

## Prioritization Subcommittee

### *Meeting Agenda*

March 2, 2021

9:00 AM

**Meeting to be held via Zoom:** <https://zoom.us/j/91373453789>

**Voting Members on the Committee:** Dan Baechtold (City of Asheville), Larry Harris (Black Mountain), Peyton O’Conner (Buncombe County, Chair), Autumn Radcliff (Henderson County), Anthony Sutton (Town of Waynesville), Elizabeth Teague (Town of Waynesville, Vice-Chair), Jerry Vahaun (Town of Woodfin)

<b>1. Welcome and Introductions</b>	Peyton O’Conner
<b>2. Public Comment</b>	Peyton O’Conner
<b>3. Approval of February, 2021 Meeting Minutes</b>	Peyton O’Conner
<b>4. Business</b>	
FTA 5310 Project Selection	MPO Staff
LAPP Request: Accelerate BL-0005	MPO Staff
<b>5. News, Events, Updates</b>	Peyton O’Conner
<b>6. Public Comment</b>	Peyton O’Conner
<b>7. Adjournment</b>	Peyton O’Conner

## Item 3

February, 2021 Meeting Minutes

### **Prioritization Subcommittee Meeting Minutes\* February 2, 2021**

\*Meeting held virtually via Zoom. All votes held by roll-call.

#### **ATTENDING**

##### **Voting Members**

- Peyton O'Conner, Buncombe County
- Dan Baechtold, City of Asheville
- Larry Harris, Town of Black Mountain
- Anthony Sutton, Town of Waynesville
- Jerry Vehaun, Town of Woodfin

##### **Non-Voting**

- Tristan Winkler, FBRMPO
- Nick Kroncke, FBRMPO
- Emily Scott Cruz, FBRMPO
- John Ridout, FBRMPO
- William High, Buncombe County
- Kim Roney, City of Asheville
- Brian Burch, NCDOT
- Janna Peterson, Henderson County
- Daniel Cobb, Town of Mills River
- George Webb, CAC
- Vicki Eastland, LOSRPO
- Mark Gibbs, NCDOT
- Steve Williams, NCDOT
- Stephen Sparks, NCDOT
- Brendan Merithew, NCDOT
- David Wasserman, NCDOT
- Steve Williams, NCDOT

## **I. Welcome and Introductions**

Prioritization Chair, Peyton O’Conner, presided calling meeting to order at 9:00 am. Members gave their introduction. The Agenda was approved.

## **II. Public Comment**

None at this time.

## **III. Approval of January 2021 Minutes and Approval of Agenda**

The minutes from the previous meeting were reviewed. Jerry Vebaun made a motion to approve. Larry Harris seconded the motion. All approved.

## **IV. Business**

### **IV-A // Call for Planning Projects – Project Selection**

Emily Scott-Cruz brought this item before the committee that this project is for fiscal year 2022 funding. This call had \$200,000 available with a 20% local match. There were three projects submitted. The first was the City of Asheville Reed Creek Greenway Feasibility study that requested \$40,000 looking at the final two sections of greenway along the Reed Creek. The City noted that this project is time sensitive due to coordination with UNCA. The second project was the Haywood County Hellbender Greenway feasibility study which requested \$90,000 to identify and analyze alignments for connecting trail segments in Haywood county. The third project was the Buncombe County multimodal master plan with \$100,000 requested to examine existing plans and get an understanding of connecting between previous and future planning efforts. Emily brought up a PWP voting link for each project so voting members could provide input for each project. Janna Peterson asked for clarification on who submitted the Haywood County project and Emily responded the County did approve it before it was submitted. Tristan stated that the county can fund planning studies where non-profit(s) are the partner, but it generally requires buy-in from the municipal partner. Emily stated that the preliminary scoring was based on existing and active planning projects in that jurisdiction and the second part is based on whether the project is located in a local or regional plan. The other part of scoring is based on input of the Prioritization members. A live survey was answered by voting members to answer questions regarding the *importance* and *need* for each of the three

projects. Emily recapped the scores covered here and the methodology showed that the Haywood County and Buncombe County projects would receive funding. Tristan stated that the amount could be increased from \$200,000 to around \$230,000 using STBG funds given that those additional funds would not be needed for staffing the MPO this year.

*Dan Baechtold made the recommendation to fund all three projects submitted by increasing the funding from \$200,000 to ~\$230,000. Anthony Sutton seconded. All approved.*

#### **IV -B // JARC Call for Projects**

Emily provided an overview of the JARC applications received. One was received from the City of Asheville for the Route 170 transit operations, and one received from Buncombe County for the Black Mountain Trailblazer route. City of Asheville requested \$231,558 and Buncombe County requested \$81,704. There was a total of \$290,514 available in this round once the 10% administration was accounted for. This includes \$23,019 in leftover funds from Spring 2020. Emily had voting members use a survey link to assess the scoring. Janna Peterson asked the submitters questions regarding transit usage versus funding mechanisms and route availability for Black Mountain and the County.

