Voting Members and Alternates Represented at the Table
Marianna Hanefeld, Chair – SNOTRAC; Jerri Kelly - Pierce County Human Services; Aaron Morrow – KCMC; Francie Peltier – PCCTC; Tim Renfro – Pierce Transit; Tom Dietz – Homage Senior Services; Alex O'Reilly – City of Bellevue; Don Okazaki – King County Metro; Jonathon Morrison Winters – Seattle Aging and Disability Services; Jacqueline Mann – PSESD; Mark Smutny – Sound Generations; Donna Smith – Sound Transit; Melinda Adams – Everett Transit; Penny Lara – King County Metro; Bruce Braun - Snohomish County LTC and Aging; Christina Robertson - Catholic Community Services – Snohomish; John Mikel - Pierce County Human Services Aging and Disability Resources; Leigh Spruce – SNOTRAC; Francois Larivee – Hopelink; Dorene Cornwell – KCMC; Penni Belcher – UWPC/South Sound 211; Steve Hutchins – Around the Sound; Amy Biggs – Snoqualmie Valley Transportation

Via phone: (no participants)

Non-voting Members Represented at the Table
Staci Haber – KCMC; Hollianne Monson - Catholic Community Service of WW - King County; Mona Steele – Homage-TAP; Stacy Clauson – WSDOT; Ryan Warner – WSDOT; Monica Ghosh – WSDOT

Via phone: (no participants)

Other Guests: Eric Irelan – King County Metro; Joanne Donohue – Sound Generations; Brigid Dean - WSDOT

PSRC Staff: Gil Cerise, Jean Kim (via phone), Monica Adkins, Kathryn Johnson

Welcome and Introductions, Public Comment, and Announcements
Marianna Hanefeld, Chair, welcomed everyone at 9:30 a.m., and then turned the meeting over to Gil Cerise, PSRC, to facilitate the remainder of the meeting for the WSDOT Consolidated Grant deliberations. Self-introductions were provided around the room and on the phone.

Public Comments
There was no public comment.

Approval of Meeting Summary
The meeting summary for the September 19, 2018 meeting was approved.
The SNTC convened on October 17, 2018 to review special needs transportation projects competing for a regional priority ranking in WSDOT’s 2019-21 Consolidated Grant competition, a statewide competition that funds a variety of special needs transportation and rural transportation projects from a variety of federal and state funding sources.

Regional priority rankings provided by Regional Transportation Planning Organizations (RTPO’s) add points to the overall project score in WSDOT’s statewide competition. WSDOT allocated 21 regional priority rankings as follows for the PSRC region in the current competition:

- 7 “A” rankings = 50 points added to WSDOT statewide scoring
- 7 “B” rankings = 25 points added to WSDOT statewide scoring
- 7 “C” rankings = 12 points added to WSDOT statewide scoring
- Unlimited “D” rankings = 0 points added to WSDOT statewide scoring

Twenty-two projects were submitted to the PSRC region for consideration for regional priority rankings. The projects totaled $9.8 million in request and consisted of a mix of operating projects serving seniors and other people with special transportation needs, mobility management programs, and three capital vehicle requests for private nonprofit transportation providers.

WSDOT’s 2019-21 Consolidated Grant competition includes funding from a variety of federal and state sources that can be applied anywhere in Washington State. In addition, as part of this competition, WSDOT also includes the FTA Section 5310 funding for the large urban area. Funding for this source can only be used for programs benefiting this large urban area, consisting of western portions of King, Pierce, and Snohomish counties. PSRC estimated that $4.5 million in the large urban FTA Section 5310 funding source would be available for the next two years. Funding amounts from the other federal and state sources that WSDOT awards cannot be predicted for the PSRC region, since those funds are distributed statewide.

PSRC staff worked with the SNTC to develop six initial evaluation factors to review and provide an initial sorting of the projects submitted to PSRC for regional priority ranking. Most of these evaluation factors were based on PSRC’s Coordinated Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan (Coordinated Plan), adopted in May 2018 as part of the Regional Transportation Plan. These factors included:

1. Project Type (Preservation vs. New/Expansion);
2. Coordinated Plan: Emerging Needs and Gaps;
3. Coordinated Plan: Prioritized Strategies;
4. Uniqueness of Service or Program;
5. Performance Measures and Targets; and

PSRC staff reviewed all 22 applications submitted by WSDOT’s September 14, 2018 deadline and provided an evaluation of whether the projects adequately addressed these six factors. PSRC
staff used a consistent methodology for review and evaluation based upon guidance developed and publicly shared with the Notice of Funding Availability information.

