

MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
 ELDERLY PERSONS AND PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES 5310 TRANSPORTATION
 AD HOC COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
 JUNE 12, 2013, CHAPARRAL ROOM

<u>MEMBERS ATTENDING</u>	<u>OTHERS PRESENT</u>
Jessica Blazina, City of Surprise Matt Dudley, City of Glendale, Vice Chair Julie Howard, City of Mesa, Chair Deron Lozano, Valley Metro Christine McMurdy, City of Goodyear Wendy Miller, City of Phoenix Ann Marie Riley, City of Chandler Kristen Sexton, City of Avondale	Rachel Brito, MAG DeDe Gaisthea, MAG Amy St. Peter, MAG *Those members neither present nor represented by proxy. +Those members present by audio or videoconference.

1. Welcome and Introductions

Julie Howard, City of Mesa, Chair, called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. Introductions ensued.

2. Call to the Audience

No comments were made at this time.

3. Approval of the FTA Ad Hoc Elderly and Persons with Disabilities Transportation Committee December 20, 2012 Meeting Minutes

Chair Howard asked for a motion to approve the December 20, 2012, meeting minutes. Deron Lozano, Valley Metro, requested a correction to reflect his agency affiliation from the City of Phoenix to Valley Metro in the December meeting minutes. Kristen Sexton, City of Avondale, made a motion to approve the minutes with the correction requested. Wendy Miller, City of Phoenix, seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

4. FY 2013 Program Overview and Application Process

Chair Howard invited DeDe Gaisthea, MAG, to provide an overview of the FY2013 Section 5310 Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disability Transportation Program and the Section 5307 Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) eligible projects application process and offer a presentation on the FY2014 MAG Human Services Coordination Transportation Plan.

Ms. Gaisthea provided a brief overview of revisions through MAP-21. The Section 5310 program has been renamed the Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disability Transportation Program. Both Section 5316 JARC and 5317 New Freedom programs have been rescinded. JARC projects are now eligible under the 5307 formula funds. New Freedom has been consolidated into the Section 5310 Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Persons with Disabilities Transportation program. Along with MAP-21 revisions, there was an opportunity for regional large urban areas, including this region, to appoint a Designated Recipient (DR).

During the previous meeting, the Committee moved to recommend the City of Phoenix Public Transit Department to be the DR for the MAG urbanized area. In February 2013, the MAG Regional Council accepted the recommendation forwarding a letter notifying the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) as liaison to the Governor's Office. ADOT, on behalf of the Governor's Office, notified to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) of the DR change for the MAG region.

Ms. Gaisthea provided an overview of the roles and responsibilities under the new designation. The City of Phoenix Public Transit Department will manage the grant program to include providing quarterly reports and procuring capital items and contracts. They will also ensure compliance with Government Accountability Office (GAO) FTA regulations, certifications and assurances and all potential applicants meet all federal requirements. MAG will continue to coordinate the application process, ensuring a regional focus and recommendations to go through the MAG Committee approval process. MAG is also responsible for ensuring the program of projects is included in the Transportation Improvement Program.

Ms. Gaisthea informed the Committee that MAG, the City of Phoenix, and ADOT have been coordinating on this year's application process. With new census and demographic information, the MAG Information Services division developed two maps that identify the DR eligible areas. Ms. Gaisthea noted the Avondale/Goodyear area falls under ADOT's eligible area for the Section 5310 applications. However, this area also falls under MAG's planning area; therefore the Committee will be reviewing the 5310 applications. She noted ADOT's deadline for applications has been extended to July 1, 2013, for the Avondale/Goodyear areas. She advised ADOT will forward any applications in the MAG planning area for review and ranking. Ms. Gaisthea added, the City of Maricopa, and the City of Florence has been added to the MAG regional planning area. She noted the Committee may want to have a discussion on these changes at a future meeting.

At the previous meeting, the Committee was informed of the MAG Transit Committee discussion of the EPDT Committee to review the Section 5307 JARC eligible applications. The Transit Committee noted the inclusion of nonprofits as eligible applicants and would fit within the evaluation process of the EPDT Committee. Ms. Gaisthea advised the Transit Committee met in February and recommended that the EPDT Committee integrate review of the JARC funding applications into the current process. She noted that there is \$1.8 million available for 5307 JARC eligible projects.

