

Maricopa Association of Governments
Elderly Persons and Persons with Disabilities 5310 Transportation Program
Ad Hoc Committee Meeting Minutes
March 20, 2009, Cholla Room

MEMBERS ATTENDING

John Fischbach, City of Goodyear, Chair
Gary Bretz, Valley Metro/RPTA
*Ann Marie Riley, City of Chandler
Matt Dudley, City of Glendale
+Julie Howard, City of Mesa
Gregg Kiely, Arizona Department of
Transportation (ADOT)
Ken-Ichi Maruyama, Town of Gilbert
Wendy Miller, City of Phoenix
Kristen Taylor, City of Avondale

OTHERS PRESENT

DeDe Gaisthea, MAG
Amy St. Peter, MAG
Rachel Brito, MAG

*Those members neither present nor
represented by proxy.

+Those members present by audio or
videoconference.

1. Welcome and Introductions

Chair John Fischbach called the meeting to order at 10:02 a.m.

2. Call to the Audience

No comments were made at this time.

3. Approval of the March 18, 2009 Meeting Minutes

Committee members reviewed the meeting minutes. Amendments to the minutes were requested by Gregg Kiely, Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) and Wendy Miller, City of Phoenix. Mr. Kiely requested the minutes reflect the ADOT definition of mobility management is the same as the Federal Transit Administration's definition, not merely similar to it. He also requested that the minutes reflect "one vision for mobility management projects is to have projects throughout the Valley, such as..." The minutes previously reflected Mr. Kiely's comments as referring to "his" vision. Ms Miller corrected the minutes to read that Ms. Ashcroft responded to the committee's question, not Ms. Miller as the minutes indicated. In the same paragraph, Mr. Kiely requested that his comment about the agency not attending the ADOT compliance workshop be changed to reflect that he inquired why the agency did not receive a point for attending the workshop. Ms. Miller motioned to approve the March 18, 2009 meeting minutes as amended. Kristen Taylor, City of Avondale, seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

4. Section 5310 Application Discussion

Chair Fischbach opened the meeting for discussion on the 2009 Section 5310 applications and agency interviews that took place on March 18, 2009. Chair Fischbach noted Committee member Kristen Taylor, City of Avondale, did not score the City of Avondale's application due to conflict of interest. He requested to have his score for the City of Avondale removed because the City of Goodyear benefits from the City of Avondale's programs. Chair Fischbach asked if there were any other scores that should be removed due to conflict of

interest. He asked if Chandler Gilbert ARC (CG ARC) receives funding from the City of Gilbert. Committee representatives from Chandler were not available to respond. Ken-Ichi Maruyama, Town of Gilbert, was unaware of any funding provided to CG ARC from the City of Chandler or the Town of Gilbert.

Julie Howard, City of Mesa, discussed the request submitted by Triple R for two lift vehicles. She said for the purpose of coordination, the explanation given by representatives of Triple R explaining the limited number of lift vehicles being requested is unsatisfactory. Ms. Howard stated her preference to rank lift vehicles higher than non-accessible vehicles during the final priority ranking. Ms. Howard said Triple R was not making themselves available to coordination efforts by only having two to three lift-vehicles available.

Ms. Miller discussed the request submitted by Hacienda Healthcare. She expressed concern about their stance toward coordination efforts during the interview. Ms. Miller noted that applicants do provide services to a specialized clientele. She also added that coordination between agencies is a requirement and that agencies can benefit from coordination at varying levels. Gregg Kiely, ADOT, agreed coordination can take place at different levels and agencies need to reach out to other organizations to look for possible opportunities.

Matt Dudley, City of Glendale, shared his personal experience with Hacienda Healthcare and confirmed the clientele they serve are medically fragile. He suggested with additional training, the agency could increase coordination efforts. Mr. Kiely commented many agencies approach coordination efforts in the same manner. He said there are many other aspects to coordination that agencies could do in terms of sharing information and coordinating transportation. He noted it would be important to have Dr. Robert Miller at the table to lend his expertise in discussion for coordination opportunities.

Ms. Taylor asked for clarification on the ranking process and noted the large number of vehicles requested by Triple R as compared to Foothills Caring Corp. Amy St. Peter, MAG, said the Committee, in the past, has prioritized requests based on the agencies' first requests factoring in the Committees' application scores. The Committee then prioritizes agencies' second requests and third requests in the same manner. Mr. Kiely pointed out the Committee has had instances where they have felt strongly about an application and have the option of giving an agency's second request for a vehicle priority over other agencies' first requests.

