

Date: July 23, 2008
W.I.: 1311
Referred by: PAC
Revised: 10/22/08-C
09/23/09-C

ABSTRACT

Resolution No. 3860, Revised

This Resolution adopts the Second-Cycle Lifeline Transportation Program Guidelines and Fund Estimate.

The following attachment is provided with this Resolution:

Attachment A— Second-Cycle Lifeline Transportation Program Guidelines and Funding FY 2009 through FY 2011

This Resolution was revised on October 22, 2008, to update the funding amounts for the STA funds based on new figures from the final State Budget.

This Resolution was revised on September 23, 2009 to update the Tier 2 STA and JARC funding amounts for FY 2010 and to revise the deadline for submittal or revision of the Lifeline Program of Projects (Tier 2) to October 30, 2009.

Further discussion of the Lifeline Program Guidelines is provided in the Programming and Allocations Committee summary sheets dated July 9, 2008, October 8, 2008, and September 9, 2009.

Date: July 23, 2008
W.I.: 1311
Referred by: PAC

RE: Second Cycle Lifeline Transportation Program Guidelines and Fund Estimate

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
RESOLUTION NO. NO. 3860

WHEREAS, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) is the regional transportation agency for the San Francisco Bay Area pursuant to Government Code Section 66500 *et seq.*; and

WHEREAS, MTC adopted Resolution 3814, which directed Proposition 1B funds to the Lifeline Transportation Program; and

WHEREAS, MTC adopted Resolution 3837, which established a consolidated policy for State Transit Assistance (STA) – population-based funds, including a set percentage to the Lifeline Transportation Program; and

WHEREAS, MTC is the designated recipient for federal Job Access Reverse Commute (JARC) funds and has incorporated these funds into the Lifeline Transportation Program; and

WHEREAS, MTC has conducted an administrative evaluation of the interim Lifeline Transportation Program and has made revisions to the program based on evaluation results; and

WHEREAS, MTC will use the process and criteria set forth in Attachment A of this Resolution to fund a program of projects for the second-cycle of the Lifeline Transportation Program - Fiscal Year 2009 through Fiscal Year 2011; now, therefore be it

RESOLVED, that MTC approves the program guidelines to be used in the administration and selection of the second cycle of Lifeline Transportation projects, as set forth in Attachment A of this Resolution; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Executive Director shall forward a copy of this Resolution, and such other information as may be required, to such other agencies as may be appropriate.

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Bill Dodd, Chair

The above Resolution was entered into by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission at a regular meeting of the Commission held in Oakland, California on July 23, 2008.

Date: July 23, 2008
W.I.: 1311
Referred by: PAC
Revised: 10/22/08-C
09/23/09-C

Attachment A
MTC Resolution No. 3860
Page 1 of 8

Second-Cycle Lifeline Transportation Program Guidelines and Funding FY 2009 through FY 2011

Program Goals: The Lifeline Transportation Program is intended to fund projects that result in improved mobility for low-income residents of the nine San Francisco Bay Area counties, and are expected to carry out the following regional Lifeline Program goals:

The Lifeline Program supports community-based transportation projects that:

- Are developed through a collaborative and inclusive planning process that includes broad partnerships among a variety of stakeholders such as public agencies, transit operators, community-based organizations and other community stakeholders, and outreach to underrepresented stakeholders.
- Address transportation gaps and/or barriers identified in Community-Based Transportation Plans (CBTP). While preference will be given to CBTP priorities, strategies emerging from countywide or regional welfare-to-work transportation plans, the Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan or other documented assessment of need within the designated communities of concern will also be considered. Findings emerging from one or more CBTPs or other relevant planning efforts may also be applied to other low-income areas, or otherwise be directed to serve low-income constituencies within the county, as applicable.
- Improve a range of transportation choices by adding a variety of new or expanded services including but not limited to: enhanced fixed route transit services, shuttles, children's programs, taxi voucher programs, improved access to autos, capital improvement projects. Transportation needs specific to elderly and disabled residents of low-income communities may also be considered when funding projects. Existing transportation services may also be eligible for funding.