Emily brought up the scoring totals given the poll and Buncombe County received 100 points and City of Asheville received 97.5. Emily discussed the scoring alternatives, the first being to fund at the same % of funding. This would mean funding them at 93.1%. The second was fully funding Buncombe County and funding City of Asheville at 90.74%. The third was funding City of Asheville in full and Buncombe county at ~70%. Discussion took place around the period of performance for each entity, and both applicants stated they would have to re-evaluate period of performance if funding was not received. Dan Baechtold stated the issue that both providers depend on this funding to carry out their services and he doesn't see a big difference between them receiving funding. Janna Peterson asked about eligibility for 5307 for deviated fixed route versus fixed route given how CARES Act funding was distributed. Tristan stated he believes deviated-fixed route is eligible under 5307.

*Anthony Sutton made a motion for funding alternative two with fully funding Buncombe County at \$81,704 and City of Asheville at \$210,124. Jerry Vehaun seconded. All approved.*

#### **IV -C // 5310 Project Selection and CRRSAA**

Emily stated that this item was originally planned to come before this committee but it is being delayed until March while funding for CRRSAA is determined.

*Item delayed till March.*

#### **IV -D // NCDOT Project Delays**

Tristan Winkler wanted to provide updates for the group regarding these proposed delays. Tristan stated the MPO heard from the public about better prioritizing the Amboy/Meadow road projects, and discussions have taken place with David and Hannah in the programming unit. What is being considered is splitting the project into two projects, a Amboy project and a Meadow project. It would potentially bump it up into construction in 2025, an acceleration of 4 years. Tristan noted that NCDOT told the MPO to consider using STBGDA funds for accelerating these projects, which has not been done before. Tristan wanted to hear from the group about how they would feel about the MPO using DA funding for larger projects. Dan Baechtold expressed concerns for using this funding towards larger projects because the MPO only receives a few million in DA funding annually while these projects are much more expensive. Larry Harris echoed support and expressed concern for smaller projects or municipalities not getting funding if this funding was used for larger projects. Janna Peterson stated this likely wouldn't be a good item to take before TCC and Board given the previous issues figuring out which projects to fund. Peyton echoed comments and stated in order to move Hellbender projects forward, they would have to be prioritized in future DA rounds. David Wasserman made comment that this funding could be used to accelerate projects. Janna Peterson asked for specifics on the Amboy/Meadow Road projects. Tristan gave a brief overview and stated the specifics of using limited funding to fix the bridge connection over the river. Mark Gibbs provided some information on how these funds could be utilized on the Amboy/Meadow project. Discussion took place around the merits and challenges of running these projects through the STBG call for projects.

Tristan mentioned discussion between MPO leadership and NCDOT Board and Division members about project delays. This discussion was based around improving processes and collaboration in the future for how delays are determined. Tristan mentioned the project delays will be coming before TCC and Board this month.

John Ridout provided a brief update that the LAPP projects are good to move forward, as of now, for each phase as programmed in the January 2021 TIP amendments.

*Informational Item.*

#### **IV - E // Prioritization/P 6.0 Update**

Tristan provided an update about the statewide Prioritization Workgroup meeting and that local input point methodologies will be due in July. This will be a future item coming before Prioritization and will likely include a more constrained financial element so funds are not overprogrammed. Also, resiliency may be considered given the number of rockslides and flooding and other events in the region. Tristan also pointed out that not a lot of funding is available for P6.0 and that may influence how this round is executed.

*Informational Item.*

#### **V. Announcement, News, Special Updates -**

None at this time.

Next Meeting **March 2 at 9am.**

**VI. Public Comment** – None at this time.

**VII. Adjournment** - The meeting was adjourned at 10:20 A.M.

# Item 4A

## 5310 Project Selection and CRRSAA

Section 5310 (Enhanced Mobility for Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities) funds are allocated to the Asheville Urbanized Area, with the City of Asheville serving as the designated recipient for these funds. The application process for Section 5310 ran from November 20<sup>th</sup>, 2020 through December 31<sup>st</sup>, 2020. Additional information about Section 5310 is available at: <http://frenchbroadrivermpo.org/5310-and-jarc/>.

The 5310 Grant has two categories for funding:

- Traditional/Capital projects: at least 55% of the total funding amount has to go to “traditional” projects.
- Other/Operations projects: no more than 45% of the total funding amount can go to these projects

<b>FY2020 5310 Available Funding</b>	\$346,676	<b>55% of Funds (Traditional)*</b>	\$190,672
<b>Admin</b>	\$34,668	<b>35% of Funds (Other)*</b>	\$121,336
<b>After 10% Admin</b>	<b>\$312,008</b>	*Note: percentage divisions were calculated before 10% Admin	

*\*It is important to note that 10% of the original allocation is set aside for Administrative funds for the City of Asheville, so “Other” projects only receive up to 35% of total funding as a result since Traditional projects are required to receive a minimum of 55% of the allocation before administrative costs are considered.*

MPO Staff and the Prioritization Subcommittee will review the 5310 applications, rating them based on a scorecard (out of 100 points). The following pages show recommendations for awarding 5310 funds based on scores. The quantitative scoring methodology was simplified for this round of funding. The blank scorecard is included in this agenda as well as a summary of the scored projects.

