

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

November 28, 2018

MAG Office Building, Chaparral Room
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Carolynn Ballard, Town of Florence	Wendy Miller, City of Phoenix
Rob Antoniak for Ron Brooks, Valley Metro	Christina Plante, City of Goodyear
Matt Dudley, City of Glendale	*Janice Simpson, City of Avondale
*Joan Freeman, City of Scottsdale	*Jeff Tourdot, Maricopa County Human Services Department
#Autumn Grooms, City of El Mirage	Robert Yabes, City of Tempe, Vice Chair
Ed Jones, City of Mesa	
Martin Lucero, City of Surprise, Chair	

*Neither present nor represented by proxy.

#Attended by telephone conference call.

+ Attended by videoconference

OTHERS ATTENDING

DeDe Gaisthea, MAG
Shantel Wyke, MAG
Jim Rogers, LifeWell/Mobility Manager
Guillermo Gonzalez, Valley Metro

1. Welcome and Introductions

Martin Lucero, City of Surprise, Chair of the Elderly Persons and Persons with Disabilities (EPDT) Ad Hoc Committee, called the meeting to order at 10:10 a.m. Introductions ensued.

2. Call to the Audience

Audience members were given an opportunity to address the Committee on items not on the agenda for discussion or information only. There were no comments from the audience.

3. Approval of the MAG Ad Hoc EPDT August 9, 2018 Meeting Minutes

Wendy Miller, City of Phoenix, moved to approve the August 9, 2018 meeting minutes. Christina Plante, City of Goodyear, seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

4. MAG Subregional Mobility Manager Update

Chair Lucero introduced Jim Rogers, Lifewell Transportation Manager, Subregional Mobility Manager for the Central and North Valley area. Mr. Rogers began by stating the first project he would be working on is to develop a resource library for Section 5310 grant

subrecipients. He noted stakeholders at the June 2018 TAP meeting suggested developing a consolidated listing of resources. Mr. Rogers noted the resource library would provide participates in the grant process, especially new recipients, to have access to valuable information such as driver training, new recipient training (as an introduction to the 5310 program), and how to successfully pass an audit. Chair Lucero inquired on how the resource library would be accessed. Mr. Rogers responded that most information would be accessible from the MAG webpage while hard copy materials could be checked out from the MAG office. The Sub-Regional Mobility Managers have a webpage that could house the resource library. Ms. Gaisthea noted that information from the Rural Transit Assistance Program while focuses on rural areas, has many crossovers with urban areas and would therefore be a resource to include. The vision of the project is to develop an easily accessible, one-stop clearinghouse of resources on the MAG webpage to assist recipients. Wendy Miller, City of Phoenix requested the resource library to include a link to the City of Phoenix sub-regional recipient resource page

Mr. Rogers noted he is researching how emergency management plans address Section 5310 vehicles being utilized in the event of an emergency. He noted research would including looking into what type of equipment, technology, or resources would be helpful for locating 5310 vehicles in the case of an emergency. Chair Lucero commented that this type of plan was a big topic other Arizona cities were considering due to the recent fire that occurred in California. Individuals were in need of evacuation, but efficient, emergency management was not properly planned and many citizens were trapped as a result. This example demonstrated the importance of being able to track the vehicles so they could be deployed for evacuation purposes. Ms. Gaisthea noted Section 5310 vehicles were federal assets, and it would be helpful to develop guidelines on how the region can utilize the vehicles in the case of an emergency. She noted Eddie Cain from CAG was also looking into emergency management plan guidelines for the rural areas. She suggested Mr. Rogers work with Mr. Caine to develop guidelines suitable for urban areas as well as rural ones.

Mr. Antoniak, Valley Metro, commented it would be important to include information on vehicle drivers. He noted sometimes vehicle drivers are contracted, which might pose a problem for utilizing 5310 vehicles drivers in case of an emergency. Mr. Jones mentioned that a protocol for communication would be needed between vehicle recipients and emergency operating centers. Ms. Miller stated an official delegation may be needed to require recipients to mobilize their vehicles and the next step would be searching for a best practice. Chair Lucero mentioned that the City of Surprise is working with West Valley Emergency Management Center and the three major areas of interest in developing the emergency management plan would be to identify who would trigger the vehicles, who should be contacted in the emergency center, and what is the responsibility for the contact in transitioning the vehicles for emergency use. Ms. Miller mentioned that ADOT should be included in this plan. She offered to provide a list of the vehicles stored once the emergency

management plan becomes more developed. With no further questions, Chair Lucero thanked Jim for his work on behalf of the region.