The results of the initial evaluation were shared with the SN TC as follows:

- 2 projects adequately addressed all 6 factors;
- 6 projects adequately addressed 5 out of 6 factors;
- 8 projects adequately addressed 4 out of 6 factors;
- 2 projects adequately addressed 3 out of 6 factors;
- 3 projects adequately addressed 2 out of 6 factors;
- 1 project adequately addressed 1 out of 6 factors.

After review of the initial evaluation and PSRC’s process for conducting the evaluation, the SN TC discussed additional factors to take into consideration in their deliberation on recommendations for regional priority recommendations. The SN TC previously reviewed and discussed factors to take into consideration, creating a list of additional factors for consideration in the spring of 2018, which were then posted with the Notice of Funding Availability information on PSRC’s Special Needs Transportation Funding web page. At the October 17th meeting, SN TC decided that the factors already discussed were adequate for purposes of making a recommendation. These additional factors included:

a) Geographical distribution of regional priority rankings (identifying projects by county as well as multi-county projects);

b) Project types (e.g., operations, mobility management, capital);

c) Agency equity (e.g., number of projects submitted by each agency);

d) Compelling cases for agencies with limited resources;

e) Strategic application of federal/state funds; and

f) Coordination.

PSRC staff suggested that based upon the initial evaluation in comparison to the number of regional priority rankings, projects addressing 5-6 of the initial evaluation factors would receive an “A” ranking; projects addressing 4-5 of the initial evaluation factors would receive a “B” ranking; projects addressing 2-4 of the initial evaluation factors would receive a “C” ranking; and the project addressing 1 of the 6 initial evaluation factors would receive the “D” ranking.

The committee discussed adjustments to the initial sorting of projects, including the need to address strategic application of federal/state funds in review of the project list. In particular, it was noted that with the large urban FTA Section 5310 funds being required to be awarded in the PSRC region, and because of FTA rules that require a minimum amount of those funds being spent on “Traditional 5310” projects (e.g., mobility management, operations that are through a contract for services, and capital), then higher ranking projects that are eligible for those Traditional 5310 funds could receive a lower regional priority ranking than they otherwise would receive and still have a good chance of being funded.

In initial evaluation of projects addressing 5 or 6 of the initial evaluation criteria, most Traditional 5310 projects were awarded a “B” priority ranking. The committee noted that by awarding “B”’s to
Traditional 5310 projects receiving a 5 or 6 in initial evaluation, they were able to use “A” rankings for other key operating projects in other counties, including those that received 4 out of the initial evaluation, addressing the geographical distribution of regional priority rankings. In addition, these lower-ranking operating projects have a higher chance of needing to compete statewide for funds given that they are not eligible or the Traditional 5310 funds. The committee allotted four A’s to projects meeting these criteria, covering projects in all three counties.

The committee also addressed project types and geographic distribution, discussing the importance of countywide mobility management programs, and volunteer transportation programs in each of the three counties. The countywide mobility management programs are all eligible for the more secure Traditional 5310 funds that need to be spent in the large urban area; whereas the volunteer transportation programs are not eligible for that funding source and need to compete for funds statewide. Therefore, countywide mobility management were prioritized by “B” rankings and three of the highest ranking volunteer transportation programs were prioritized with “A” rankings.

The committee examined distribution of A’s and B’s by geography at that point as the committee considered allocation of the remaining A’s and B’s. Priority for remaining A’s and B’s went to higher ranking projects in King and Pierce counties based on discussions relating to project type, strategic application of funding and coordination.

As the committee discussed its higher priorities for awarding A’s and B’s, it purposely awarded too many B’s and decided to revisit those awards as they continued review of projects. In looking at lower-ranking projects, the committee decided to award “C” rankings to projects receiving initial evaluations of 2-3. However, it was noted that the project receiving a 1 out of 6 in the initial evaluation is a capital purchase of vehicles tied to a higher-ranking project, TAP Operations Expansion – both in Snohomish County. The project sponsor offered that they would take a “D” ranking for the second, lower-ranking volunteer transportation program in Snohomish County in exchange for a “C” for the capital vehicle purchase needed for TAP Operations Expansion. This would provide the same “C” ranking for both the operations and the capital needed for that expansion of service. “C” rankings were awarded to all the other lower-ranking projects receiving 2’s or 3’s, as well as remaining projects receiving a 4 in initial evaluation that was not yet awarded a ranking.