## CRRSAA

The Asheville UZA was also awarded Coronavirus Response and Relief Supplemental Apportionment Act (CRRSAA) funds to Section 5310. Funds are to be used for 5310 operations

# FRENCH BROAD RIVER

METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

and payroll (if recipients have furloughed employees). The UZA received \$60,153 in additional Section 5310 funds. The Regional Transit Operators Workgroup met to discuss CRRSAA funding, deciding that the best approach would be to divert the funding, which totals \$54,138 after taking out 10% Admin costs for the City of Asheville to a single recipient. The ongoing 5310 Call for Projects made this process simplified.

The agencies that submitted “Other” (operating) projects with the highest funding request, for only one project, were asked if they could provide an updated letter of local match and extend their Period of Performance to expend the entire \$54,138. Senior Companions was approached first because their project spans more than one County; however, they were unable to provide a match commitment letter for the full amount. Mountain Projects was also approached and confirmed their ability to provide a local match commitment, revised budget, and certification that they have not furloughed employees.

Note: Mountain Projects is eligible to receive CRRSAA funds, in which case **all** Other Projects could be fully funded for FY22 with 5310 funds, and an additional \$14,902 could be added to the Traditional pot of funds.

## SUBMITTED PROJECTS:

The table below shows the projects submitted and funding requested.

Applicant	Traditional or Other	Project Title	Period of Performance	Project Description	Funding Requested	Local Match	Total Cost
Buncombe County	Traditional	SED TAP	7/1/21 - 6/30/22	Door-to-door service for seniors/disabled on ADA compliant vans. Funds to support medical trips for elderly adults; demand response for customers with disabilities. 5310 funds allow more state and local funds to extend across all programs to cover transportation needs.	\$ 200,081	\$ 50,021	\$ 1,257,510
City of Asheville	Traditional	Asheville Paratransit	7/1/21 - 6/30/22	Allows CoA to offer service to residents beyond the 3/4 service boundary	\$ 166,832	\$ 41,708	\$ 208,540
Buncombe County	Other	RIDE Voucher Program	2/1/22 - 6/20/22	Curb-to-curb, user-side subsidy that allows users to purchase vouchers for rides at a lower rate to be used in Buncombe county for same day, unforeseen trips and trips not available through public transit	\$ 20,112	\$ 20,112	\$ 40,224
Land of Sky	Other	Senior Companions Program	7/1/21 - 6/30/22	Provides companions for senior adults that provide transportation and other needed services.	\$ 42,838	\$ 42,838	\$ 85,676
Madison County	Other	Expanded Nutrition Access	7/1/21 - 6/30/22	Continue providing home delivery meals for Mars Hill meal side and provide extra 35 home deliveries since March 2020.	\$ 26,058	\$ 26,058	\$ 52,116
Madison County	Other	Expanded Transportation to Mars Hill	7/1/21 - 6/30/22	Allow MCTA to continue providing transportation services to Mars Hill residents for medical appointments and other accessibility, covering cost of driver, vans, scheduling, and management.	\$ 17,426	\$ 17,426	\$ 34,852
Mountain Projects, Inc.	Other	Haywood Public Transit Paratransit	7/1/21 - 6/30/22	Funds support paratransit services; if awarded, 5310 State funding could serve a wider portion of Haywood County and these funds could pay for the UZA	\$ 43,136	\$ 43,136	\$ 86,272

## Step 1: Score Traditional Projects

### Traditional

#### **Buncombe County SEDTAP (Supplemental Elderly and Disabled Transportation Assistance Program)**

Project Evaluation Criteria	Possible Points	Buncombe County SEDTAP
<b>Project Needs and Goals</b>	<b>40</b>	
Is the project consistent with the 5310 grant program's objectives?	0 or 5	Mountain Mobility provides transportation services to clients of human service agencies, local governments, and general public transportation. Funding support is provided to Call-A-Ride and Foster Grandparents Program, RIDE, and Senior Bus Pass Program. These funds allow state and local funds to be extended across all programs to cover more transportation needs. These funds match HCCBG, ROAP, and EDTAP funds.
To what degree will the project increase or enhance the availability of transportation for the Asheville Urbanized area's elderly and disabled populations?	0 – 5	54,087 trips between 7/1/21 and 6/30/22
Does the project address a need identified in the Coordinated Human Services Transportation Plan?	0 or 5	p. 33 (B-2, B-8, B-11)
Does the project provide a service that would not otherwise be available?	0 or 5	This project funds transportation services for a variety of elderly/disabled groups. The program provides fare free transportation where other grants are insufficient.
To what extent will the project be affected if it does not receive 5310 funds? 0=unaffected, 10=unable to exist	0 – 10	If not funded, the program and associated services would terminate because this is the only source of grant funding available to support the project.
<b>Project Budget and Organizational Preparedness</b>	<b>30</b>	
Were the necessary budgets completed and submitted?	0 or 5	Yes.
Are the certified local match sources for the project listed in the budget as matching funds?	0 or 5	Yes.
Does the agency propose to continue commitment to the life of the project beyond the availability of the requested grant resources?	0 – 5	5310 funding is critical for the sustainability of this project.
How experienced is the agency with financial responsibilities like quarterly reporting, annual audits, and/or other forms of financial reporting?	0 – 10	Buncombe receives 5311 funds, 5310 funds for RIDE, and 5307 funds.
Does the project demonstrate efficiency in its proposal?	0 or 5	5310 funds are used to match HCCBG, ROAP, and EDTAP, which shows efficiency in stretching funding to serve various needs while meeting 5310 goals.
<b>Project Implementation</b>	<b>15</b>	
Does the proposal outlines implementation and evaluation plan?	0 or 5	This program is a continuation
How closely does the project align with organization's mission and objectives?	0 – 5	The mission of Mountain Mobility is to provide responsive transportation and act as a leader in accessible and efficient transportation
How experienced is the applicant staff in managing transportation projects and/or operating passenger transportation?	0 – 5	Mountain Mobility has extensive experience in managing projects.
<b>Equity, Outreach, and Partnerships</b>	<b>15</b>	

