

MINUTES OF THE
MAG ELDERLY PERSONS AND PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES
5310 TRANSPORTATION AD HOC COMMITTEE

January 30, 2014

MAG Office Building, Chaparral Room
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Alicia Becker for Valley Metro
*Michael Celaya, City of Surprise
Matt Dudley, City of Glendale, Chair
Julie Howard, City of Mesa

#Christine McMurdy, City of Goodyear
Wendy Miller, City of Phoenix
Ann Marie Riley, City of Chandler
*Kristen Sexton, City of Avondale

*Neither present nor represented by proxy.
#Attended by telephone conference call.
+ Attended by videoconference

OTHERS PRESENT

Ron Brooks, Valley Metro
Wayne Davis, Terros

DeDe Gaisthea, MAG
Amy St. Peter, MAG

1. Welcome and Introductions

Matt Dudley, City of Glendale, Chair, called the meeting to order at 10:03 a.m. Introductions ensued.

2. Call to the Audience

No comments were made at this time.

3. Approval of the FTA Ad Hoc EPDT Committee August 22, 2013 Meeting Minutes

Chair Dudley asked for a motion to approve the August 22, 2013, meeting minutes. Wendy Miller, City of Phoenix, made a motion to approve the minutes. Ann Marie Riley, City of Chandler, seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

4. FY 2014 Section 5310 Application Workgroup Update

Chair Dudley invited DeDe Gaisthea, MAG to offer an update of the FY 2014 Section 5310 application workgroup. Ms. Gaisthea advised that at the August 22, 2013, Elderly Persons and Persons with Disabilities Committee, it was suggested that a workgroup be developed to provide comment and feedback for development of the FY 2014 Section 5310 application to offer feedback to the City of Phoenix Public Transit department. A workgroup was formed consisting of Chair Dudley; Vice Chair Deron Lozano, Valley Metro; Christine Sexton, City of Avondale; Wendy Miller, City of Phoenix; and Ms. Gaisthea. The workgroup reviewed the previous year application and offered feedback. After the initial review and input, the

draft application was forwarded to the Committee for further feedback. Ms. Gaisthea advised no further input has been received.

Ms. Gaisthea advised that a request was made by the City of Phoenix for additional feedback on specific sections of the application. Input received pertained to Section 7, Operating Assistance. The workgroup also recommended that MAG review Section 8, Coordination. During the prior year application process there had not been a limit to the number of vehicles an agency could request. The Committee had recommended limiting the number of vehicles to award to three which fulfilled most vehicle requests and encourages agencies to coordinate. Ms. Gaisthea advised this suggestion was incorporated into the current application with members of the workgroup suggesting to limit vehicle requests to five. Additionally, the Committee had recommended funding Mobility Management for a two-year process. All comments were integrated and provided to Committee members for further review and input. Having received no further input, the application is being brought before the Committee for review and additional feedback.

Ms. Gaisthea referred the Committee to the on-screen application noting further input is requested on the highlighted sections. She acknowledged the City of Phoenix Public Transit Department for offering the opportunity to provide feedback and collaborating with MAG and the EPDT Committee on the application process.

The Committee proceeded to review the application. Ms. Miller discussed the recommendation to limit the number of vehicles noting the Committee can further discuss whether to maintain or remove this limitation. With regard to the Mobility Managers two-year funding, Ms. Miller noted discussion with Stephanie Childs, Budget Analyst and Ken Kessler, Deputy Director, indicated some administrative concerns with providing two years of funding. Funding for the full two years would have to be drawn from a single year of funding. Ms. Miller noted doing so is possible; however it would create difficulty in tracking funds and could limit available funding for vehicles. Ms. Miller also noted concerns regarding future apportionments and meeting the 55 percent on an annual basis. She noted there are no current guidelines for implementing a two year process at this time. She recommended waiting to implement the two-year award until after further guidance when FTA reauthorizes this program later this year. She suggested maintaining mobility management to one year funding but noting mobility managers will remain a priority.