Ms. Howard asked for clarification on ranking mobility management. Ms. St. Peter said the Committee typically has developed the list using the scores for prioritizing applications. She noted two requests were received for mobility management this year. Based on the scores, one application was scored high while the other was scored low. The Committee expressed concerns about the low scoring application and whether it is a true mobility management effort or funding for internal staff.

Ms. Howard asked for clarification on whether or not mobility management is indeed reliant on the request for a vehicle and if they are prioritized as separate items or grouped together. Ms. St. Peter said the Committee has latitude on whether to prioritize vehicles and mobility management separately or together based on the proposal. Mr. Kiely said vehicles and

mobility management have typically been prioritized separately. He stated his support for factoring in the Committees scores in determining the applicant prioritization.

Ken-Ichi Maruyama, Town of Gilbert, noted some confusion regarding appropriate use of funds for a mobility management staff person. He added, in his opinion, the application packet lacks sufficient information about the responsibilities for such a position and the Committee has not adequately discussed the issue. Ms. St. Peter said, based on guidance from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), one indication of mobility management is a signed formal agreement by at least two agencies agreeing to work together. She said it behooves any agency to coordinate efforts with other partnering agencies.

Mr. Kiely said the general view is that an agency would work with another agency, or other agencies, with a formal agreement describing their efforts. He said the function of mobility management is to convene committed partners with the broader view of bringing in additional participants in the future. Mr. Kiely noted the function of mobility management is intended to be short-term. Mr. Kiely commented the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) is also placing more attention on mobility management projects.

Mr. Maruyama said, from a grant writer's perspective, the application process is not clear regarding requirements for a formal agreement. He hoped that MAG would clarify the requirement so applicants do not submit inappropriate applications in the future. He said the agencies have good intentions and are doing a great job with mobility management but the application requirements need to be clearer. Mr. Kiely acknowledged Mr. Maruyama's comments and noted applicants have had many opportunities to learn about the requirements for mobility management projects through presentations and trainings. He said the trainings do not guarantee applicants will have a full understanding of mobility management and said the requirements can be made clearer during the next application process.

Mr. Bretz, RPTA, inquired if feedback is provided to the applicants. He asked in regard to the request from Foothills Caring Corp. for mobility management to fund a position that is currently a volunteer position. Ms. St. Peter said there are two opportunities for feedback. One is if the agency calls and requests feedback; the second is if the Committee provides formal feedback and directs MAG staff to inform the agency. Ms. Howard said decisions made now will be at the forefront of decisions made later. She said coordination is an important part of mobility management even if it does not include the sharing of vehicles. Ms. Howard said using mobility management to fund a dispatcher does not serve a regional purpose.

Mr. Kiely reminded the Committee that grant funding is still unknown at this time and ADOT is still operating under a continuing resolution. He discussed options for placing applications in a category "B" list. He said it is up to MAG and the Committee if they choose to use different categories for prioritizing applications.

5. Development of Priority Listing

Chair Fischbach introduced Ms. Gaisthea who provided a brief overview of the process to develop the priority listing. She directed the Committee's attention to the tentative first draft

based on the Committee's scoring of the applications, agency interviews and the applicant first request. Ms. St. Peter discussed three possible options for determining priorities to develop the list. First, the Committee can decide whether to prioritize applications based on the priority of providing lift vehicles as opposed to the agency's vehicle preference. Second, the Committee can decide to prioritize applications based on fulfilling all first requests before fulfilling any multiple requests. The Committee's scoring would determine the order within the first request group, second request group, and so on. The third option is to prioritize applications keeping all equipment requests in the same order as with the van requests. Since the Committee did not receive any equipment requests, Ms. St. Peter noted the third option as moot.

Mr. Bretz said the first option would be difficult to presuppose the agency's need for a specific type of vehicle. He added it would take much more information from each agency before a decision could be made to preempt their requested choice. The consensus from the Committee was to prioritize the awards based on the agency preference as opposed to accessibility.

The Committee continued discussion regarding the mobility management request submitted by Foothills Caring and various options for prioritizing the application. The concern among the Committee members is that the application does not enhance mobility management efforts and the application does not meet FTA guidelines for mobility management projects. The lack of a written agreement with other agency partners and a specific job description for the mobility manager raised concerns. Mr. Kiely reiterated the intention of the program is not to provide salary for a staff position but to enhance coordination efforts with various partners within a service area. Members were in agreement that additional guidance from the Committee and MAG staff might improve the agency's project so it could meet the goals of the program in the future and benefit the community they serve. Ms. St. Peter noted MAG staff is willing to work with applicants and to provide feedback to improve submissions in future years. There was consensus among the Committee members that the Foothills Caring Corp. mobility management project be placed either last on the list or to remove it from the list entirely because the Committee did not believe the project should be funded.

