation services, and it also provides oversight to ensure responsible and efficient use of Federal funds.

- **Study the feasibility of county/municipal transfer points/locations:**
  As a means to boost collaboration and ridership, various entities should study where county and municipal transfer points may be feasible. For example, Butler County can coordinate drop-off/pickup places and times with their riders where they can be transferred to Wichita Transit to complete their journey. This will save county transportation providers money because fewer miles will be driven to and from destination in Wichita. Providers will need to make agreements on fares and transfers that are cost-effective for the rider and financially feasible for all agencies involved.
Priority

- **Establish partnerships with nursing homes, assisted living centers, etc.:**
  In an effort to increase ridership, and therefore increase revenue, partnerships with nursing homes, assisted living centers, and other senior care agencies should be considered. Most of these establishments provide rides solely to their clientele, and they are often duplicate service to destinations transportation service providers serve. Establishing partnerships and coordinating these rides can be a cost-effective solution to budget constraints.

- **Expand awareness of county volunteer programs in transportation services:**
  Each county has existing volunteer programs in place including volunteer driver programs. In an effort to reduce costs and/or increase service, transportation service providers are encouraged to engage in outreach activities in order to begin or increase their volunteer driver program.

- **Study the feasibility of promotional opportunities that promote transit riding culture:**
  Part of improving the overall system is creating a cultural paradigm shift to one that sees the benefit and ease of riding transit. In order to do so, providers must first get non-transit riding citizens accustomed to riding transit. This can be done in small increments and promotional opportunities such as: free rides to school-aged children during the summer, collaborating with colleges and universities to provide student rides paid as part of their student fees, rides to/from annual civic and community events, etc.

- **Study the cost vs. benefit for alternative energy vehicles:**
  Alternative energy vehicles have the potential to reduce the cost of operating for transportation service providers. However, there tends to be a period of time before these savings are seen as the cost of procuring the vehicle tends to be higher than traditional gasoline/diesel vehicles. There are also several options to choose from when considering alternative fuel vehicles such as gas/diesel-electric hybrids, full electric, compressed natural gas (CNG), hydrogen, and others. Providers should study the cost vs. benefits of procuring such vehicles when fleet replacement is necessary in order to promote long-term cost savings.
Figure 25: Butler County Strategies

- **Outreach**: Improve public perception of available transportation options.
- **Collaboration**: Explore new ways to promote services to the general public in Andover and Whitewater.
- **Funding**: Explore the feasibility of transfer points/locations in Harvey and Sedgwick Counties.
Butler County

High Priority

- **Improve public perception of available transportation options:**
  Through input from the public meetings, it was discovered that many residents in Butler County are not aware of their transportation options, nor that the County transportation services are for the general public. Many residents believe the transportation services are just for seniors or disabled. Transportation providers are encouraged to employ marketing strategies to advertise services available to the general public. Such strategies could include: bus-wrapping, flyers and pamphlets placed in strategic locations, education programs, etc.

- **Explore the feasibility of transfer points/locations in Harvey and Sedgwick Counties:**
  In order to promote ridership and reduce overall cost, Butler County is encouraged to consider where possible transfer locations may be in the other 2 counties and then collaborate with transportation service providers in those counties to determine the feasibility of this service.

Priority

- **Explore new ways to promote services in Andover and Whitewater:**
  These two cities are the main focus of boosting ridership in Butler County. Despite its relatively large population, Andover has minimal ridership and therefore limited times of service. In order to boost ridership and increase service frequency, strategies to inform the public may include: providing promotional rides during Andover Days and other civic events, and providing shuttle transfer service into Wichita so that riders can take advantage of the fixed-route bus system.

  Whitewater residents seek rides primarily to El Dorado and Newton (in Harvey County). It was discovered that there is a large disconnect between Whitewater residents understanding of services available and Butler County’s perception of potential ridership. Measures should be taken in order to coordinate rides among Whitewater residents in order to make cost-effective trips for Butler County transportation.
Figure 26: Harvey County Strategies

- **Outreach**
  - Seek to generate cost-effective trips within Newton through the coordination of rides.

- **Funding**
  - Explore the feasibility of expanding public transportation options in Newton/North Newton.

- **Collaboration**
  - Increase coordination with local taxi service.
  - Foster partnerships with local agencies to advocate for--and increase awareness of--transportation services.
Harvey County

High Priority

- **Seek to generate cost-effective trips within Newton through the coordination of rides:**
  Many times, providing trips within Newton is cost-prohibitive. Efforts should be taken to coordinate rides to create cost-effective trips for residents. This can be accomplished through outreach activities in neighborhoods/population centers and other marketing endeavors.

- **Explore the feasibility of expanding public transportation options in Newton/North Newton:**
  Because Newton and North Newton are home to such a high percentage of the county’s population, the county—in partnership with both cities—should study the feasibility of providing one of the following 3 public transportation options to residents of both cities:
  1. **Demand Response**—a type of service that does not adhere to a specific route at all times.
  2. **Deviated Route**—a system in which there is an established route but at times the driver may deviate from that route to pick up a rider.
  3. **Fixed-Route**—service provided on a repetitive basis along a specific route with vehicles stopping to pick up and deliver passengers to specific locations. Each fixed-route trip serves the same origins and destinations.

Priority

- **Increase coordination with local taxi service:**
  Because of the frequency of cost-prohibitive trips for Harvey County, efforts to coordinate with the local taxi service should increase in order to provide residents with alternative means of transportation. In addition to coordinating service, efforts should be taken to encourage the local taxi company to increase the quality of their service by increasing the number of vehicles available to the public, promoting clean and safe transportation, and promote dependability.

- **Foster partnerships with local agencies to advocate for—and increase awareness of—transportation services:**
  In an effort to increase awareness of services available to residents throughout the county, partnerships should be sought with local social service agencies in order to more efficiently and effectively communicate with individuals needing transportation. In addition, these partnerships will increase support for enhancing and improving current transportation services.
Provide centralized mobility management.

- Outreach
- Collaboration
- Funding

Coordinate with other agencies to provide rides from unincorporated areas to suburban jobs and services.

- Collaboration
- Funding

Promote ridership by removing barriers that are transit-prohibitive.

- Outreach
- Collaboration

Promote transit ridership by evaluating and modifying routes as needed.

- Outreach
- Funding
Implement educational programs designed to promote the benefits of transportation services.

Study and implement alternative, user-friendly payment methods.

Study the feasibility of regional express bus service to employment centers.
Sedgwick County

High Priority

- **Provide centralized mobility management:**
  Due to the high number of transportation service providers, and therefore the propensity for rides to be duplicated, the institution of centralized mobility management should be sought. This will promote system efficiency by operating a transportation brokerage to coordinate agencies, which in-turn leads to an overall reduction of cost per trip system-wide. Mobility management encourages travel training and trip planning as means of removing barriers that prevent individuals from using transportation services, and it also provides oversight to ensure responsible and efficient use of Federal funds.