Program Administration: The Lifeline Program will be administered by county congestion management agencies (CMAs) or other designated county-wide agencies as follows:

County	Lifeline Program Administrator
Alameda	Alameda County Congestion Management Agency
Contra Costa	Contra Costa Transportation Authority
Marin	Transportation Authority of Marin
Napa	Napa County Transportation Planning Agency
San Francisco	San Francisco County Transportation Authority
San Mateo	City/County Association of Governments
Santa Clara	Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority and Santa Clara County
Solano	Solano Transportation Authority
Sonoma	Sonoma County Transportation Authority

Lifeline Program Administrators are responsible for soliciting projects for the Lifeline Program, which requires a full commitment to a broad, inclusive public involvement process. Further guidance for public involvement is contained in MTC’s Public Participation Plan. For the selection of projects involving federal funds, Lifeline Program Administrators must also consider fair and equitable solicitation and selection of project candidates in accordance with federal Title VI requirements, i.e. funds must be distributed without regard to race, color, and national origin.

Funding: Fund sources for the second-cycle Lifeline Program (FY 2009 - FY 2011) include Job Access Reverse Commute (JARC), State Transit Assistance (STA) and Proposition 1B - Transit funds, as shown in Table A. Funding amounts will be assigned to each county by each fund source, based on the county’s share of poverty population consistent with the estimated distribution outlined in Table B. Lifeline Program Administrators will assign funds to eligible projects. Funded projects must meet the eligibility requirements of the respective funding source.

For projects receiving JARC Funds: Lifeline Program Administrators will enter projects into the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). Following approval of the TIP, MTC will enter projects into MTC’s Federal Transit Administration (FTA) grant to be submitted in spring 2009. Following FTA approval of the grant, MTC will enter into funding agreements with project sponsors.

For projects receiving STA funds: For transit operators receiving STA funds, MTC will allocate funds directly through the annual STA claims process. For other STA eligible projects administered by sponsors who are not STA eligible recipients, MTC or the local transit operator will enter into a funding agreement directly with the project sponsor.

For projects receiving Proposition 1B Transit Funds: Project sponsors receiving Proposition 1B funds must submit a Proposition 1B application to MTC for submittal to Caltrans with prior review by MTC. The estimated due date to Caltrans is November 2008. The state will distribute funds directly to the project sponsor.

Multi-Year Programming: The second-cycle Lifeline Transportation Program will cover a three-year programming cycle. Since funding amounts for STA are unpredictable and will not be finalized before the release of the call for projects, MTC recommends that Lifeline Program Administrators select projects in two programming tiers.

Tier I Program: The Tier I Program covers the first two years of funding. Funding for the second year is expected to be known with approval of the FY 2009 state budget, or by September 2008. Tier I projects are due to MTC by November 30, 2008¹, and are scheduled to be presented to the Commission for adoption in January 2009. Lifeline Program Administrators are strongly encouraged to program the full amount of the Tier I county targets illustrated in Table B. Any remaining amounts not submitted by November 2008 may be programmed under Tier II. However, it should be noted that due to the timing of federal deadlines associated with JARC and state deadlines associated with Proposition 1B funds, any projects for these funding sources submitted after the November 2008 deadline will experience a delay in receipt of funds of up to one year.

Tier II Program: The Tier II Program covers the third year of funding. As of August 2009, the Tier II Program consists of a one-time augmentation of STA funding per the STA Consolidated Policy, Proposition 1B Transit funds, and anticipated FY2010 JARC funds. Tier II projects will be due to MTC by October 30, 2009.

At their discretion, Lifeline Program Administrators may conduct a consolidated competitive selection process for both Tiers, selecting the Tier II projects at the same time as the Tier I projects. However, funding for Tier II projects will not be available until after they are presented to the Commission for adoption in December 2009.