Ms. Gaisthea provided a brief overview of the application timeline noting due dates for questions from the Committee, responses from the applicants, and the applicant interview schedule. Discussion ensued regarding specific due dates and the timeframe allotted for applicants to respond to the Committee's questions. A deadline of July 12, 2012, was set for the Committee to submit questions to Ms. Gaisthea.

Ms. Gaisthea discussed the timeline for the applicant interviews scheduled for July 23, 2013. She noted there are 26 applications representing 22 agencies applying for Section 5310/New Freedom funds and 12 applications representing six agencies for JARC. Discussion ensued

regarding extending the process from one to two day to accommodate all the applicants. The Committee suggested having Section 5310 applicants present on the first day and JARC applicants on the second day. Ms. Gaisthea expressed appreciation for the Committee's time and efforts. She continued with an overview of the MAG approval process and the next steps and timeframe following approval. It was noted the prioritized list will be heard by the MAG Regional Council in September for approval and availability of funding is anticipated for 2014.

Chair Howard invited Wendy Miller, City of Phoenix, to provide an overview of the key changes in the FY2013 application process. Ms. Miller advised efforts focused on combining and simplifying the application process taking into consideration feedback from committee members and applicants. She noted while there were some glitches in the PDF format, but in general, it worked better than the previous excel spreadsheet. Ms. Gaisthea referred the Committee to the handout on frequently asked questions received during the application review process to help guide the discussion. Confirmation was noted that the criteria apply to the current year process.

Ms. Miller advised both MAG and the City of Phoenix conducted a cursory review of the applications. City of Phoenix also conducted a review from the Designated Recipient perspective and found some anomalies on eligibility issues. A question was raised on whether an application was received from the City of Avondale. Ms. Miller noted no applications were received from City of Avondale as those would go through ADOT for review. However, she noted an application was submitted by Valley Metro for a Buckeye Express which may be eligible through the Avondale Urbanized Area (UZA).

Ms. Miller advised a review of the application was conducted with all of the agencies that signed up for assistance. Additionally, an excel spreadsheet was provided to allow agencies to enter data that did not fit on the application itself. For example, the VIN number field on the PDF did not allow enough space to fill in the entire VIN number; therefore agencies were allowed to attach the information in a spreadsheet.

The Committee inquired if they should consider coordination efforts during the application scoring process. Ms. Miller noted in past years, ADOT has provided guidance on the need for coordination and in terms of scoring an agency's coordination efforts became critical. Ms. Miller advised the City of Phoenix, as a DR, does not have an official perspective on coordination, but suggested the decision be left to the Committee as this is a regional process. She noted discussion would need to ensue regarding identifying priorities such as funding capital or operating costs. She requested feedback on whether the Committee wants the City of Phoenix to offer an official position.

Christine McMurdy, City of Goodyear, noted if coordination is not a key issue, the Committee can save time by not having to review what an agency has stated they would do in terms of coordination and what has actually been done. She noted the importance of the Committee being informed which categories should be reviewed and weighted more significantly.

Ms. Miller advised ADOT is not eligible to apply for this source of funding however the City of Phoenix is eligible to apply. She suggested next year, the Committee can work to revamp the application to better suit the criteria and eligibility required for the region adding that as programs change, the evaluation form should change as well. The Committee suggested for MAG to weigh in on the importance of coordination and to assist in evaluating an agency's coordination efforts since one of the requirements is for participation. Ms. Gaisthea noted MAG maintains a matrix of coordination efforts based on previous requests for this type of information. Ms. Gaisthea advised the matrix will be provided to the Committee as well as background on coordination efforts.

Chair Howard noted previous discussion regarding attendance at meetings but added that is not coordination. She questioned whether any thought has been given to creating a working group to address issues that have been brought to the Committee's attention to better assist applicants in the future. Ms. Gaisthea advised one of the strategies in the plan is for sub-regional mobility managers to participate in working groups and identify topics to address such as driver training or insurance coverage. Chair Howard stressed the need to include participants from other agencies such as the Department of Economic Services (DES). She noted DES regulations continue to be mentioned in different discussions and stressed the importance of including DES in this process.

