



Salem Area Mass Transit District

Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund Advisory Committee

Tuesday, November 15, 2022

12:30 – 2:00pm

Google Meet joining information

Video call link: <https://meet.google.com/epw-ttwg-cgm>

Phone: 1 636-400-7339 PIN: 978 284 709#

MINUTES

PRESENT:

Kathy McClaskey, Peggy Greene, Ramiro Navarro, Karen Sherman, Steve Dickey, Kelsie Cole, Chris French

Members: Ron Harding, Jim Row, Marja Byers, Kyle Miller, Emily Broussard, Bryant Baird, John Hammill

Guest: Arla Miller, Karen Odenthal

ABSENT: Sheena Lucht, Jason Gottgetreu

Members: Jeremy Gordon

Recorder: Angela Henson

A. CALL TO ORDER

12:36PM

1. Ron Harding called the meeting to order. A quorum was present.
2. Mr. Dickey presented the Safety Moment: It's colder outside, and with that cold comes frost in the morning. It creates slick roads and sight impairments, so be sure to give enough time to clear windows on the vehicle. This will help to see the vehicle extremities, including blind spots. Some newer vehicles are equipped with safety elements, such as forward facing cameras and sensors; if you fail to clear these features of frost or debris, the elements will not function properly.

B. PUBLIC TESTIMONY

1. None

C. MOTION / VOTING on previous meeting's Action Items

1. Approved prior meetings minutes (10-18-22) as amended; motioned, and seconded for approval of minutes. City of Woodburn section D.1.a. included a typo of terminology stating "medication transportation", which should read as "medical transportation".
2. Approved STIF / STF applications as amended and presented; motioned, and seconded for approval.
3. Approved 5310 applications as presented; motioned and seconded for approval.
4. Ron Harding voted in as Chair; motioned and seconded for approval.
5. Marja Byers voted in as Vice-Chair; motioned and seconded for approval.

D. INFORMATION ITEMS and DISCUSSION

We're addressing areas on the application that were required due to updates and changes made to the application by ODOT. The profile this year has been a bit of a challenge and there have been some changes in our process of combining STF with STIF. Even while we've been underway in this process ODOT has brought about the latest of changes, such as separating all the population based projects (formerly known as STF) into separate projects within the application. Those funds would not be available to us because the radio button had to be checked affirming these services would benefit seniors and persons with disabilities. This new feature required all of the Public Transit Service Providers (PTSP's) to rearrange everything that was in their application into a different order. The projects that were funded with the formerly STIF or STF funds, would be their own projects and would have the radio button checked, affirming the projects would be benefiting seniors and people with disabilities.

This is only the only change in outline; SAMTD will talk about the changes to their application, and the other three agency applications are the same, but arranged differently so that they will still have access to those funds as required by ODOT.

1. PTSP Presentations

a. City of Woodburn:

- The only thing that we did was create a new reserves section for formally STF funds.

DISCUSSION, QUESTIONS & ANSWERS:

None.

b. City of Silverton:

- No changes.

DISCUSSION, QUESTIONS & ANSWERS:

None.

c. West Valley Hospital (WVH):

- No changes.

DISCUSSION, QUESTIONS & ANSWERS:

None.

d. Salem Area Mass Transit District (SAMTD):

- Added a fourth project for the South Salem Transit Center (SSTC), which includes land acquisition costs; these funds could be used as match in the federal grant process as we look for other funds, totaling \$2.5M.
- Construction costs associated with the SSTC in the property development design and construction, infrastructure, permitting, and inspection. These funds total \$1M that we're funds from the previous biennium reserves (that we've already had), and they're being allocated to be used for the SSTC.

DISCUSSION, QUESTIONS & ANSWERS:

None.

2. In the past the STF side of business had 5310 funds flowing through ODOT, and were handled in tandem with the STF funding. Now that the programs are split apart the funds are in different sections where ODOT holds the 5310 and 5311 which we don't ever see because those are direct from the agencies to ODOT. So really what we're looking at today is the 5310 applications. These are the federal funds that flow through ODOT, to us that can be used anywhere in Marion and Polk counties.

In a few weeks, we will have one more meeting to address a different avenue of 5310 money, which comes directly to SAMTD from the FTA, and those can only be used for services within their Urban Growth Boundary (UGB). This committee still has to approve the funding on those. Typically the 5310 funds have been used for preventative maintenance, mobility management, and contracted services operations; so, a number of types of services as long as they benefit seniors and persons with disabilities.

SAMTD has received applications from Silverton, Woodburn and SAMTD.

a. City of Silverton:

- Silverton is not present, however, their application indicated a small amount for preventative maintenance on their Silver Trolley service that they operate within the City of Silverton; the total 5310 asks is \$10,319.

