



Planning Technical Advisory Committee (PTAC) Meeting

REGULAR MEETING AGENDA

**Wednesday, May 15, 2013
10:30 a.m.**

**South Florida Regional Transportation Authority
Boardroom
800 NW 33rd Street
Pompano Beach, Florida 33064
*www.sfrta.fl.gov***

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CALL JOSEPH QUINTY AT (954) 788-7928

Members

Michael Busha, Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council
Monica Cejas, Miami-Dade Transit
William Cross, South Florida Regional Transportation Authority
James Murley, South Florida Regional Planning Council
Irma San Roman, Miami-Dade Metropolitan Planning Organization
Barney McCoy, Broward County Transit
Gustavo Schmidt, Florida Department of Transportation, District IV
Phil Steinmiller, Florida Department of Transportation, District VI
Greg Stuart, Broward Metropolitan Planning Organization
Fred Stubbs, Palm Tran
Nick Uhren, Palm Beach Metropolitan Planning Organization
Jeff Weidner, FDOT, District IV

Directions to SFRTA: I-95 to Copans Road. Go west on Copans to North Andrews Avenue Ext. and turn right. Go straight to Center Port Circle, which is NW 33rd Street, and turn right. SFRTA's offices are in the building to the right. The SFRTA offices are also accessible by taking the train to the Pompano Beach Station. The SFRTA building is southeast of the station. Parking is available across the street from SFRTA's offices, at the Pompano Beach Station.

PLANNING TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (PTAC)
MEETING OF MAY 15, 2013

The meeting will convene at 10:30 a.m., and will be held in the Boardroom of the South Florida Regional Transportation Authority, Administrative Offices, 800 NW 33rd Street, Pompano Beach, FL 33064.

CALL TO ORDER

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

AGENDA APPROVAL – Additions, Deletions, Revisions

DISCUSSION ITEMS –

MATTERS BY THE PUBLIC – Persons wishing to address the Committee are requested to complete an “Appearance Card” and will be limited to three (3) minutes. Please see the Minutes Clerk prior to the meeting.

CONSENT AGENDA

Those matters included under the Consent Agenda are self-explanatory and are not expected to require review or discussion. Items will be enacted by one motion in the form listed below. If discussion is desired by any PTAC Member, however, that item may be removed from the Consent Agenda and considered separately.
--

C1 – MOTION TO APPROVE: Minutes of PTAC Meeting of April 10, 2013

REGULAR AGENDA

Those matters included under the Regular Agenda differ from the Consent Agenda in that items will be voted on individually. In addition, presentations will be made on each motion, if so desired.
--

No items.

INFORMATION / PRESENTATION ITEMS

Action not required, provided for information purposes only.
--

I1 – INFORMATION: BCT Connected – The Broward County Transit FY 2014-2023 Transit Development Plan (TDP) Major Update

I2 – INFORMATION: SFRTA Moving Our Region Forward - FY 2014-2023 Transit Development Plan (TDP) Major Update

I3 – INFORMATION: Summary of ULI/SFRTA Event – “Development Opportunities on the FEC Corridor: An Interactive Forum”

(Continued next page)

I4 – INFORMATION: Regional Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Planning Discussion

I5 – INFORMATION: Upcoming PTAC Meeting Calendar and Locations

I6 – INFORMATION: 2013 Transportation Summit – Visioning the Future of Miami-Dade County’s Public Transportation

I7 – INFORMATION: Tri-Rail Ride and Play – Saturday, May 18

OTHER BUSINESS:

PTAC MEMBER COMMENTS

MEETING ATTENDANCE SUMMARY – Enclosed

NEXT MEETING DATE – June 12, 2013

ADJOURNMENT

In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act and Section 286.26, Florida Statutes, persons with disabilities needing special accommodation to participate in this proceeding, must at least 48 hours prior to the meeting, provide a written request directed to the Executive Office at 800 NW 33rd Street, Suite 100, Pompano Beach, Florida, or telephone (954) 942-RAIL (7245) for assistance; if hearing impaired, telephone (800) 273-7545 (TTY) for assistance.

Any person who decides to appeal any decision made by the Board of Directors for the South Florida Regional Transportation with respect to any matter considered at this meeting or hearing, will need a record of the proceedings, and that, for such purpose, he/she may need to ensure that a verbatim record of the proceedings is made, which record includes the testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is to be based.

Persons wishing to address the Board are requested to complete an “Appearance Card” and will be limited to three (3) minutes. Please see the Minutes Clerk prior to the meeting.

MINUTES
SOUTH FLORIDA REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
PLANNING TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (PTAC) MEETING
APRIL 10, 2013

The Planning Technical Advisory Committee (PTAC) meeting was held at 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, April 10, 2013 in the Board Room of SFRTA Administrative Office, 800 NW 33rd Street, Pompano Beach, Florida 33064.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS/ALTERNATES PRESENT:

Ms. Monica Cejas, Miami-Dade Transit (MDT)
Mr. William Cross, South Florida Regional Transportation Authority (SFRTA)
Ms. Kim Delaney, Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council (RPC)
Mr. Wilson Fernandez, Miami-Dade Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)
Ms. Amie Goddeau, Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) District 4
Ms. Angela Morlok, Palm Beach MPO
Mr. Joseph Quinty, SFRTA
Mr. Jonathan Roberson, Broward County Transit (BCT)
Mr. Phil Steinmiller, FDOT District 6
Mr. Greg Stuart, Broward MPO
Mr. Fred Stubbs, Palm Tran

ALSO PRESENT:

Mr. Steve Anderson, SFRTA
Mr. Jorge Azur, Zuni Transportation
Mr. Tomas Boiton, Volen Center & Citizens for Improved Transit
Mr. Ed Carson, MDT
Ms. Shannon H. Cash, Volen Center – Lift
Ms. Michele Edwards-Collie, Branches (Formerly South Florida Urban Ministries)
Mr. Larry Foutz, HNTB
Mr. Alex Hansen, City of West Palm Beach
Ms. Marie Jarman, SFRTA
Ms. Elaine Magnum, SFRTA
Ms. Carla McKeever, SFRTA
Mr. Mohammad Nasir, City of Opa-Locka
Ms. Darlene, Pfeiffer, City of Fort Lauderdale
Mr. Doug Robinson, MDT
Ms. Jaime Sullivan, City of Lauderhill
Ms. Mary Wardell-King, MDT
Mr. Ravi Wijesundera, Kimley Horn
Ms. Jessica Vargas, Tindale Oliver-Associates
Ms. Lynda Westin, SFRTA
Ms. Natalie Yesbeck, SFRTA
Mr. Eric Zahn, MDT

CALL TO ORDER

The Chair called the meeting to order at 9:40 a.m.