Chair Fischbach requested a motion addressing the concerns of the Committee regarding Foothills Caring Corp. mobility management application. Mr. Bretz made a motion to remove the Foothills Caring mobility management project from further consideration for funding. Ms. Miller seconded the motion. Mr. Dudley and Ms. Taylor opposed the motion. Mr. Maruyama abstained. Ms. Howard was not present for the vote. The motion passed three to two with Chair Fischbach, Mr. Bretz, and Ms. Miller voting in favor.

Ms. Gaisthea gave an overview of the final ranking which recommends 23 vehicles and one mobility management project for funding.

**FTA ELDERLY INDIVIDUALS AND INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES
TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM GRANT 30 (2009)
RECOMMENDED RANKING OF MAG REGION APPLICATIONS**

PRIORITY	APPLICANT & CAPITAL REQUEST(S)	POPULATION SERVICE
Group A		
1	TERROS, INC. < Mobility Manager	Terros serves adults who have serious mental illness and may have substance abuse issues. Most have been determined to be disabled and are dependent for transportation. Coordination includes these agencies: Triple R, New Arizona Family and Arizona Healthcare.
2	CHANDLER/GILBERT ARC < One Type 4, Minivan, no lift/ramp (replacement)	Clients of all ages in southeastern Maricopa County with developmental disabilities who need transportation to the agency's supervised day program, employment training, medical and therapy appointments, and social-recreational events.
3	ARIZONA RECREATION CENTER FOR THE HANDICAPPED (ARCH) < One Type 2, Lift equip cutaway (replacement)	Provides services to individuals with developmental disabilities related to recreation, education, socialization, living skills, and community independence.
4	UNITED CEREBRAL PALSY OF CENTRAL ARIZONA, INC. (UCP) < One Type 2, Lift equip cutaway (replacement)	Provides persons with disabilities transportation to and from daily programming which includes day treatment and training for adults and children, work adjustment training, employment services.
5	CITY OF AVONDALE < One Type 2, Lift equip cutaway (expand)	Provides services to seniors and persons with disabilities to social services, rehabilitation, shopping, and recreational activities. In addition providing low to moderate income people with transportation to and from the new resource center.
6	PPEP, INC. /ENCOMPASS < One Type 2, Lift equip cutaway (replacement)	Provides services to adults with developmental/physical disabilities and serious mental illnesses. Service includes activities related to job training, employment socialization, medical care and community independence.
7	HORIZON HUMAN SERVICES < One Type 1, Lift equip maxivan (replacement)	Private, nonprofit agency serving individuals with psychiatric disabilities and/or developmental disabilities, some who are elderly. Programs include behavioral health treatment, prevention and other services.
8	VALLEY OF THE SUN SCHOOLS AND HABILITATION CENTER < One Type 5, five passenger minivan, with ramp (replacement)	Provides services to individuals with developmental disabilities for their medical, dental, nutritional, dialysis, and surgery appointments from their group homes and day program areas to their respective destinations.
9	TRIPLE R BEHAVIORAL HEALTH < One Type 1, 12 passenger maxivan, no lift/ramp (replacement)	Triple R Behavioral Health provides residential and rehabilitation services, including transportation to treatment sites, community resources, medical appointments, rehabilitation and public services, socialization activities and retail activities of daily living.
10	SCOTTSDALE TRAINING AND REHABILITATION SERVICES, INC. (STARS) < One Type 3, 12 passenger maxivan, no lift	Provides individuals with severe disabilities a variety of programs, including Day Treatment and Training, Sheltered Employment, Job Development and Placement, on the job training, and Residential Treatment.