- **Coordinate with other agencies to provide rides from unincorporated areas to suburban jobs and services:**
  A disconnect was discovered where occasionally a local provider is unable to pickup an individual living outside the city limits of a suburb, and in addition, other providers only pick up county residents and bring them into Wichita. Providers are encouraged to collaborate in order to overcome this disconnect in order to provide rides to individuals needing transportation to suburban jobs and services.

- **Promote ridership by removing barriers that are transit-prohibitive:**
  It was discovered that many people second-guess or choose not to ride transit due to various barriers such as: a run-down transit center, lack of designated covered bus stops, minimal capacity for bikes on the front racks of the bus, lack of bike-racks at bus stops, no park-and-ride facilities, long wait times during non-peak hours, and the like. Efforts to increase the quality of services should be taken in order to remove potential barriers that discourage transit use.

- **Promote transit ridership by evaluating and modifying routes as needed:**
  Transit routes should be evaluated and modified in order to maximize efficiency and increase the total number of people served. By modifying routes to ensure popular origins and destination are being served, individuals are more likely to choose transit.
Priority

- **Implement educational programs designed to promote the benefits of transportation services:**
  In an effort to produce a paradigm shift to one where riding transit is favorable, programs should be implemented to educate the public on the benefits of riding transit such as reducing the cost an individual pays for gasoline, reducing traffic congestion, and improving air quality.

- **Study and implement alternative, user-friendly payment methods:**
  As technology has advanced, there are now a myriad of options available to broaden the payment options for riders instead of having to purchase and/or refill a ride card. Implementing alternative payments methods in addition to the ride card should be considered in order to promote ridership and increase the quality of service to the rider.

- **Study the feasibility of regional express bus service to employment centers:**
  In order to better serve the greater metropolitan area, regional express bus service should be considered to provide commuter service to concentrated employment centers such as the downtown urban core. Service could begin very limited by providing service twice a day, once in the morning inbound and once in the evening outbound to cities along the four major cardinal compass points around the metropolitan area.
Recommendations

Though all of the aforementioned strategies are important, it is necessary to set forth recommendations that outline specific “next step” actions as a foundation for the strategies to be successfully implemented. The following are the formal recommendations of this Coordinated Plan:

- Designated recipients of Federal funding programs should follow-through with routine audits of sub-recipients to:
  - Ensure proper and responsible use of allocated dollars.
  - Ensure that mandatory rides are being given depending on the requirements of the agency.
- Local providers and stakeholders should advocate for an increase in a local commitment of funds.
- Institute centralized mobility management—especially in Sedgwick County—to streamline coordination efforts among transportation service providers.
- A concerted effort among county transportation service providers to:
  - Ensure accessibility to transportation is available to eligible riders.
  - Achieve efficient, cost-effective, regional transportation.

Amendments and Updates to the Coordinated Plan

This plan is intended to be treated as a fluid document, which is expected to be reviewed and updated every five years. Amendments and updates may occur more frequently as priorities and needs of the CTD #12 region may change. For example, the previous plan was adopted in 2010, and this current plan is being updated only 3 years later because it was deemed necessary based on new priorities and needs. Providers are encouraged to address the goals, objectives and strategies of this Coordinated Plan when implementing various capital and operating project
Appendix A: Definitions

Accessibility— The extent to which facilities and vehicles are barrier free and useable by people with disabilities, including wheelchair users. Accessible vehicles are equipped with lifts and ramps.

Allocated Program— Where a set amount of funding is available as outlined by the Federal Transit Administration.

Ambulatory— Transit defines a rider who is “ambulatory” as one who is not confined to a wheelchair, or if in a fold-up manual wheelchair, can transfer from it to a seat in the vehicle without assistance.

Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)—A civil rights law passed by Congress in 1990 which makes it illegal to discriminate against people with disabilities in employment, services provided by State and local governments, public and private transportation, public accommodations and telecommunications.

Attendant—Designated by the eligible rider as someone who is responsible for providing personal care and assistance to the eligible rider during the entire trip and whose presence is essential for the eligible rider to travel. Attendant does not pay a fare. Also called a Personal Care Attendant (PCA) or escort.

Brokerage—A method of transportation service delivery that matches passengers with appropriate providers through a central trip request and administrative facility.

Demand Response—Non-fixed route service utilizing vans or buses with passengers boarding and alighting at prearranged times at any location within the system’s service area. Also called “Dial-a-Ride.”

Designated Recipient— An entity that can apply directly to FTA for grant funding they have received through the designated recipient’s competitive selection process.

Deviated Route Systems—A type of service that does not adhere to a specific route at all times.

Deviated Fixed-Route System—is a system in which there is an established route but at times the driver may deviate from that route to pick up a rider.

Direct Recipient— An entity designated in accordance with the planning process under 49 U.S.C. 5303, 5304, and 5306 by the chief executive officer of a State, responsible local officials, and publically owned operators of public transportation, to receive and apportion amounts under 49 U.S.C. 5336 that are attributable to Transportation Management Areas (TMAs) identifies under
49 U.S.C. 5303; or a State of regional authority if the authority is responsible under the laws of a State for capital project and for financing and directly providing public transportation. 49 U.S.C. 7307(a)(2).

**Disadvantage Business Enterprise**—a for-profit small business concern that is (1) at least 51% owned by one or more individuals who are both socially and economically disadvantaged or, in the case of a corporation, in which 51% of the stock is owned by one or more such individuals; and (2) whose management and daily business operations are controlled by one or more of the socially and economically disadvantaged individuals who own it.

**Disability**—A long-term physical or mental condition which limits a person’s ability to get around care for one-self, and/or prevents or limits one from employment.

**Discretionary Program**—a program that does not have a specific annual awarded amount of funding during the timeframe of the current transportation bill.

**Dispatcher**—A person employed at a transit center who is responsible for assigning drivers and scheduling routes.

**Elderly**—Individuals 65 years of age or older.

**Fare**—The portion of a cost of a trip that is paid by the rider.

**Fixed-Route**—Service provided on a repetitive, fixed-schedule basis along a specific route with vehicles stopping to pick up and deliver passengers to specific locations. Each fixed-route trip serves the same origins and destinations.

**Illustrative Project**—Potential projects if additional funding becomes available or if there is a change in priorities.

**Intercity Bus Service**—A bus with front doors only, high backed seats, separate luggage compartments, and usually with restroom facilities for use in high-speed, long distance service (e.g. Greyhound).

**Low-Income**—an individual or household below a certain income threshold as defined by the U.S. Census Bureau. The income threshold changes based on the number of individuals in the household.

**Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)**—The policy board of an organization created and designated to carry out a metropolitan area’s transportation planning process. An MPO is required in order for metropolitan areas with populations over 50,000 to receive Federal transportation funds.

**Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP)**—The official multimodal transportation plan addressing no less than a 20 year planning horizon that is developed, adopted, and updated by the MPO for the metropolitan planning area through the metropolitan transportation planning process.
**No Show**—When a rider does not call to cancel a scheduled trip and is not there for pick-up.

**Non-urbanized CTD #12 Provider**—A transit or specialized transportation service organization which is located and operates outside of the WAMPO planning area and Wichita urbanized area. This includes all of Harvey County and most of Butler County.

**Non-urbanized WAMPO Provider**—A transit or specialized transportation service organization which is located and operates within the WAMPO planning area but is not located within the Wichita Urbanized Area.

**Objective**—Measurable steps that can be taken to achieve a goal.

**Paratransit**—Also known as “specialized transportation” or “Dial-a-Ride” service, is an alternative mode of flexible passenger transportation that does not follow fixed routes or schedules. Mini-buses and minivans are typically used to provide this service.

**Peak Period**—Time period(s) of the day when transit ridership is the heaviest—typically in the morning and evening.

**Poverty Universe**—The population excluding children under the age of 15 who are not related to the householder and people living in institutional group quarter, college dormitories, or military barracks.

**Programmable Project**—When a project is in a position where it has been and/or can reasonably expect funding in the near future.

**Public Transportation**—Any form of transportation that charges set fares, run fixed-routes, and are available to the general public such as buses and trains.

**Priority Seating**—An area designated at the front of a bus for seniors and persons with disabilities.

**Response Time**—The time that elapses between when a ride is dispatched and the rider is picked up.

**Ride Card**—An individual deemed eligible to ride a transportation service can, in some cases, bulk purchase rides, pay for them in advance, and therefore receive a discount. This individual then receives a “ride card” to use a proof of payment instead of paying for each individual ride.

**Securement**—Refers to lap belts, shoulder harnesses, and/or devices that secure a wheelchair or scooter on a vehicle.

**Service Animal**—An animal that is individually trained to perform tasks for people with disabilities, such as guiding people who are blind, alerting people who are deaf, pulling wheelchairs, and alerting and protecting a person who prone to having seizures.
**Stakeholder**—An individual that has an investment, share, or interest in the plan as an organization, business or industry.

**Strategy**—An identified, specific step that will help achieve one or more objective.

**Sub-recipient**—An organization/provider that receives Federal funds through a designated recipient.

**Transit**—Transportation systems that are designed to move large numbers of people (typically in buses) in cities, suburbs, and large metropolitan areas. Transit systems are usually publically owned.

**Transfer**—(1) An additional fare paid by the rider in order to board another bus in the same system to reach a destination. (2) Ability for a rider to move from a wheelchair or scooter to a transit vehicle seat without assistance.

**Travel Training**—A program that teaches people with disabilities how to ride a fixed-route service.

**Trip**—A one-way ride and each rider is counted individually.

**Urbanized Provider**—A transit or specialized transportation service organization which is located and operates within the Wichita Urbanized Area.

**Vendor**—A transportation provider that contracts with a Brokerage to provide transportation services.

**WAMPO title VI & Environmental Justice Policy**—Information regarding this policy can be found at [http://www.wampoks.org/Publications/Title+VI+Program.htm](http://www.wampoks.org/Publications/Title+VI+Program.htm)
Appendix B: Provider Profiles

On an annual basis the Paratransit Council, Inc. reviews and updates its membership directory. This directory identifies many specialized transportation providers and stakeholders in the CTD #12 region that receive at least one form funding assistance from FTA or KDOT and/or have a vested interest in these services. Providers shown within this appendix are those listed within the 2012 Paratransit Membership Directory. For a copy of the most recent Paratransit Membership Directory, go to www.paratransitrides.org.

Public Providers

Butler County Department on Aging (Section 5311)
The Butler County Department on Aging is a local government agency that provides rides to older adults, individuals with disabilities, and the general public. Both demand response and deviated route systems are used by the Butler County Department of Aging to provide adequate service to Butler County residents. In addition, two trips to Wichita are made each week. The Butler County Department on Aging is funded through FTA Section 5307, FTA Section 5311, KDOT, and through Butler County mill levy funds. The Butler County Department on Aging has a total fleet size of 7 vehicles, all of which are ADA compliant vehicles equipped with lifts.

Harvey County Commission (Section 5311)
The Harvey County Commission provides all types of trips to older adults, individuals with disabilities, and the general public. It uses fixed route, demand response, and deviated route systems to provide service in Harvey County. The Commission receives Section 5311 and KDOT funds. The Harvey County Commission operates a total fleet of 7 vehicles, which consists of wheelchair accessible minivans and 17-passenger minibuses.

Sedgwick County Department on Aging (Sections 5307, 5311 & New Freedom)
The Sedgwick County Department on Aging transportation unit was organized in December 1998. The Sedgwick County Transportation (SCT) program provides brokered and direct transportation based on availability 24 hours a day, seven days a week to eligible individuals within Sedgwick County. Contracted services are encouraged and current providers through SCT include not-for-profit agencies, private pay and volunteers. The Aging department has two ADA wheelchair lift vehicles and operates as a demand response with some flexibility of same day service for seniors, persons with disabilities and rural residents of Sedgwick County. Additionally they have over 70 vehicles of vendors that include taxi cabs, minivans, and wheelchair accessible buses.

Wichita Transit (Section 5307 & JARC)
Wichita Transit (WT) is a City of Wichita department that provides mass transit and specialized transportation services within the City of Wichita. WT operates 54 buses and trolleys (all ADA compliant) and 24 wheelchair lift vans on 18 fixed routes and 17 demand response paratransit routes. Rides are also purchased by WT under contracts with six social service agencies throughout the Wichita area.
Private/Non-Profit Providers

American Red Cross
The American Red Cross focuses on medically related transportation for older adults. Its service area includes Wichita, Haysville, Valley Center, Maize, Park City, Derby, Kechi, and many rural areas in Sedgwick County. The Red Cross operates a fleet of 6 sedans. Clients may have oxygen, canes, and walkers, however wheelchairs are not accommodated.

The Arc of Sedgwick County (Section 5310)
This is a non-profit agency providing transportation services to its disabled clients. Trips made for the Arc’s program activities in Sedgwick County, include recreational, shopping, meals, and social event trips. The Arc received Section 5310 funds and operates 1 bus that is ADA accessible.

Arrowhead West, Inc. (Section 5310)
Arrowhead West, Inc. is a non-profit agency which provides rides to their clients for medical purposes, personal business, education, recreational, and employment. Both demand response and deviated route systems are used. Arrowhead West, Inc. is funded through a variety of programs including: Section 5310, State Operating Funds, and State Capital Funds. Arrowhead West, Inc. has a total fleet of 14 vehicles: 3 sedans, 2 minivans, 7 wheelchair accessible minivans with ramps, and 2 wheelchair accessible full-size vans with lifts.

