FTA Subrecipient Workshops

GDOT Intermodal Division – Transit Program

April 3, 2017: Macon, Georgia
April 10, 2017: Gainesville, Georgia
April 12, 2017: Atlanta, Georgia
Today’s Agenda

9:30 AM  Welcoming Remarks and Introductions
9:40 AM  Team Introductions and Handouts
9:55 AM  Update on FY 2018 Grant Funding
10:15 AM GDOT’s Electronic Contract System
10:30 AM Vehicle Delivery Update
10:40 AM BREAK and “Three Bucket Challenge”
10:50 AM Update on National Transit Database (NTD) and Statewide Dispatching/ Scheduling Contract
11:00 AM FTA Compliance Activities/Audits
11:15 AM Transit Asset Management (TAM) Update
11:30 AM Program Updates
12:00 PM Group Discussion
12:30 PM Adjourn
Introductions

Transit Program Manager

Rural Transit
Michele Nystrom (Group Leader)  
D1 – Jemal Sheppard  
D2 – Mellie Pettit  
D3 – Carrie Anderson  
D4 – Troy Green  
D5 – Algenia Skinner  
D6 – Freida Black

Small Urban Transit
Group Leader (vacant)  
Ryan Walker – Planning, Albany, and Athens  
Yves Wilkerson – Macon, G’ville-Hall, and Bartow  
Mark Lambert – Rome and Hinesville  
Kayla Thomas – Grants and Reimbursements

Transit Asset Mgmt/Fleet
Lisa Rudder  
Andrew Pofahl

Contracts
Toshiro Butler  
Tonya Fair

Contractors
AECOM Team  
GA Tech  
RouteMatch  
RLS Associates
Handouts

- Meeting Agenda
- Transit Organization and Contact Information Form
- Subrecipient Contact Database Update Form
- GDOT Transit Customer Satisfaction Survey
- National Academy of Science – Transportation for Dialysis Research
- New GDOT Electronic Contract Handout
Update on FY 2018 Grant Funding
Where Are We Today?

Current Public Transit Systems in Georgia

Areas With Transit Service: 123 counties (77% of total)

Areas Without Transit Service: 36 counties

Total = 159 Counties
Georgia’s Statewide Transit Framework

FTA/GDOT Funding and Program Oversight

Rural Transit Plans (Regional Commissions)

Small Urban Plans (Under 200K Population MPOs, i.e. Athens, Albany, Hinesville, Gainesville, Rome, and Macon)

Coordination with Intercity Transit Carriers (Greyhound and SE Stages)

Large Urban Plans (Over 200K MPOs – Metro Atlanta, Savannah, Columbus, and Augusta)

Statewide Transit Program

(program coordination and information sharing)
## Public Transit in Georgia: By The Numbers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>No. of urban transit systems in GA (2016)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Number of rural transit systems in Georgia (2016)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Number of transit systems helping with Hurricane Matthew response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rank in total number of rural transit systems in U.S. (2014)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289</td>
<td>Total number of transit trips made in Georgia in 2016 (in millions)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Number of regional planning agencies in GA working on transit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: US Census, American Public Transit Administration, State of Georgia
## Peer State DOT Transit Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>State Funding for Transit FY2012</th>
<th>State Funding per Capita FY2012</th>
<th># of Rural and Small Urban Systems (FY 13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>$2,920,272</td>
<td>$0.29</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>$12,350,000</td>
<td>$2.38</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>$217,309,774</td>
<td>$11.25</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>$56,018,794</td>
<td>$8.57</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
<td>$2.08</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>$1,489,991</td>
<td>$0.34</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>$4,955,000</td>
<td>$1.08</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>$240,436,975</td>
<td>$24.33</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>$1,600,000</td>
<td>$0.54</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>$319,142</td>
<td>$0.32</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>$2,900,000</td>
<td>$1.56</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>$73,574,654</td>
<td>$7.54</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>$3,151,595</td>
<td>$4.50</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>$7,300,000</td>
<td>$0.63</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>$32,669,819</td>
<td>$8.38</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
<td>$1.27</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>$44,499,000</td>
<td>$6.89</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>$30,341,068</td>
<td>$1.16</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>$117,851,500</td>
<td>$20.58</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>$2,522,468</td>
<td>$4.38</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## FY 2016 Public Transit Expenditures
(in $ millions)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUND SOURCE</th>
<th>RURAL SYSTEMS</th>
<th>SMALL URBAN SYSTEMS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal (FTA)</td>
<td>$ 19.5</td>
<td>$ 12.1</td>
<td>$ 31.6</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of GA</td>
<td>$ 0.6</td>
<td>$ 0.5</td>
<td>$ 1.1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Sources</td>
<td>$ 15.4</td>
<td>$ 8.0</td>
<td>$ 23.4</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 35.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 20.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 56.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Rural and Small Urban (under 200K in population only)*
GDOT Transit Grants – Target Timeframes

