

March 30, 2016

TO: Members of the MAG Elderly and Persons with Disabilities Transportation Ad Hoc Committee

FROM: Ann Marie Riley, City of Chandler, Chair

SUBJECT: MEETING NOTIFICATION AND TRANSMITTAL OF TENTATIVE AGENDA

Meeting - 10:00 a.m.  
Wednesday, March 30, 2016  
MAG Office, Suite 200 - Chaparral Room  
302 North 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue, Phoenix

The Ad Hoc Committee meeting will be held at the MAG offices at the time and place noted above. Members of the Committee may attend either in person, by videoconference or by telephone conference call.

The meeting agenda and resource materials are also available on the MAG website at [www.azmag.gov](http://www.azmag.gov). In addition to the existing website location, the agenda packet will be available via the File Transfer Protocol (FTP) site at: <ftp://ftp.azmag.gov/ElderlyandPersonswithDisabilitiesTransportationCommittee>. This location is publicly accessible and does not require a password.

Please park in the garage underneath the building. Bring your ticket to the meeting, parking will be validated. For those using transit, the Regional Public Transportation Authority will provide transit tickets for your trip. For those using bicycles, please lock your bicycle in the bike rack in the garage.

In 1996, the Regional Council approved a simple majority quorum for all MAG advisory committees. If the MAG Elderly and Persons with Disabilities Transportation Ad Hoc Committee does not meet the quorum requirement, members who have arrived at the meeting will be instructed a legal meeting cannot occur and subsequently be dismissed. Your attendance at the meeting is strongly encouraged.

Pursuant to Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), MAG does not discriminate on the basis of disability in admissions to or participation in its public meetings. Persons with a disability may request a reasonable accommodation, such as a sign language interpreter, by contacting the MAG office. Requests should be made as early as possible to allow time to arrange the accommodation.

If you have any questions, please call the MAG office at (602) 254-6300.

**MAG Elderly and Persons with Disabilities Transportation Ad Hoc Committee**

**TENTATIVE AGENDA**

**March 30, 2016**

**COMMITTEE ACTION REQUESTED**

1. Call to Order

2. Call to the Audience

An opportunity will be provided to members of the public to address the Elderly and Persons with Disabilities Transportation (EPDT) Ad Hoc Committee on items not scheduled on the agenda that fall under the jurisdiction of MAG, or on items on the agenda for discussion but not for action. Citizens will be requested not to exceed a three minute time period for their comments. A total of 15 minutes will be provided for the Call to the Audience agenda item, unless the EPDT Committee requests an exception to this limit. Please note that those wishing to comment on agenda items posted for action will be provided the opportunity at the time the item is heard.

3. Approval of the MAG EPDT Ad Hoc Committee January 14, 2016 Meeting Minutes

4. Valley Metro Paratransit Update

Ron Brooks, Valley Metro, will offer an update on Valley Metro's paratransit services. Committee members will be offered an update on regional paratransit services including any services changes to the program. Information provided will provide Committee members with an overview of services available to older adults and individuals with disabilities.

4. Arizona Department of Transportation Section 5310 Program Overview

Jaclyn Meli, Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT), will provide an overview of the FTA Section 5310 state-wide application process for the small urban and rural areas. Information provided will include the ADOT Section 5310 application process, federal changes to the program, and application timeline. Due to

2. For information.

3. Approve the MAG EPDT Ad Hoc Committee January 14, 2016 meeting minutes.

4. For information and discussion.

4. For information and discussion.

the 2013 Federal Highway Administration Designated Recipient approved revised boundary the are now MAG member agencies included in the small urban and rural areas.

5. FY 2016 Section 5310 Overview of Application and Program Update

DeDe Gaisthea, MAG, will provide an overview of the FY 2016 Section 5310 application process. This includes information on applications received for the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) FY 2016 Section 5310 program for the Phoenix-Mesa Urbanized Area (UZA). Committee members will be provided an update on funding apportionments available for the Phoenix-Mesa UZA region.