ROLL CALL

The Chair requested the roll call.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

AGENDA APPROVAL – Additions, Deletions, Revisions

Mr. Jonathan Roberson made a motion to approve the agenda. The motion was seconded by Mr. Fred Stubbs. The motion was called to a vote and carried unanimously

DISCUSSION ITEMS

MATTERS BY THE PUBLIC – None

CONSENT AGENDA
Those matters included under the Consent Agenda are self-explanatory and are not expected to require review or discussion. Items will be enacted by one motion in the form listed below. If discussion is desired by any Committee Member, however, that item may be removed from the Consent Agenda and considered separately.

C1 – MOTION TO APPROVE: Minutes of Planning Technical Advisory Committee Meeting of March 20, 2013.

Ms. Monica Cejas made a motion to approve the meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Mr. Fred Stubbs. The motion was called to a vote and carried unanimously.

REGULAR AGENDA
Those matters included under the Regular Agenda differ from the Consent Agenda in that items will be voted on individually. In addition, presentations will be made on each motion, if so desired.

R1. - MOTION TO ENDORCE: Recommended Ranking & Funding Levels for Job Access Reverse Commute (JARC) Program Grant Application

Ms. Yesbeck Pustizzi, introduced the item and overview of the process. Ms. Pustizzi stated that the committee will go through the JARC items first. Staff will go through each application and have the PTAC review each recommendation for JARC. The same process will be repeated for New Freedom (NF).

It was noted that the SFRTA became the designated recipient of JARC and NF funds in 2009. This is the agency’s fourth cycle, over that time 16 JARC projects in the Miami UZA worth approximately \$14 million have been funded. The NF has funded 12 projects worth approximately \$8.8 million. JARC is a program designed to improve access to employment for low income individuals and welfare recipients

and improve access to suburban employment opportunities for residents of urbanized and non-urbanized areas (reverse commute).

NF is to expand transportation mobility options available to persons with disabilities that go beyond the ADA requirements.

It was explained that in this round there are just over \$3.6 million in JARC and \$2 million in NF funds available. In previous cycles, SFRTA as the designated recipient has taken 10% of that awarded amount to administer the program. However, this year, SFRTA decided not to accept administrative funds so the entire amount is available to be distributed.

JARC and NF applications were reviewed by the team of Natalie Yesbeck Pustizzi, Carla McKeever, Marie Jarman and Ravi Wijesundera. SFRTA staff reviewed the applications to ensure that projects met FTA eligibility requirements. Projects were then ranked according to selection criteria previously approved by the PTAC. PTAC recommended projects will go to next month's SFRTA Governing Board meeting for approval followed by submittal to the FTA for final determination.

The following selection criteria are available online and were published in the newspapers. It is also available in your package.

Criteria 1: Eligibility Screening: Does the project meet the intent of JARC/NF Programs? Is the project consistent with local TDSP/HSTP? Is local match provided for eligible sources?

Criteria 2: Service Area and Coordination: The amount of coverage and the amount of service and coordination with transit agencies and non-transit agencies.

Criteria 3: Project readiness, scalability, qualifications and financial strength.

Criteria 4: Sustainability- will the projects move on past the life of the grant.

Criteria 5: Need- have applicants been able to demonstrate the need of the project.

Criteria 6: Other factors: Based on an overall assessment of the grant application for clarity, completeness, and approach for project development, implementation and innovation.

It was noted that PTAC will rank the projects found to meet FTA program eligibility. The team asked that PTAC rely upon the written applications. Some applicants are present should PTAC members have questions. No presentations allowed.

PTAC recommendations must include rank and dollar award.

The following is an overview of the staff recommendation and distribution of JARC funds:

Project	Project Cost (Application)	Federal Funding Request (Application)	Eligible Project Cost*	Eligible Federal Funding Request*	Eligible Project Cost - Year 1	Eligible Federal Funding Request - Year 1	Preliminary Rank	Funding Recommended?	Step 1 - Recommended Percentage of Year 1 Request	Step 1 - Federal Funding Allocation (Year 1)	Step 2 - Additional Allocation	Total Federal Funding Recommended
Lauderhill - L-JARCS	\$729,232	\$364,626	\$729,232	\$364,626	\$364,626	\$182,313	1	Y	100%	\$182,313	\$65,010	\$247,323
West Palm Beach - Downtown Circulator	\$1,596,930	\$598,260	\$1,596,930	\$598,260	\$598,260	\$299,130	1	Y	100%	\$299,130	\$65,010	\$364,140
MDT - Bus Service	\$5,788,000	\$2,211,730	\$5,788,000	\$2,211,730	\$3,207,480	\$1,753,730	1	Y	100%	\$1,753,730	\$65,010	\$1,818,740
SPRTA - Opa-Locita South Route	\$757,900	\$378,950	\$757,900	\$378,950	\$378,950	\$189,745	4	Y	100%	\$189,745	\$39,005	\$228,750
Opa-Locita - North Route	\$400,000	\$200,000	\$400,000	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$100,000	3	Y	100%	\$100,000	\$39,005	\$139,005
FalmTren - Fixed Route Improvements	\$514,432	\$257,216	\$514,432	\$257,216	\$257,216	\$128,608	5	Y	100%	\$128,608	\$39,005	\$167,613
SPRTA - Ft. Lauderdale Tri-Rail Shuttle	\$727,870	\$363,935	\$727,870	\$363,935	\$363,935	\$181,967	5	Y	100%	\$181,967	\$39,005	\$220,972
Ft. Lauderdale - Community Bus	\$4,031,843	\$2,642,615	\$4,031,843	\$2,642,615	\$424,492	\$303,202	8	Y	100%	\$303,202	\$19,500	\$322,702
Branches - Ways-to-Work	\$781,040	\$366,360	\$346,520	\$173,260	\$173,260	\$86,630	9	Y	100%	\$86,630	\$19,500	\$106,130
Pearl Transit - Way2Work	\$662,871	\$431,433	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	NR	N	0%	\$0	\$0	\$0

The PTAC packages contained a recommendation for JARC. However, staff has made a modification to that table. Ms. Pustizzi asked if everyone agreed to discuss the revised staff recommendations. The PTAC members agreed unanimously.