Chair Dudley agreed with the need to have a process in place and the importance of funding mobility management. Further clarification was requested pertaining to the apportionment. Ms. Miller advised the apportionment is annual and the amount is undetermined at this time. Julie Howard, City of Mesa, inquired if agencies that are awarded for a mobility management position are able to fill the position and then seek reimbursement once funds become available. Ms. Miller noted the funding process has varied based upon the federal government. FTA applications from last year are currently being finalized, however the agreements have not been signed and FTA has not awarded the funding. ADOT agreements expired on September 30, 2013; grantees have not been able to get reimbursed since September 1, 2013. Ms. Miller noted this would be a benefit to offering guaranteed funding for two years; however, these are reimbursement grants with funding availability based on

the release of federal funding. It was noted that additional time is added to the process by having to proceed through the MAG TIP approval process.

Ms. Howard noted the time line for the funding distribution is important as to whether or not a two year process is implemented. Ms. Miller discussed the tentative timeline noting funding would be available in early 2015. Ann Marie Riley, City of Chandler, expressed the importance of informing agencies that will be applying for mobility management funds of the waiting period pertaining to the availability of funds. Ms. Miller noted in the past year there was a lot of communication with the agencies during the transition from ADOT to the City of Phoenix regarding the timeline. Ms. McMurdy noted MAP-21 could run on continuing resolution. She recommended, conversation be had with agencies that are being awarded, regarding the timeframe of when a decision would need to be made on a continuing resolution vs the program ending.

Ms. Miller noted there is pre-award authority which indicates once an agency has been selected to receive the funds, they may start expending. However, they will not be reimbursed until FTA has awarded funding and the agreement has been signed. She noted agencies can be notified of the award and anticipated funding, but also informed that the agreement cannot be finalized and exact dollar amounts are unknown until the continuing resolution is signed, or a new bill is enacted. Discussion ensued regarding agencies potentially not wanting the funding due to potential risk of federal funding. Ms. Miller advised final apportionments for this year has not been approved at this time. The notice of selection will not be issued until apportionments are approved.

Chair Dudley noted a few things to consider when moving forward with the application workshops are the pending apportionment, when can applicants may begin drawing down funds from the current apportionment, and the possibility of mobility management program funding for two-years. Ms. Miller noted her interest in having input from agencies that would be considering a mobility management program. Ms. Miller invited Wayne Davis from Terros who is the sub-regional mobility manager for central Phoenix to provide input. He addressed the Committee advising that Terros is a very large agency that can absorb the expenses related to mobility management however, he noted Jayne Hubbard, who is also a sub-regional mobility manager, works for a smaller agency that cannot absorb the cost and depends on the funding. He added that mobility managers come from a wide array of places and there is no specific answer. Chair Dudley inquired about the agencies perspective in terms of a one year award versus a two year award. Mr. Davis noted the convenience of going through the application process every two years as opposed to every year. However, he noted funds for the current year have not been awarded and the process for the next year is now underway. Mr. Davis noted there are no issues with renewing every year until the process becomes more stable.

Ms. Miller noted a two year program is more convenient; however, apportionments are on an annual basis as is awarding of vehicles. Ms. McMurdy express agreement but noted in light of the transportation funding situation, this may not be the best time to implement a two year structure. Chair Dudley suggested maintaining a one-year funding process for mobility management pending further information on the status of MAP-21. He noted should there be

a continuing resolution; a two-year process can then be reconsidered. Ms. Miller suggested the Committee review the process annually and ensuring current guidelines are in place. Chair Dudley noted the importance of sharing information with the agencies during the application workshops. Ms. Howard expressed agreement with reviewing the process annually. Chair Dudley discussed the 55 percent threshold and suggested different options that may be offered to nonprofits such as the possibility of receiving additional funding if the vehicle threshold is not met. Ms. Miller advised there would be several issues to consider such as a competitive process. More time would be needed to research such a possibility.

Ms. Gaisthea noted through the application process in the past with ADOT, mobility managers have been informed that funding is contingent upon continued FTA funding. Ms. Gaisthea summarized the Committees recommendation to move forward with one-year funding for mobility management; restating the funding status to applicants during the application process and training; the Committee's request to evaluate the process and two year funding option for mobility management every year on a continuous basis. Ms. Gaisthea proceeded with reviewing revisions to the application.