6. FY 2015 Section 5310 Evaluation Process

DeDe Gaisthea, MAG, will lead a discussion on the FY 2016 Section 5310 evaluation process. Committee members will be provided an overview of the evaluation time line, evaluation materials, and the proposed applicant interview process for the Section 5310 program. Evaluation materials will include a matrix of applicant's regional coordination participation efforts and a summary of applicant's funding requests. Committee members will be offered an opportunity to discuss and approve the evaluation process to be utilized. Copies of the FY 2016 Section 5310 Phoenix-Mesa UZA applications will be distributed to Committee members.

7. Request for Future Agenda Items

Topics or issues of interest that the EPDT Program Ad Hoc Committee would like to have considered for discussion at a future meeting will be requested.

8. Comments from the Committee

An opportunity will be provided for EPDT Ad Hoc Committee members to present a brief summary of current events. The Committee is not allowed to propose, discuss, deliberate or

5. For information and discussion.

6. Approval of FY 2016 Section 5310 evaluation process.

7. For information and discussion.

8. For information.

take action at the meeting on any matter in the summary, unless the specific matter is properly noticed for legal action.

Adjourn

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

January 14, 2016

MAG Office Building, Chaparral Room  
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Matt Dudley, City of Glendale,  
Janeen Gaskins, City of Surprise  
Ed Jones, City of Mesa  
Jorge Luna, Valley Metro  
Wendy Miller, City of Phoenix

Kristin Myers, Town of Gilbert  
Christina Plante, City of Goodyear  
Ann Marie Riley, City of Chandler, Chair  
\*Kristen Taylor, City of Avondale  
Jeff Tourdot, Maricopa County  
+Robert Yabes, City of Tempe

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

\*Cydney DeModica, ADOT MVD, Ex-  
Officio Member

OTHERS PRESENT

Ron Brooks, Valley Metro  
Eddie Caine, CAG  
Denise Jones, TCH  
Kristine Kokasko, Civitan Foundation  
Jayne Hubbard, Foothills Caring corps.  
Joan Freeman, City of Scottsdale  
Billy Parker, Chandler Gilbert ARC

Tim Smetana, STARS  
Rick Vaughan, MARC Community  
Resources  
DeDe Gaisthea, MAG  
Brandee Mead, MAG  
Teri Kennedy, MAG

1. Welcome and Introductions

Chair Ann Marie Riley, City of Chandler, called the meeting to order at 10:03 a.m. Introductions ensued.

2. Call to the Audience

Audience members were given an opportunity to address the Committee on items that were not on the agenda that are within the jurisdiction of MAG, or non-action agenda items that are on the agenda for discussion or information only. There were no comments made.

3. Approval of the Elderly and Persons with Disabilities Transportation (EPDT) Ad Hoc Committee April 21-22, 2015 Meeting Minutes

Chair Riley requested a motion to approve the April 21-22, 2015 meeting minutes. Christina Plante, City of Goodyear, made a motion to approve the April 21-22, 2015 meeting minutes. Janeen Gaskin, City of El Mirage, seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

#### 4. Sub-regional Mobility Managers Presentation

Chair Riley noted this next agenda item was include due to the discussion from our previous meeting regarding mobility managers. To offer a little background to our new representatives and a review to the Committee. It is a federal requirement for recipients of federal grant awards to develop a Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan. Plan are to include prioritized strategies, activities and/or projects to address current gaps. The utilization of sub-regional mobility managers and the projects they are undertaking are prioritized strategies outlined in the MAG Human Services Transportation Coordination Plan. At this time I would like to introduce the sub-regional mobility managers to provide an update on projects they are currently undertaking.

Richard Vaughan, Marc Community Resources, sub-regional mobility manager in the East Valley provided an overview of an agency to agency website. He noted the purpose of the website is to serve as a central communication center for agencies to share relevant available resources. Mr. Vaughan stated the website will provide information on ways to successfully coordinate transportation services, sharing information regarding vehicle acquisition and disposal, also including a community events calendar. Another feature is the preferred quality vendors that would offer assistance to find vendors for agencies. He noted this feature is more for the end user than the consumer. The advantage is to provide more services and less challenges for agencies. The MAG Human Services Provider Inventory is also featured on the website. Mr. Vaughan stated there was a request for an assistance component to be used when an agency has a need for services. The agency in need would fill out a request for services and someone from the Marc Community Resources would send out an email blast with the agency's request.