Breakthrough Club of Sedgwick County (New Freedom)
The Breakthrough Club of Sedgwick County is a Clubhouse Model rehabilitation program that serves individuals with serious mental illness who are 16 years of age or older. Its mission is to provide a safe, understanding, and non-judgmental environment where people who have a mental illness can learn and give back to their community by developing social, educational, and job expertise.

The Breakthrough Club is the only rehabilitation program in Kansas that is certified by the International Center for Clubhouse Development (ICCD) and it has become a national leader in the Clubhouse movement. Breakthrough provides transportation for a variety of purposes including employment, medical, shopping, education, and recreation. Breakthrough’s provides service primarily in the Wichita metro area. The organization operates 4 vehicles: 3 minivans and one 15-passenger van.

Catholic Charities Adult Day Health (Sections 5307 & 5310)
Catholic Charities Adult Day Health is a division within Catholic Charities that provides transportation services for older adults and individuals with disabilities to adult day center(s), medical, recreational, shopping, and community outings. Catholic Charities Adult Day Health uses a deviated route system primarily within the city limits of Wichita, but extends throughout
Sedgwick County. A total of 5 vehicles are operated, 3 of which are equipped with lifts.

Cerebral Palsy Research Foundation/Timber Lines Transportation (Sections 5307 & 5310)
The Cerebral Palsy Research Foundation (CPRF)/Timber Lines Transportation is a non-profit organization that provides rides in the Wichita area to older adults and persons with disabilities for medical, personal business, education, recreational, and employment. CPRF/Timber Lines Transportation uses a demand response system and is funded through Section 5307, Section 5310, and KDOT funds. CPRF/Timber Lines Transportation Section 5307 funds are through a reimbursement from Wichita Transit for services rendered in the City of Wichita. CPRF/Timber Lines Transportation operates a fleet of 4 wheelchair accessible vans.

Creative Community Living of South-Central Kansas (Section 5310)
This non-profit agency provides transportation services to developmentally disabled clients who live in Creative Community Living residences or in their homes. Trips are made for medical, education, recreational, shopping, employment, church, and other trips. The agency uses demand response and deviated route systems. The service area in the CTD #12 region consists of only Butler County, but they operate more specifically in the El Dorado area. The agency receives Section 5310 and KDOT funds. It operates a fleet of 9 vehicles: four, 13-passenger minibuses that are ADA compliant equipped with lifts, 1 minivan that is equipped with a lift, and 4 retired or agency-purchased vehicles.

Envision, Inc. (Sections 5307 & 5310)
This non-profit agency provides transportation service to individuals who are visually impaired. The trips are usually made in Wichita and include medical, personal business, recreational, and employment. ENVISON uses a demand response system. It received Section 5310 funds and operates 5 vehicles: 3 wheelchair accessible buses, one 13-passenger van, and one 7-passenger minivan. This provider also receives Section 5307 funding as a reimbursement from Wichita Transit for services rendered in the City of Wichita.

Flinthills Services, Inc.
Flinthills Services is a non-profit that offers day and residential services, self-directed care and case management to individuals, families and guardians of persons with developmental disabilities. Flinthills operates only within Butler County. They are a demand response system that does not receive Federal funding. Flinthills operates a fleet of 20 vehicles including vans and buses—2 of which are ADA compliant vehicles equipped with a lift.

Heartspring (Section 5310)
Heartspring is a non-profit organization that provides rides to disabled individuals for medical purposes, educational, recreational, and employment. Heartspring operates only within Sedgwick County. Heartspring uses a demand response system and is funded through Section 5310 funds. Heartspring operates a fleet of 12 vehicles, 1 of which is an ADA compliant vehicle equipped
with a lift.

**Kansas Elks Training Center for the Handicapped (KETCH) (Sections 5307 & 5310)**
This non-profit agency provides transportation services to older adults and individuals with disabilities. Trips provided include medical, recreational, shopping, and employment throughout the Wichita metro area. The agency uses demand response and fixed route systems. It received Section 5307 funding as a reimbursement from Wichita Transit for services rendered in the City of Wichita. KETCH also has received Section 5310 and KDOT funds in previous years on an infrequent basis. KETCH operates a fleet of 49 vehicles.

**Mennonite Housing**
Mennonite Housing is a non-profit organization that provides free bus service to their senior residents for purposes such as grocery shopping and/or social gatherings. Their residents consist of low-income older adults. The organization operates one 12-passenger bus that is ADA complaint with a wheelchair lift.

**Mental Health Association of South Central Kansas (MHA)**
MHA is a non-profit organization that provides transportation services for residents who receive MHA services. The primary purpose of their services is to ensure transportation for their members to MHA appointments. They operate of fleet 9 vehicles: 1 sedan, 4 passenger vans, 1 minivan, and 3 buses.

**Prairie View, Inc. (Section 5310 and JARC)**
Prairie View, Inc. the state’s largest and longest serving non-profit behavioral and mental health center. Prairie View, Inc. offers a complete range or mental and behavioral health services for children, adolescents, adults, and older adults and families. Prairie View operates in 5 counties: Harvey, Marion, McPherson, Reno, and Sedgwick and falls within 2 CTD’s (CTD #6 and CTD #12).

Within the CTD #12 region, Prairie View provides trips within Harvey County to medical, education, recreational, shopping, employment, and to psychosocial groups. Services are scheduled on an individual basis with the client’s direct care staff. Prairie View, Inc. operates a fleet of six 7-passenger minivans and 1 sedan.
**Project Independence (New Freedom)**
Project Independence is a non-profit agency that is a consumer run organization for adults with mental illness. They provide transportation only for their members: to and from their program activities, the Lords Diner, social activities, shopping, medical appointments, and mental health crisis centers. This organization receives New Freedom Program funds for capital costs only. Project Independence operates with 2 vans with wheelchair lifts.