# FRENCH BROAD RIVER

METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

Does applicant include their Title VI Plan or description of equity work/commitment to equity?	0 or 5	Public outreach with County and Mountain Mobility staff at events; makes services available to target population. Included Title VI plan.
To what extent does the applicant include plans to market to target group and promote awareness of the project?	0 – 5	Human service agencies refer individuals to Mountain Mobility programs
Does the project include coordination and/or partnerships with transportation providers or other relevant stakeholders?	0 or 5	Work with LOSRC, AB Tech, Asheville Parks, MountainCare, DayStay, NCDSB, and RHA.

## City of Asheville Paratransit Services

Project Evaluation Criteria	Possible Points	City of Asheville Paratransit
<b>Project Needs and Goals</b>	<b>40</b>	
Is the project consistent with the 5310 grant program's objectives?	0 or 5	Continue providing paratransit service to persons with disability in the service area and within ¼ mile of fixed route service. Funds provide a required FTA service.
To what degree will the project increase or enhance the availability of transportation for the Asheville Urbanized area's elderly and disabled populations?	0 – 5	41,107 between 7/1/21 and 6/30/22
Does the project address a need identified in the Coordinated Human Services Transportation Plan?	0 or 5	B-8, D-5, D-1
Does the project provide a service that would not otherwise be available?	0 or 5	Project extends service beyond ¼ mile boundary
To what extent will the project be affected if it does not receive 5310 funds? 0=unaffected, 10=unable to exist	0 – 10	If not funded, ONLY essential service would be offered until funding is available. This funding ensures the city in collaboration with the County can offer service to residents beyond ¼ service boundary
<b>Project Budget and Organizational Preparedness</b>	<b>30</b>	
Were the necessary budgets completed and submitted?	0 or 5	Yes.
Are the certified local match sources for the project listed in the budget as matching funds?	0 or 5	Yes.
Does the agency propose to continue commitment to the life of the project beyond the availability of the requested grant resources?	0 – 5	This project is required by FTA. City will continue this service after 5310 funds expire.
How experienced is the agency with financial responsibilities like quarterly reporting, annual audits, and/or other forms of financial reporting?	0 – 10	Incredibly used to reporting and federal grant management.
Does the project demonstrate efficiency in its proposal?	0 or 5	Efficiency and required service
<b>Project Implementation</b>	<b>15</b>	
Does the proposal outlines implementation and evaluation plan?	0 or 5	This program is a continuation
How closely does the project align with organization's mission and objectives?	0 – 5	Aligned tightly.
How experienced is the applicant staff in managing transportation projects and/or operating passenger transportation?	0 – 5	Highly experienced
<b>Equity, Outreach, and Partnerships</b>	<b>15</b>	
Does applicant include their Title VI Plan or description of equity work/commitment to equity?	0 or 5	Title VI plan included; Program is affordable (fare-free) transportation option that removes economic barriers for low-income individuals

# FRENCH BROAD RIVER

METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

To what extent does the applicant include plans to market to target group and promote awareness of the project?	0 – 5	Share information with CTAB and Human Service Agencies. Clients referred by community groups. Contract with multiple human service agencies.
Does the project include coordination and/or partnerships with transportation providers or other relevant stakeholders?	0 or 5	Outreach with CTAB and Human Service Agencies and Mountain Mobility.