Competitive Process: Projects must be selected through an open, competitive process with the following exceptions.

(1) In an effort to address the sustainability of fixed-route transit operations, Lifeline Program Administrators may elect to allocate a portion of their STA funds directly to transit operators for Lifeline transit operations within the county. Projects must be identified as Lifeline projects before transit operators can claim funds, and will be subject to Lifeline Program reporting requirements.

(2) Due to the one-time nature of the Tier II STA funding augmentation, project solicitations that occurred for Tier I funding may satisfy the competitive selection process for Tier II. Furthermore, at their discretion, Lifeline Program Administrators who have gone through a competitive process may choose to select alternative projects for Tier II that sustain existing Lifeline-eligible transit services as a result of state budget cuts to the STA program. However, JARC funds can only be used for projects identified through a competitive process.

Grant Application: To ensure a streamlined application process for project sponsors, a universal application form (or standard format and content for project proposals) will be used, but, with

¹ Small Urbanized Area JARC projects will be due to MTC in September 2008.

review and approval from MTC, may be modified as appropriate by the Lifeline Program Administrator for inclusion of county-specific grant requirements.

Program Match: The Lifeline Program requires a minimum local match of 20% of the total project cost; new Lifeline Transportation Program funds may cover a maximum of 80% of the total project cost.

There are two exceptions to the 20% match requirement.

(1) JARC operating projects require a 50% match. However, consistent with MTC's approach in previous funding cycles, Lifeline Program Administrators may use STA funds to cover the 30% difference for projects that are eligible for **both** JARC and STA funds.

(2) All auto-related projects require a 50% match.

Project sponsors may use federal or local funding sources (Transportation Development Act, operator controlled State Transit Assistance, local sales tax revenue, etc.) to meet the match requirement. The match may include a non-cash component such as donations, volunteer services, or in-kind contributions as long as the value of each is documented and supported, represents a cost that would otherwise be eligible under the program and is included in the net project costs in the project budget

For JARC projects, the federal match must be *non*-Department of Transportation (DOT) federal funds. Eligible sources of non-DOT federal funds include: Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF), Community Services Block Grants (CSBG) and Social Services Block Grants (SSBG) administered by the US Department of Health and Human Services, Community Development Block grants (CDBG) and HOPE VI grants administered by the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). Grant funds from private foundations may also be used to meet the match requirement.

Project Assessment: Standard evaluation criteria will be used to assess and select projects. The six criteria include (1) project need/stated goals and objectives, (2) community-based transportation plan (CBTP) priority (3) implementation plan, (4) project budget/sustainability, (5) coordination and program outreach, and (6) cost-effectiveness and performance indicators. Lifeline Program Administrators may establish the weight to be assigned for each criterion in the assessment process.

Additional criteria may be added to a county program but should not replace or supplant the regional criteria. MTC staff will review the proposed county program criteria to ensure consistency and to facilitate coordination among county programs.

Each county will appoint a local review team of CMA staff, a local representative from MTC's Minority Citizens Advisory Committee, as well as representatives of local stakeholders, such as, transit operators or other transportation providers, community-based organizations, social service agencies, and local jurisdictions, to score and select projects. Each county will assign local priorities for project selection.

Project Selection/Draft Program of Projects: In funding projects, preference will be given to strategies emerging from local CBTP processes. Projects included in countywide regional welfare-to-work transportation plans, the Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan or other documented assessment of need within the designated communities of concern will also be considered. Findings emerging from one or more CBTPs or other relevant planning efforts may also be applied to other low-income areas, or otherwise be directed to serve low-income constituencies within the county, as applicable. Per federal requirements, all JARC projects must be derived from MTC's Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan. Regional Lifeline funds should not supplant or replace existing sources of funds.