DISCUSSION, QUESTIONS & ANSWERS:

None.

b. City of Woodburn:

- Two major projects focused on mobility management and preventative maintenance. The projects have been divided out according to the service type, which is new. First, we have the ADA complementary paratransit and within that project we have mobility management and our preventative maintenance vehicles that service paratransit.
 - Mobility Management: \$196, 000 to cover staff time, cost of living adjustments, as well as the projected 20% increase.
 - Ability to provide high quality transportation to all of its riders; it operates within the city limits; the service ensures that disabled and elderly riders who are unable to use traditional transit, have reliable access to groceries, medicine, social services, and all other services within the city of Woodburn. The dial-a-ride service is operates door-to-door; staff facilitate coordination of services through the dial-a ride phone conversation.
 - Receive approximately 5,500 calls annually for the dial-a-ride service; with 30% of those being new callers. We also receive calls from Adult and Family Services, Salud Medical Center, Davita Senior and Disabled Services, to coordinate rides for passengers needing to go to those facilities. We also coordinate trips to outside agencies that are coming into Woodburn, such as Cherriots, Regional Canby CAT, Greyhound and The Point.
 - We advertise through our website, as well as a newsletter that goes out once a week on Fridays, it's called the Eblast (with English and Spanish translations). Our Facebook site is bilingual, as well as a radio program that is Spanish speaking, which the city staff discussed new changes or things that are coming up. These messages are also announced during public meetings, such as city council meetings, brochures flyers, and all bus stops. Demand response and fixed route schedules are available at City Hall, Woodburn Public Library, Aquatic Center, and all bus schedules can be given out to drivers or be mailed by request. We also have language lines, a Limited English Proficiency program (LEP). So if somebody calls in that is Spanish speaking, and we have nobody here in the office that can speak Spanish, we call language lines and get somebody on the phone that can relay the information and we book right through them.
 - Preventative Maintence: \$55,000 for the (7) Paratransit vehicles, which support the Out of Town Medical Transportation program, and the Dial-a-ride Cutaway vehicles. Preventative maintenance includes regularly scheduled maintenance, and the in-house mechanics who will service these vehicles. \$55,000 is a second

portion of this project is for Fixed Route vehicles, Express Route, and the Fixed Route Loop; (4) buses serve these routes.

DISCUSSION, QUESTIONS & ANSWERS:

Q. How does the City help you fund these programs?

A. There's local match involved for the 5310, there's 10.27% match that comes directly from the city and local funding. We also pursue other state grants, competitive grants, and also federal grants to support this term.

Q. Will you provide the full grant request?

A. Total project cost is \$306,000; total grant amount is \$274,575. Project match, stated in application, for Mobility Management was indicated as \$17,254 in error; the correct match amount is \$20,129, which is reflective in the total match amount of \$31,425.

d. Salem Area Mass Transit District (SAMTD):

- Mobility management projects include: planning training and management activities for improving coordinating among public, transportation, and transportation service providers. We intend to work towards our mission of creating community connections, by focusing, efforts, and attention, on the following goals: promoting accessibility and livability; focus on the individual improve it; and improve coordination with other agencies and foster education and awareness.
- Purchase of services for our lift service, the ADA paratransit within the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB). Purchase of service in the regional service area, which is connecting the communities outside of the UGB. Service for Shop and Ride, which is a non-dial-a-ride service for seniors and people with disability that don't qualify for the lift service. And then preventative maintenance for our regional system. The total ask for those projects is \$2,347,777.

DISCUSSION, QUESTIONS & ANSWERS:

Q. You did not include preventive maintenance for the Cherry Lift vehicles; is that correct?

A. That is correct. That's provided through another funding source.

E. DISCUSSION, QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

- Q. Are the funding allocations predetermined for each of the applicants? Or is there a fixed pot of money?
- A. The allocation is by the qualified entities Region. The amount, including the 20% that ODOT asked us to include in the applications, is \$2,602,130; the total sum of all the 'asks' is \$2,632,371. – we're \$30,241 over allotted availability.
- Q. ODOT asked us to apply for 20% above what was listed, and the total ask is slightly over 21%; is it a preference that we reduce some of these tasks or just go ahead and request the full amount that's 21.1%?
- A. I would go ahead and put in the 21% ask. I would put the 20% into some type of "if we get it then we'll do this" type of project. You're not necessarily going to be able to count on it; ODOT think's you will be able to, but we cannot guarantee it.
- D. I do have a concern about Silverton's ask. I'm looking at a spreadsheet that I've been keeping track of Silverton spending in the past. Right now, they have a 5310 preventive maintenance agreement that they've only spent \$1,213, with a balance of \$9,106. This funding only goes until June 30th of 2023, so they've historically left money on the table. I'm a little concerned about that.
- D. Committee members have shared, to some extent, that concern in the past. I think Silverton's services fluctuated a little bit. But we've, continued to recommend funding up to this point. What's less of a concern is their ask amount is fairly low, considering the amount of funds that are available, but at the same time, other service providers are actually implementing their plans, strategically.

