Special Needs Transportation Committee

June 20, 2018 • 9:30 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.
PSRC Board Room • 1011 Western Avenue, Suite 500 • Seattle, WA 98104

9:30 1. **Welcome and Introductions** – Marianna Hanefeld, Chair
2. **Public Comment**
3. **Approval of Meeting Summary** – May 16, 2018*

9:35 4. **Reports from PSRC Committees and Boards**
   - Regional Staff Committee – Marianna Hanefeld, Chair
   - Transportation Operators Committee – Gil Cerise, PSRC
   - Transportation Policy Board – Gil Cerise, PSRC & Tim Renfro, Pierce Transit

9:45 5. **Discussion: PSRC Region’s Priority Rankings for WSDOT 2019-2021 Consolidated Grant Competition*** – Gil Cerise, Sarah Gutschow & Jean Kim, PSRC
   - Review updated draft “policy premises” and description for how applications will be reviewed (15 minutes)
   - Review updated draft “additional factors” for determining regional priority rankings for PSRC region (30 minutes)
   - Confirmation of PSRC’s policy premises evaluation (5 minutes)
   - PSRC data support for the upcoming grant competition (5 minutes)

10:45 6. **Information: Next Steps for the Upcoming Consolidated Grant Competition** – Gil Cerise, PSRC
   - Reminder on changes to the PSRC’s role
   - Review of 2019-2021 Consolidated Grant timeline for PSRC region

11:00 7. **Information: 2018 PSRC Regional Transportation Plan & Coordinated Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan** – Gil Cerise, PSRC

11:15 8. **Discussion: Local Coalition Reports / Emerging Issues** – Local Coalition Mobility Managers/Representatives

9. **Save the Date: WSDOT Consolidated Grant / PSRC Regional Priority Ranking Training**
   July 16, 2018 from 1:00 pm to 4:00 pm in PSRC Board Room
   (Register by July 10 at [https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/XFTYRVW](https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/XFTYRVW))

   **Next SNTC Meeting:**
   July 18, 2018 from 9:30 am to 11:30 am in PSRC Board Room, 1011 Western Avenue, Suite 500, Seattle, WA 98104-1035

11:30 10. **Adjourn**

*Supporting materials attached
Welcome and Introductions, Public Comment, and Announcements

Marianna Hanefeld, Chair, welcomed everyone at 9:30 a.m. Self-introductions were provided around the room and on the phone.

Public Comments

There were no public comments.

Approval of Meeting Summary

The meeting summary for the April 18, 2018 meeting was approved.

Reports from PSRC Committees and Boards

Regional Staff Committee – Marianna Hanefeld, Chair, reported that there were updates from the VISION 2050 project, a review of the Regional Centers Framework update and the types of centers and changes to the designation procedures for new centers.

Gil Cerise, PSRC, noted PSRC will present its 2017 Regional Household Travel survey at the May Regional Staff Committee meeting.

Transportation Operators Committee – Marianna Hanefeld, Chair, highlighted the various topics discussed at the TOC which included PSRC Transit-related Work Program for 2018-2019 Biennium, and a presentation on transit related performance measures, which was an overview of the 2017 Annual Transit Ridership data found in the National Transit Database (NTD).

Gil Cerise mentioned that the change in special needs transportation grant process was approved by the PSRC’s Executive Board on April 26, 2018.
**Discussion: 2018 Transit Integration Report** *(Maggie Moore & Gil Cerise, PSRC)*

Gil Cerise, PSRC, introduced the topic of the 2018 Transit Integration Report to the committee. The draft schedule for the 2018 edition was included in the agenda packet. Maggie Moore, PSRC, reviewed plans for the production, organization and schedule of the report. She reviewed some of the features and how the report would be organized in a similar way to the 2017 report and said the report would focus once more on the benefits of integration, such as saving transit agencies money and improving the customer experience (presentation slides can be found at: [https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/sntc201805-pres-transitintegrationreport.pdf](https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/sntc201805-pres-transitintegrationreport.pdf)).

Maggie asked the committee if they had any ideas that they would like to include in the 2018 report, and some of the suggestions were discussed: KCMC Request for Information for transportation software, helping transportation needs for homeless, getting transportation for seniors and other special transportation need populations to medical facilities in north Snohomish county, and the King County Metro's CAT program. Gil mentioned a need for common regional data and for travel training as other opportunities to look at for the report.

Next steps will be to meet with the TOC with these ideas for discussion and PSRC will follow up with those that offered ideas for the report.