Ms. Pustizzi: First we will start with the JARC applications that are not eligible for funding:

Ms. McKeever: Pearl Transit is the only application not recommended for funding. The applicant is based out of Southern New Jersey where they are serving three counties in that area. They are a successful sub-recipient for JARC/NF in New Jersey. Staff reached out to the South Jersey Transit Authority to find out more about the applicant. The applicant did not provide evidence of coordination with transit providers in South Florida. Their letters of support were outreach and coordination requests. They did not provide enough information for staff to make a determination to a specific start date in South Florida. Staff felt that there is not enough money to distribute to projects that are not ready to go. Therefore, the project was not recommended for funding.

Ms. Pustizzi: The remaining JARC applications were recommended for funding and proceeded to discuss each application. Staff recommended that these applicants be funded at 100% for the first year request. The remaining \$390,000 was split accordingly:

- 50% to the top 3 projects (\$65, 010)
- 40% to the middle 4 projects (\$39,005)
- 10% to the lowest 2 (\$19,500)

Ms. Pustizzi informed PTAC members that modifications could be done at anytime.

City of Lauderhill: This is a continuation of the existing JARC application. There's a question why the operating cost of existing routes 6 and 7 are higher than the other routes. Those two routes are operated at \$55.00 vs. \$33.00. Staff requested to review the agreement between the City and the Operator for that difference in price. In addition, the resolution by the City requires JARC funds to cover 80% of the projects cost with a local match of 20%. However, the maximum allowable federal match for this operating cost is at 50%, so it's a 50-50 match.

Mr. Jonathan Roberson: How would your budget address the two year allocation? How will the City be handling the rest of the funds?

Jane Sullivan: By year two, the City will be able utilize general funds. This is a very much needed service. The ridership that we are getting is increasing dramatically every single month.

City of West Palm Beach: This application is a continuation of a previously JARC funded project. They received funding in FY 2010 and FY 2011. The City of West Palm Beach is successful in their operations. The application is requesting another two years of operating dollars. Staff found the hourly operating cost of \$55 an hour per vehicle to be high. This application is fully recommended.

Mr. Phil Steinmiller: Is there any indication that with the smaller allocation of funding for the second year that the cities are going to fund the gap? .

Ms. Pustizzi: One of the questions in the application is “whether or not the project is scalable.” So, staff felt confident that even though they did not get a full second year, the operation could still proceed. Ms. Jarman stated some of the applications also indicated that they could operate on one year’s worth of funding if necessary.

Mr. Phil Steinmiller: Is this a reimbursement program?

Ms. Pustizzi answered “Yes”.

Miami-Dade - The application requests two years of operating funds for the continuation of previously funded JARC projects. Staff recommends this application.

Mr. Wilson Fernandez: with the year two shortfalls will MDT be able to continue those routes in year two? A fixed amount was \$65,000 (about 35%) goes a longer way for a smaller request. For a larger request the \$65,000 does not go so far, it is not proportional. What was the rationale in putting a fixed amount of \$65,000? If the ranking is what you go by then why didn’t you just assign the money to the top ranking until you ran out of money. Why fund everybody no matter where the project ranked?

Ms. Pustizzi: In previous cycles the PTAC has taken the position of trying to somewhat distribute funds amongst the region. Staff was trying to continue this position but, again, this is up to the PTAC to make the recommendations. The top three applicants scored well. However, if those three were funded, then there would not be any remaining funds for other applicants. Ms. McKeever stated this year was a little different because there was only one year of funding to distribute. So staff had to come up with some methodology to distribute those funds so that everybody got something.

Mr. Fernandez: In the application, do you break it down by different routes and different improvements?
Ms. Pustizzi answered “Yes”.

Mr. Fernandez: The ranking, if you will, is based on totality not individual improvements. Does it make sense to say fund all routes the first year, and for the second year select routes from within the application for funding?

Ms. McKeever: There is only one route being requested in the second year - Route 150.

Mr. Jonathan Roberson: The one thing I like about the distribution type of methodology is that with a lot of these city based routes, it really helps the budgets. There are a number of different sources of funds that come together compared to the major county operators and it is pretty critical to receive at least a minimum amount. In some examples, when you go back to your city commission with grant money the entire program is better liked.

Mr. Fernandez: This may work in Broward County where 90% of the population is represented by municipalities. However, essentially MDT is the service provider for a larger population of unincorporated areas and cities.

Mr. McKeever: Also for the record, the applicant indicated that route 288 funding could be withdrawn if they needed to scale back. So that’s also a possibility in terms of how they will work that route.

Jane Pietrowski: These funds will be available to recipients of 5307. Ms. Jarman stated JARC will be merged into 5307 next year (FY 2013) MDT will be the recipients for their JARC funding because it will no longer be competitive.

Mr. Wijesundera of Kimley Horn: To clarify, the second year of funding is less than a full year. However, it does not mean that the recipient must use the funding over a twelve month period. A recipient could operate full level of service for as long as possible until the money is completely expended.

Mr. Phil Steinmiller: Are projects 1 through 9 all existing services? Which ones are new services?

Ms. McKeever: Although the Fort Lauderdale Community Bus is an existing service it has not been previously funded by JARC. Branches Ways to Work program is an existing service.