## OTHER

### Buncombe County RIDE

Project Evaluation Criteria	Possible Points	Buncombe County RIDE
<b>Project Needs and Goals</b>	<b>40</b>	
Is the project consistent with the 5310 grant program's objectives?	0 or 5	Curb-to-curb, user-side subsidy that provides subsidized vouchers for trips in Buncombe County.
To what degree will the project increase or enhance the availability of transportation for the Asheville Urbanized area's elderly and disabled populations?	0 – 5	18,886 trips between 2/1/22 and 6/30/23; 14,468 trips annually.
Does the project address a need identified in the Coordinated Human Services Transportation Plan?	0 or 5	A-1, A-2, B-2, B-11, D-5
Does the project provide a service that would not otherwise be available?	0 or 5	This provides flexibility and control for target population over when travel occurs and for what purposes. Would NOT be otherwise available for same-day trips.
To what extent will the project be affected if it does not receive 5310 funds? 0=unaffected, 10=unable to exist	0 – 10	If not funded, this service would terminate because 5310 is only source of grant funding.
<b>Project Budget and Organizational Preparedness</b>	<b>30</b>	
Were the necessary budgets completed and submitted?	0 or 5	Yes.
Are the certified local match sources for the project listed in the budget as matching funds?	0 or 5	Yes.
Does the agency propose to continue commitment to the life of the project beyond the availability of the requested grant resources?	0 – 5	County does not see the potential for funding program without 5310 funding.
How experienced is the agency with financial responsibilities like quarterly reporting, annual audits, and/or other forms of financial reporting?	0 – 10	Incredibly used to reporting and federal grant management.
Does the project demonstrate efficiency in its proposal?	0 or 5	Uses participating providers for services.
<b>Project Implementation</b>	<b>15</b>	
Does the proposal outlines implementation and evaluation plan?	0 or 5	This program is a continuation
How closely does the project align with organization's mission and objectives?	0 – 5	The mission of Mountain Mobility is to provide responsive transportation and act as a leader in accessible and efficient transportation
How experienced is the applicant staff in managing transportation projects and/or operating passenger transportation?	0 – 5	Highly experienced
<b>Equity, Outreach, and Partnerships</b>	<b>15</b>	
Does applicant include their Title VI Plan or description of equity work/commitment to equity?	0 or 5	Included Title VI Plan; serves low-income individuals through subsidized vouchers that only cost participants \$2.50.

# FRENCH BROAD RIVER

METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

To what extent does the applicant include plans to market to target group and promote awareness of the project?	0 – 5	Land of Sky Regional Council—also partners with taxi companies.
Does the project include coordination and/or partnerships with transportation providers or other relevant stakeholders?	0 or 5	LOSRC and taxi companies that provide rides.

## Land of Sky Senior Companions

Project Evaluation Criteria	Possible Points	LOS Senior Companions
<b>Project Needs and Goals</b>	<b>40</b>	
Is the project consistent with the 5310 grant program's objectives?	0 or 5	This program provides transportation and other services free of charge for elderly adults living independently. Seniors are paired with clients who may not meet income criteria of traditional transportation providers and who lack a diagnosis that makes them eligible. Senior Companions make \$3 an hour and \$3.10 additional per trip.
To what degree will the project increase or enhance the availability of transportation for the Asheville Urbanized area's elderly and disabled populations?	0 – 5	The program serves 306 clients. Anticipate serving 75 clients and having roughly 20 volunteers. It provides 27,638 trips.
Does the project address a need identified in the Coordinated Human Services Transportation Plan?	0 or 5	Yes both the needs in Buncombe and Henderson County
Does the project provide a service that would not otherwise be available?	0 or 5	Yes, it allows individualized transportation as well as activity opportunity for senior volunteers.
To what extent will the project be affected if it does not receive 5310 funds? 0=unaffected, 10=unable to exist	0 – 10	If not funded, clients would be limited in options for transportation, would need to plan appointments based on existing structures, and would limit mobility or would be unable to afford services.
<b>Project Budget and Organizational Preparedness</b>	<b>30</b>	
Were the necessary budgets completed and submitted?	0 or 5	Yes.
Are the certified local match sources for the project listed in the budget as matching funds?	0 or 5	Yes. Corporation of National and Community Services.
Does the agency propose to continue commitment to the life of the project beyond the availability of the requested grant resources?	0 – 5	The Corporation of National and Community Services is a grant from 2020-2023. Additionally, Senior Companions aims to continue seeking 5310 funds in the future.
How experienced is the agency with financial responsibilities like quarterly reporting, annual audits, and/or other forms of financial reporting?	0 – 10	Incredibly used to reporting and federal grant management.
Does the project demonstrate efficiency in its proposal?	0 or 5	Promotes efficiency because it meets needs of clients faster than public transit can provide or other programs.
<b>Project Implementation</b>	<b>15</b>	
Does the proposal outlines implementation and evaluation plan?	0 or 5	This program is a continuation from past 5310 funded projects.
How closely does the project align with organization's mission and objectives?	0 – 5	Land of Sky connects volunteer services; this program provides opportunities for seniors, which is in line with LOS mission.
How experienced is the applicant staff in managing transportation projects and/or operating passenger transportation?	0 – 5	Highly experienced. Senior Companion Program Manager and 2 finance persons manage the financial side.
<b>Equity, Outreach, and Partnerships</b>	<b>15</b>	
Does applicant include their Title VI Plan or description of equity work/commitment to equity?	0 or 5	Most clients live in HUD housing; aim to serve low income individuals.

# FRENCH BROAD RIVER

METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

To what extent does the applicant include plans to market to target group and promote awareness of the project?	0 – 5	VA Hospital; HUD Senior Housing; Council on Aging; local agencies. Referrals come from local nonprofits, health agencies, and community agencies. Presentations at career fairs and other groups
Does the project include coordination and/or partnerships with transportation providers or other relevant stakeholders?	0 or 5	Henderson and Buncombe Aging offices match seniors in need with volunteers; VA Hospital, HUD Senior Housing, and other local agencies are coordinated too.

