

**WEDNESDAY, JULY 16, 2008**

9:00 AM Morningside Community Center

**Attendees**

Debra Gaikowski, City of Sioux Falls  
Angie Hilton, South Eastern Council of Governments  
Sam Trebilcock, Sioux Falls Planning  
Jackie Mattheis, SDDOT  
Karla Johnson, YWCA  
Sam Wilson, AARP  
Lynette Thorstenson, Adult Aging Services  
Jean Crowe, SD Achieve  
Rick DiSanto, SD Achieve  
Bob Bohm, DakotAbilities  
Kate Heligas, Project Car  
Vicki Rowe, SE Behavioral Healthcare  
Frank Hanson, Project Car  
Jim Shafer, School Bus Inc.  
Steve Hey, School Bus Inc.  
Tamera Jerke, The Banquet  
Angie Balzer, American Cancer Society  
Priscilla Nikolas, Center for Active Generations  
Bill Troe, URS Corporation

**Introduction**

Bill Troe from URS welcomed those in attendance. He reviewed the meeting agenda and the purpose of the meeting.

**Meeting Purpose and Plan Background**

The purposes/goals of this meeting were to:

- Summarize the unmet needs that were identified through the provider/stakeholder surveys and input from the public.
- Review the universe of reasonable strategies that have been developed and screened with city/MPO staff and URS.
- Gather input on the screening process and results.
- Provide information on the next level of screening that will result in a prioritized listing of strategies.

**Presentation and Discussion**

Bill Troe provided an overview of the steps followed and criteria that were used to classify unmet needs into the categories of Core and Peripheral Needs. Core Needs were those that would provide for a basic level of

mobility for persons in the three constituent groups. Peripheral Needs were those that would result in an added level of comfort and convenience from a minimal subsistence level of transportation. Peripheral Needs were not luxuries, but enhancements such as reservation policies, vehicle accessibility, etc.).

Following the presentation of information on the unmet needs and the classification, information was provided on the methods and evaluation criteria employed in screening the universe of alternatives. The goal of the initial screening was to place each strategy into one of two “folders”; a “maintain the concept into the next phase” folder and a “discard/set aside” folder. Measures of effectiveness that were used in screening the alternative strategies were based on whether the strategy would address a core or peripheral need; the order of magnitude cost of implementation; and the level of local support the concept may already have or the significance of barrier that exists in gaining local support.

A similar discussion of the strategies was held with city and MPO staff about a week prior to this meeting. The discussion required about three hours. In the interest of time, selected strategies that would be maintained and selected strategies that would be discarded/set aside were discussed. Limited input from those in attendance was gathered.

Towards the end of the meeting, the discussion began to focus on coordinated efforts that were on-going and how some of them paralleled several of the strategies provided. Of particular interest was the services provided by Project CAR and the coordination they and various churches and the YMCA/YWCA presently accommodate.

The primary product of the meeting was to establish an idea of presenting several more grassroots coordination plans at the next meeting.