Mr. Steinmiller: Please explain how in the second year the funding will be going to Miami-Dade as they would become the direct recipient.

Ms. McKeever: Under MAP-21 JARC, was repealed and now merged with 5307, so those funds now exist under that program. The same would be for BCT and Palm Tran. JARC projects will now be an eligible activity under 5307.

Mr. Steinmiller: So, in that second year will there be available monies offered to the transit agencies provided by MAP 21?

Ms. Jarman: The merging of JARC with 5307 does not apply to FY 2012. It is moving forward under MAP-21 (FY 13). This is the FY 2012 and under this current cycle, applicants are eligible to apply for up to two years of funding. Although it's two years of funding, it still comes out of the FY 2012 pot. Under MAP-21, FY 2013 JARC will merge with 5307 formula funds. FY 2013 will not be a competitive cycle.

Mr. Jonathan Roberson: Requested RTA staff to have a discussion item at PTAC on the Federal funding distribution.

City of Opa-Locka – It's the North Route operated by City of Opa-Locka. This is a continuation of a previously funded grant. We recommend funding.

Palm Tran – This is two years worth of funding for fixed-route improvements. The application is recommended for funding.

SFRTA Ft. Lauderdale Tri-Rail Shuttles – This is for the previously JARC funded Fort Lauderdale Tri-Rail shuttles. Staff recommend funding.

City of Fort Lauderdale – Community Bus – This is for two years of capital and operating funding. Administrative costs were deducted out of the application because it is not eligible. Staff recommends funding for the Downtown Link. Staff did not feel that the Galt, Las Olas and Beach links met the intent of the program. However, the Downtown Link operates Monday through Friday 7:30 am to 5:30pm providing connections between the BCT terminal and Downtown Fort Lauderdale. Staff felt this route met the program intent.

Branches – Ways-to-Work – Branches Ways to Work (formerly known as South Florida Urban Ministries) is a previously funded JARC project. This is to fund the operating portion of a program that provides loans for car sharing. This application is not to fund the car loan only the operation of the program.

Ms. Michele Edwards-Collie of Branches: The requested funding is for operating costs. The National Ways to Work program provides loans to low-income and welfare recipients to purchase vehicles in order to access employment and training. The clients must go through financial education training in order to be eligible.

Ms. McKeever: This is an eligible project according to FTA guidelines. Staff did a lot of research, contacted FTA and the National Ways to Work program. Staff found that a lot of entities were not comfortable with funding the capital side of the project and they funded the operating side of it.

Ms. Edwards-Collie: Clients are getting an opportunity to purchase a vehicle. They are required to sign up and go through the process of car sharing in both Miami-Dade and Broward. They understand that's part of the requirement to receive the loan. All of our clients have signed up for the vehicle sharing program. If we discover that the client is not following the requirements of the program, the car is repossessed.

Mr. Greg Stuart made a motion to endorse the recommended ranking and funding levels for the JARC applications. The motion was seconded by Ms. Irma San Roman. The motion was called to a vote and passed unanimously.

R2. – MOTION TO ENDORSE: Recommended Ranking & Funding Levels for New Freedom (NF) Program Grant Application

Ms. McKeever stated the following were not recommended for funding under the NF Program:

Ambassador Transportation – Applicant is requesting 10 vehicles for persons with disabilities and elderly persons. The applicant will provide same day service 6 days a week. The applicant states that certain areas of Broward County have gaps in service for the disabled. However, the applicant does not provide an analysis of existing para-transit services, such as service coverage and limitations of Broward County's TOPS. The project is in compliance with FTA. However, there is conflicting information in the application, so staff is not recommending them for funding. The target population appears to be elderly persons being transported for a medical need (Please see response to question 24). The applicant did not elaborate on the planning efforts to identify the need or estimated ridership. The ridership is based on 5 days a week service, but the applicant reference 6 days a week. Staff asked for clarification on their Civil Rights program and more information about coordination efforts between Broward County and any other transit providers. Staff did not feel that there was enough information to recommend funding this project.

Fort Lauderdale – Tri-Rail/NW and Neighborhood Link: Based on the project description this application did not meeting the FTA NF program intent. The applicant is seeking NF funds for operating existing Sun-Trolley routes and the hiring of Mobility Management Consultants for the TMA system. The applicant describes the route as serving low income and disadvantaged populations on the system by providing affordable access to jobs, social services, health and education facilities. The applicant refers to low income population several times throughout the application. The project as described by the

applicant is more applicable to JARC than NF. NF is a program that expands transportation mobility options for persons with disabilities beyond the requirements of the ADA. Staff did not feel the project met the NF program intent.

Federation Transportation- Scheduling Independence: Staff could not evaluate the application due to incomplete responses. The application lacked justification for their capital requests.

Medix Senior Healthcare: Medix proposed the purchase of wheelchair accessible vehicles for persons with disabilities and elderly. They proposed to operate 24 hours 365 days in the service area without the needs for advance reservations. The applicant also stated there were gaps in service for paratransit transportation. However, the applicant does not provide an analysis of existing para-transit services, such as service coverage and limitations of Broward County's TOPS. The project is in compliance with FTA guidelines, but there is conflicting information in the application. The target population appears to be elderly persons needing medical transportation, as referenced in Q.7 & Q8. Also, Medix Senior Healthcare Service was not registered with the Florida Department of State as a business. Staff does not recommend funding this project.

Ruth Rales Jewish Family Service - Based on the project description this application did not meet NF program intent. The applicant clearly states that the project intent is to transfer seniors Monday through Friday 9 am to 4 pm (please refer to Q. 6 and Q8) . NF is not for seniors only it is to expand mobility options for persons with disabilities. Staff is not recommending this project for funding.

Greg Stuart: What is the geographic distribution of these funds?

Ms. McKeever: Zuni is in Miami Dade and Mae Volen and Metro are in Palm Beach County. Pearl Transit will operate in all three counties.

Mr. Stuart: So, basically the \$819,219 is being left on the table? Mr. Stuart expressed concern over the lack of equitable distribution.

