



MEMORANDUM

To: Paratransit Advisory and Planning Committee

From: Paratransit Coordination Team

Date: April 19, 2013

Subject: **Gap Grant Cycle 5 Funding Recommendation**

Recommendation

PAPCO is recommended to approve the Gap Grant Review Subcommittee's recommendation to the Alameda CTC Commission for Cycle 5 funding in the amount of \$2,150,644.

Background

On March 4, 2013, the Alameda CTC received 17 applications for Gap Grant Cycle 5 funding. The total Measure B paratransit discretionary funds requested totaled \$3,472,744. See Table 1 for a list of applications received.

Seven PAPCO members were appointed to the Gap Grant Review Subcommittee. They were:

- Sylvia Stadmire, PAPCO Chair, representing Alameda County Supervisor Wilma Chan, D-3
- Will Scott, PAPCO Vice Chair, representing Alameda County Supervisor Keith Carson, D-5
- Joyce Jacobson, representing City of Emeryville
- Sandra Johnson Simon, representing BART
- Sharon Powers, representing City of Fremont
- Carmen Rivera-Hendrickson, representing City of Pleasanton
- Hale Zukas, representing A.C. Transit

Unfortunately Ms. Powers was unable to serve due to extenuating circumstances. All other members scored applications and participated in

subcommittee meetings. Additionally, applications were scored by four staff members. They were:

- John Hemiup, Project Manager, Alameda CTC
- John Nguyen, Alameda CTC
- Naomi Armenta, Paratransit Coordinator
- Cathleen Sullivan, Nelson\Nygaard, Paratransit Coordination Team

Gap Grant Cycle 5 is primarily focused on supporting mobility management types of activities that improve consumers' ability to access services and/or improve coordination between programs. Projects/programs that do not fit a traditional trip-provision model and that are multi-jurisdictional in scope (e.g. countywide, cross-planning area, or cross-city) were prioritized in evaluating applications. All applications were scored using a detailed Scoring Guidance to assign point values for seven approved evaluation criteria. The criteria were: Gap Closure/Needs and Benefits; Cost Effectiveness/Efficiency; Applicant Experience/Qualifications; Demand; Implementation Readiness; Innovation; and Leveraging Outside Funds.

The Gap Grant Review Subcommittee met three times. The first meeting was March 15, 2013. At this meeting, members determined appropriate recusals for scoring.

- Sylvia Stadmire – City of Oakland/Department of Human Services, Taxi-Up & Go Project
- Joyce Jacobson – City of Emeryville, 8-To-Go: A Demand Response, Door to Door Shuttle
- Carmen Rivera-Hendrickson – Livermore Amador Valley Transit Authority, Wheels Para-taxi and Paratransit Scholarship Program
- Sharon Powers – City of Fremont/Human Services Department, Tri-City Mobility Management and Travel Training Program, Volunteer Driver Programs, Tri-City Taxi Voucher Program (in absentia)

Members then discussed initial scoring results and impressions of the applications. Members then listed questions requiring follow-up from the applicants. All applicants received a minimum of one question: The Alameda CTC received applications requesting almost twice the available funding. As a result, we are asking all applicants: Could the applicant still implement part of their proposed program/project if awarded partial funding? Questions were forwarded to applicants on March 18, 2013 and responses were requested by March 22, 2013. All applicants responded.

The Gap Grant Review Subcommittee met for the second time on March 27, 2013. At this meeting members reviewed the answers provided by applicants. Members also reviewed a number of analytical tools, including average scores of all reviewers, average rankings of all reviewers, score divided by cost, and geographic “rank” (how an application ranked compared to other applications from the same planning area). Some reviewers amended their scores based on the additional information provided by applicants.

Throughout the review process, members were also kept apprised of relevant funding processes, including the FTA 5310 funding process (which affected 2 applicants), and the Measure B Pass-Through funding program plan review (which affected 12 applicants).

The Gap Grant Review Subcommittee met for a third and final time on April 12, 2013. Members reviewed analytical tools again, as scores had been finalized. Using overall average rank (1-17) as a starting point, members began to determine potential funding allocations. It quickly became apparent that with full funding, only the top six grants could be funded. The committee then began proposing partial funding for some grants based on a number of factors: their answer to follow-up Question 1 (“Could the applicant still implement part of their proposed program/project if awarded partial funding?”), external sources of funding, prior Gap grant history, and program and geographic parity. This allowed the subcommittee to fund the top nine grants.

