

NEW YORK STATE ASSOCIATION OF MPOs

TRANSIT WORKING GROUP

FEBRUARY 11, 2014

MEETING NOTES

1. Participating

- A/GFTC – Kate Mance
- BMTS – Scott Reigle, Jennifer Yonkoski
- CDTC – Anne Benware
- ECTC – Jim Arey
- GTC – Robert Torzynski
- HOCTS – Dana Crisino
- ITCTC – Dwight Mengel
- NYMTC – Angelina Foster
- OCTC – John Czamanske, Rob Parrington
- PDCTC – Mark Debald
- SMTC – Mario Colone
- UCTC – Brian Slack
- NYSDOT – Tom Vaughan, David Kimmel, Kari Sidicki
- FTA – James Goveia, Daniel Moser

2. FTA §5310 Program

a. Solicitation schedule and platform

Vaughan reports:

- Application process will proceed through NYMTC's Sharepoint; NYSDOT is finalizing licensing and user support.
- Reworking online application, with business rules to guide applicants through the required questions.
- Refining agreement between NYMTC and NYSDOT; will be shared with MPOs
- Everything will be electronic; addressing a question on verification of digital signature.
- Not using NYS Grants Gateway, it was not ready. Sharepoint is an alternative through NYMTC. It should be less confusing to applicants.
- Goal is to get grant approved prior to end of FFY 2014; application process of 10-11 weeks, workshops starting 3rd 4th week.
-

b. Items for review: project categories, scoring, review committees

Vaughan: These are not yet ready for distribution. Will be seeking input from MPOs.

Will send out matrix that shows project categories and dollar amount.

Each MPO will rate/rank projects.

Logistics of MPO scoring will be in document to be distributed.

Czamanske: Asks about coordination in MHSTCC on categories. Would like to keep it easy in this round. Can it be just capital this round?

Vaughan: 3 MPOs in TMA need to agree, but can also reflect primary county of service.

Debald: PDCTC would like to include mobility management.

Vaughan: Then should do by county within the TMA
Foster: From NYMTC perspective, will not have project category restrictions because of large non-profit population and project variety; want TCC review
Czamanske: More straightforward to allow flexibility across TMA
Slack: Should address at upcoming TMA meeting. Flexibility a good idea.
Vaughan: Will you score it as one TMA? Will be asking MPOs to identify review committee.
Czamanske: Sense is that review has to be as a TMA.

Czamanske: Will NYSDOT be doing oversight/coordination for mobility management projects?
Vaughan: If a county who is a DR of §5307 wants oversight, NYSDOT will allow that with a supplemental agreement. But want to get single grant approved.
Foster: Will NYSDOT have an OGS vehicle contract?
Vaughan: Current contract is through December 2014.
Vaughan: traditional recipients/traditional capital projects must be 55%.
RT: Has DR designation made for statewide administration?
Vaughan: All MPO resolutions are in place, but no letter yet.

Torzynski: How will NYSDOT get input from TMAs on project types?
Vaughan: Draft information to Transit WG by mid-week next week; will come in pieces as they are ready. Tentative schedule depends on solving logistics with NYMTC process.
Debald: For mobility management project, will reimbursement requests be processed through NYSDOT?
Vaughan: Yes, recipients will contract with NYSDOT.

Arey: Review Committee assumed to be MPO members?
Vaughan: Prefer some participation by state/county human service agencies.

Mengel: Tompkins has already done a §5310 solicitation, and ITCTC has acted. Will we need to do it over? Done in anticipation of the grant process. Waiting for final §5310 Circular to determine if SUZAs can be DRs (draft Circular states State must be DR for SUZAs.)

Vaughan: Potential application date: Feb 28 or Mar 7.
Foster: How much time for applicant to submit applications?
Vaughan: 11-12 weeks.
Torzynski: Will workshops be in-person or web-based?
Vaughan: Planning 4 upstate locations, then available on web.
Foster: Will MPO staff be expected support workshop?
Vaughan: Will reach out to everyone once application process is confirmed. MPOs and Coordinated Plan participants will be involved.
Reigle: Clarify – is rural §5310 capital only? Vaughan: Yes.

ACTION ITEM: Vaughan will send out items for review as they are prepared: project type matrix, review committee membership, application process in Sharepoint.

3. 2014-2015 Working Group Work Program
 - a. Proposed subcommittees [see notes below]
Torzynski: Proposal is to form subcommittees to best use Working Group member time and further the work of the WG.

Foster: Concur with this approach

Torzynski reviews the subcommittees, asks for volunteers.

- §5310 program. Torzynski, Foster
 - §5307 program, JARC. Mengel
 - Mobility Management. Mengel, Arey or Hager, Torzynski; possibly NYCDOT
-
- Work with NYSDOT and the FTA to clarify and understand newly-implemented MAP-21 requirements for the §5310 Program and how to most effectively meet these requirements. I think we need to find a way to move this along more quickly than using conference calls alone. I would suggest we consider identifying several individuals that will commit to work with Tom to help coordinate the roll-out for the upcoming 5310 solicitation. This should be a top priority.
 - Discuss potential approaches to funding JARC-type projects under MAP-21 utilizing fund sources such as FTA §5307. This has been brought up by at least one MPO, and it could benefit from some focused attention by those most affected. I think this is the second priority, but only if there is at least one person willing to step up and start on the ground work. (To start with by identifying the MPO's and/or Transit Agencies that are interested in funding the JARC-type projects and that feel they need additional guidance to do so.)
 - Discuss mobility management strategies and practices to advance innovative, sustainable, integrated consumer mobility services. This is an important area, in my opinion. Third priority only because we seem to have a little bit of time and the 5310 roll-out is more pressing.

4. Other Business

Czaminske asks about NY-NJ allocation of §5307 and §5340?

Vaughan: Not yet resolved.

- STIP

Vaughan: Would be beneficial to NYSDOT to have discussion on STIP processing for FTA projects. Is the Transit WG right group?

Notes STIP changes for FTA projects do not happen a lot; so need to improve eSTIP input process. Determined that Transit WG members are not necessarily the right MPO people.

ACTION ITEM: Gayle will discuss with NYSAMPO Executive Committee and Directors to identify correct people from each MPO.

- Non-emergency Medicaid transportation

Arey: Notes impact of regional dispatch approach. Rural counties are losing ridership and revenue. Slack: significant issue in Ulster County. How to provide service ; no solutions. Meeting in coming weeks.

Benware: Regional Transportation Coordination Committee has been talking about this. Creates less opportunity to coordinate, single purpose. Less use of transit.

Mengel: Central NY counties are impacted, mobility managers began talking last month, working with NYPTA on issue. Contact Mengel if interested in involvement.

Torzynski: GTC will address in update of Coordinated Plan.

Arey: Requests this be an agenda item for subsequent meetings.