Ms. McKeever: Expressed understanding of Mr. Stuart's concern, but explained that projects have to be eligible to be funded.

NF Approved Applicants:

Mae Volen – LIFT – The request is for two years of operating dollars. The project is a continuation of a previously funded NF project. The funding is to support the operating expenses of the LIFT transportation program, which provides same-day transportation services to all persons with disabilities ages 18 to 59 and the elderly. It operates between 5 a.m. 9 p.m.

Mr. Tomas Boiton of Mae Volen: The services are based on density. The highest density of the target populations is in southern Palm Beach County.

Mae Volen - Community Mobility Manager: The request is for two years of capital dollars. The project is a continuation of a previously funded NF project. The funding is to support the Mobility Manager to continue working with human service agencies, public transportation providers, local and counties governments to develop new transportation options. Staff is recommending this project for funding with the exception of the requested support staff.

Pearl Transit – Funding requested for a new project, Way2Work. The applicant is located in New Jersey. They are proposing to provide services in South Florida. The services include Mobility Management and travel training to persons with disabilities living in the region. Staff verified that they are currently sub-recipients in New Jersey. The grant award is contingent upon the applicant obtaining a business license to operate in the State of Florida. Staff will also like to see coordination with the local transit providers. Also, staff has concerns regarding if the number of proposed drivers is adequate to operate the service area.

Metro Taxi of PBC – Metro Taxi Mobility: The applicant is requesting capital dollars to purchase 5 wheelchair accessible vehicles. This is for same day service provided 24 hours a day 365 days a year to all areas of Palm Beach County. Staff is concerned with the lack of coordination with the local transit providers. The applicant did receive partial funding to purchase two wheelchair accessible vehicles during the last JARC/NF competitive cycle.

Mr. Fred Stubbs: Are they part of the metro mobility group that contracted with Palm Tran and Palm Beach County for Para-Transit?

Staff: No, that was not indicated in the application. This is not the same group.

Zuni Transportation – South Dade NF Service: The applicant is requesting capital dollars to purchase 10 wheelchair accessible vehicles. Staff proposes funding 5 of those vehicles. The vehicles will be used to provide same day services 24 hours per day 365 days a year to all areas of the Southern Miami-Dade County. Staff had concerns regarding the process used to identify the level of need in the county and the lack of coordination with existing transportation providers. Staff is also unclear regarding the proposed fare structure. The application indicates that they would have a zone style fare structure. Prior to award, staff would need to review the proposed fare structure to ensure that there is no discrimination for persons with disabilities. Estimated ridership is based on capacity not actual riders. The application also states service will be operating 24 hours 7 days a week to fill gaps. However, Miami-Dade Transit currently offers that same type of service throughout Miami-Dade County. The \$20,000 in consultant fees contained in the request is not recommended for funding due to procurement issues. During the last funding cycle, the applicant was partially funded to purchase two wheelchair accessible vehicles.

Mr. Greg Stuart: The City of Fort Lauderdale application was poorly written. However, looking at the response to Q. 3 of the application it stated that 42% of that population is disabled. I don't think it can get any clearer than that. This is the route that was funded for the Housing Authority of Fort Lauderdale last year.

Ms. McKeever: The Housing Authority project was not for a route. It was a capital grant request for a vehicle and Mobility Manager. There is constant reference to low-income and for the NF program it has to go beyond the ADA. Mr. Stuart agreed that the application was written poorly.

Ms. Pustizzi: It is not what we interpret, but what is written in the application.

Mr. Stuart: The information is in the application and they should have focused on the 42%; and it's wrong throughout the rest of the document. There's a common sense element that must be applied to understand what you are looking at. So if the common sense element is not applied to that and we just do this, then I don't disagree with it. They wrote the wrong thing in the rest of the application. Clearly they

have the intent, so then the question is you need to pick up the phone and say “what are you doing here” or you should sit together and understand. I’m looking at disabled population at almost 50%, to turn around and say that this grant is not for them. I’m sorry I think you might have made a mistake.

Mr. McKeever: If we picked up the phone we violated another potential subrecipient’s process. This is a competitive process.

Mr. Cross: PTAC laid out some guidelines and it wasn’t really staff’s role to make decisions rather to follow the guidelines and make a recommendation to this group. This is the group that’s supposed to apply the discretion. So again one of the questions you might want to ask on Fort Lauderdale application in particular there looks like two different routes in that one application. Perhaps we want to hear and ask more details on the route. Then as a group if we decided we want to fund one of those that’s the role of PTAC to go beyond and apply that judgment and knowledge.

Mr. Steinmiller: I understand Greg’s point. It sounds like RTA staff is doing their job correctly. I think people writing these applications have to understand the program. If that can’t be brought forth in the application maybe they don’t understand the program and what’s the purpose of the funding. I don’t know what the time frame is involved since we do have available funding; can there be a second round? Maybe they need to come in and make a presentation and explain the purpose of the program, routes they intend to run and number of disabled people they will serve before I would be comfortable to give them funding.

Mr. Cross: This is our last year and we have gone through many cycles. It has been the wisdom of this group previously that we didn’t want verbal presentations because we cannot necessarily rely upon verbal it needed to be in the written document. If an applicant does a poor job of making their case in the application, than that’s what we have to consider if they don’t make their case.

Mr. Cross: We are acting as staff to PTAC, so that takes some of the burden of reading all of these. However, the recommendation to the Board is coming from PTAC not from staff. So it’s up to this group and your judgment we try to inform the discussion. The PTAC is free to make your recommendation as seen fit. Before you proceed, there are two options to consider, because we don’t want to do another cycle. Let’s get all the money out the door today.

Monica Cejas: What happens to the money that is left behind?

Ms. McKeever: These are not lapsing funds, so technically if money was left on the table there is time to have another cycle. Ms. McKeever also stated that she understood that PTAC could override the staff recommendations. However, she cautioned the members to keep in mind that per FTA guidelines this is a competitive process. We have to be careful as to what we present to the FTA. We do not want applicants to come back and say we violated their process because we allowed projects that are not eligible to move forward.

