Special Needs Transportation Committee Agenda

Date: December 19, 2018 from 9:30 a.m. to 11:30 a.m.
Location: PSRC Board Room, 1011 Western Avenue, Suite 500, Seattle, WA 98104

1. Welcome and Introductions (9:30 a.m.) – Marianna Hanefeld, Chair
2. Public Comment
3. Approval of Meeting Summary – October 17, 2018*
4. Report on PSRC Committees and Boards (9:35 a.m.)
   a. Regional Staff Committee – Marianna Hanefeld, Chair
   b. Transportation Operators Committee – Marianna Hanefeld and Gil Cerise
   c. Transportation Policy Board and Executive Board – Gil Cerise, PSRC
5. Action: Nominations for SNCTC Chair and Vice-chair for 2019-2020 (9:45 a.m.)*
   – Gil Cerise, PSRC

   According to Section 2.3 of the SNCTC Operating Procedures, the Committee will seek a chair and vice-chair from among its voting membership for 2019-2020. We will seek nominations at the meeting and conduct a vote-by-email following the meeting.

6. Discussion: WSDOT Grants Program Advisory Committee (GPAC) Work for 2019 (9:55 a.m.) – Jean Kim, PSRC

   Discuss regional interest in the topics being considered for the Consolidated Grant, including the move to formulize the funds for future competitions.

7. Discussion: PSRC Committee Structure and 2019-2020 SNCTC Work Program (10:10 a.m.) – Gil Cerise & Jean Kim, PSRC

    PSRC is surveying its staff-level committee and considering some possible restructures. At the meeting, PSRC staff will share a draft structure of all PSRC’s transit-related committees including SNCTC and the committee work program for 2019 and 2020. We will also discuss future meeting dates based on the updated committee structure and work of the committee now that PSRC is not in project selection authority for special needs transportation funds.
8. Information: Snoqualmie Valley Transportation Coalition and Transportation Services (10:50 a.m.) – Marianna Hanefeld, SNOTRAC and Staci Haber, King County Mobility Coalition

9. Discussion: Local Coalition Reports / Emerging Issues (11:15 a.m.) – Local Coalition Mobility Managers/Representatives

10. Next SNTC Meeting: To Be Determined (see agenda item #7)

11. Adjourn

*Supporting materials attached

Other Formats:
- Sign language and communication material in alternate formats can be arranged given sufficient notice by calling (206) 464-7090 or TTY Relay 711.
- العربية | Arabic, 中文 | Chinese, Deutsch | German, Français | French, 한국 | Korean, Русский | Russian, Español | Spanish, Tagalog, Tiếng việt | Vietnamese

Call 206-587-4819
October 17, 2018

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 SNTC 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 SNTC discussed additional factors to take into consideration in their deliberation on recommendations for regional priority recommendations. The SNTC 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, SNTC 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 or 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.
1. Committee Purpose

The Special Needs Transportation Committee (SNTC) will serve as the primary forum for discussing and addressing the needs and gaps in special needs transportation and other human services transportation issues of common concern and/or interest to the stakeholders of special needs transportation in King, Kitsap, Pierce, and Snohomish Counties. Actions approved by the Special Needs Transportation Committee will be forwarded as recommendations to the Transportation Operators Committee (TOC) for their consideration.

2. Roles and Responsibilities

2.1. Primary Responsibilities

Primary responsibilities of the SNTC include:

- Development and implementation of the region’s Coordinated Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan (for updates to the Regional Transportation Plan) as required by federal and state law;
- Recommendations relating to regional priorities for special needs transportation funding and the fair and equitable distribution of that funding; and
- Providing the perspective of people with special transportation needs for consideration in other PSRC plans and policies.

Other issues of general interest will be identified by SNTC members at the beginning of each calendar year and incorporated into the annual work plan.

2.2. Individual Committee Member Responsibilities

- Identify issues vital to the interests represented on the Committee.
- Provide timely review of the information provided by PSRC staff.
- Provide representation on the TOC, Regional Staff Committee and other PSRC committees seeking a special needs perspective.
- Represent and report to their agencies and local mobility coalitions on activities and assist in building a regional consensus on specific strategies and policies related to the improvement of special needs transportation in the central Puget Sound region.
2.3 Committee Leadership Responsibilities

- A SNTC Chair and Vice Chair will be elected by the Committee from among the voting membership for a two-year term. Efforts will be made to rotate representation by agency and geography for the SNTC leadership positions. Leadership positions should not be held by members from the same county at the same time.
- The Chair’s role will be to keep the discussions focused and to ensure that all SNTC members have the opportunity to express their views on the issues at hand. The Chair will make every effort to conduct and complete the meetings on time unless otherwise agreed to by Committee members.
- The Chair or designated alternate will represent SNTC at other PSRC Committee meetings including Transportation Operators Committee and Regional Staff Committee meetings.
- The Vice Chair will serve in place of the Chair when the Chair is unable to attend.