- **Determine Available Funding (July-Aug)**
- **Call for Projects (Sept-Nov)**
- **Submit Grants and Prepare Contracts (Apr – June)**
- **Evaluation of Fund Requests (Dec-Mar)**
- **Contract Execution (June-July)**
GDOT Transit Grants – Current Status

- Subrecipient Applications Evaluated – COMPLETE
- FTA Grants Submitted for FY 2018 – COMPLETE
- FTA Approval of Grants – PENDING
- Prepare FY 2018 Contracts – UNDERWAY
  - Schedule training for subrecipients (new electronic contract system) – April 2017
  - Preparation of draft contracts – April/May 2017
  - Execute contracts (as they are routed to GDOT) – May/July 2017
FY 2018 Grant Funding Considerations

- First Year of Benchmarking for Rural and Small Urban Systems
- Eliminating Turning Back State and/or FTA Funds
- Reasonably Accounting for Potential Fuel Cost Increases
- Accounting for Systems With Very Long Trip Lengths/High Odometer Readings
- Consideration of Georgia TAM Targets and Plan
- Small Urban Apportionments PLUS Section 5339 for Capital
GDOT’s Responsibility for Allocating Rural Funds

A Sound Approach for Allocating Capital, Operating, and Planning Funds

Receive and Incorporate Feedback into This Approach

Establish a Fair and Equitable Award Decision-Making Process
Factors Considered in Rural Funding Decisions

### Special Factors
- Trending Urban Caps
- Contracted vs. Expended Funds
- Expended Operating Funds Over Time (FY 2013-FY 2016)
- Requested FY 2018 Funds
- % Increase from Contracted Funds

### Operating Performance
- Cost per Hour
- Cost per Trip
- Cost per Vehicle
- Farebox Revenue per Trip

### Service/System Characteristics
- Miles per Trip
- Trips per Vehicle
- % Population in Poverty
- % Population 65 or Older

### Vehicle Characteristics
- Age of Vehicle
- Odometer Reading
- Projected Annual Mileage

Operating Funding Decisions
Capital Funding Decisions
## Size and Extent of Rural Transit Systems

### Key Questions:

- **How should system performance affect funding?**
- **Does system performance vary by size of system?**
- **What factors positively influence system performance?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYSTEM SIZE</th>
<th>NO. OF ACTIVE VEHICLES</th>
<th>NO. OF SYSTEMS</th>
<th>PERCENT OF TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SMALL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>50.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MID-SIZE</td>
<td>4 – 6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 – 9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 – 16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LARGE</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Funding Strategies for Small Urban Systems

Call for Projects – Identify Apportionments by Area

Systems Using Funds | Identify Unused Funds

Redistribution of Unused Funds

Use for Operating Funds (if requested)

Program Capital Fund Requests

First Use Section 5307 | Then Use Section 5339*

*Section 5339 projects require 20% local match.
NEW ELECTRONIC CONTRACTING PROCESS

Toshiro Butler
GDOT’s New Electronic Contract Process

- GDOT has been using a new electronic contract process called CATS (Contracts Authorization Tracking System) since early 2016.

- GDOT Intermodal Division, including the Transit Program, must use this new process starting April 1, 2017.
Only two changes in the process involves (1) how to submit the LOCAL FUND match share for capital projects only and (2) routing the contracts for signatures.

This system accommodates both paper checks and automated clearinghouse (ACH) submittals.

Paper checks for the local share can be sent to GDOT at:

Georgia Dept. of Transportation
P.O. Box 117137
Atlanta, GA 30368-7137
GDOT’s Electronic Contract System

• This new process is intended to enable the contracting process to be shorter and more efficient.

• Handout – “Electronic Signature Incorporated within Contracts Authorization”

• Training webinars will be provided by GDOT for all our subrecipients.
Electronic signatures are inserted in key places in the contract document and routed to assigned persons in order.
Update on Rural Vehicle Delivery

Lisa Rudder
Update on Section 5311 Vehicle Delivery

- Delivery of FY 2016 and FY 2017 Section 5311 Vehicles Is Underway
  - Number of FY 2016 vehicles = 125
  - Number of FY 2017 vehicles = 94
  - Total order = 219

- Total vehicles delivered as of March 29, 2017 is 44.