## MCTA Expanded Nutrition Access for Elderly and Disabled in Mars Hill

Project Evaluation Criteria	Possible Points	Madison County Transportation Authority
<b>Project Needs and Goals</b>	<b>40</b>	
Is the project consistent with the 5310 grant program's objectives?	0 or 5	The funds will allow continuation of transportation service and home delivery during COVID 19 to Mars Hill meal sites and will help provide an extra 35 home delivered meals. The goal is to eliminate the waiting list for home delivered meals and increase nutrition access in Madison County.
To what degree will the project increase or enhance the availability of transportation for the Asheville Urbanized area's elderly and disabled populations?	0 – 5	MCTA would provide 3,300 service units and 7,280 delivered meals.
Does the project address a need identified in the Coordinated Human Services Transportation Plan?	0 or 5	Page 54 of the plan
Does the project provide a service that would not otherwise be available?	0 or 5	This project provides assistance to those who otherwise do not have reliable transportation (or ability to get food) through meal delivery.
To what extent will the project be affected if it does not receive 5310 funds? 0=unaffected, 10=unable to exist	0 – 10	Without this funding, Madison County would not be able to cover as many residents with home delivered meals and would be unable to transport them to meal sites when COVID has calmed down.
<b>Project Budget and Organizational Preparedness</b>	<b>30</b>	
Were the necessary budgets completed and submitted?	0 or 5	Yes.
Are the certified local match sources for the project listed in the budget as matching funds?	0 or 5	Yes.
Does the agency propose to continue commitment to the life of the project beyond the availability of the requested grant resources?	0 – 5	Uncertain if this service would be possible without 5310 grant funding.
How experienced is the agency with financial responsibilities like quarterly reporting, annual audits, and/or other forms of financial reporting?	0 – 10	Madison County Staff is experienced with 5310 grant funding.
Does the project demonstrate efficiency in its proposal?	0 or 5	MCTA provides meals to 55 residents M-W and Fridays.
<b>Project Implementation</b>	<b>15</b>	
Does the proposal outlines implementation and evaluation plan?	0 or 5	This program is a continuation
How closely does the project align with organization's mission and objectives?	0 – 5	MCTA seeks to provide excellent and responsive transportation services, which lines up with the project goals.
How experienced is the applicant staff in managing transportation projects and/or operating passenger transportation?	0 – 5	Staff is very capable of oversight and implementation of this continued meal site delivery and expansion of meal delivery.

# FRENCH BROAD RIVER

METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

<b>Equity, Outreach, and Partnerships</b>	<b>15</b>	
Does applicant include their Title VI Plan or description of equity work/commitment to equity?	0 or 5	Commitment demonstrated to serve low income residents; drivers and staff Title VI and ADA trained
To what extent does the applicant include plans to market to target group and promote awareness of the project?	0 – 5	They work with nonprofits in the region to reach the target group. Madison County DSS, the Lord’s Harvest, Salvation Army, and Beacon of Hope contribute as well.
Does the project include coordination and/or partnerships with transportation providers or other relevant stakeholders?	0 or 5	Work with Neighbors in Need, Salvation Army, and Beacon of Hope.

### MCTA Expanded Mars Hill Transportation

Project Evaluation Criteria	Possible Points	Madison County Transportation Authority
<b>Project Needs and Goals</b>	<b>40</b>	
Is the project consistent with the 5310 grant program’s objectives?	0 or 5	These funds will allow for a continuation of transportation services to Mars Hill—funds will cover cost of driver, vans, scheduling, and management for trips to Weaverville and Asheville for target population to get to shopping and medical appointments.
To what degree will the project increase or enhance the availability of transportation for the Asheville Urbanized area’s elderly and disabled populations?	0 – 5	In light of COVID-19, this service would likely only provide transportation to 1,000 rides in FY22.
Does the project address a need identified in the Coordinated Human Services Transportation Plan?	0 or 5	P. 54 of the plan
Does the project provide a service that would not otherwise be available?	0 or 5	This service expands MCTA’s existing services to seniors and individuals with disabilities.
To what extent will the project be affected if it does not receive 5310 funds? 0=unaffected, 10=unable to exist	0 – 10	Without funding, fewer residents would have access to medical appointments and errands that help support them living independently.
<b>Project Budget and Organizational Preparedness</b>	<b>30</b>	
Were the necessary budgets completed and submitted?	0 or 5	Yes.
Are the certified local match sources for the project listed in the budget as matching funds?	0 or 5	Yes.
Does the agency propose to continue commitment to the life of the project beyond the availability of the requested grant resources?	0 – 5	Uncertain if this service would be possible without 5310 grant funding.
How experienced is the agency with financial responsibilities like quarterly reporting, annual audits, and/or other forms of financial reporting?	0 – 10	Madison County Staff is experienced with 5310 grant funding.
Does the project demonstrate efficiency in its proposal?	0 or 5	MCTA provides meals to 55 residents M-W and Fridays.
<b>Project Implementation</b>	<b>15</b>	
Does the proposal outlines implementation and evaluation plan?	0 or 5	This program is a continuation of existing expanded transportation services in Mars Hill
How closely does the project align with organization’s mission and objectives?	0 – 5	MCTA seeks to provide excellent and responsive transportation, which is in line with the goals of this project.
How experienced is the applicant staff in managing transportation projects and/or operating passenger transportation?	0 – 5	Staff is very capable of oversight and implementation of this continued transportation service. .
<b>Equity, Outreach, and Partnerships</b>	<b>15</b>	

# FRENCH BROAD RIVER

METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

Does applicant include their Title VI Plan or description of equity work/commitment to equity?	0 or 5	Commitment demonstrated to serve low income residents; drivers and staff Title VI and ADA trained
To what extent does the applicant include plans to market to target group and promote awareness of the project?	0 – 5	Work with local health agencies and nonprofits in order to reach target population
Does the project include coordination and/or partnerships with transportation providers or other relevant stakeholders?	0 or 5	Mars Hill Commons, Mountain Housing Opportunities, Hot Springs Health Program, DSS, Council on Aging.