5. Progress Report from the FY 2018 Section 5310 Enhance Mobility of Seniors and Person with Disabilities Program Debrief for the Phoenix-Mesa Urbanized Area Application Process

Chair Lucero introduced DeDe Gaisthea, MAG, who provided a progress report of Committee comments from the FY 2018 Section 5310 Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Person with Disabilities Program for the Phoenix-Mesa Urbanized Area (UZA), evaluation process. Ms. Gaisthea noted the Points of Consideration matrix was presented at the previous meeting for member's feedback. She began by providing an update on the preventative maintenance (PM) requests item. Billy Parker, Subregional Mobility Manager, Chandler-Gilbert Arc, would hold a PM informational workshop for the 2019 application process. MAG and the City of Phoenix staff will continue to review other strategies to provide more guidance on PM and researching best practices to add the handbook and training. The Committee inquired if PM was a separate request from vehicles. Ms. Miller noted keeping the requests separate will assistance during the application evaluation process for effectively allocating funds to the applicants who need PM the most. Ms. Gaisthea noted ADOT also follows a similar process of having PM as a separate request.

Christina Plante, City of Goodyear, inquired if there was a standard PM request, which takes into account, vehicle mileage and recipients who undertake better maintenance practices. Ms. Miller commented that all 5310 recipients are required to provide all documentation on vehicles maintenance and their related expenses each year. City of Phoenix staff reviews vehicle documentations to ensure recipients have followed the manufacturers' guidelines, which is an FTA requirement. She noted most vehicles are still under warranty since the City of Phoenix started procuring vehicles in 2014. As they receive more documentation, they anticipate a better understanding of recipients PM requests. Chair Lucero noted the necessity of PM requests could be addressed effectively by asking follow-up questions during the application period. Ms. Miller agreed, noting during the last process, staff followed up on the need of an agency requesting a new vehicle. They discovered the vehicle was in still in good condition and recommended replacing the lift instead, at a lower cost. Ms. Gaisthea noted Mr. Parker, MM, is examining data and cost averages regarding PM that can provide information PM requests.

Ms. Gaisthea noted a request for an overview on how staff calculates the evaluation point averages. Steve Tate, MAG, has offered to share the technical information of how the averaging of points is taken into consideration when Committee members recuse themselves evaluating a project. She noted the review would be good information for new and existing members. Ms. Gaisthea noted further information was requested on intent of the 5310 program and the distinction between capital and "other" New Freedom 5310 eligible projects. She pointed out the FTA still considers Section 5310 a capital awards

program. Operating projects that were eligible under the rescinded New Freedom program are included in the Section 5310 program. MAG staff will remove the "New Freedom" wording and revise it to "Other" to avoid confusion in the application. MAG staff will also provide more guidance during the applicant workshop to reiterate that New Freedom is no longer a stand-alone project program.

Ms. Gaisthea noted the Committee expressed concern of the expanding requests for operating, such as mileage reimbursement and ensuring the requests are in line with the intent of the Section 5310 grant program. She thanked Ms. Miller for providing guidance on which operating requests are allowable, such as a volunteer drivers program, mileage reimbursement, and background checks. MAG and City of Phoenix staff will continue to provide guidance and training to the Committee and recipients on items that are allowable. Ms. Miller noted fuel is not allowable, and volunteers should drive their own vehicle, and not an agency Section 5310-funded vehicle. She noted it is preferable to see mileage reimbursement because there is a standard federal rate. Ms. Gaisthea stated for clarification, "fuel reimbursement" will be replaced by "mile reimbursement" in the application. Ms. Plante inquired on clarification if volunteer drivers drive 5310 vehicles or if they should report mileage for reimbursement if they are driving their own vehicle. Ms. Miller responded volunteers can drive a 5310 vehicle but cannot file for mileage reimbursement unless they are driving their own vehicle. Chair Lucero noted clarification in this area is beneficial for applicants to understand which funds are allowable. Clarification will also help to avoid problematic situations that previously occurred regarding agencies requesting large amounts of fuel reimbursement based on mileage.