It is a little unnerving. We should make sure that we let them know. We are going to look at it closely for the next funding cycle.

These funds are unlike the STF and STIF; once the agreement or the amounts are awarded, then they're contractual relationship is directly with ODOT. So Arla will be able to provide that information.

They've submitted for reimbursements, but they're low cost tickets per quarter.. And you know, historically that's been about the same because I've gone clear back to 2007-2009. That's when we first started our system and they've always left money on the table. That's just one of ODOT's concerns; not that money's short right now, but you know it needs to be spent responsibly.

- Q. Please provide clarification on the grant applications themselves. In the past, the grant requests have included a total, which was their "ask", and then a lesser amount they felt they could manage with. If funding didn't stretch to cover all of it, is it the same as what we're talking about when we drop back to a 20% increase, from the 21.1% that they're

totaled to? If you add up all the numbers, are we as a committee obliged to do some math on the applications at this point?

- A. I believe what Arla is talking about was more if it didn't come in with the 20% increase or somewhere in between what was published and that 20%, that the applicants understand that their requests may ultimately be less than what's awarded through this process, and that they need to have planned accordingly.
- D. We're not trying to do a plus and minus calculation here. I think all the applicants and the services that they're proposing are worthy and needed services. The question is do we discuss some sort of modified motion that provides guidance to ODOT if funds fall a little short. If we approve the applications as presented, and include stipulations outlining if the funds come in under the award amount that they would proportionately reduce each application, rather than trying to do a ranking. Is that a fair way to do it? I'm open to discussion from committee members.
- Q. Sounds reasonable, as you know that each application is proportionally impacted, if there isn't enough. In the past, SAMTD has said, "No, we can't take any less", and the funds end up coming from somewhere else. Is that the case here or is it that each one could proportionately take the hit if that was to happen?
- A. Because we've never had this 20% over, we've made our plans to scale back on all of our projects based on that 20%. So in our applications, we know that if we don't get that full amount, all of them will scale back to 20% less.
- Q. If applications come in at 21%, the agreements that would be drafted, will the aspect of reducing the amount be addressed in the agreement language, or will that just be identified by writing in "an up to amount as funding is available"?
- A. Yes, our agreements have always covered that; it states right into the body of the agreement that if we don't receive all the funding that is awarded, the recipients won't receive all the funding that's awarded. That covers that 20%. That way ODOT can write these agreements for over the amount that's allocated, assuming that IJJA (Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act) funds are going to come in.
- Q. So in effect, what the committee is discussing as being a proportionate reduction, wouldn't by default occur if the funding did not come into that full 20%. By default because the agreement would be written for "up to everyone's agreement. Regardless, if it's a \$10k or \$2M request would be reduced by the same percentage of the overall funding the ODOT received once below that 20% target.
- A. Yes, correct; everybody would be reduced by that same ratio.

D. Jim Row disclosed he works for one of the applicants. He doesn't feel like he has a personal conflict of interest. He didn't participate in the preparation of the applications, though he is planning to vote on them, unless there are objections from other members.

** No objections.*

Q. Do they ever or do you think they will start wondering and questioning about well, which one are we supporting all the time?

A. The funds are dedicated to special purposes related to transit, and I believe the items that are able to be funded, have to be within our strategic plan.

Everything that was submitted in these applications is directly related to providing rides, whether it's providing the maintenance of the vehicles of the rides are provided on, or it is the mobility management, which are the people behind helping people connect to those rides and helping them learn how to use the system and be able to coordinate those services, or to actually be a contractor to operate those services. But there's nothing in these applications that is going to specific community events or something that is not related to providing transportation for seniors and people with disabilities.

F. ACTION ITEMS

- 1. Review and approve prior meeting's minutes.**
- 2. Formal motion from AC for recommendation that SAMTD Directors approve the PTSP projects included in their respective applications as presented.**

G. NEXT STEPS

- 1. Present AC recommendations at the December 15th Board of Directors meeting; presenting STIF applications, 5310 ODOT applications, and Chair & Vice-Chair appointments.**
- 2. STIFAC Discretionary & 5310 FTA Process; meeting December 16th, 2022.**

H. ADJOURNED

1:37 PM

Angela Henson
Administrative Assistant
Finance and Technology & Program Management