## **Mountain Projects / Haywood Public Transit Paratransit**

Project Evaluation Criteria	Possible Points	Mountain Projects Paratransit
<b>Project Needs and Goals</b>	<b>40</b>	
Is the project consistent with the 5310 grant program's objectives?	0 or 5	Funds would assist the operation of paratransit on the URBAN fixed routes. With 5310 funding, door-to-door paratransit service is available in Haywood County.
To what degree will the project increase or enhance the availability of transportation for the Asheville Urbanized area's elderly and disabled populations?	0 – 5	Paratransit provisions for 6,500 individuals from 7/1/21 through 12/31/22
Does the project address a need identified in the Coordinated Human Services Transportation Plan?	0 or 5	p. 46 and p. 48 of the plan
Does the project provide a service that would not otherwise be available?	0 or 5	Paratransit services are federally required, but this funding allows the scope of services to be expanded.
To what extent will the project be affected if it does not receive 5310 funds? 0=unaffected, 10=unable to exist	0 – 10	Haywood County paratransit would exist without 5310 funds, but would be much more limited in scope and frequency. With this funding, paratransit services can also be provided in other areas of the County.
<b>Project Budget and Organizational Preparedness</b>	<b>30</b>	
Were the necessary budgets completed and submitted?	0 or 5	Yes.
Are the certified local match sources for the project listed in the budget as matching funds?	0 or 5	Yes.
Does the agency propose to continue commitment to the life of the project beyond the availability of the requested grant resources?	0 – 5	Service would be limited without 5310 funds but would continue through EDTAP and ROAP funding.
How experienced is the agency with financial responsibilities like quarterly reporting, annual audits, and/or other forms of financial reporting?	0 – 10	Mountain Projects has received JARC and 5310 funds for years and is familiar with reporting duties.
Does the project demonstrate efficiency in its proposal?	0 or 5	Project increases efficiency by providing access to services off the fixed route in Haywood County.
<b>Project Implementation</b>	<b>15</b>	
Does the proposal outlines implementation and evaluation plan?	0 or 5	This program is a continuation of existing transportation service.
How closely does the project align with organization's mission and objectives?	0 – 5	Program aligns directly with the mission of the organization.
How experienced is the applicant staff in managing transportation projects and/or operating passenger transportation?	0 – 5	Staff is capable and experienced with operating and managing passenger transportation projects.
<b>Equity, Outreach, and Partnerships</b>	<b>15</b>	
Does applicant include their Title VI Plan or description of equity work/commitment to equity?	0 or 5	Work with DSS for referrals; actively seek to serve low-income residents.

# FRENCH BROAD RIVER

METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

To what extent does the applicant include plans to market to target group and promote awareness of the project?	0 – 5	Work with DSS and other local agencies to connect riders to services.
Does the project include coordination and/or partnerships with transportation providers or other relevant stakeholders?	0 or 5	DSS. Also Mountain Projects itself is a very influential nonprofit in Haywood County that serves the target population in multiple ways.

## Step 2: Consider alternatives

### Alternative 1:

Only fund Traditional projects with 5310 money. Score “Other” Projects to determine which project should be awarded CRRSAA funding.

ALTERNATIVE 1	Project Title	Recommended Funding	Recommended Funding Level	Funding Requested	Local Match	Total Cost
Buncombe County	SEDTAP	\$ 170,135	85%	\$200,081	\$50,021	1,257,510
City of Asheville	Asheville Paratransit	\$ 141,873	85%	\$166,832	\$41,708	\$208,540

Applicant	Project Title	Recommended Funding	Recommended Funding Level	Funding Requested	Local Match	Total Cost
Buncombe County	RIDE Voucher Program	\$ -	0%	\$20,112	\$20,112	\$40,224
Land of Sky	Senior Companions Program	\$ -	0%	\$ 42,838	\$ 42,838	\$ 85,676
Madison County	Expanded Nutrition Access	\$ -	0%	\$ 26,058	\$ 26,058	\$ 52,116
Madison County	Expanded Transportation to Mars Hill	\$ -	0%	\$ 17,426	\$17,426	\$ 34,852
Mountain Projects, Inc.	Haywood Public Transit Paratransit	\$ -	0%	\$ 43,136	\$ 43,136	\$ 86,272
CRRSAA Funding						
TBD Based on SCORING						

Pros: Both Traditional projects will receive a large percentage of their funding request.

Cons: The Other / operating projects across the region will receive nothing.