Ms. Gaisthea provided an update on the request to research possible techniques for reviewing Section 5310 applications. Janice Simpson, City of Avondale, presented on potential evaluation techniques the Committee could take into consideration for the next application process. The Committee's consensus was to continue with the current evaluation process and reviewing all applications, after reviewing the alternative evaluation processes. Ms. Gaisthea noted to assist the Committee with their evaluation process; staff has factored in an additional week for the internal eligibility review. This would allow MAG and the City of Phoenix staff more time to review for federal eligibility requirements. The City of Phoenix could also provide information on how much funding is available for traditional 55 percent and "other" 35 percent project requests. This information would be provided prior to evaluating applications.

Ms. Gaisthea provided an update on reviewing subregional mobility managers' projects to ensure they are fulfilling federal requirements. She noted the Committee's concern was of Northwest Valley Connect's program having more of a local focus rather than regional. Ms. Gaisthea commented that Chair Lucero attended a subregional mobility manager's meeting. He shared feedback from the Committee and emphasized that projects should be regional in focus. At the request of the Committee, MAG staff met with the Northwest

Valley Connect Subregional mobility manager. Clarification was provided on the need to coordinate with all sub-recipients, as well as participate in other types of coordination and trainings on a regional level. The Northwest Valley Connect mobility manager received the feedback well, and she will be taking the guidance into consideration for the next year. Ms. Gaisthea thanked the Committee for providing their feedback and added that the Committee will be receiving regular mobility manager updates moving forward.

Ms. Gaisthea noted the next item was to review the intent of coordination efforts. She commented MAG staff will continue to review strategies and gather best practices from other regions and states regarding coordination activities. The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5310 circular notes the federal requirement of participation is attending coordination meetings. Ms. Gaisthea noted the MAG Transportation Ambassador Program (TAP) meetings are designated as regional coordination meetings. Attendance at TAP meetings is a requirement for 5310 recipients, and MAG staff will continue to review recipients' participation. Ms. Gaisthea noted staff provides information on applicant's attendance at TAP and three years of recipient's coordination efforts as stated in their applications. The Committee noted that until FTA provides further guidance on coordination activities, MAG staff to continue to provide coordination participation updates to the Committee as it becomes available.

Ms. Gaisthea stated the last item on the Points for Consideration matrix was to provide clarification on the Committee member's role during the application ranking and presentation process. She noted the Committee could formalize the guidelines in the "MAG Elderly And Persons With Disabilities Transportation Ad Hoc Committee Review And Prioritization Guidelines" that prohibit members from ranking their own applications and require them to recuse themselves from participation in the applicant review process. The guidelines include ensuring a fair and objective evaluation of submitted applications based on the evaluation criteria, requiring Committee members to sign a Statement of Confidentiality and Disclosure form, and requiring them to recuse themselves from evaluating their respective agency's application(s). In addition to refraining from participating in their respective agency's applicant interview while being a sitting member of the Committee.

Chair Lucero acknowledged that clarification regarding the matter would be helpful for all members of the Committee. Ms. Miller noted for clarification that a Committee member could vote on a regional project but not one that benefits them solely and/or financially. Chair Lucero offered an applicable situation that had occurred in the past, where an agency had made a JARC application on the behalf of multiple agencies. Other members of the Committee, as regional partners, could vote on the application, the Committee member from the submitting could not because they were the applicant. He noted that this is the same process was for all committees at MAG and should be adopted as a formal procedure to encourage a fair and objective application process. He noted that in the past

members, by their own accord, have recused themselves when their staff gives an application interview. Mr. Antoniak asked for further clarification regarding the intent of the guidelines to prevent a Committee member from voting on a project that solely benefits their city. Chair Lucero responded by saying someone from the agency could write the application with the Committee member's guidance, but the Committee member would not rank his or her own organization's application and would recuse his or her self during the presentation to promote a fairer process.