Eligible operating projects, consistent with requirements of funding sources, may include (but are not limited to) new or enhanced fixed route transit services, restoration of lifeline-related transit services eliminated due to budget shortfalls, shuttles, children's transportation programs, taxi voucher programs, improved access to autos, etc. See Attachment 1 for additional details about eligibility by funding source.

Eligible capital projects, consistent with requirements of funding sources, include (but are not limited to) purchase of vehicles; bus stop enhancements, including the provision of bus shelters, benches, lighting or sidewalk improvements at or near transit stops, rehabilitation, safety or modernization improvements, etc.; or other enhancements to improve transportation access for residents of low-income communities. See Attachment 1 for additional details about eligibility by funding source.

Inter-county projects may also be funded if two or more counties wish to jointly plan for and fund such a project. Interested project sponsors or CMA staff should contact MTC to facilitate coordination.

Transportation needs specific to elderly and disabled residents of low-income communities may also be considered when funding Lifeline projects.

Project Delivery: All projects funded under the county programs will be subject to MTC obligation deadlines and project delivery requirements. All projects will be subject to a "use it or lose it" policy.

Policy Board Adoption: Projects recommended for funding must be submitted to and approved by the respective governing board of the Lifeline Program Administrator. The appropriate governing board shall resolve that approved projects not only exemplify Lifeline Program goals, but that the local project sponsors understand and agree to meeting all project delivery, funding match and eligibility requirements, and obligation deadlines.

Project Oversight: Lifeline Program Administrators will be responsible for oversight of projects funded under the county programs and ensuring projects meet MTC obligation deadlines and project delivery requirements. In addition, Lifeline Program Administrators will ensure, at a minimum, that projects substantially carry out the scope described in the grant applications. All scope changes must be fully explained and must demonstrate consistency with Lifeline Program goals. All changes to JARC-funded projects must be reported to MTC and reconciled with FTA.

Lifeline Program Administrators are responsible for programmatic and fiscal oversight of new Lifeline projects. As part of the Call for Projects, applicants will be asked to establish project goals, and to identify basic performance indicators to be collected in order to measure the effectiveness of the Lifeline projects. At a minimum, performance measures for service-related projects would include: documentation of new “units” of service provided with the funding (e.g. number of trips, service hours, workshops held, car loans provided, etc.), cost per unit of service, and a qualitative summary of service delivery procedures employed for the project. For capital-related projects, project sponsors are responsible to establish milestones and report on the status of project delivery. All reports containing performance measures will be forwarded to MTC for review and overall monitoring of the Lifeline Transportation Program.

Timeline Summary

Action	Due Date
Issue Lifeline Call for Projects	Late July 2008
Small Urbanized Area JARC projects due to MTC	September 2008
All other Lifeline projects due to MTC	November 30, 2008
Proposition 1B transit projects due to Caltrans	November 2008 (estimated)
Commission approval of Tier I Lifeline Program of Projects	January 2009
STA-funded projects: project sponsors begin to claim funds or enter into agreements	February 2009
Proposition 1B transit-funded projects: project sponsors receive funds from state	February 2009 (estimated)
MTC submits Federal Transit Administration (FTA) grant with JARC projects	Spring 2009
JARC-funded projects: project sponsors begin to enter into agreements	Summer 2009 (following FTA grant approval)
Submittal or revision of Lifeline Program of Projects (Tier II)	October 30, 2009
Commission approval of Tier II Lifeline Program of Projects	December 2009

**Table A – Lifeline Transportation Program
Second Cycle Funding
FY 2009 – FY 2011**

FUND SOURCE	CYCLE II: FY 09 - FY 11				
	Tier I Program ¹			Tier II Program ²	3-YEAR TOTAL
	<i>Year 1</i> Actual	<i>Year 2</i> Feb. 2009 Approved State Budget	<i>Subtotal Tier I</i>	<i>Year 3</i> Estimated	
STA ³	\$ 13,599,855	\$ 4,718,396	\$ 18,318,251	\$ 4,158,139	\$ 22,476,390
Prop. 1B ⁴	\$ 6,329,987	\$ 10,482,412	\$ 16,812,399	\$ 10,482,412	\$ 27,294,811
JARC ⁵	\$ 289,809	\$ 2,885,368	\$ 3,175,177	\$ 2,808,913	\$ 5,984,090
TOTAL	\$ 20,219,651	\$ 18,086,176	\$ 38,305,827	\$ 17,449,464	\$ 55,755,291

Notes:

¹ The Tier I Program is due to MTC on November 30, 2008.