	(replacement)	
11	FOOTHILLS COMMUNITY FOUNDATION/FOOTHILLS CARING CORP < One Type 1, Lift equip maxivan (replacement)	Provides transportation for elderly and disabled to and from medical and nutrition appointments, grocery and other shopping, social and recreational outings.
12	HACIENDA HEALTHCARE < One Type 2, Lift equip cutaway (replacement)	Provides transportation services to the developmentally disabled and ventilator dependent individuals who require respiratory therapists during transport.
13	THE CENTERS FOR HABILITATION < One Type 4, Minivan, no lift/ramp (replacement)	Clients are a diverse population that includes low income children and adults with developmental and physical disabilities. Providing transportation to and from various medical facilities and social activities.
Group B		
14	CHANDLER/GILBERT ARC < One Type 4, Minivan, no lift/ramp (replacement)	Clients of all ages in southeastern Maricopa County with developmental disabilities who need transportation to the agency's supervised day program, employment training, medical and therapy appointments, and social-recreational events.
15	UNITED CEREBRAL PALSY OF CENTRAL ARIZONA, INC. (UCP) < One Type 2, Lift equip cutaway (expand)	Provides persons with disabilities transportation to and from daily programming which includes day treatment and training for adults and children, work adjustment training and employment services.
16	TRIPLE R BEHAVIORAL HEALTH < One Type 4, Minivan, no lift/ramp (replacement)	Triple R Behavioral Health provides residential and rehabilitation services, including transportation to treatment sites, community resources, medical appointments, rehabilitation and public services, socialization activities and retail activities of daily living.
17	THE CENTERS FOR HABILITATION < One Type 4, Minivan, no lift/ramp (replacement)	Clients are a diverse population that includes low income children and adults with developmental and physical disabilities. Providing transportation to and from various medical facilities and social activities.
Group C		
18	TRIPLE R BEHAVIORAL HEALTH < One Type 4, Minivan, no lift/ramp (replacement)	Triple R Behavioral Health provides residential and rehabilitation services, including transportation to treatment sites, community resources, medical appointments, rehabilitation and public services, socialization activities and retail activities of daily living.
19	TRIPLE R BEHAVIORAL HEALTH < One Type 4, Minivan, no lift/ramp (replacement)	Triple R Behavioral Health provides residential and rehabilitation services, including transportation to treatment sites, community resources, medical appointments, rehabilitation and public services, socialization activities and retail activities of daily living.
20	TRIPLE R BEHAVIORAL HEALTH < One Type 4, Minivan, no lift/ramp (expand)	Triple R Behavioral Health provides residential and rehabilitation services, including transportation to treatment sites, community resources, medical appointments, rehabilitation and public services, socialization activities and retail activities of daily living.
21	TRIPLE R BEHAVIORAL HEALTH < One Type 4, Minivan, no lift/ramp (expand)	Triple R Behavioral Health provides residential and rehabilitation services, including transportation to treatment sites, community resources, medical appointments, rehabilitation and public services, socialization activities and retail activities of daily living.

22	TRIPLE R BEHAVIORAL HEALTH < One Type 4, Minivan, no lift/ramp (expand)	Triple R Behavioral Health provides residential and rehabilitation services, including transportation to treatment sites, community resources, medical appointments, rehabilitation and public services, socialization activities and retail activities of daily living.
23	TRIPLE R BEHAVIORAL HEALTH < One Type 1, Maxivan, with lift	Triple R Behavioral Health provides residential and rehabilitation services, including transportation to treatment sites, community resources, medical appointments, rehabilitation and public services, socialization activities and retail activities of daily living.
24	TRIPLE R BEHAVIORAL HEALTH < One Type 1, Maxivan, with lift	Triple R Behavioral Health provides residential and rehabilitation services, including transportation to treatment sites, community resources, medical appointments, rehabilitation and public services, socialization activities and retail activities of daily living.

Chair Fischbach called for a motion to recommend the priority ranking be approved. Ms. Taylor so moved. Mr. Bretz seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

6. Evaluation of Application Process

Chair Fischbach asked the Committee for feedback on the application process for FY 2009. Ms. Taylor asked to reconsider scheduling meetings on a Friday because some agencies are now closed on Friday's. The Committee also discussed different timing options for agency interviews and the option of conducting interviews with the priority ranking all in one day. The following suggestions were made.

- Not to schedule meetings on Friday.
- Combine the presentations and final meeting to develop the priority listing into one day.
- Provide additional time between interviews and for each interview as time allowed.
- Give standard questions to every agency to make the most of the time within the presentations.
- Offer more time for presentations about mobility management requests.
- For mobility management staff positions, require an outline of the job description.
- Require all applicants to attend all application training and coordination meetings.
- Require agencies requesting both vehicles and mobility management awards to give detailed, separate answers within the same application as appropriate for each item requested. Supply one detailed cover letter with sufficient reference material for each request.
- Provide a regional map for use by agencies to clarify areas of service. MAG can use this information to create a service concentration map for use by the Committee during the application process.
- Provide a copy of the agency questions to all Committee members before the interviews.
- Schedule mobility management presentations back to back to allow the Committee a better comparison.
- Invite mobility management applicants to attend all the presentations so they have a better understanding of the other agencies and how they might coordinate services with them.

The Committee commented that they appreciated the signs letting applicants know when their presentation time was about to end and requested that the signs be used in the future. The Committee also spoke to the usefulness of the coordination tracking sheet prepared by MAG.

Chair Fischbach thanked the Committee for all their committee and expertise during the application process. He also thanked Ms. Gaisthea and Ms. St. Peter for their assistance.

7. Comments from the Committee

There were no additional comments from the Committee.

8. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 1:36 p.m.