Ms. Miller noted agreement with the recommendation to form a working group. She commented on the importance of ensuring Mobility Managers recipients are providing some sort of value to the region as a whole. Ms. Miller suggested having sub-regional mobility managers support these types of efforts as a requirement of participation. Chair Howard inquired about the possibility of including language in the application that identifies such requirements. Discussion ensued on questions added to the application for those applying for a Mobility Manager. The additional questions will help determine their experience and the agencies to which they will provide direct services. Ms. Miller requested input from the Committee to ensure the application aligns with what the Committee wants to accomplish for the region. Amy St. Peter, MAG, recommended changing the questions to better reflect the expectations.

Ms. Miller discussed confusion among some applicants that submitted for JARC and New Freedom funding in the same application. She noted there has been discussion considering the possibility of the JARC eligible projects being combined in the 5307 competitive process because that funding is evaluated by the Transit Committee. If so, in the future, the Committee may not have to review applications for two different funding sources.

Ms. Miller proceeded with an overview of key changes made in the application. They include the following:

- Address the cover letter to MAG to the attention of DeDe Gaisthea, Human Services Transportation Planner.
- Add the MAG summary sheet.
- Ms. Miller advised regarding the written policies and procedures, when staff meets with agencies they are questioned on whether the agency are practicing these efforts and if

they have adopted a policy. It was noted not all agencies are required to adopt all of the policies depending on the application submitted. As the DR, Ms. Miller advised they will ensure agencies are meeting the requirements. She noted the Committee does not need to weight this section highly when reviewing it. The application will be reworded next year for further clarity.

- Make the project summary one page.
- The question regarding the estimated number of consumers served will be broken out further to identify unduplicated numbers for elderly, disabled, and low income. Ms. Miller noted ridership to be an acceptable number for consumers served for all JARC applications.
- Ms. Miller advised an additional line was added to the vehicle inventory form requesting the number of hours a vehicle is used per day. This column was added in response to past applicants submitting the hours of an agency's overall program and not the specific vehicle usages hours. She noted an example that has occurred in the past, a vehicle may be "on call" 24 hours seven days a week but the actual day to day usage of the vehicle may be six hours, three hours in the morning and three hours in the afternoon.
- On page ten, additional lines or a supplemental page will be added for agencies to provide information on how much funding has been received and how much has been spent. Ms. Miller noted this is new this year, and from a DR perspective, it will help ensure outstanding grants are being spent.
- Ms. Miller noted the project description in question number seven on plans to evaluate and report the success of the project posed a challenge for agencies. She noted the intent of this question was to inquire how agencies were evaluating their success. Ms. Miller advised the DR will review the question in reference to the application; they are seeking information on how agencies are evaluating their projects. Ms. Miller advised follow-up meetings will be scheduled to ensure complete understanding of the requirements.

Chair Howard inquired on the question regarding the applicant's timely reimbursements for expenses. When grantees are awarded funding and the funding is delayed on the federal level, is the delay taken into consideration when evaluating the question if funding has been spent in a timely manner. Ms. Miller noted the intent of this question was to inquire if applicants were making good use of the funding they were awarded. Ms. Miller advised the only vehicles outstanding would be the ones awarded last year. She noted the process will improve over time. Vice Chair Dudley noted the review panel awarded multiple years in the past for JARC and New Freedom,. He suggested a question be asked during the interview process on why funds are not expended.

Discussion ensued regarding the process of creating a "B" list for funding. Ms. Gaisthea advised as of last year, ADOT no longer utilized the "B" list process. The Committee discussed the importance of the interviews and valuable information provided during the interview process. Ms. Miller requested clarification on the committee's request to weight the interview process. She noted weighting the interview process can be incorporated into future application processes.

Ms. Miller provided further comments on the applicant. They include the following:

- Revision will be made on the project budget form. Ms. Miller advised agencies were asked to ensure the local match amount is included as the form did not allow them to automatically populate the information.
- Revisions will be made to the Vehicle Inventory form to enable the inclusion of the whole vehicle inventory numbers (VIN). The committee discussed the need for the VIN number inquiring if it was need for inspections. A question was raised on whether the City of Phoenix will be conducting inspections. Ms. Miller advised this is yet to be determined.
- Signatures are required from CEO and attorney for the Assurances form.
- Ms. Miller noted the most common requirements are in bold print on the Certification and Assurances check list,. She noted applicants were advised to sign off on all bolded requirements to avoid the delay of the application by the FTA.