Staff informed the committee that approximately \$200,000 in unspent Coordination and Mobility Management Planning (CMMP) gap funds remained. The committee assigned those funds to the grants ranked ten and eleven, which also met the intent of CMMP funds, and were also original CMMP Pilots. The CMMP process determined that three types of programs filled identified gaps in the county: 1. Volunteer Driver programs (which provide door-through-door assistance for the most fragile and vulnerable senior populations), 2. Taxi programs (which provide same day service), and 3. Mobility Management and Travel Training (which provide needed education and orientation to mobility options allowing more people to use lower cost fixed route transit and enabling people to better select the most appropriate mode for each trip).

The final stage of evaluation was consideration of geographic equity, another approved factor for Gap Grant evaluation. As a result of this stage of review,

subcommittee members asked staff to determine if further gap funding could be identified to fund the twelfth ranked grant.

The subcommittee concluded with a unanimous motion to fund the grants ranked one through eleven, and twelve if possible. (The motion was made by Carmen Rivera-Hendrickson, seconded by Sandra Johnson Simon).

Alameda CTC staff confirmed that funding could be established to fund the twelfth ranked grant at the reduced program level that the applicant confirmed as acceptable.

Table 1 lists funding recommendations including partial funding recommendations and applicable notes. Table 2 lists geographic data related to the recommendation.

Table 1.

| AVG RANK | ID # | Sponsor | Program/Project Title | Funds Requested | Total Program/Project Cost | Recommended Funding | Notes |
|----------|------|-------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 | 13 | Alzheimer's Services of the East Bay | Special Transportation Services for Individuals with Dementia | \$300,000 | \$837,318 | \$200,000 | Ranked in top third. Subcommittee recommended partial funding. Reduction is based on ASEB already receiving \$75,000 from Measure B pass-through funding, the small number of consumers served, and overall funding limitations. |
| 2 | 5 | Center for Independent Living, Inc. | Mobility Matters Project | \$500,000 | \$833,560 | \$350,000 | Ranked in top third. Subcommittee recommended partial funding. Reduction is based on one partner already receiving \$70,000 in Measure B pass-through funding , another partner receiving \$272,000 from another grant, potential for funding from outside sources (e.g. New Freedom), and overall funding limitations. |
| 3 | 10 | Bay Area Outreach & Recreation Program | Accessible Group Trip Transportation for Youth and Adults with Disabilities | \$272,000 | \$340,200 | \$272,000 | Ranked in top third. Subcommittee recommended full funding. Program is Countywide and fills a gap that is not met by any other programs in the county. |
| 4 | 3 | City of Fremont/Human Services Department | Tri-City Mobility Management and Travel Training Program | \$233,982 | \$269,982 | \$200,000 | Ranked in top third. Subcommittee recommended partial funding. Reduction is based on the fact that all Tri-City grants are recommended for funding and overall funding limitations. |
| 5 | 8 | Senior Support Program of The Tri Valley | Volunteer Assisted Senior Transportation Program | \$150,000 | \$165,000 | \$150,000 | Ranked in top third. Subcommittee recommended full funding. |
| 6 | 17 | City of Pleasanton | Downtown Route Shuttle (DTR) | \$85,544 | \$105,777 | \$85,544 | Ranked in top third. Subcommittee recommended full funding. Program has already made significant cuts in service to reduce costs and increase shuttle utilization; applicant indicated that program would be discontinued without full requested grant amount. |
| 7 | 9 | City of Fremont/Human Services Department | Tri-City Volunteer Driver Programs | \$285,626 | \$285,626 | \$200,000 | Ranked in middle third. Subcommittee recommended partial funding. Reduction is based on the fact that all Tri-City grants are recommended for funding and overall funding limitations. |
| 8 | 16 | City of Fremont/Human Services Department | Tri-City Taxi Voucher Program | \$228,188 | \$228,188 | \$200,000 | Ranked in middle third. Subcommittee recommended partial funding. Reduction is based on the fact that all Tri-City grants are recommended for funding and overall funding limitations. |
| 9 | 12 | City of Emeryville | 8-To-Go: A Demand Response, Door to Door Shuttle | \$106,000 | \$186,200 | \$106,000 | Ranked in middle third. Subcommittee recommended full funding. Program/project demonstrates mobility management and cannot reasonably be implemented without full funding. This two-year gap grant also fills a funding gap to transition program to full city funding in the future. |