Section One

- Updated contact information
- Included MAG summary sheet
- Includes sections that will be in the application
- The workgroup considered including agency official, financial contact and programming coordinator.

Ms. Miller advised the MAG summary sheet will be added to the application.

Section Three

- Added information that would be beneficial for Committee members such as number of years the agency has been providing services, the grants matrix.
- Question number nine was simplified.
- Question one also relates to the availability of the funding source and has been simplified to determine the sustainability of the agency continuing the project and/or support the capital being requested.
- Question 12 is for the City of Phoenix's auditing process.
- Question 13 now includes a chart for unexpended funding. Ms. Miller noted agencies will only need to list the grants they received through this process only if they have not spent down their funds.

Ms. Miller noted the application is now set up to follow the evaluation criteria and the revised questions will also follow the evaluation criteria. Chair Dudley clarified applicants can indicate partial FTEs. Ms. Miller inquired whether clarification is needed on question 10 to indicate it is in reference to capital projects only. Discussion ensued on the question applicable to capital and new freedom eligible projects. Ms. Miller noted the funding sources are described as Traditional 5310 and New Freedom 5310 to ensure a distinction between the two sources.

Ms. Miller noted several questions were removed regarding civil rights question and DBE policy. Agencies are required to follow all guidelines, however it was noted that past applications inquired about these policies but that FTA does not require the policy be submitted. A question was raised on whether there is a check and balance to ensure truthfulness in the application. Ms. Miller advised agencies will be audited through the City of Phoenix compliance program to ensure requirements are in place. Ms. McMurdy requested clarification that if an agency checks “no” on the application with regard to policy requirements, the Committee will not need to conduct further follow-up. Ms. Miller confirmed noting some of the policies may not be required for the type of service that is provided.

Section Four

Ms. Gaisthea advised the section remains largely the same other than references to JARC were removed. Ms. Miller noted requirement from FTA to enter start and end date. She noted this section is applicable to mobility management. Ms. Riley requested clarification regarding the New Freedom 5310 replacing the previous New Freedom program. She noted in the past Valley Metro would submit applications on the agencies behalf and inquired if that process has changed. Ms. Miller advised Valley Metro would still be able to file on behalf of the agencies.

Ms. Gaisthea proceeded with highlighting areas in the application in which the workgroup and the City of Phoenix Public Transit Department requested additional feedback. The feedback requested is in asking agencies to describe how their program was cost efficient or good use of federal funding based on number of client served. The Committee agreed that the inclusion of this question would be beneficial in the evaluation of the applicants. Committee members noted the gaps in the number of vehicles per number of clients served is one of the issue. Ms. Miller noted the question is to not look at the cost benefit analysis because all of the applicants are filling a critical need for the underserved. She noted the question is focused on the agencies perspective on why it is a good use of funding based on the number of clients.

Section six

Ms. Miller noted the cost estimate for the vehicles are in line with what ADOT does for their process. Ms. Miller noted next year will continue using some of state contracts as long as they are still available.

- Question #36 – life expectancy of equipment requested. Ms. Miller noted input requested is for the industry standard life expectancy on the equipment requested. Discussion ensued on language to add regarding life expectancy versus industry standard. This offers opportunity for agencies to provide information on equipment requesting.

Section Seven

Chair Dudley noted input is requested from the Committee on the operating assistance questions as it relates to traditional 5310 funds. The committee suggested adding: *Please specifically describe how this project goes above the minimum ADA requirements.* Ms. Riley expressed her concern regarding sustainability of services that are above and beyond ADA –

discussion on funding availability. The committee suggested adding: *Please describe your agency's ability to continue to fund the project after federal funding has ended (reference to Q10 pg.)*. Ms. Gaisthea noted a matrix was added for agencies to describe how their project fits into a coordination plan.

Section Eight

- Information was added on the required supporting documents

Ms. Gaisthea concluded the revisions made by the workgroup. Ms. Miller summarized the application will reference one-year of funding for all projects. A question was raised on whether the question regarding coordination activities was necessary. Ms. Gaisthea advised the information will offer direction on what type of training may be required for awardees and can provide data for the coordination plans. Committee members expressed concern that agencies check all “will consider” section and continue to be awarded but do not put forth any effort towards coordination. Ms. Gaisthea offered to remove the question and include it in the service provider survey rather than on the application form. Ms. Riley suggested keeping the question in the application. Discussion ensued on the various types of coordination efforts that are available.