Christina Ms. Plante, City of Goodyear, noted there has been movement on the Marc Community Resources website project. She added using resources that are already available is a great utilization of time. She inquired if they would be able to track who received assistance from this services. Mr. Vaughan noted staff would send out the request and then track who gets serviced. Ms. Plante noted this was a good tool for agencies to use. The Committee inquired on where an agency would log in. Mr. Vaughan noted agencies would log-in onsite to add event. He noted the logistics where still under construction. Mr. Vaughan noted they anticipate to be able to track resources. Kristin Meyers, Town of Gilbert, requested clarification on the term of "preferred". Mr. Vaughan stated it would be based on agencies referrals and their experience with the vendor. The Committee inquired on the service area and capacity of Marc Community Resources. Mr. Vaughan stated 80-90 percent of services are in Maricopa County with two sites in Pinal County. Mr. Dudley inquired on the next step for the website. Mr. Vaughan replied they are working on providing additional guidance and making the website available for agencies. Jorge Luna Valley Metro, inquired on how you will reach out to other agencies. Mr. Vaughan replied they will work with MAG and the Transportation Ambassador Program.

Billy Parker, Chandler Gilbert Arc, sub-regional mobility manager in the East Valley provided an overview his project. Mr. Parker noted as the Executive Director at Chandler Gilbert Arc he had been developing a working relationship in sharing vehicles with the City of Chandler and Valley Center of the Deaf. He noted working with Jayne Hubbard from

Foothills Caring Corps. Mr. Parker stated Ms. Hubbard also has vehicle sharing experience with her agency but on a different level as a volunteer driver's agency. He noted they have developed a vehicle sharing workshop for other nonprofit agencies sharing experiences and challengers. Ms. Parker noted they share documents that they use such as policies and agreements when sharing vehicles with another agencies. He stated the purpose is to let other agencies know that sharing vehicles could be a possibility with the proper documentation. Mr. Parker acknowledge the barriers in sharing vehicles such as liability and insurance. He noted the goals moving forward is to have more partner. He has also reached out to other organizations such as Experience Matters and Section 8 agencies. Robert Yabes, City of Tempe, inquired on the sharing hours. Mr. Parker noted the hours varies depending on the need and the availability, generally on weekends.

Jayne Hubbard, Foothills Caring Corps, sub-regional mobility manager in the North East Valley, noted for her agency insurance is covered by being volunteer drivers. She noted providing services for other outside communities and working with MAG. Ms. Hubbard noted a concern working with County Island's that lack transportation resources. Ms. Gaskins inquired if they track who is eligible for van sharing. Ms. Hubbard replied the federal priority for the utilization of the vans are for the aging and disabled population. Jeff Tourdot, Maricopa County, expressed appreciation of the work they are doing with the County Island's. He noted he would like to continue the discussion with Foothill Caring Corps. Mr. Dudley inquired on the type of software they are using. Ms. Hubbard noted they have developed their own program. Mr. Vaughan noted they also developed their own program and GPS insight. Mr. Parker said they are using Excel and staff. Mr. Yabes inquired on the cost of sharing. Mr. Parker noted there is minimal cost that cover gas and drivers use their insurance. Mr. Yabes inquired on Foothills Caring Corps eligibility. Ms. Hubbard noted they use the City of Scottsdale eligibility criteria. No other comments were made. Chair Riley thanked the sub-regional mobility managers for their presentation.

5. Overview and Legislative Update of the Section 5310 Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Transportation Program

Chair Riley invited DeDe Gaisthea, MAG, to provide an overview of the Section 5310 Transportation Program. An update on the Fixing America's Surface Transformation Act (FAST Act) and any changes to the Section 5310 program. Ms. Gaisthea noted the number of new Committee representatives and offered an overview of the Federal Transit Administration Section 5310 grant program. She stated the FTA Section 5310 Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities grant program makes funding available for capital and operating expenses to support the provision of transportation services to meet the specific needs of seniors aged 65 and over and individuals with disabilities when public transportation is insufficient, unavailable, or inappropriate.