**Discussion: PSRC Region’s Priority Rankings for WSDOT Consolidated Grant Competition 2019-2021 Biennium** *(Gil Cerise, Sarah Gutschow & Jean Kim, PSRC)*

Gil Cerise, PSRC, reviewed the updated Draft policy premises identified at the last SNTC meeting that were agreed upon by the committee to remain, and went over the questions that the committee asked to have edited.

He reminded the committee that these questions are a preliminary screening to help identify the higher priority applications for a regional priority ranking. All of the questions were constructed for a yes or no answer for a more simplified assessment. Gil noted that PSRC staff took the SNTC’s original list of topics to include and in some cases, combined them into a single question. He reviewed what changes the Committee asked for from the last meeting on the Policy Premises for Regional Priority Rankings for PSRC Region.

Gil then reviewed a Draft of Additional Factors for Determining Regional Priority Rankings for PSRC Region. He noted that the policy premises are the initial basis to rank priority rankings, and additional factors are then used to help the SNTC develop a recommendation for allocation of regional rankings for other PSRC committees and boards to act on before sending final priority ranking list to WSDOT. He explained that applications would be turned in to both PSRC and WSDOT. PSRC would use them for regional priority rankings and WSDOT would use them for the state's scoring for the Consolidated Grant funding.

The committee briefly revisited the issue of how policy premises are evaluated, but agreed that PSRC staff can provide a neutral and fair assessment of grant applications for the policy premises.

PSRC staff will provide proposed updates from some of the feedback received for the committee’s consideration in June.

**Information: Preparing for Consolidated Grant Competition. Follow-up on Materials Shared at April SNTC** *(Monica Ghosh, Ryan Warner & Stacy Clauson, WSDOT)*

Gil Cerise, PSRC, introduced the topic of preparing for Consolidated Grant Competition by reviewing the key points, including the call for projects on July 9th. He reiterated that this is a WSDOT-led grant competition, and that this is an opportunity for stakeholders to hear from WSDOT staff about the grant.

Monica Ghosh and Ryan Warner, WSDOT provided an update to the state Consolidated Grant program, and reviewed the white papers resulting from the most recent Grants Program Advisory Committee (GPAC) process. Monica began by reviewing which projects were eligible to seek four years vs. two years of funding and noted that the white papers address qualifications for applying for four years of funding vs. two years of funding. Gil noted that if a project used
qualitative measures for performance, then the project is only eligible for two years and emphasized that quantitative measures need to be used for four years option. Regions that provide a regional ranking for four years give up use of that ranking until the end of the 4-year period, if the project is funded.

Ryan Warner, WSDOT, mentioned that the state will look at if a project is eligible for funding first and that project need to be in good standing to apply for either two years or four years. He also noted that those who are not in good standing have been told early this year.

Ryan clarified that WSDOT scores all project independent of the regional rankings. Regional rankings are added in after the projects are scored. He also noted that WSDOT does have a caveat that the 4 year projects’ continued funding is dependent upon appropriation from the State Legislature. There is no guarantee.

Gil asked that any additional questions be sent directly to WSDOT staff. Stakeholders may also want to raise questions for the June 20 SNTC meeting.

Consolidated Grant information is also on the WSDOT website: https://www.wsdot.wa.gov/NR/rdonlyres/EE73A350-9C35-4BA6-B335-E4DC99207755/0/ConsolidatedGrantProgramwhitepapers.pdf

---

**Discussion: Local Coalition Reports / Emerging Issues (Local Coalition Mobility Managers/Representatives)**

Jerri Kelly, PCCTC, said the PCCTC newsletter had been distributed and asked people to let her know if they want to be added to the newsletter distribution list. She noted that the next Quarterly Coalition meeting will be Friday, May 18th in Tacoma.

Staci Haber, KCMC, reported that the King County Mobility Coalition had their meeting May 15th and follow ups will be sent to update the KCMC Needs Assessment. She also mentioned that if anyone has questions regarding the Request for Information for transportation software, she can send the final one, but noted that the software companies have until June 1st to respond; then all information will be compiled into a summary report to go to the 2018 CTA Provider Summit at end of June.

David Lynch, RARET, noted that the RARET meeting will be on Wednesday, May 23rd, at Pierce County Emergency Management in Tacoma.