The committee then reviewed the need to convert one “B” ranking to a “C” ranking. After reviewing all of the projects allotted a “B” in the initial review, the committee decided that both because it was a multi-county project covering all three counties, and because it was eligible for the Traditional 5310 funding source, the Hopelink Regional Emergency Management/Transportation for Vulnerable Populations project would be converted from a “B” ranking to a “C” despite its high initial ranking. The committee discussed this further and reaffirmed its decision to award that project a “C” because it is a relatively small request compared to many of the other projects allotted “B’s” and that because it is a three-county partnership, the project is expected to generate local support to fund it if it does not receive Consolidated Grant funding and because it may be eligible for other funding sources as well.

The committee reviewed geographic distribution of A’s, B’s, and C’s now that all of them were allotted.
King, Pierce, and Multi-County projects all received 2 “A” rankings and Snohomish County received 1 “A” ranking. It was noted that one of the Multi-county projects also served part of Snohomish County.

Pierce County received 3 “B” rankings, whereas King and Snohomish counties each received 2 “B” rankings;

Snohomish and Multi-county projects each received 3 “C” rankings and Pierce County received 1 “C” ranking.

Snohomish County received the one “D” ranking.

It was further noted, in discussion on geographic distribution, that Snohomish County submitted the most applications with 7 submittals; and King County submitted the fewest with 4 submittals. The committee noted that over time, programs have merged and as they have grown, they have converted from single-county projects to multi-county projects, such as Mt. Si’s Snoqualmie Valley Transportation, as it expanded from King County only to a multi-county when it extended service from Duvall to Monroe.

The committee was satisfied with their proposal for awarding regional priority rankings, as providing a balance of priorities with the geographical distribution, appropriately prioritizing project types, and being strategic with the eligibility for Traditional 5310 funding sources in those priorities.

The committee next reviewed the regional priority rankings in the context of whether the rankings would go to projects seeking 2-years of funding or 4-years of funding. If a regional priority ranking is awarded to a project seeking 4-years of funding, that ranking slot will not be available for the competition in 2020. The committee discussed the implications of this change to the rules. In examining the regional priority rankings compared to how applicants submitted for the 2-year/4-year of funding, the committee found:

- Only 1 “A” ranking sought 2-years of funding;
- 3 “B” rankings sought 2-years of funding; and
- 5 “C” rankings sought 2-years of funding.

The committee decided that that distribution was acceptable, in part, because most of the higher priority programs would be funded for 4-years. It was acknowledged that PSRC and WSDOT should monitor how this new rule plays out over time and revisit it if there are issues with application of the rule.

The committee deliberated for more than three hours to develop a recommendation for PSRC’s regional priority rankings for WSDOT Consolidated Grant competition that generally prioritized projects addressing the initial factors based upon the PSRC Coordinated Plan for addressing the mobility needs and gaps of people with special transportation needs. These priorities were adjusted using additional factors not initially addressed as follows:

- Strategically applying higher regional rankings (A or B) to projects evaluated higher that are not eligible for Traditional 5310 funds and lower regional rankings (B or C) to higher ranking projects that are eligible for Traditional 5310 funds. This is due, in part, to the region’s experience of fully funding Traditional 5310 projects because of FTA’s priorities in that area, and the need for projects not eligible for Traditional 5310 to compete statewide.
• Ensuring a mix of projects are addressed with the priorities, including higher priority rankings to the major operating programs and volunteer transportation services in the three counties; and ensuring that countywide mobility management programs providing core mobility management functions receive at least a "B" ranking.

• Geographically distributing A’s to all counties and makes sure that counties with fewer A’s are provided with more other rankings than the other counties.

The motion to recommend the final package to the TOC was approved unanimously by the SNTC.

Next meeting
December 19, 2018 from 9:30 am to 11:30 am

Adjourn
The meeting adjourned at 11:00 a.m.