Ms. Gaisthea stated the most recent legislative act the Section 5310 program falls under was the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century, MAP-21. Ms. Gaisthea stated federal guidelines under MAP-21 allowed for large Urbanized Areas (UZAs), with populations over 200,000, to directly administer Section 5310 funds. She noted the City of Phoenix took over in 2013 as the Designated Recipient (DR) of funding for the Phoenix-Mesa UZA. In 2015, the programming responsibility moved to MAG in coordination with the City of Phoenix

Public Transit Department as the DR. For the Non-Urbanized areas with populations under 50,000 and the Small Urbanized areas with populations between 50,000-200,000, ADOT is still the Designated Recipient of funding and the programming authority.

Ms. Gaisthea commented FTA apportionments requires not less than 55 percent of the funds available must be used for projects planned, designed, and carried out to meet the special needs of seniors and individuals with disabilities, typically carried out by nonprofit agencies for “traditional” capital projects. Traditional capital projects includes mobility management, vehicles, and equipment. UZA’s may use most or all of their Section 5310 funds for these types of projects. She noted in addition, up to 45 percent may be used for public transportation projects that exceed the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) minimum requirements; improve access to fixed route service and decrease reliance by individuals with disabilities on complementary paratransit; or provide alternatives to public transportation that assist seniors and individuals with disabilities. The ten percent administration is allocated from this portion.

Ms. Gaisthea stated on December 4, 2015 President Obama signed into law the Fixing America’s Surface Transportation Act (FAST Act). The FAST Act is a five year bill authorizing legislation to improve the Nation’s surface transportation infrastructure. The FAST Act authorizes transportation initiatives through fiscal year 2020. Year six is an unfunded year which extends the FAST Act through 2021. Ms. Gaisthea noted this legislation is the first long-term national transportation spending package in a decade and takes full effect after congress funds the legislation through its appropriations process. The FAST Act program purpose remains similar to MAP-21. To improve mobility for seniors and individuals with disabilities by supporting transportation services planned, designed, and carried out to meet the special transportation needs of seniors and individuals with disabilities in all areas. Eligible projects continue to include both traditional capital investment and nontraditional investment beyond the ADA complementary paratransit services. Ms. Gaisthea noted formula funds are apportioned to direct recipients such as States for rural and small urban areas and designated recipients chosen by the Governor of the State for large urban areas. The FAST Act still includes the flexibility of how subrecipient projects are selected for funding.

Ms. Gaisthea stated changes under the FAST Act include that State or local governmental entity that operates a public transportation service and that is eligible to receive direct grants under 5311 or 5307 are now an eligible direct recipient for Section 5310 funds. FTA will publish a collection of best practices to public transportation stakeholders on innovation, program models, new services delivery options, performance measure findings, and transit cooperative research program reports. Section 3006(b) is a new discretionary pilot program that is open to 5310 recipients and subrecipients. The intention is to assist in financing innovative projects for the transportation disadvantaged that improve the coordination of transportation services and non-emergency medical transportation services. Section 3006(c) requires the interagency transportation Coordinating Council on Access and Mobility to create an updated strategic plan on transportation coordination across federal agencies, and develop a cost-sharing policy.

Ms. Gaisthea noted the federal share and local match remain similar. Depending on the type of project, 80 percent for capital projects, 50 percent for operating assistance, and an 85 percent share for ADA capital projects. The formula for apportionment is based on census data. The formula funds are apportioned to each state based on the number of older adults and individuals with disabilities and allocated by area. She stated large UZAs receive 60 percent of apportionments, the small UZA's would receive 20 percent, and rural areas would receive 20 percent. Ms. Gaisthea noted states can transfer small urban or rural allocations to large UZA's but not the other way around.