Ms. Pustizzi: To further elaborate on the two options that Mr. Cross mentioned. Staff spoke to FTA as to what is permissible to do with the left over money. The first option is to supplement the approved projects further if those applicants are able provide the match and it the funds must be for used that project only and not for any other project. The second option is to fund the Ambassador and Medix projects, but they would have to make sure to meet the federal requirements that were identified as lacking in their application. The other applicants did not meet the program goals.

Mr. Fernandez: There is an assumption on the other side that they can come up with more match money; it is not guaranteed that money will not be left. There is still a possibility that the money could be left on the table.

Ms. Pustizzi: Another option could be to separate projects into project “A” and “B” so that if you couldn’t fund more out of “A” you could fund some from “B”.

Mr. Roberson: Here’s something to consider today Zuni duplicates Miami-Dade County’s Para-transit. I heard Mae-Volen LIFT duplicates Palm Beach County’s Para-transit to a degree. If it is NF, it must do something similar to Para-transit. Ambassador and Medix in the unfunded category is technically Broward County’s duplication of Para-transit. Their applications were apparently weaker. There is a pattern to consider in these other options. The Fort Lauderdale application could probably be reworded any day and it would qualify based on needs. Those are the things I’ve seen the extra money but there is a policy implications duplicating Para-transit, the three counties have to consider, do you want that in general? Or do you the smaller services? There are a number of things that are floating out there, but pure duplication of your county Para-transit program? Miami-Dade county do you need that? Do you know Para-transit is unfunded? How far is duplication?

Mr. Jorge Azur, of Zuni Transportation: Thank you for the opportunity to speak. Zuni is not trying to duplicate the Para-transit service provided by Miami Dade County; we currently provide some of that service. They do not provide same day service and recently had funding issues. The service that Zuni provides is based in North Miami Beach and South Dade-County. Zuni works and coordinates much needed service in Miami including providing backup service during breakdowns of the Metro-Rail service, which occurs quite frequently. We propose to go get people from one station to the other when the Metro-Rail is not working.

Ms. McKeever: One concern with the application is the consultant fee. That raises procurement issues so we would strongly caution adding that back into the amount awarded.

Ms. Pustizzi: Zuni requested 10 vehicles and staff recommended 5.

Ms. Delaney: There is a niche in the market for Para-transit services. There is a daily demand for transit service for the disabled outside of the standard transit operators established programs. The Mae-Volen LIFT, Ambassador and Medix are similar programs that represent a fair regional distribution of those projects. The other very different type of application is Fort Lauderdale’s application which has two services. Is there someone from the city to touch on that.

Ms. Darlene Pfeiffer, City of Fort Lauderdale: Respectfully requests reconsideration. Throughout the application there is reference to “disabled low income riders” specifically in Q. 3. There is reference to almost 32,000 disabled residents. Low income and disabled and elderly riders are again referenced in Q. 6. The population that utilizes the NW route is primarily low income and affordable housing complex, seniors and disabled.

Mr. Steinmiller: Feels comfortable in saying that the City wrote a bad application that didn’t qualify. However, using PTAC’s discretion and knowing the target population and the services provided we should fund the City and the other project in the chart highlighted in orange.

Ms. Jarman: Some of the applications have a lot of inconsistencies for e.g. Ambassador Taxi. Through sunbiz.org all applicants are verified to confirm they are licensed in the State of Florida. Staff could not find Ambassador or Medix registered under the business name listed in the application. In addition, the vehicle quotes that were received appear to be altered. The projects that are proposed are good projects and are eligible, but the companies, misrepresented themselves.

Mr. Fred Stubbs: We all have good intentions of trying to include the applications that didn't quite meet the bar, but we don't want to include anything that doesn't meet the FTA requirements. Staff did a good job and we need to move on from this point.

Mr. McKeever: For Mae Volen the service is for disabled form 18 to 59 and it's clearly stated in the application. It's open to everyone that has a disability.

Ms. Delaney: Based on the discussions it sounds as though Federation would drop out. The Fort Lauderdale project appears to have more merit than what was originally presented in the application itself. It sounds as though Ruth Rale's also has more merit that what was presented in the application itself. Is there any disagreement with that?

Ms. Delaney requested to edit the spreadsheet. Its sound like Zuni will jump up to \$349,644; Fort Lauderdale would be fully funded at \$564,841 and Ruth Rales will be funded at \$148,781.

Mr. Azur: Suggested that Zuni could reduce the vehicle request from 10 to 8.

After several discussions and calculations the following are the final NF figures that we called to a vote:

New Freedom:

Project	Total Project Cost	Funding Request	PTAC Funding Recommendation
Mae Volen - LIFT	\$1,419,566	\$608,158	\$608,158
Mae Volen - Community Mobility Manager	\$109,000	\$87,200	\$73,600
Pearl Transit - Way2Work	\$576,703	\$288,352	\$288,352
Metro Taxi of PBC - Metro Taxi Mobility	\$164,775	\$131,820	\$131,820
Zuni Transportation - South Dade NF Service	\$457,055	\$365,644	\$269,219
Ruth Rales Jewish Family Service -Community Center Van Access	\$214,135	\$148,781	\$148,781
Ft. Lauderdale - Tri-Rail/NW and Neighborhood Link	\$961,522	\$564,841	\$564,841
Ambassador Transportation - New Freedom	\$369,157	\$295,326	\$0
Federation Transportation - Scheduling Independence	\$80,920	\$64,736	\$0
Medix Senior Healthcare - Medix Broward NF	\$152,980	\$122,384	\$0
Total Recommendation			\$2,084,771
Total Funding Available			2,084,771
Amount Leftover			\$0

Mr. Steinmiller: motioned to endorse the Recommended Ranking & Funding Levels for New Freedom (NF) Program Grant Application as amended. The motion was seconded by Ms. Irma San Roman. The motion was called to a vote and approved unanimously.

The committee then agreed to take a ten minute recess.