**\*\*If this is the preferred alternative, then we will need to also score “Other” Projects. This alternative would leave the breakdown of 5310 funds as follows:**

# FRENCH BROAD RIVER

METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

<b><i>Funding Type</i></b>	<b><i>Amount</i></b>	<b><i>Percentage of Total Allocation</i></b>
Admin	\$ 34,668	10%
Total Traditional Projects Funding	\$ 312,008	90%
Total Other Projects Funding	\$ -	0%
Total 5310 Funding Amount	\$ 346,676	100%

**Alternatives 2-4:** 5310 funding breakdown and CRRSAA allocation—recommended by Regional Transit Operators Group:

<b><i>Funding Type</i></b>	<b><i>Amount</i></b>	<b><i>Percentage of Total Allocation</i></b>
Admin	\$ 34,668	10%
Total Traditional Projects Funding	\$ 205,574	59%
Total Other Projects Funding	\$ 106,434	31%
Total 5310 Funding Amount	\$ 346,676	100%

# FRENCH BROAD RIVER

METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

Applicant	Project Title	Period of Performance	Recommended Funding	Recommended Funding Level	Funding Requested	Local Match	Total Cost
Buncombe County	RIDE Voucher Program	2/1/22-6/30/22	\$ 20,112	100%	\$20,112	\$20,112	\$40,224
Land of Sky	Senior Companions Program	7/1/21 - 6/30/22	\$ 42,838	100%	\$ 42,838	\$ 42,838	\$ 85,676
Madison County	Expanded Nutrition Access	7/1/21 - 6/30/22	\$ 26,058	100%	\$ 26,058	\$ 26,058	\$ 52,116
Madison County	Expanded Transportation to Mars Hill	7/1/21 - 6/30/22	\$ 17,426	100%	\$ 17,426	\$17,426	\$ 34,852
CRRSAA Funding							
Mountain Projects, Inc.	Haywood Public Transit Paratransit	7/1/21 - 12/31/22	\$ 108,276	100%	\$ 54,138	\$ 54,138	\$108,276

## CONSIDER THE TRADITIONAL SCORES

### Alternative 2:

Fund Buncombe County's SEDTAP at 100% and use remaining Traditional Funds for Asheville's Paratransit (3% of their requested funding). Use CRRSAA funds as detailed above and fully fund Other 5310 projects, diverting an extra \$14,902 to Traditional percentage of the 5310 allocation.

ALTERNATIVE 2	Project Title	Recommended Funding	Recommended Funding Level	Funding Requested	Local Match	Total Cost
Buncombe County	SEDTAP	\$ 200,081	100%	\$200,081	\$50,021	1,257,510
City of Asheville	Asheville Paratransit	\$ 5,493	3%	\$166,832	\$41,708	\$208,540

### Alternative 3:

Fund Asheville's Paratransit at 100% and use remaining funds for Buncombe County's SEDTAP (19% of their requested funding). Use CRRSAA funds as detailed above and fully fund Other 5310 projects, diverting an extra \$14,902 to Traditional percentage of the 5310 allocation.

ALTERNATIVE 3	Project Title	Recommended Funding	Recommended Funding Level	Funding Requested	Local Match	Total Cost
Buncombe County	SEDTAP	\$ 38,742	19%	\$200,081	\$50,021	\$ 1,257,510
City of Asheville	Asheville Paratransit	\$ 166,832	100%	\$166,832	\$41,708	\$ 208,540

**Alternative 4:**

Fund both Buncombe SEDTAP and Asheville’s Paratransit at 56% of their requested funding. Use CRRSAA funds as detailed above and fully fund Other 5310 projects, diverting an extra \$14,902 to Traditional percentage of the 5310 allocation.

Alternative 4	Project Title	Recommended Funding	Recommended Funding Level	Funding Requested	Local Match	Total Cost
Buncombe County	SEDTAP	\$ 112,148	56%	\$200,081	\$50,021	\$ 1,257,510
City of Asheville	Asheville Paratransit	\$ 93,426	56%	\$166,832	\$41,708	\$ 208,540

**Action Required: Select a funding alternative to be recommended to TCC and Board.**

# Item 4B

## LAPP Project- Request to Accelerate

NCDOT Division 13 is requesting to accelerate BL-0005 Broadway Avenue/NC 251 Sidewalks, a sidewalk project from FY22 to FY21. This will allow NCDOT to start construction in the Summer of 2021 whereas the construction would not begin until Spring 2022. The current project will extend the sidewalk along Broadway that currently terminate at the north-west corner State Employee Credit Union location at the 19/23 Northbound offramp, under the overpass to Riverside Drive.

PROJECT	ROUTES	DIVISIONS	COUNTIES	DESCRIPTION	TIP Amendment Detail	TOTAL COST (in thousands)	ACTIVITY	FUNDING	Cost in Thousands						
									2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026
BL-####	SR 1781 (Broadway)/NC 251	13	Buncombe	Construct sidewalk along SR 1781 (Broadway) and NC 251 from US 19/23 NB Exit 25 to 160 Ft. North of SR 1477 (Riverside Drive)	Add project to TIP based on 2020 LAPP		PE	BGDA			51				
								S(M)			13				
							CST	BGDA			259				
								S(M)			65				



(Image: Google Maps)