The Committee inquired on an anticipated timeline for the release of the new requirements under the FAST Act. Ms. Gaisthea noted at this time FTA has not developed guidelines for the FAST Act. Requirements and guidance is still continuing under the MAP-21 circular. The Committee inquired if there was an increase in funding. Ms. Gaisthea replied there was a slight increase in funding to over \$2.9 million available for the 2016 process. She added the \$2.9 million is the authorized amount for Phoenix-Mesa UZA, which is 60 percent of the apportioned amount for the state. Congress still has to appropriate the funds to the states in order to draw down funding. She noted this is similar to previous processes under both ADOT and the City of Phoenix as DR. Ms. Gaisthea noted MAG will continue to monitor the grant program and coordinate with the City of Phoenix Public Transit Department regarding any additional or new requirements. Ms. Gaisthea concluded her update. There was no further discussion

#### 6. Review of the FY 2016 Application Process

DeDe Gaisthea provide an update on the FY 2016 Section 5310 application process and review the time line for the evaluation process. Ms. Gaisthea noted information will be presented by offering an overview of the Committee's previous application comments and the subsequent outcomes, results of the best practices research, and reviewing the application times. She began by providing an update on suggestions offered by the Committee for the application process. She noted the Committee will have an opportunity to review the methodology and prioritization when develop the priority listing. Ms. Gaisthea provided a brief summary of the Committee's discussion items along with outcomes:

- Setting parameters for unspent funds was addressed by including a question on the application of, how much and what type, of unspent funding for an agency. A matrix of unspent funding will be provided as part of the evaluation process.
- The appropriateness of project requests that serve the general population when the intent of program is for older adults and persons with disabilities. MAG staff included the language of the intent of the program in the Handbook and Program Guidelines, the evaluation tool, and application. The Handbook appendices also includes definitions and a link to the ADA legislative website.
- The Committee's consensus for New Freedom eligible project parameters for funding requests at a threshold of \$125,000 were included in the Handbook and Program Guidelines and the application for the applicant's reference.
- Setting parameters for the year of funding requests was addressed by indicating in the beginning of the application and included in the Handbook, all project request are for the current year of funding.

- Program goals to be based on performance and eligibility was addressed by strengthening the evaluation tools. The selection criteria form included more definition and breakdown categories of evaluation. A Coordination Matrix was also developed to offer guidance on the types of goals each applicant will address in the project request.

#### Mobility Management Positions

- Mobility management position requests to fulfill the needs and responsibility of the program on a regional basis. The contract language for sub-regional mobility management positions of the goals and purpose has been integrated in the Program Handbook and Guidelines. A summary of the program goals was also included in the evaluation criteria.
- Ensuring projects of past recipients moving forward. A matrix of past project requests will be developed from previous application requests and a summary will be made available to the Committee for evaluation purposes.

Ms. Gaisthea noted the Committee recommended developing a mapping tool for applicants to utilize when indicating their service area. Jason Howard from the MAG Information Services Division developed a mapping tool that simplifies the process of creating maps for the use of nonprofit agencies. Ms. Gaisthea noted MAG staff will offer potential applicants support in the utilization of the mapping tool during the application process. Mr. Howard will also provide training on the mapping tool at the application workshop. Ms. Gaisthea noted discussion included possibly dividing up the applications among Committee members due to the number of submissions. The Committee requested clarification on the 55 percent minimum requirement. Ms. Gaisthea advised that 55 percent of the apportioned funds are for traditional capital and mobility management requests. The remaining funds are for New Freedom type projects and administrative costs. The Committee noted, knowing 55 percent of funding is required for capital projects and the regional emphasis is on replacement vehicles as outlined in the Coordination Plan may make the evaluation smoother. The Committee also noted the revised evaluation materials would offer additional support during the evaluation process. The Committee's consensus was to evaluate all applications.