INFORMATION / PRESENTATION ITEMS

Action not required, provided for information purposes only.
--

II. - INFORMATION: SFRTA Transit Development Plan (TDP) FY 2014-2023 Major Update

Ms. Natalie Yesbeck-Pustizzi of SFRTA staff and Ms. Jessica Vargas of Tindale-Oliver and Associates gave a presentation on the activities in support of the SFRTA's new TDP Major Update. Ms. Yesbeck-Pustizzi announced that the TDP's Public Involvement Plan (PIP) was approved by FDOT District 4. Other recent outreach activities were reviewed, including onboard surveys, platform surveys, and online survey. Initial findings show that over 5,000 usable onboard surveys were completed and over 1,000 platform surveys were conducted. Over 400 online surveys have been completed thus far, with over 10% of participants not being current public transportation users. Ms. Yesbeck-Pustizzi pointed out that an e-mail blast with a link to the online survey was sent to over 7,000 e-mail addresses. A variety of agencies other than SFRTA sent the link to their distribution lists, which was greatly appreciated. SFRTA's draft TDP Goals were also shared, with no concerns raised by the committee.

OTHER BUSINESS:

None

PTAC MEMBER COMMENTS

None

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 12:04 PM.

SOUTH FLORIDA REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
PLANNING TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (PTAC)
MEETING: MAY 15, 2013

INFORMATION ITEM REPORT

Information Item

Presentation

BCT CONNECTED –
BROWARD COUNTY TRANSIT (BCT)
FY 2014-2023 TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PLAN (TDP) MAJOR UPDATE

SUMMARY EXPLANATION AND BACKGROUND:

Broward County Transit (BCT) has recently launched its FY 2014-23 Transit Development Plan (TDP) known as *BCT Connected*. This TDP will serve as the strategic guide for public transportation in Broward County for the next ten years. The development of *BCT Connected* will feature a number of activities from January through November 2013, including: documentation of BCT's service area conditions and characteristics, evaluation of BCT's existing transit services in Broward County current markets, market research and public involvement efforts, development of a situation appraisal and needs assessment and preparation of a 10-year TDP that will serve as Broward County's strategic business plan for public transit services for the next ten years and beyond.

For more information on *BCT Connected*, please refer to the project webpage, <http://www.broward.org/BCT/Pages/TransitDevelopmentPlan.aspx>.

EXHIBITS ATTACHED: None

SOUTH FLORIDA REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
PLANNING TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (PTAC)
MEETING: MAY 15, 2013

INFORMATION ITEM REPORT

Information Item Presentation

SFRTA MOVING OUR REGION FORWARD –
FY 2014-2023 TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PLAN (TDP) MAJOR UPDATE

SUMMARY EXPLANATION AND BACKGROUND:

Throughout 2013, SFRTA staff and its consultant team have briefed the committee on activities in support of SFRTA’s new TDP Major Update (covering fiscal years 2014 through 2023), which has been branded “Moving Our Region Forward.” SFRTA staff will continue to engage and involve the PTAC as a steering committee throughout the project’s duration.

At the May 15 meeting, SFRTA staff and its consultants will provide a detailed briefing to the PTAC on the project’s ongoing public involvement activities and technical work. The Draft Technical Report 1A is now available online at <http://www.sfirtaforward.com/pages/project-documents> and ready for review by the committee. Draft TDP Objectives and Technical Report 2 will also be added to the project website in the coming days.

EXHIBITS ATTACHED: None

SOUTH FLORIDA REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
PLANNING TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (PTAC)
MEETING: MAY 15, 2013

INFORMATION ITEM REPORT

Information Item Presentation

SUMMARY OF ULI/SFRTA EVENT-
“DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES ON THE FEC CORRIDOR:
AN INTERACTIVE FORUM”

SUMMARY EXPLANATION AND BACKGROUND:

On the morning of Wednesday, April 17, the Urban Land Institute (ULI) Southeast Florida/Caribbean District Council and South Florida Regional Transportation Authority partnered to host an event designed to bring attendees the latest market and economic data available along the Florida East Coast (FEC) Railway corridor in Broward, Miami-Dade, and Palm Beach Counties, and to bring together urban development opportunities with area developers. “Development Opportunities on the FEC Corridor: An Interactive Forum” was organized to promote a showcase of possible station sites from municipalities and to offer feedback from the development community.

At the May 15 PTAC meeting, SFRTA staff will provide a detailed summary of the event.

EXHIBITS ATTACHED: None

SOUTH FLORIDA REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
PLANNING TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (PTAC)
MEETING: MAY 15, 2013

INFORMATION ITEM REPORT

Information Item Presentation

REGIONAL TRANSIT-ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT (TOD)
PLANNING DISCUSSION

SUMMARY EXPLANATION AND BACKGROUND:

At the March 2013 PTAC meeting, committee members agreed to hear a monthly update on Transit Oriented Development related activities occurring in the region. The purpose of the reoccurring TOD update to the PTAC is to provide a forum for coordinating the many TOD related planning activities within the region.

Since the March meeting, a TOD map was prepared as part of the Seven 50 project and a coordination meeting was held between parties involved in the various TOD related planning efforts throughout the region.

On May 15, the TOD map will be presented to the PTAC members, updates will be provided on TOD related planning activities, and next steps discussed.

EXHIBITS ATTACHED: None

SOUTH FLORIDA REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
PLANNING TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (PTAC)
MEETING: MAY 15, 2013

INFORMATION ITEM REPORT

Information Item Presentation

UPCOMING PTAC CALENDAR AND MEETING LOCATIONS

SUMMARY EXPLANATION AND BACKGROUND:

The upcoming summer months, along with various transportation planning events and meetings being held throughout the region, have required some adjustments to the PTAC and SEFTC Regional Transportation Technical Advisory Committee (RTTAC) calendars. The following are proposed meeting dates for the coming months:

- June 12 (moved ahead one week to avoid conflict with Seven 50 Summit)
- July 10
- No August meeting

Also, SFRTA staff has worked with the RTTAC Chair on preliminary plans to hold the June 12 PTAC and RTTAC meetings in Downtown Miami. Committee feedback will be sought on confirming the location of the June 12 meetings.