- Likely delay for last 70 vehicles extending into September 2017 – GDOT is working with the vendor to reduce the wait time.
Required Items for Vehicle Delivery

- Power of Attorney
- Proof of Insurance for each vehicle
- Licensed drivers, including CDL, if needed
- Without this information, the vehicle(s) cannot be released.
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

AND

INTRODUCTION TO THE
“THREE BUCKET CHALLENGE”
You received a number of small pieces of paper on which you can write your ideas about the question below and place them in the appropriate bucket. The question is:

What are things that GDOT and all of its FTA subrecipients and partners should do to improve transit in Georgia.
TIME FOR A BREAK
Update on National Transit Database (NTD) Report and Statewide Dispatching and Scheduling Procurement
NTD and Procurement Updates

Georgia’s NTD Submittal for the Rural Systems: Completed on March 29, 2017 (Deadline was March 31, 2017)

GDOT Procurement for Statewide Scheduling and Dispatching Software – Nearly Complete
FTA Compliance Activities/Upcoming Audits

Jamie Cochran
FY 2017 and FY 2018 Audits and Reviews

- **FTA Audits and Reviews**
  - March 2017 – Drug and Alcohol Audit
  - April – August 2017 – “Interim” Review
  - Early 2018 – Full FTA “Comprehensive Review” (formerly Triennial Review)

- **State Audits and Reviews**
  - July-August 2017 – State Audit of Payments

- **Transit Program Audits**
  - April – June 2017 - Agreed Upon Procedure Audits
  - GDOT Transit Program Risk Assessments – All Subrecipients
## Previous FTA Triennial Review Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review Area</th>
<th>Deficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial Management</td>
<td>ECHO authorized control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ECHO documentation of expenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>Inadequate oversight of subrecipient activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americans with Disabilities Act</td>
<td>Inadequate oversight of subrecipient activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement</td>
<td>Subrecipient contract process deficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE)</td>
<td>Failed to meet DBE goals and prepare analyses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grantee not ensuring proper payment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory Continuing Control</td>
<td>Inadequate equipment records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No evidence of physical inventory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning/Program of Projects</td>
<td>Elements in POP missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fare Increases and Major Service Reductions</td>
<td>Insufficient oversight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>Lacking documentation of expenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug and Alcohol</td>
<td>Contractors and subrecipients not properly monitored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vendors not properly monitored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Rights/EEO</td>
<td>Failure to obtain EEO plans from subrecipients</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Previous FTA
### State Management Review Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review Area</th>
<th>Deficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial Management</td>
<td>ECHO authorized control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ECHO documentation of expenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement</td>
<td>Subrecipient contract process deficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disadvantaged Business Enterprise</td>
<td>Failed to meet DBE goals and prepare analyses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grantee not ensuring proper payment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset Management (Maintenance)</td>
<td>Inadequate oversight of subrecipient activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Rights/Equal Employment Opinion</td>
<td>Failure to obtain EEO plans from subrecipients</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Peer State Staffing and SMR Deficiencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Subrecipients</th>
<th>Transit Staff</th>
<th>Subrecipients per Staff</th>
<th>SMR Deficiencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peer Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>48</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.7</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
1. FL staff includes 12 CO + approx. 14 DO (2 per district).
2. KY transit staff not available at this time.
3. TN staff include 13 in Office of Public Transit (no administrators).
Transit Asset Management (TAM) Update

Lisa Rudder
What is Transit Asset Management (TAM)?

- TAM Regulation was enacted in 2016 and will be used as a basis to approve transit capital funding in the future.

- New FTA regulations require that agencies receiving FTA funds must create a plan to maintain and manage all of their assets.

- Assets are any vehicles, facilities, or large pieces of equipment.
What is the “State of Good Repair” (SOGR)?

- SOGR is defined as establishing performance targets to assess the condition all major assets, assessing them, and then determining whether the asset is in an “acceptable” condition.

- GDOT is responsible for preparing a “Small Group Plan” for all Rural and Small Urban Systems in Georgia.

- GDOT has established some initial TAM targets.
Initial TAM Targets and TAM Plan

“Useful Life Benchmark” is not the same as FTA’s replacement criteria. It is a target describing a longer time period (than FTA’s replacement criteria) during which the asset can be used for transit by keeping it in a state of good repair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset Classification</th>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>Performance Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Vehicles (vehicles used in revenue transit service)</td>
<td>% of Vehicles that have met or exceeded their Useful Life Benchmark</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment (non-revenue vehicles and major equipment over $ 50K in cost)</td>
<td>% of vehicles that have met or exceeded their Useful Life Benchmark</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities (i.e. administrative buildings, maintenance garages, shared use buildings, passenger/parking facilities)</td>
<td>% of assets with a condition rating below 3.0 on the FTA Term Scale</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Facility Condition Assessments by Subrecipients

- Condition assessments must be completed for all transit related facilities per FTA requirements.