² The Tier II Program is due to MTC on October 30, 2009.

³ STA commitments are per MTC Resolution 3837 (including funding from the STA Consolidated Policy, Proposition 1B Swap, Spillover, and interest). The STA Year 2 amount is based on the revised state budget approved in February 2009. The STA Year 3 estimate is based on (1) \$3,888,980 in Res. 3814 Augmentation Transfer funds, (2) \$1,971 in STA funds carried over from FY 2009 (the adopted FY09 budget was \$1,971 higher than anticipated), (3) \$267,188 in FY 2009 interest, and (4) the Governor's Jan. 2009 budget proposal for FY2010, which does not allocate any funds to STA.

⁴ Prop. 1B commitment is per MTC Resolution 3814. Year 2 revised estimate reflects final FY 09 funding amounts from the State Controller. Year 3 (FY 10 funding amount) is estimated to be the same as Year 2 (FY 09 funding amount)

⁵ JARC Year 1 is the difference between the original estimate and actual FY 2008 apportionment. Year 2 is estimated FY 09 large urbanized area (UA) apportionment and small UA targets provided by Caltrans. JARC Year 3 is the difference between the original estimate and actual FY 2009 large UA apportionment, plus the estimated FY 2010 large UA apportionment.

**Table B - Estimated Funding Target by Fund Source per County
Second-Cycle Funding
FY 2009 – FY 2011**

COUNTY & POVERTY POPULATION ¹		CYCLE II: FY 09 - FY 11								
		Tier I Program				Tier II Program				Total
		STA ⁴	Prop 1B	JARC ²	Tier I Subtotal	STA ⁵	Prop 1B	JARC ⁶	Tier II Subtotal	
Alameda - Available	27.40%	\$ 4,527,210	\$ -	\$ 786,582	\$ 5,313,792	\$ 1,139,330	\$ 2,872,181	\$ 851,554	\$ 4,863,065	\$ 10,176,857
Alameda - Advanced ³		\$ -	\$ 5,098,588	\$ -	\$ 5,098,588	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,098,588
Contra Costa	12.50%	\$ 2,374,491	\$ 2,016,841	\$ 358,843	\$ 4,750,174	\$ 519,767	\$ 1,310,302	\$ 388,485	\$ 2,218,554	\$ 6,968,728
Marin	2.70%	\$ 512,890	\$ 435,638	\$ 77,510	\$ 1,026,038	\$ 112,270	\$ 283,025	\$ 83,913	\$ 479,208	\$ 1,505,245
Napa	1.70%	\$ 322,931	\$ 274,290	\$ 84,494	\$ 681,715	\$ 70,688	\$ 178,201	\$ -	\$ 248,889	\$ 930,605
San Francisco	15.10%	\$ 2,868,385	\$ 2,436,344	\$ 433,483	\$ 5,738,211	\$ 627,879	\$ 1,582,844	\$ 469,288	\$ 2,680,011	\$ 8,418,222
San Mateo	7.10%	\$ 1,348,711	\$ 1,145,565	\$ 203,823	\$ 2,698,099	\$ 295,228	\$ 744,251	\$ 220,658	\$ 1,260,137	\$ 3,958,236
Santa Clara	21.70%	\$ 4,122,116	\$ 3,501,235	\$ 632,276	\$ 8,255,627	\$ 902,316	\$ 2,274,683	\$ 647,477	\$ 3,824,477	\$ 12,080,104
Solano	5.50%	\$ 1,044,776	\$ 887,410	\$ 416,834	\$ 2,349,020	\$ 228,698	\$ 576,533	\$ -	\$ 805,230	\$ 3,154,250
Sonoma	6.30%	\$ 1,196,743	\$ 1,016,488	\$ 181,331	\$ 2,394,562	\$ 261,963	\$ 660,392	\$ 147,538	\$ 1,069,893	\$ 3,464,455
TOTAL	100.00%	\$ 18,318,251	\$ 16,812,399	\$ 3,175,177	\$ 38,305,827	\$ 4,158,139	\$ 10,482,412	\$ 2,808,913	\$ 17,449,464	\$ 55,755,291