The Committee inquired on the Disadvantage Business Enterprise requirements. Ms. Miller advised DBE was not included in the list of Certification and Assurances but it is a requirement for applicants to have policies or procedures in place. The Committee recommended that there should be better reflection throughout the application on the items that need to be evaluated and scored. Vice Chair Dudley noted coordination strategies from previous year's plans might still be valid coordination efforts. Ms. Gaisthea advised that the FY 2014 Human Services Transportation Coordination plan update provides past year strategies in the back of the plan for reference. No further discussion ensued.

5. Evaluation Process

DeDe Gaisthea led discussion on the evaluation sheet and the proposed applicant interview process. The committee was referred to the evaluation criteria shared with applicants. She advised that Ms. Miller conducted a preliminary review and categorized applications by 5310 and JARC. The City of Phoenix Public Transit Department also conducted a preliminary review to categorize capital requests, local match, operating requests, and project totals. Ms. Miller provided an overview of the notations made for each application after the review was conducted.

Ms. Miller noted there are five requests for mobility mangers. The City of Phoenix did not put a limitation on the number of requests therefore it would be up to the Committee to fund the positions. Ms. Miller proceeded with the overview of notations made for each application. The Committee noted a need to review the 5310 and 5317 to ensure everyone has a clear understanding of both funding sources and their requirements. Chair Howard recommended allowing the applicants an opportunity to resubmit their budgets to ensure a more accurate and clear budget.

Discussion ensued on when a Committee member would abstain from the application review process. Ms. Gaisthea advised that in the past, Committee members have abstained from reviewing an application in which their agency applied for funding or the request was submitted on their agencies behalf. Chair Howard noted regional applications are more complicated. Ms. St. Peter suggested researching how other MAG committees address similar situations. Ms. Miller noted in past JARC and New Freedom evaluations, panel members had reviewed application with regional requests. Ms. Miller suggested reviewing

the handbook for highlights on program requirements, including 5310 New Freedom and JARC, for further information and guidelines on the types of activities that are eligible. A brief overview of the handbook was provided.

The Committee proceeded to discuss the timeframe and dates for the agencies presentations. The Committee requested holding presentations over a two-day period. The Committee suggested presentations to take place on Monday, July 22, 2013, with Section 5310 applicants, and Tuesday, July 23, 2013, for JARC applicants. The final review and ranking will be made after all applicants have presented. Additionally, the Committee recommended sending questions to the agency and ensuring applicants use the interview time to discuss the agency's needs, not responses to the questions. Ms. Gaisthea noted applicants were informed of the Committee's previous suggestions regarding the presentations. Suggestions included for agencies to focus more on the purpose of their grant request, how the project will benefit the community, to ensure the person presenting is someone who knows the project, and to also invite the person who wrote the grant to answer any of the Committee's questions.

Ms. Gaisthea offered to revise and resend the schedule to the Committee. Clarification was requested on the due date for preliminary scores. Ms. Gaisthea requested those be submitted by July 12, 2013, along with questions from the Committee. Ms. McMurdy made a motion to approve the evaluation process for applicants. Ms. Miller seconded the motion. The motion passed.

6. Update of the Chair and Vice Chair Appointment Process

Ms. Gaisthea provided a brief update on the process to appoint a new Chair and Vice Chair for the committee. The current terms will expire on June 30, 2013. Ms. Gaisthea advised per MAG policy, the Vice Chair will ascend to the Chair position. She noted Matthew Dudley, the current Vice Chair, agreed to accept the Chair position.

Ms. Gaisthea noted a request for letters of interest for the Vice Chair position had been forwarded to Committee members. All requests received will be forwarded to the MAG Executive Committee to make the official committee appointments in June.

Chair Howard expressed great pleasure serving as Chair of the Committee. She acknowledged Vice Chair Dudley who has been on the Committee more than 10 years, adding that his services to the Committee has been outstanding.

7. Request for Future Agenda Items

Vice Chair Howard requested input on items to be addressed at future meetings. Ms. Miller requested discussion on forming a work group to address evaluation criteria and noted her interest in serving on the work group.

8. Comments from the Committee

There were no comments.

9. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 12:02 p.m.