| AVG RANK | ID # | Sponsor | Program/Project Title | Funds Requested | Total Program/Project Cost | Recommended Funding | Notes |
|---------------|------|--------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 10 | 6 | Senior Helpline Services | Rides for Seniors | \$220,000 | \$231,580 | \$150,000 | Ranked in middle third. Subcommittee recommended partial funding. Reduction is based on funding only the North County component of the project in order to ensure program is fully established and successful in one part of the county before expanding. Also based on overall funding limitations. Funding will be provided through remaining CMMP funds, which is appropriate as this was a CMMP Pilot. |
| 11 | 15 | Central County Taxi Program / City of Hayward | Central County Taxi Program | \$52,100 | \$144,500 | \$52,100 | Ranked in middle third. Subcommittee recommended full funding. Funding will be provided through remaining CMMP funds, which is appropriate as this was a CMMP Pilot. |
| 12 | 2 | City of Oakland/Department of Human Services | Taxi-Up & Go Project | \$248,468 | \$248,468 | \$185,000 | Ranked in middle third. Subcommittee recommended partial funding. Program illustrates robust coordination with social service providers. Reduction is based on the overall funding limitations. |
| 13 | 4 | Lions Center for the Blind | Tech-to-Trek Travel Training for the Blind and Visually Impaired | \$180,474 | \$190,474 | \$0 | Ranked in bottom third. Subcommittee did not recommend funding. Subcommittee hopes that there may be opportunities for coordination with funded programs/projects. |
| 14 | 14 | Livermore Amador Valley Transit Authority | Wheels Para-taxi | \$60,000 | \$75,000 | \$0 | Ranked in bottom third. Subcommittee did not recommend funding. Subcommittee hopes that other external sources of funding will allow applicant to continue program on reduced scale. |
| 15 | 11 | Bay Area Community Services (BACS) | BACS Senior Shopping Shuttle and Group Trip Program | \$225,362 | \$237,532 | \$0 | Ranked in bottom third. Subcommittee did not recommend funding. |
| 16 | 1 | Livermore Amador Valley Transit Authority | Paratransit Scholarship Program | \$25,000 | \$26,250 | \$0 | Ranked in bottom third. Subcommittee did not recommend funding. Subcommittee hopes that other sources of funding will allow applicant to continue program on reduced scale. |
| 17 | 7 | Allen Temple Health & Social Services Ministries | I'll Take You There Rides | \$300,000 | \$315,000 | \$0 | Ranked in bottom third. Subcommittee did not recommend funding. Subcommittee hopes that there may be opportunities for coordination with funded programs/projects. |
| TOTALS | | | | \$3,472,744 | \$4,720,655 | \$2,150,644 | |
| | | | | | CMMP | \$202,100 | |
| | | | | | TOTAL without CMMP | \$1,948,544 | |

Table 2.

| | Funding Recommended by Planning Area* | | Funding Recommended by Planning Area (Countywide distributed**) | | Planning Area Portion of Pass-Through Funding Formula |
|-------------------|----------------------------------------------|---------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|
| Countywide | \$622,000.00 | 28.9% | | | |
| North | \$553,000.00 | 25.7% | \$870,220.00 | 40.5% | 51% |
| Central | \$104,100.00 | 4.8% | \$ 253,380.00 | 11.8% | 24% |
| South | \$636,000.00 | 29.6% | \$ 735,520.00 | 34.2% | 16% |
| East | \$235,544.00 | 11.0% | \$ 291,524.00 | 13.6% | 9% |
| Totals | \$2,150,644.00 | 100.0% | \$2,150,644.00 | 100.0% | |

* Includes appropriate portion of Alzheimer Services of the East Bay grant which covers three planning areas (North, Central, and South).

** Assumes Countywide program split into Planning Area components based on pass-through formula percentages.

Fiscal Impacts \$2,150,644 of Special Transportation for Seniors and People with Disabilities Measure B discretionary Gap Grant funds be allocated to the first through twelfth ranked Cycle 5 Gap Grant applicants