Notes:

Estimates intended for planning purposes only. Actual allotment of funds may differ than those indicated above.

¹ Poverty percentages by county are based on federal poverty levels reported in 2000 US Census.

² JARC Tier I estimates include small urbanized area funds administered by Caltrans. The small urbanized areas in the region include Livermore, Gilroy, Petaluma, Fairfield, Vacaville, Vallejo and Napa. These funds are subject to Caltrans requirements.

³ The Alameda County – Advanced total reflects \$5.1 million in Prop. 1B programmed in advance under MTC Resolution 3834. Alameda County's share of Tier 1 and Tier 2 Prop. 1B funds was \$4.6 million. The difference of \$491,991 is repaid from Alameda County's share of Tier 1 STA, which is distributed proportionately to the remaining counties.

⁴ The STA Tier I amount is equal to the Year 1 amount (\$13,599,855) plus the Year 2 amount (\$4,718,396), which is based on the revised FY09 State Budget approved in February 2009.

⁵ The STA Tier II amount reflects \$3,888,980 in Res. 3814 Augmentation Transfer funds, \$1,971 in STA funds carried over from FY 2009 (the adopted FY09 budget was slightly higher than anticipated), and \$267,188 in FY 2009 interest

⁶ The JARC Tier II estimates include FY 2010 large UA funds only. The small UA funds are administered by Caltrans and are subject to a statewide competition. As of August 2009, Caltrans does not plan to provide small UA target amounts for FY 2010 JARC funds.

ATTACHMENT 1
Lifeline Transportation Program
Second-Cycle Funding, FY 2009 – FY 2011
Funding Source Information

	State Transit Assistance (STA)	Proposition 1B – Transit	Job Access Reverse Commute (JARC)
Purpose of Fund Source	To improve existing public transportation services and encourage regional transportation coordination	To help advance the State’s goals of providing mobility choices for all residents, reducing congestion, and protecting the environment	To improve access to transportation services to employment and related activities for welfare recipients and eligible low-income individuals
Detailed Guidelines	http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/MassTrans/Docs-Pdfs/TDA2007Work.pdf	www.mtc.ca.gov/funding/infrastructure/PTMIS_EA_12-05-07.PDF	www.fta.dot.gov/documents/FTA_C_9050.1_JA_RC.pdf
Use of Funds	For public transportation purposes including community transit services	For public transportation purposes	For transportation services that meet the transportation needs of low-income persons
Eligible Recipients	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Transit operators ▪ Cities and Counties if eligible to claim TDA ▪ MTC for regional coordination ▪ Other entities, under an agreement with an eligible recipient 	Transit operators or local agencies that are eligible to receive STA funds, as listed by State Controller’s Office	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Operators of public transportation services, including private operators of public transportation services ▪ Private non-profit organizations ▪ State or local governmental authority
Eligible Projects	<u>Transit Capital and Operations</u> , including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ New, continued or expanded fixed-route service ▪ Purchase of vehicles ▪ Shuttle service if available for use by the general public ▪ Purchase of technology (i.e. GPS, other ITS applications) ▪ Capital projects such as bus stop improvements, including bus benches, shelters, etc. ▪ Various elements of mobility management, if consistent with STA program purpose and allowable use. These may include planning, coordinating, capital or operating activities. 	<u>Transit Capital</u> (including a minimum operable segment of a project) for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Rehab, safety, or modernization improvements ▪ Capital service enhancements or expansions ▪ New capital projects ▪ Bus rapid transit improvements ▪ Rolling stock procurement, rehab, or replacements <p>Projects must be consistent with most recently adopted short-range transit plan or other publicly adopted plan that includes transit capital improvements.</p>	<u>Capital or Operating projects</u> including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Services (e.g. late-night & weekend, shuttles) ▪ Ridesharing and carpooling ▪ Transit-related aspects of bicycling ▪ Local car loan programs ▪ Marketing ▪ Administration and expenses for voucher programs ▪ ITS, AVL, etc. for improving scheduling and dispatch ▪ Mobility management <p>Projects must be derived from the regionally-adopted Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan.</p>