EXHIBITS ATTACHED: None

SOUTH FLORIDA REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
PLANNING TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (PTAC)
MEETING: MAY 15, 2013

INFORMATION ITEM REPORT

Information Item Presentation

2013 TRANSPORTATION SUMMIT – VISIONING THE FUTURE OF
MIAMI-DADE COUNTY’S PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION

SUMMARY EXPLANATION AND BACKGROUND:

In an effort to begin to chart the course of future transit development beyond the Metrorail Orange Line, the Miami-Dade County Citizens’ Independent Transportation Trust (CITT) will be hosting a Summit in June 6, 2013 which will bring together major stakeholders, agencies, communities, and select national experts.

The Summit will feature a Community Visioning Forum to engage the public and obtain public input on the future of transit development in Miami-Dade County. This event marks the “first step” in the process of engaging stakeholders and the community in charting the course of future transit development. Follow-up events will be held to continue refining the direction of future transit development in Miami-Dade County.

Further Summit details and registration information can be found online at <http://www.miamidade.gov/citt/transportation-summit.asp>

EXHIBITS ATTACHED: Transportation Summit Working Agenda

Working Agenda

As of April 24, 2013

8:00 AM - 8:45 AM	Registration	
9:00 AM - 9:15 AM	Opening Ceremony: Master of Ceremony Introduction Commissioner Dennis Moss, District 9, Chair of Transportation & Aviation Committee	
9:20 AM - 9:45 AM	Mayor Address: Mayor Carlos Gimenez, Miami-Dade County (confirmed)	
9:45 AM - 10:00 AM	Keynote Address: "Visioning the Future of Miami-Dade's Public Transportation"	
10:00 AM - 10:15 AM	Breakout to Sessions	
	"Financial Planning and Sustainability" Track	"Technology and Infrastructure" Track
10:15 AM - 12:15 AM	Innovative Financing Opportunities (Variety of government & private sources for capital costs)	Transit Technologies and Mode Choice (Existing and new technologies, such as light rail, bus rapid transit, as to address the transportation network in county)
12:15 PM - 1:15 PM	Lunch Break (On Your Own)	
1:30 PM - 3:30 PM	Public Private Partnerships (The potential for South Florida)	Corridors (Building consensus towards "the next big thing project")
3:30 PM - 3:45 PM	Reconvene to Main Room	
3:45 PM - 4:15 PM	CITT Update: Charles Scurr, Executive Director, Citizen's Independent Transportation Trust (CITT), Miami-Dade County	
4:30 PM - 6:30 PM	Community Visioning: Public Involvement Forum Moderator: FIU Metro Center Networking/Summit Adjourned	

Exhibits Open

2013 Transportation Summit Breakout Session Topics

Opening Address: Mayor Carlos A. Gimenez (confirmed)

Keynote Address: Visioning the Future of Miami-Dade's Public Transportation

Topic 1 - Innovative Financing Opportunities: Transportation projects utilize a wide variety of revenue and funding from federal, state, local, and private sources. With funding for planning and projects becoming increasingly tighter, transportation agencies are employing innovative strategies to finance capital costs.

Topic 2 – State-of-the-art Transit Technologies and Mode Choice: A key transportation issue for our community is weighing the tradeoffs among the various fixed route alternatives. Discover solutions that offer diverse ways to efficiently develop Miami-Dade's transportation network through ways including bus rapid transit, rail systems, system design, automated guideways, etc.

Topic 3 – Establishing Public Private Partnerships: Understand the importance of new partnership efforts between the private sector and the various levels of government in the state. Also hear about innovative programs in several states and share your experiences.

Topic 4: Corridor and Priorities Planning: The planning and development of multimodal corridors – “the next big thing project” – starts with consensus among many stakeholders in a region, including the walking, riding & driving public, private sector, government and non-government organizations. Prioritization involves many considerations ranging from design and construction of infrastructure to community values in areas such as mobility needs and desired land uses. These themes cut across bus (bus rapid transit, exclusive bus lanes, etc.) and rail systems (underground, elevated, and surface alignments), as well as stations, etc.

SOUTH FLORIDA REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
PLANNING TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (PTAC)
MEETING: MAY 15, 2013

INFORMATION ITEM REPORT

Information Item Presentation

TRI-RAIL RIDE AND PLAY – SATURDAY, MAY 18

SUMMARY EXPLANATION AND BACKGROUND:

SFRTA is sponsoring a special event on Saturday, May 18 to promote the recently enhanced Tri-Rail weekend service. Discounts and promotions will be provided by a number of sponsors, including Bayside Marketplace, CityPlace, International Game Fish Association, Museum of Discovery & Science, Pollo Tropical, Vizcaya Museum & Gardens, and numerous radio stations. Further information can be found online at <http://www.tri-rail.com/more-trains-on-weekends.asp>.

EXHIBITS ATTACHED: None

PTAC Attendance, January 2012-Present

	20 13				2012							
	Apr	Mar	Feb	Jan	Dec	Oct	Sep	Jul	May	Apr	Feb	
BCT												
Member									x			
Alt	x	x	x	x	x	x	x			x	x	
Other					x	x						
Broward MPO												
Member	x			x			x		x	x	x	
Alt		x	x		x	x		x	x	x	x	
Other												
FDOT D4 OMD												
Member		x		x				x				x
Alt	x	x	x	x	x	x	x			x		
Other												
FDOT D4 PLEM												
Member					x		x	x		x	x	
Alt	x		x									
Other								x				
FDOT D6												
Member	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	
Alt					x							
Other		x				x						
Miami-Dade MPO												
Member			x	x			x	x				
Alt	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Other					x		x	x				
MDT												
Member	x	x	x					x	x	x	x	
Alt				x	x		x	x		x	x	
Other	x											
Palm Beach MPO												
Member	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Alt			x	x	x							x
Other												
Palm Tran												
Member	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Alt												
Other												
South Florida RPC												
Member		x			x	x	x	x				
Alt			x									
Other												
South Florida RTA												
Member	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Alt	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Other	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Treasure Coast RPC												
Member												
Alt	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		
Other									x			x