Ms. Plante requested clarification regarding how a Committee member who recused his or her self might respond during the review/ranking process if there is a question raised. Ms. Miller responded by saying it would be inappropriate to promote for a particular application they are associated with but the Committee member could participate in the overall regional discussion and answer general questions about the organization but not the application. Chair Lucero agreed and added that the intent is to produce a fair and transparent process, not only for the applicants but also for the Committee members in the case of an audit. After further discussion, consensus was to formalize Committee member's guidelines to include refraining from participating in the applicant interview, to be able to remain as impartial as possible during the evaluation process.

Ms. Gaisthea summarized the Committee's suggested revisions going into the next Section 5310 application process for the Phoenix-Mesa UZA. Revisions included changing "fuel reimbursement" with "mile reimbursement" in the application and removing "New Freedom" and replace with "Other" to avoid confusion in the application. For the City of Phoenix to provide funding information prior to the application review process. In addition, to formalizing Committee member participation guidelines, including "not evaluating application where conflicts exists with the exception of regionally beneficial projects", and recusing themselves from participating in applicant interviews. Chair Lucero stated the suggested revisions will be brought back in the next agenda for approval. No further comments were offered.

6. Update of FY 2019 Section 5310 Enhance Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Program

Ms. Gaisthea provided an update on any changes or revisions to the FTA Section 5310 Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individual with Disabilities Program. She also provided an overview of the FY 2019 Section 5310 Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Person with Disabilities Program application process for the Phoenix-Mesa UZA, including review items requested to be added into the next application process. At this point, there are no major changes to the program. The only minor change is to the Transit Asset Management Plan, of which Ms. Miller is working with the sub-recipients on. In 2017, \$2.9 million was allocated for Phoenix-Mesa UZA, and in 2018 it was \$3.1 million. In anticipation of 2019, the \$3.1 million will be used as an estimate for the upcoming application cycle. The EPDT Ad Hoc Committee 2019 schedule was reviewed to accommodate for the AzTA conference and was

updated to reflect more time for the internal review process, which will give Ms. Miller more time to convey funding information to the Committee. At the next meeting, January 15th, an internal schedule will be provided to the Committee members.

Ms. Gaisthea then provided an update regarding ADOT's process. Starting this year, ADOT will be going through a two-year process, alternating between when the mobility managers' applications are due and when other 5310 projects are due. This was coordinated to allow mobility managers more time to help sub-recipients develop their applications as opposed to working on their own applications each year. Ms. Gaisthea will update the Committee on the effectiveness of this process as it progresses. Mr. Antoniak asked when applications were due. Ms. Gaisthea responded February 25th.

Chair Lucero reviewed the Committee's requested revisions for the 2019 Section 5310 application process for the Phoenix-Mesa UZA. The requested revisions include 1) changing "fuel reimbursement" to "mileage reimbursement" (specifying that this option is only available for volunteers who drive their personal vehicles for 5310 transportation projects). 2) Remove the term "New Freedom" and replace with "Other" to avoid confusion in the application. 3) City of Phoenix to provide funding information prior to the application review process. 4) Committee's role formalized by reflecting the Statement of Confidentiality and Disclosure instructions in the EPDT Review and Prioritization Guidelines including adding the regional aspect of "financial beneficiary" and Committee members to refrain from participating applicant interview. No further discussion was offered.

Chair Lucero called for a motion to approve the recommended revisions as summarized. Ms. Miller motioned to approve the recommended revisions to the 2019 Section 5310 application process as reviewed by Chair Lucero. Mr. Antoniak seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

7. Request for Future Agenda Items

Chair Lucero requested a legislative report regarding future legislation and how it might affect 5310 programs. Ms. Gaisthea offered to invite Nathan Pryor, MAG Policy and Government Relations Director, to provide a legislative update to the Committee.

8. Comments from the Committee

Chair Lucero announced that the City of Surprise has adopted a short-range transit plan, including the FTA Section 5310 program. They are working with the cities of Glendale and El Mirage, and potentially Goodyear and Buckeye. The process is viewable online, and the PDF of the plan can be sent to Committee members if they email Chair Lucero.

9. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 11:42 p.m.