- A number of components of each facility have to be assessed and rated on a 1 to 5 scale.

- GDOT will provide training and a packet of information and forms to complete the condition assessments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Substructure</td>
<td>5: Excellent</td>
<td>New construction, no visible defects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4: Good</td>
<td>Minor improvement or superficial repairs needed, can be addressed through routine maintenance. No significant visible damage such as cracking, spalling, sagging, rust, or shifting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3: Adequate</td>
<td>Needs some repair. There may be surface cracking, rust, shifting, and spalling on components. Insulation or drainage may need maintenance. Substructure is cosmetically “fair”, and functioning as designed; within useful life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2: Marginal</td>
<td>Components need extensive repair at a minimum. They show signs of significant cracking, sagging, rust, shifting, and spalling / decay. Significant insulation or drainage issues may be present. There are no apparent safety issues, however. Components are functional but have exceeded their useful lives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1: Poor</td>
<td>Components show critical defects affecting function, health, or safety. They are visibly in poor condition. They cannot be repaired; must be replaced. They have exceeded their useful life and warrant structural review.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TAM Plan Schedule

April/May 2017: Develop training for subrecipients to assess the condition of their facilities and complete condition assessments.

June-Aug 2017: Complete data collection and analysis

Sept 2017-Jan 2018: Complete asset modeling (with compiled data) and asset budget plans for future funding

Feb -March 2018: Draft TAM Plan available for public review

April – June 2018: Finalize TAM Plan

Aug-Sept 2018: Final Plan due to FTA and NTD reporting
Planning Update (Sections 5303 and 5304)
Ryan Walker
Planning Emphasis Areas for FY 2017 and FY 2018

- Developing Solid Data on Transit Needs in Anticipation of Georgia’s First Statewide Transit Plan
- FTA Compliance
  - Third Party Contracting (i.e. consultants, deliverables, etc.)
  - Oversight/Compliance by subrecipients (MPOs) over third-party service operators
- FTA procurement rules
- DBE participation
- “Trending Urban” Issue
The “Trending Urban” Challenge in Georgia:

As certain parts of Georgia grow and urbanize, more and more rural transit trips are actually becoming urban transit trips. What transit funding will support these needs?

- 5311 Rural Funding
- 5307 Urban Funding
- Both Urban and Rural Funding
- Individual Cities Funded
Rural Transit Update (Section 5311)

Michele Nystrom
Why Rural Transit Matters
Section 5311 Funding Update

- FTA Grant for Section 5311 Funds for FY 2018 has been submitted to FTA for approval.

- Total FY 2018 requests for rural programs is about $41 million.

- Development of contracts with subrecipients has started.
FY 2016 Rural Transit Trips in Georgia

- Public Transit Trips = 798,852

- Sponsored Trips = 1,050,479 (DHS, Medicaid, etc)

- Total Trips = 1,849,331 (slight increase from 2015)

- % Sponsored Trips of Total = 56%
- % Public Trips of Total = 43%

Source: FY 2016 National Transit Database Reporting – Georgia Section 5311 Program
Section 5311 – FY 2018 Objectives

- More Training Opportunities
- Electronic processes for efficiencies
- Statewide ROADEO
- Statewide Transit Plan
- Improved website and quarterly newsletters
- Wish list:
  - Increased service hours, increased marketing efforts, increased focus on safety, others?
Small Urban Program Update
(Sections 5307 and 5339)

Yves Wilkerson and Mark Lambert
Better coordination between GDOT and local systems.
- More on-site visits
- Project coordination meetings

More training opportunities
- Maintenance Programs
- Transit Asset Management
- Drug and Alcohol Program
- Procurement
- Civil Rights, DBE, and ADA Compliance
GDOT Focus Areas for Small Urban Systems – Funding/Financial Activities

- Standard Templates
- Reduce Unnecessary Changes in Processes/Procedures
- Better Quality Documentation
  - More Timely Payments to Subrecipients
  - Reduce Reimbursement Request Issues and Delays
Group Discussion/Last Comments

All
Next Steps

- Update Subrecipient Contact Database
- Initiate Training on New Electronic Contract System
- Begin Working on Facility Condition Assessments
- Continue Rural Transit Vehicle Delivery
- Proceed with FY 2018 Grant Contracts
- Get Ready for Audits!
Adjourn

Thank You Very Much for Participating Today!

For More Information:

Jamie Cochran, FAICP
GDOT Transit Program Manager
jacoehran@dot.ga.gov
Phone: 404-631-1237