Marianna Hanefeld, SNOTRAC, reported the SNOTRAC April 23rd meeting was a grants workshop at the Marysville Library. She said the RFP for a community transportation survey will be out sometime this week and explained that this survey is to be developed to reach more of the eastern part of Snohomish County and crossover areas like the north Snohomish areas near Skagit County.

Gil Cerise, PSRC, reminded everyone that PSRC is in the project selection process of the distribution of the FHWA funds and Thursday, May 24th will be the RPEC FHWA recommendations. Also, the FTA funding recommendations will be discussed at the FTA Caucus meeting on June 12th. These meetings are opportunities for SNTC to see how other PSRC committees deliberate to produce recommendations.

---

**Next meeting**

June 20, 2018 from 9:30 – 11:30 a.m.

---

**Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m.
# Simple Matrix of Policy Premises

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Simple Matrix of Policy Premises</th>
<th>Guidance for which WSDOT application question addresses this topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Preservation vs. New/Expansion:</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the application for preservation of an existing program, or needed to support ongoing operations of an existing program? This includes capital needs to support an existing program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance: New/expansions: answer “No”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Emerging Needs and Gaps:</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the application support programs meeting “Emerging Needs and Gaps” identified in the 2019-2022 Coordinated Plan (page 31)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance: Only applications showing that they address one or more “Emerging Needs and Gaps” will receive a “Yes.” Applications addressing other needs and gaps in the Coordinated Plan will receive a “No.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Prioritized Strategies:</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the application address “High” priority strategy(ies) identified in the 2019-2022 Coordinated Plan (page 43)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance: Only applications showing that they address one or more “High” priority strategies will receive a “Yes.” Applications only addressing “Other” priority strategies in the Coordinated Plan will receive a “No.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Uniqueness of Service or Program</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the application provide information demonstrating there are no alternate public transportation options for the populations served by the program within same geographic area? If there are alternate public transportation options, does the application demonstrate the uniqueness of the project and how it meets needs that cannot be met by the other public transportation programs/services in existence?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Guidance:** The expectation in addressing uniqueness of service or program is that applicants can explain how their service is unique and does not duplicate other existing services or programs for target populations, including those provided by public transportation (fixed-route, demand response, etc.). Responding that there is no similar services or programs without explanation is insufficient to warrant a “Yes.”

5) **Performance Measures and Targets:**

Does the application include appropriate performance measures and targets and a plan for ongoing data collection and evaluation of program performance?

**Guidance:** Performance measures listed in application should be both quantitative and relevant to the goals of the type of program for which funding is requested, with targets included for future funding cycles. Applicants should demonstrate that they can collect the data needed to evaluate each measure at regular annual intervals. If performance targets are not met, applicant should provide an explanation and/or plans for improving performance in future funding cycles.

6) **Financial Sustainability:**

Does the application demonstrate that it is providing more than minimum required match in its project budget?

**Guidance:** Operating projects seeking federal/state funding amount less than 50% (demonstrating more than 50% of the net project cost can be fulfilled with local match) of their net project cost will receive a “Yes.” Also, capital and mobility management projects seeking federal/state funding amount less than 80% (demonstrating more than 20% of the net project cost can be fulfilled with local match) of their net project cost will receive a “Yes.”
Attachment 5B: Additional Considerations for Deliberation

1) **Geographical distribution of regional priority rankings**

   Notes:
   - We will start fresh with this additional factor. In previous years, the distribution has been in terms of funding. For 2018 competition, it will be in terms of distributing A’s, B’s, C’s, and D’s.
   - This factor can be supported by data showing where people with special transportation needs live by county within the region. In the past, PSRC has provided updated demographic data showing the breakdown of seniors and people with disabilities by county.

2) **Project types**

   Note: This factor addresses how many mobility management, operating, and capital projects/programs are being recommended.

3) **Agency equity**

   Note: This factor addresses the number of projects/programs recommended to receive funding by an agency.

4) **Compelling cases for agencies with limited resources**

   Notes: This factor addresses projects/programs that provide valued services and programs but which are challenged to provide minimum local match. Small agencies and/or community based organizations might have less local support compared to larger agencies that have local partners providing sufficient local matching funds.

5) **Strategic application of federal/state funds**

   Note: Include region and/or stakeholder assessment of possible program eligibility for state/federal funding programs found within Consolidated Grant program.

6) **Coordination**

   Note: This factor addresses projects/programs that work together to make the most efficient use of limited resources. There are many levels of coordination, ranging from the basic sharing of training resources to the full integration of services. The Committee can discuss the full range of coordination for this topic.