**Starkey, Inc. (Sections 5307, 5310 & New Freedom)**
Starkey is a non-profit agency that provides transportation services to individuals with disabilities in Sedgwick County for medical, personal business, recreational, shopping, employment, and day programs. Starkey operates 8 daily routes from 6:30am to 5:30pm, allowing for additional evening and weekend hours as well as a demand response system. Starkey operates 79 vehicles, 18 of which are wheelchair accessible.
### Appendix C: Low-Income Threshold Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of family unit</th>
<th>Weighted average thresholds</th>
<th>Related Children Under 18 Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One person (unrelated individual)...........</td>
<td>11,139</td>
<td>11,344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 65 years...............................</td>
<td>11,344</td>
<td>11,344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 years and over.............................</td>
<td>10,458</td>
<td>10,458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two people..............................</td>
<td>14,218</td>
<td>14,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Householder under 65 years..............</td>
<td>14,676</td>
<td>14,602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Householder 65 years and over.............</td>
<td>13,194</td>
<td>13,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three people..............................</td>
<td>17,374</td>
<td>17,057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four people..............................</td>
<td>22,314</td>
<td>22,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five people..............................</td>
<td>26,439</td>
<td>27,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six people...............................</td>
<td>29,897</td>
<td>31,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven people..............................</td>
<td>34,009</td>
<td>35,896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eight people...............................</td>
<td>37,934</td>
<td>40,146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nine people or more..........................</td>
<td>45,220</td>
<td>48,293</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau.
Appendix D: Section 5310 Competitive Selection Process

PROJECT SELECTION CRITERIA – 5310

Applications will be evaluated by the Kansas Coordinated Transit Council and KDOT Public Transportation staff based on the following criteria:

A. Identification of Needs 25 points
   a. Documented demand for service in the area. Documentation can include but is not limited to log sheets of trip turn downs, surveys, testimonials from people not served, and additional services requested by existing riders and the general public.
   b. Estimated number of people in the services area.
      i. Estimated number of people to be served.
      ii. Number of transit dependent people (e.g. no vehicle, elderly, disable, and low-income).
      iii. Identification of the type of trips to be provided (medical, personal business, employment, etc.).
      iv. Does the proposed service and schedules meet the needs of the identified riders?

B. Replacement/Expansion/New Start
   a. Replacement.
      i. Vehicle model year.
      ii. Maintenance history and vehicle condition.
      iii. Current mileage.
   b. Expansion/New Start.
      i. Description of need.
      ii. Description of benefit.

C. Utilization of Services 20 points
   a. Service indicators (estimated for new starts, expansions, and actual for replacements, and retention of current level of operating funds).
      i. Vehicle service hours per week.
      ii. Average miles per month per vehicle.
      iii. Identification of types of local activities and employment centers served (trips generators).
   b. Trip purpose and passenger type statistics (are transportation services being delivered to the appropriate need).
D. Coordination of Efforts 10 points
   a. Level of coordination with other transportation providers within the proposed service area.
   b. Level of coordination with local government agencies in determining transportation needs and whether those needs are being met.
   c. Level of coordination with human services and other social service agencies within the proposed service area that have client transportation needs.

E. Accessibility, Safety, & Training 20 points
   a. Accessibility of project vehicles and compliance with ADA criteria. This would include Coordination Agreements with other providers to enable equal access to wheelchair accessible vehicles.
   b. Provision for training of drivers as per the KDOT/RTAP training requirements.

F. Financial Management/Grant Capability 15 points
   a. Qualifications and experience in managing grants and/or other governmental programs.
   b. Amount of local revenues obtained and support from local governments revenue sources.
   c. Letter verifying local match share.
   d. Budget (non-KDOT) sheet attached.

G. KDOT Contract Activities 5 points
   a. CTD member in good standing.
   b. CTD meeting attendance and level of participation.
   c. Copy of contracting activities attached (example: taxi voucher program, NEMT contracts, etc.).

H. Public Notice Attached 5 points
Appendix E: Rider/User Survey and Summary

The Rider/User Survey was provided to transportation service providers in the CTD#12 region for distribution to their riders. This survey primarily targeted those citizens who use paratransit services. Respondents either returned the survey to the provider or mailed it to WAMPO. Overall, WAMPO received 153 surveys, which equates to about a 25% return. Shown on pages 73 through 75 is the Rider/User Survey distributed to respondents. A summary of the responses begins on page 76.
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Rider/ User Survey
The Wichita Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (WAMPO) would appreciate your input on transportation services (bus, taxi, paratransit, etc.). Please take a few minutes to fill out this survey. Your answers will be kept confidential. Once you have completed the survey, please return it to the person who gave it to you.

Completed surveys may also be sent to:
WAMPO—Coordinated Plan
455 N. Main, 10th Floor
Wichita, KS 67202

Completed surveys will be accepted until JUNE 28, 2013. Results from this survey will be used to help identify issues and needs of transportation services within Butler, Harvey, and Sedgwick Counties.

Thank you for your participation.

General Information:

1. On average, how often do you use transportation services (bus, taxi, paratransit, etc.)?
   ○ Daily
   ○ At least once a month
   ○ At least once a week
   ○ Less than once a month
   ○ At least twice a month
   ○ Never

2. Do the transportation services (bus, taxi, paratransit, etc.) currently available meet your needs?
   ○ Yes
   ○ No
   □ If no, please explain

   __________________________________________

3. What are your main uses for transportation services (bus, taxi, paratransit, etc.)? (check all that apply).
   ○ Medical Appointments
   ○ Social/Recreational
   ○ Shopping
   ○ School
   ○ Job
   ○ Other

4. What currently prevents you from using transportation services (bus, taxi, paratransit, etc.) more often? (check all that apply)
   ○ Hours of service
   ○ Cost
   ○ Can’t get where I need to go
   ○ Other
   ○ Takes too long
5. Are you aware of transportation services (bus, taxi, paratransit, etc.) currently available?
   ○ Yes   ○ No

6. Do you know who to contact for assisted transportation services (bus, taxi, paratransit, etc.)?
   ○ Yes   ○ No

Scheduling a Ride: If your desired transportation service requires advanced scheduling, please complete questions 7 & 8.

7. Are you able to schedule a ride for your desired time?
   ○ Yes   ○ No

8. How far in advance do you schedule transportation services (bus, taxi, paratransit, etc.)?
   ○ Less than ½ day   ○ Between ½ and 1 day   ○ Between 1 and 2 days
   ○ More than 2 days   ○ Don't know

Possible Improvements:

9. How do you think transportation services (bus, taxi, paratransit, etc.) in Butler, Harvey, Sedgwick Counties can be improved?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Available information</th>
<th>Butler</th>
<th>Harvey</th>
<th>Sedgwick</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expanded hours of operation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better advertising/marketing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded service area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility of service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Ride</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better coordination between service providers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Typically, what hours do you need transportation services (bus, taxi, paratransit, etc.)?

   ○ Weekdays 6am – 8am   ○ Weekends 8am -noon
   ○ Weekdays 8am – noon  ○ Weekends noon – 5pm
   ○ Weekdays noon – 5pm  ○ Other: ________________
   ○ Weekdays 5pm – 7pm   ○ Weekdays 7pm – 10pm
Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Plan
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Personal Information—Providing the following information is OPTIONAL.