2.4. PSRC Responsibilities

- PSRC will provide staff support to the Special Needs Transportation Committee and develop information to facilitate discussion, as well as providing information on the activities and meetings of the SNTC to the TOC, the Regional Council’s policy boards, and the general public.
- PSRC staff will develop an annual calendar of planned SNTC meetings and work program items in consultation with the SNTC.
- PSRC staff will prepare or collect agenda materials and distribute them to SNTC members.
- PSRC staff will have reporting responsibilities to the TOC, Regional Staff Committee, Transportation Policy Board, and Executive Board on the activities of the Special Needs Transportation Committee.
- PSRC will be responsible for adequate public information and dissemination of SNTC materials.
- Provide information to the SNTC on other PSRC planning initiatives, plan updates, and other topics of potential interest to the committee.
- PSRC staff will attend and participate in county mobility coalition meetings, as needed.

3. Committee Membership

3.1. General Composition

The Committee will be composed of staff from various local, regional, and state agencies (both government and non-profit), and county and local mobility coalitions involved in the planning, funding, coordination, or delivery of special needs transportation services. Voting membership seats on the Committee may include others as determined appropriate by the Committee while maintaining the sense of equity in representation both by agency as well as geography.
3.2. Membership Types

The SNTC includes both voting members and non-voting (informative) members.

**Voting Membership**

SNTC voting membership reflects the need for a committee that is a workable size and also addresses the requirements for representation associated with seniors, people with disabilities, and other special needs transportation populations associated with federal and state planning requirements. Voting membership guidelines for SNTC recognize that there are some groups with multiple organizations representing them. Therefore, in these cases, county or local mobility coalitions may assist in identifying a representative for the SNTC. See Attachment A for voting membership seats. Voting membership will be reviewed at least once every three years; each time membership is updated, the rationale and background determined by the committee will be documented.

Each voting member will have a designated alternate. Please note that only designated voting members or their alternates may participate in voting. Where meeting room space is constrained, priority shall be given to providing space at the table for designated voting members and their designated alternates.

Formal recommendations intended for PSRC action will be held by vote of the SNTC. Two subjects that the SNTC shall make recommendation to PSRC on include:

- **Coordinated Plan:** All voting members or their alternates may vote on issues related to the Coordinated Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan and other planning-related recommendations.

- **Regional Priority/Grant Funding:** All voting members or their alternates may vote on issues related to special needs transportation regional priorities for grant funding with the following exception. Voting members representing a county or counties that do not participate in the PSRC regional ranking for the Consolidated Grant competition may not participate in voting for that funding competition. In those instances, voting members from such county or counties are considered non-voting (informative) members for that vote.

Appointments for each voting member and alternate are to be provided in writing to PSRC as follows:

- **County/Local Coalition Appointments:** Several voting membership seats may be satisfied by a variety of organizations. In those instances, a county or local mobility coalition will be responsible for appointing the voting member and alternate. These appointments are noted on Attachment A.

- For other voting members or alternates, the appointment shall be provided by the organization’s executive, department head, or other responsible official.
Non-voting (Informative) Membership

Given the wide variety of interests involved in coordinated transportation for special needs populations, the SNCT may also include non-voting membership for those organizations interested in contributing their technical or program expertise to special needs transportation discussions. Non-voting members may include representatives from governmental, non-profit, human services and/or private transportation sectors with an interest or role in special needs transportation. Informative members may participate in discussions of the committee, but may not vote.

Addition of non-voting members to the SNCT shall be evaluated on a case-by-case basis by PSRC. Non-voting membership will be requested in writing from the sponsoring organization for consideration by PSRC. The SNCT will maintain a roster of non-voting membership. The non-voting membership roster will be updated periodically, as needed.

4. Committee Meetings

4.1. Meeting Procedures

- Meeting materials, including summaries of past meetings are included on the website prior to each scheduled SNCT meeting.
- Meetings will be open to the public and time will be made available at each meeting for public comments.
- Meeting agendas will be sent to SNCT members at least three business days in advance of the scheduled meeting.
- Relating to a SNCT action item, supporting materials shall be distributed to the SNCT members at least three business days in advance of the scheduled meeting date, as a courtesy to all. When appropriate, the Chair will consider issuing a determination on materials not meeting this requirement.

4.2. Meeting Schedule

- The SNCT will meet at least quarterly, and more frequently as determined by PSRC in consultation with the SNCT leadership.
- Additional meetings will be held as needed upon agreement of the Committee.

5. Evaluation

The purpose and formal composition of the SNCT will be re-evaluated periodically, as needed. But, in no case shall the evaluation occur any less frequently than once every five years.