Ms. McMurdy expressed agreement with not removing the question from the application. She suggested removing the “will consider” column and a yes or no column. She also suggested adding a field for agencies to explain any barriers to any coordination activities. Doing so will provide feedback allowing for greater opportunity to address the issues agencies are having that prevent coordination efforts. Chair Dudley agreed to keeping the question in the application but to ask agencies to explain their response which would provide greater detail. Ms. Miller noted a text box could be added to provide agencies an opportunity to explain their response. Ms. Gaisthea thanked the members who participated in the application review workgroup. Chair Dudley thanked Ms. Miller and the City of Phoenix for the opportunity to provide feedback for the FY 2014 application. Chair Dudley moved forward to the next agenda item.

5. Review of the FY 2014 Application Process

DeDe Gaisthea noted two basic changes and asked the Committee to provide feedback on the evaluation criteria in the handbook. Ms. Miller noted the application was matched to the criteria the Committee had decided was important. She requested feedback on the weighting of the scoring as this section was changed. She added one of the greatest Committee requests was to add points to the agencies presentation score.

Ms. Gaisthea advised the application process is tentative based on the current information available. The tentative date is February 14, 2014. Ms. Gaisthea requested having everyone's input in a timely manner to ensure changes are integrated into the application before distribution. Ms. Gaisthea reviewed the workshop timeline and process. Applications will be due on March 14th. The City of Phoenix and MAG will review the applications for eligibility requirements. Ms. Gaisthea noted this process was very beneficial to the agencies. A week has been set aside for this process allowing the Committee to focus on the evaluation process rather than an agency's eligibility. Adding this week shortens the timeline for the

preliminary scoring and follow-up questions. Ms. Gaisthea noted concerns last year with not allowing applicants enough time to review and respond to the Committee's questions. Ms. Gaisthea suggested the committee develop the questions and allow applicants to respond during the interview process.

Ms. Howard suggested having applicants respond to the questions during the interview process defeats the purpose of the presentation. Ms. Gaisthea advised the process is similar to other MAG application processes and the timeline falls in line with the MAG committee approval process. Ms. Miller advised a request was made by the Committee in the previous year to allow applicants more time to respond to the questions. However, she indicated it is helpful to have the answers prior to the presentations. Further discussion ensued on the timeline and schedule of events. The group agreed to providing applicant questions to Ms. Gaisthea on Monday, April, 14, 2014. Ms. Gaisthea will forward the applicants response to the Committee on Thursday, April 17, 2014.

Ms. McMurdy inquired if there is a need to interview all applicants. Chair Dudley expressed his preference to receive answers to the Committee's questions before the presentations. He requested the Committee to provide the applicant questions to Ms. Gaisthea in a timely manner. Ms. Gaisthea advised the timeline is similar to last year's process. Revisions will be made per the Committees discussion and redistributed. The consensus of the Committee was to tentative schedule for a two-day presentation process. Ms. Gaisthea advised another meeting will be held prior to the presentations to distribute applications to the Committee. It was noted time will need to be factored in for presentation to the Human Services Technical Committee. Chair Dudley advised the timeframe will also need to be updated in the application packet.

A motion was requested. Ms. Howard made a motion to approve the FY 2014 Section 5310 committee meeting schedule. Ms. Miller seconded the motion. The motion passed.

6. Update on the MAG Ad Hoc EPDT Vice Chair Position

Chair Dudley advised that Deron Lozano of Valley Metro and vice chair of the Committee has taken another position. Per MAG policy, the chair and vice chair terms will expire June 30, 2015. Due to Mr. Lozano's departure, letters of interest are being solicited for the vice chair position. Mr. Dudley requested that requests be submitted to Ms. Gaisthea by February 7, 2014.

7. Request for Future Agenda Items

Chair Dudley requested input on items to be addressed at future meetings. Ms. Gaisthea noted further discussion of the two-day presentation timeframe will be included in the evaluation process agenda item.

8. Comments from the Committee

There were no comments.

Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 12:05 p.m.