11. Which age group are you in?
   ○ 17 and under  ○ 18-29  ○ 30-39
   ○ 40-49  ○ 50-59  ○ 60 and over

12. What is your gender?
   ○ Male  ○ Female

13. Which best identifies your race/ethnic origin?
   ○ Black/African American  ○ White/Caucasian  ○ Hispanic/Latino
   ○ Native American  ○ Asian  ○ Other ____________

14. What is your annual household income?
   ○ No income  ○ Less than $10,000  ○ $10,000-$20,000
   ○ $20,001-$30,000  ○ $30,001-$50,000  ○ $50,001 or greater

Additional Feedback:

15. Please share any additional comments

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey. Your input is appreciated.
Rider/User Survey Summary

General Information

Transit Frequency
It is important to know the frequency of use in order to gain an understanding of how important paratransit services are. According to the survey, 45% of the respondents use this service on a daily basis. From there, a little over 20% use this service at least once a week. Therefore, it is easy to say that this service is heavily relied upon.

Purpose of Transit Use
The survey asked not only how often respondents used transportation services but also where they are taken by these services. The majority of the riders use transportation services to take them to medical appointments (35%). The second highest response
was commuting to and from work (21%). Third, respondents use transit for and shopping (16%) and social/recreational activities (12%). The breakdown of where transit takes citizens seems to be in line with the frequency for transit use.

**Needs Assessment**

It is necessary to know if the transportation services are meeting all of the riders’ needs. An overwhelming majority (87%) of the riders indicated that, yes, the transportation services meet their current needs. However, 12% indicated that not all of their needs are met. Most of those who said “no” to the previous question indicated that areas in which their needs are not met fit in line with factors that are prohibitive for all riders. The most prohibitive factor is the hours of operation (28%) closely followed by citizens not being able to get where they need to go and other non-specified reasons (22%). The third most prohibitive factor is the cost of the service at 19%.
Service Awareness

Overall, awareness of what services are available is very high. 93% of respondents indicated they are aware of what services are available to them. In addition, 92% of respondents indicated they knew exactly who to contact in order to take advantage of transportation services. The high affirmative response to these two questions shows a measurable attainment to an objective from the previous update to the Coordinated Plan. The objective stated to increase outreach activities to educate and inform the public about transportation resources.

Scheduling a Ride

Even though 75% of those who use transportation services in the region must schedule a ride at least 24hrs in advance (44% more than 2 days, 33% more than 1 day), they indicated that they were able to get a ride for the desired time. Many who indicated that they were not able to schedule a ride when they wanted, expressed that they would prefer to be able to give shorter notice. This gives credence to the idea that those who use the transportation services in the region have gotten use to how the system works. Though it may be inconvenient for short notice
activities, the services work well for routine activities such as medical appointments or commuting to and from work.

Possible Improvements
The following section delineates some of the most important information gathered from the survey: ways that transportation services can be improved in each county. It is worth noting that respondents who indicated earlier in the survey that the services met their needs also took the time to indicate where they would like to see improvement.

The data collected for each individual county was tabulated together to created a perspective for how services can be improved in the entire CTD#12 region. Overall, the information gathered shows a relatively even distribution indicating that those riding public transportation in the region would like to see improvements in all areas. That being said, the category that received the most votes was expanding hours of operation at 19%. This directly relates to what factors where prohibitive to riding transit. The hours of operation were indicated as the most prohibitive. Riders would like to see services run longer in the day. The next highest category is to have an expanded service area. Again, this directly relates to prohibitive factors. The second highest prohibitive factor was that riders cannot get to where they want or need to go. What is interesting is that many indicated that they would like more information—yet they previously said that they were aware of services in the area and who to contact. Perhaps in future studies this category should be more specific as to what type of information riders are looking for.

CTD #12 Region
If the available information category is disregarded for a moment, the next most indicated category is cost. Once again, there is direct correlation to the 3rd most prohibitive factor. It is apparent that riders would like to see reduced cost in services provided. Of the 7% of those who responded as “other,” many did not specify an improvement. Those who did reinforced their desire to see extended hours such as evenings and Sundays. One thought of adding more drivers would help in the effort, and others thought that smaller vehicles might cut down on some cost.
Butler County
The breakdown of desired service improvements for Butler County follows the same trend and the region as a whole. The highest number of individuals would like to see expanded hours of service, followed by an expanded service area, and then to see a reduction in the cost. An even number of respondents (9%) indicated that improvements should be made in areas of better advertising, accessibility, better provider coordination, and other improvements.
Harvey County

Harvey County received the fewest responses to this question in comparison to Butler and Sedgwick Counties. However, it does have the lowest population of the three counties. The characteristics of this county are much different than the three as the majority of Harvey County is rural with only 1 major populated city—Newton. Therefore, fewer people ride transportation services in Harvey County, and there could have been some difficulty in getting the survey to some riders in the time that was allotted for the survey. The biggest difference in responses seen in Harvey County is that there seems to be a lack of available information regarding transportation services. This category equaled the opinion of those wanted expanded hours of operation at 21%. From there, the story is the same with expanded service area and cost of ride coming in next on the list of areas riders would like to see improvements made.
Sedgwick County

As expected, Sedgwick County received the highest amount of responses to this question. Unlike the other two counties, there isn’t a category in Sedgwick County that demonstratively stands out. It does follow the same trend with extended hours, expanded service area, and cost being the highest three. More riders in this county indicated they would like to see more available information and coordination between service providers. This makes sense as there are more service providers to choose from in Sedgwick County than the other two counties.

A possible conclusion from this data collected could be that just because the regional transportation service is relatively user friendly, there is always need for improvement. Many people use the services available because they have to. They would be stranded without it. Making strides to improving the system in these areas will only meet the needs of the riding public to a greater degree—increasing their quality of life.
Transportation Service Hours

The survey was able to identify the peak times that riders need transportation services. Almost 70% of respondents need services during the weekday between the hours of 6am and 5pm. Roughly 11% of riders indicated they need transportation services after 5pm during weekdays. Approximately 13% of respondents said they needed transportation services during the weekend, with the majority (8%) indicating they make trips between 8am and noon. It can be inferred from this data that many would like to see services available on Sundays during the morning hours. Several comments throughout the surveys indicated that many riders would like the ability to go to a church service on Sunday morning and are currently unable to because there is no service available to take them.

![Hours of Transit Services Needs](image-url)
Demographics

**Age of Respondant**
- 1% 17 and Under
- 36% 18-29
- 24% 30-29
- 12% 40-49
- 11% 50-59
- 17% 60 and over

**Ethnicity**
- 66% Black/African American
- 8% White/Caucasian
- 5% Hispanic/Latino
- 1% Native American
- 1% Asian
- 1% Other

**Gender**
- 62% Male
- 38% Female

**Income**
- 46% No Income
- 23% Less than $10K
- 8% $10K to $20K
- 4% $20K to $30K
- 7% $30K to $50K
- 12% $50K or Greater
Appendix F: Transit Survey and Summary
The Transit Survey was conducted on both June 20, 2013 and June 25, 2013 at the Wichita Transit Center located at 214 S. Topeka St. in Wichita, Kansas. Previous studies done by Wichita Transit have indicated that an overwhelming majority of residents in the greater Wichita area do not use the Wichita Transit system. Therefore, this study was conducted to ask those residents who actually rely on the transit system, or even just use it semi-regularly, to help identify the service gaps and needs.