Ms. Gaisthea reviewed additional comments from the Committee. She noted while the Committee did not request a match letter for this round of applications there was interest in continuing the discussion. The Committee expressed interest in furthering the discussion regarding the fiscal responsibilities of agencies for spending funds in a timely and appropriate manner. Ms. Gaisthea provided an overview of other discussion items. The Committee expressed concern on the perception of individual members advocating for certain projects including providing additional outside information not presented from the requesting agency. Additional comments included individual members having internal insight on project's unspent funding. The Committee emphasized the evaluation should be based on information provided from the requesting agency to ensure a fair and equitable process for all applicants.

Ms. Gaisthea provided information on national best practices as requested from the Committee. She noted reviewing Section 5310 applications from like regions in California, Georgia, North Carolina, and Georgia. Ms. Gaisthea stated, the applications reviewed were similar to the MAG region. The majority of the application had narrative questions and language was similar from being derived from the federal circular. Ms. Gaisthea advised

revisions would be made to the 2016 application to ensure wording that is more concise from the review of the other regional applications are included. Ms. Plante expressed appreciation that efforts have been put forth to ensure the regional application has been update during each process and decisions made with the best knowledge available. Mr. Dudley noted the MAG region has been recognized as a best practice with the process continuing to evolve.

Ms. Gaisthea provided an overview of the 2016 Section 5310 timeline. She advised the approval of the application process and tentative timeline is for action. Ms. Gaisthea noted the application deadline for the Section 5310 Phoenix-Mesa UZA is tentatively scheduled for Friday, March 19, 2016. She noted this may be revised to Monday, March 21 2016 to include any federal requirements that may be released due to the FAST Act or additional suggestions from the Committee. The Committee will next meet on Wednesday, March 30, 2016 to receive the 2016 applications. She noted all applications, revised evaluation materials, and coordination matrix will be provide on a flash drive at that time. Ms. Gaisthea advised applicant interviews have been scheduled for May 3-4, 2016. Applicants are allowed ten minutes for their presentation and to respond to a specific question being asked of all applicants. Ms. Gaisthea noted the Committee will have the opportunity to review the methodology and prioritization when develop the priority listing

Ms. Gaisthea provided an overview of the 2016 Section 5310 evaluation process for developing the priority listing of projects. The evaluation process includes; an internal review of applications to ensure projects meet federal eligibility requirements, Committee review of project requests meeting evaluation criteria's, an in-person interview of all applicants, and then the regional prioritization of projects. The Committee commented on the benefit of the in-person applicant interviews to the overall evaluation process. Ms. Gaisthea noted in addition, the priority listing will be presented to the MAG Transit Committee and MAG Human Services Technical Committee for information. Ms. Gaisthea noted upon final approval from the MAG Regional Council, the priority listing of projects will be forwarded to the City of Phoenix Public Transit Department as the Designated Recipient to be submitted to the FTA.

Ms. Gaisthea noted the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) Section 5310 application deadline for small urban and rural areas is tentatively planned for early March. ADOT is not requiring regions to evaluate Section 5310 application. She noted regions are requested to forward a prioritization of projects based on coordination plan goals and strategies to ADOT. MAG staff will continue efforts to coordinate with ADOT's and the City of Phoenix Public Transit Department on the application process. Ms. Plante thanked MAG staff on their attentiveness to address concerns from the Committee and integrating changes into the next process.

Chair Riley requested a motion to move forward with the FY 2016 Sections 5310 application evaluation process to included further federal requirements inclusions if needed, and the tentative timeline. Ms. Plante made a motion to approve the FY 2016 Section 5310 Phoenix-Mesa Urbanized Area application process and tentative timeline. Mr. Dudley seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

## 7. Request for Future Agenda Items

Mr. Dudley suggested reaching out to ADOT to share best practices regarding their Section 5310 application process. The Committee also requested an update from Valley Metro to provide an overview of public paratransit transit in the region.

8. Comments from the Committee

Ms. Miller noted the City of Phoenix was in the process of the 2015 Section 5310 contracts and working on the placement of vehicles. Ms. Gaisthea extended her appreciation to Ms. Miller and the City of Phoenix for ensuring the vehicles procured through this process were meeting the needs of our regional sub-recipients.

9. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 12:14p.m.