The transit survey was administered in person by WAMPO staff. Respondents completed the surveys on location or returned them to the transit center at a later date. A total of 104 surveys were collected.

Shown on pages 86 and 87 is the transit survey distributed to respondents. A summary of the responses begins on page 88.

Results from the survey conducted by Wichita Transit can be found at:
http://www.wichitatransit.org/AboutUs/Pages/TransitTalks.aspx
Transit Survey

The Wichita Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (WAMPO) is in the process of compiling information for the Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Plan (Coordinated Plan). This plan will address each mode of transportation. This survey is designated to understand the needs, gaps in service, and obstacles community members face when choosing to USE PUBLIC OR PRIVATE TRANSIT SERVICES.

The information obtained from this survey will be incorporated into the WAMPO Coordinated Plan.

Completed surveys can be dropped off at the transit center (214 S. Topeka) or in the planning department at Wichita City hall (455 N. Main, 10th Floor) by June 21, 2013. The survey is also available online at www.wampoks.org

Current Use

1. On average, how often do you use transit for the following reason?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>At least once a week</th>
<th>At least once a month</th>
<th>At least once a year</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Go to work</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go to school</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor/Medical appointments</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run errands (post office, dry cleaning, shopping, etc.)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/recreation</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. What factors prevent you from using transit more often?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Major Reason</th>
<th>Minor Reason</th>
<th>Not a Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Driving is more convenient</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can’t get where I need to go</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wait too long at bus stops</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus stops are not convenient to get to</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking the bus takes too long</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know what bus to take</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus doesn’t run when I need it to</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t feel safe riding a bus</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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3. Does the paratransit system meet your needs?
   Yes | No | Don't Use
   ☐   | ☐  | ☐

   If No, please explain: -

Future Use

4. If funding were available, what would you prefer? (mark only two)
   o Bus service later in the evening. If so, how late? __________
   o More frequent bus service during the day
   o New routes to areas not being served now
   o Park and ride facilities
   o Other (specify) __________________

5. In order to help support the transit system, how would you feel about a portion of road funding being used for transit?
   Agree | Somewhat Agree | Neutral | Somewhat Disagree | Disagree
   ☐     | ☐             | ☐      | ☐                | ☐

6. How should the level of spending for public transit change over the next 5 years?
   Much Greater | Somewhat Greater | Stay the Same | Be Reduced
   ☐           | ☐                | ☐         | ☐

The following questions help WAMPO understand the demographics of people filling out the survey. These questions are OPTIONAL.

7. Which age group are you in?
   o 17 and under
   o 18-29
   o 30-39
   o 40-49
   o 50-59
   o 60 and over

8. Which best identifies your race?
   o Black/African American
   o White/Caucasian
   o Hispanic/Latino
   o Native American
   o Asian
   o Other

9. Gender:
   o Male
   o Female

10. Annual household income
    o No income
    o Less than $10,000
    o $10,000-$20,000
    o $20,001-$30,000
    o $30,001-$50,000
    o $50,001 or greater
Transit Survey Summary

Current Use

Purpose of Transit Use
Respondents were asked for what purpose they use transit in Wichita. Between 23% and 24% of respondents indicated that they use transit to run errands (such as grocery shopping, etc.) and commute to/from work. Other major purposes were for medical appointments (22%) and for social/recreational activities (21%).

Frequency of Transit Use
Respondents were also asked not only how frequently they use transit, but also to indicate how frequently they use transit for which purpose. 38% of respondents use transit daily and 22% use it at least once a week.
Daily Use:
Of the 38% of those use transit on a daily basis, 14% of them use it to commute to/from work, and 10% of them use transit to run errands (such as grocery shopping, etc.). Others use it for social/recreational activities (8%) and between 4% and 5% use it for going to school and medical appointments.

![Daily Transit Use](image)

Once a Week Use:
Within the category of using it once a week, 9% of transit riders use it to run errands, and between 5% and 6% use it for medical appointments and social/recreational activities.

![Once a Week Transit Use](image)
Once a Month and Year Use:
The majority of those who transit just once a month, use it for medical appointments (8.42%). After that, 4.59% indicated they use transit once a month for social/recreation activities and 3.32% use it to run errands. Though few respondents indicated using transit just once a year, of those who did, the majority use it for medical appointments (1.53%). When compared to once a week and daily use, it appears that the types of trips that occur on a less frequent basis (like medical appointments) occupy the higher share when respondents indicated a less frequent use of transit.

Transit Never Used:
Those who use transit in Wichita also indicated purposes for which they do not use transit. This could mean that such a purpose is not part of their lifestyle or that the transit system does not meet their need in this area. The majority of respondents do not use transit to go to school (8.67%). This could be reflective of the age of those using the transit system, the majority of which are in the 30-39 and 40-49 age groups. About 5% of respondents do not use the transit system to go to work.
**Transit Barriers**

This study looks at potential barriers to riding transit even for those who admittedly use the system the most. Respondents could either indicate if something was a major or minor barrier or not a barrier at all—a major barrier being something that significantly impacts or prohibits their use of transit, a minor barrier being something that is more of an inconvenience, and not a barrier means it does not have any effect on their use of transit.

![Transit Barriers Diagram]

**Major Barrier:**

The highest number of respondents indicated that the transit system’s hours of operation are a major barrier (7%). Next, respondents indicated the next major barrier is split between the following: they can’t get where they want to go (5%), they wait too long at bus stops (5%), and riding the bus to their destination takes too long (5%). The third major barrier indicated is that driving is more convenient (4%) and the bus stops are not conveniently located (3%).

Respondents who indicated other reasons that were major barriers noted that cost for a family or even the cost to daily use of the bus was prohibitive.
Minor Barrier:
Overall, fewer people indicated any reason as being a minor barrier to transit. Of the responses, the following are the most indicated minor barriers to riding transit: wait too long at the bus stop (4%), the bus takes too long (4%), can’t get to where I need to go (3%), and bus stops are not conveniently located (3%). As said before, a minor barrier is meant as something being more of an inconvenience than something that’s actually prohibitive. It appears that all reasons stated have to do with how much time is spent with the whole process of riding the bus (getting to/from a bus stop, waiting for the bus, and the trip itself) verses non-trip related issues.

Not a Barrier:
Though the transit system in Wichita does not appear to be very convenient for most people, it does, however, appear to be safe. Safety does not seem to be a factor for people to ride the bus (7%). Additionally, the system seems to be fairly user-friendly in that the second highest reason that does not prevent people from using the bus is knowing which bus to take (7%). An interesting figure is that 6% said that the convenience of driving is not a barrier—meaning they ride the bus over driving a car. This could indicate that certain respondents must rely on the bus as their sole-source of transportation. The reasoning behind this notion is that Wichita Transit’s study found that the number one reason individuals in the metro area do not use the transit system is that driving is more convenient.

Paratransit
Those taking the survey were asked if they use paratransit service in the region, and if so, does it meet their needs. It is worth noting that in future studies, this question should be rephrased with paratransit being defined. Many of those who filled out the survey on location did not understand what “paratransit” meant. Of those who answered this question, 46% indicated that paratransit services do meet their needs. Of the almost 15% who said their needs were not met indicated that the service would meet their needs better with expanded hours in the morning and evening. Almost 39% of respondents indicated that they do not use paratransit services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Needs Met by Paratransit</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Future Use
Respondents were asked to give their opinion as to what potential improvements they would prefer in addition to how much funding should be focused on improving the transit system.

Preference for Improvements
Respondents were asked to indicate 2 preferences of improvements they would like to see should funding become available. An overwhelming majority indicated they would like to see expanded hours of service (46%). At about 20%, respondents indicated they would like see high frequency of bus service during the day as well as new routes to areas not currently being served.

In talking with some individuals while they were taking the survey, some of those who indicated expanded hours explained that they worked the second or third shift at their job and the current hours of operation did not run late enough in the evening to get them to/from their place of employment or residence. They also had the opportunity to give a preference as to how late the bus should operate in order to meet their needs. Overall, most respondents indicated the bus should run as late as 9pm to midnight, with some even indicating they would like to see 24hr service. Of that, almost 28% said the bus should run until 12am/midnight. 26% said the bus should run at least until 10pm.
Funding

When asked if a portion of funding used for the road system should be used to help support the transit system, 66% said they agreed, 22% said they had a neutral stance on the subject, 11% somewhat agreed, only 1% somewhat disagree, and zero respondents completely disagreed.
In conjunction to this idea, those taking the survey were asked how much spending on public transit should increase over the next 5 years. 56% said it should increase much greater and 24% responded that it should increase somewhat over the next 5 years. 12% said it should stay the same and 8% said it should actually decrease.

It is very apparent that those who are using the transit system believe that the system would improve if the city made more funding available.

Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age of Riders</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17 and under</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 to 29</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 to 49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 to 59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 &amp; Older</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black/ African American</td>
<td>No income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/ Caucasian</td>
<td>Less than $10K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/ Latino</td>
<td>$10 to $20K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>$20K to $30K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>$30K to $50K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$50 or Greater</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Wichita Transit Study Comparison

In November 2011, the City of Wichita published their Public Transportation Survey, which was conducted by ETC Institute. This survey polled residents in the City of Wichita and surrounding Sedgwick County. Despite the inherent differences between the two surveys, there are some interesting correlations with some of the datasets. Questions 3, 5, and 12 were the only questions from the Public Transportation Survey that had any relevant correlation to the Transit Survey WAMPO administered.

It was discovered that 88% of the regional population does not use public transportation in favor of driving a personal vehicle. However, respondents were asked that if they were to use public transportation, what would be their primary reason for doing so. The majority (43%) indicated that they would use it to commute to/from work. The next highest responses include a split between running errands and medical appointments (26%). This has a direct correlation to the survey results gathered by WAMPO. The top 3 reasons for using transit are commuting to/from work, running errands, and medical appointments. The correlation between these two studies identifies the primary need for public transportation in Wichita, and provides a foundation on which to build on...
as improvements to the system are made.

In order to further identify system-wide improvements, a study of what prevents people from using transit must also be considered. Both sets of respondents were asked to identify factors that limit their use of transit, and there is a clear correlation between surveys. Respondents of the Public Transportation Survey indicated that the following reasons were limiting factors to using transit: service not available near their home, preference to driving, the bus takes too long, service doesn’t go where they need to, and service is not offered at preferred times. WAMPO’s transit survey revealed corresponding results. Apart from the preference to drive, the results from the WAMPO study show that the hours of operation, riders not being able to get where they need to, and the duration of time spend riding the bus are all prohibitive factors as well.

Overall, the general trend identifying what improvements need to be made was pretty consistent throughout both surveys. These improvements include extending hours of operation both how long the bus operates during the work day, but also adding service on Sundays and holidays. In addition to extending service hours, respondents would like to see a higher frequency of bus service throughout the day especially in the higher traffic areas.

The final comparison between the two surveys is in regards to funding. Both sets of respondents are in favor of Wichita continuing to support the transit system. The majority of both survey respondents indicated that Wichita should continue to fund and even increase funding for the transit system. Where the studies can not be compared is where respondents would prefer the funding should come from. The questions asked were not similar, and therefore no comparison can be made.

Respondents to the Public Transportation Survey were asked a more detailed question regarding potential funding sources being sales tax, property tax, gas tax or motor vehicle registration fees. Of those options, respondents were most in favor of increasing sales tax (48%).
In conclusion, in comparing the two independent surveys conducted two years apart from each other, the similarities cannot be ignored. It appears that the state of the transit service in Wichita is a classic case of knowing exactly what needs to change but lacking the funds to do so.
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Strengths and Weaknesses

Strengths:

Advocacy
- Opportunity for provider input to the process
- Leadership
- Advocacy
- Relationship with WAMPO

Awareness
- WT has improved an understanding of PTC activities in the urban area
- More folks understand about funding opportunities
- Awareness, education, information sharing, technological advances available
- More folks are taking an interest in activities like KPTA and the big Region 7 meeting coming up
- Learning and wanting to learn more about all issues like transit and funding
- Communication among providers

Support
- Good coordination between local agencies (WAMPO, KDOT, FTA)
- Coordination
- Partnerships
- WAMPO area covered by service providers

(Could be considered weaknesses)
- Large number of service providers
- Variety of agencies

Advocacy- determined to meet the needs and improve service throughout the region
Awareness- more agencies/providers are becoming aware of opportunities for funding and collaboration
Support- Federal, State, and local coordination to improve service in the region
Weaknesses

Funding

• Lack of funding—very small pool for the needs out there
• Lack of dedicated local funding for transit
• Available funds
• Lack of funding available or match
• Funding restrictions
• Competition for funds and turf
• Political Environment

Coordination

• Coordination of scheduling
• No coordination for scheduling mandated ADA trips
• Coordination

Service Gaps

• No regional transit service—general public
• Meeting gaps in service
• Wichita Transit

Funding- insufficient funds for a growing number of competing applicants
Coordination- no formal collaboration between providers/agencies to increase regional efficiency
Service Gaps- pockets of population underserved throughout the region