	State Transit Assistance (STA)	Proposition 1B – Transit	Job Access Reverse Commute (JARC)
Lifeline Program Local Match	20%	20%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 50% for operating projects (may use STA funds to cover up to 30% if project is eligible for both JARC and STA) ▪ 50% for auto projects ▪ 20% for capital projects
Estimated timing for availability of funds to project sponsor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Transit operators and eligible cities and counties can initiate claims immediately following MTC approval of program of projects for current fiscal year funds. ▪ For “Other entities”, the eligible recipient acting as fiscal agent will initiate a funding agreement following MTC approval of program of projects. Funds will be available on a reimbursement basis after execution of the agreement. 	Project sponsors must submit a Proposition 1B application to MTC for submittal to Caltrans. The estimated due date is November 2008 (or February 2009) (Tier I) and November 2009 (or February 2010) (Tier II). Disbursement is estimated to occur within 3 months of receipt of the application.	Following MTC approval of program of projects, there will be a 6-12 month process of securing the grant from FTA (adjusting funding depending on actual Congressional appropriation, entering projects in the TIP, applying for the FTA grant, FTA review and approval) and MTC entering into funding agreements with the project sponsors. Funds will be available on a reimbursement basis after execution of the agreement.
Accountability & Reporting Requirement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Transit operators and eligible cities and counties must submit annual ridership statistics for the project, first to Lifeline Program Administrators for review, and then to MTC along with annual claim ▪ “Other entities” must submit quarterly performance reports with invoices, first to Lifeline Program Administrators for review, and then to MTC for reimbursement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Using designated Caltrans forms, project sponsors are required to submit project activities and progress reports to the state every six months, as well as a project close-out form. Caltrans will track and publicize progress via their website. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ All project sponsors will submit quarterly performance reports with invoices for reimbursement to MTC. Prior to submittal to MTC, reports will be submitted to Lifeline Program Administrators for review.

Note: Information on this chart is accurate as of May 2008. MTC will strive to make Lifeline Program Administrators aware of any changes to fund source guidelines that may be enacted by the appropriating agencies (i.e. State of California, Federal Transit Administration).

Metropolitan Transportation Commission Programming and Allocations Committee

July 9, 2008

Item Number 4b

Resolution No. 3860

- Subject:** Second Cycle Lifeline Transportation Program Guidelines and Fund Estimate
- Background:** The Lifeline Transportation Program (LTP) is intended to result in improved mobility for low-income residents of the Bay Area, and is administered at the county level. With the Transportation 2030 long range plan adopted in 2004, MTC dedicated Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) and Proposition 42 State Transit Assistance (STA) funds to the program beginning in FY 2009. In 2005, MTC funded an \$18 million interim LTP cycle to jumpstart the program.
- Through actions in June 2007 (MTC Resolution 3814) and January 2008 (MTC Resolution 3837), MTC confirmed and augmented its commitment to the Lifeline Program, resulting in a total 10-year estimated program of \$260 million. If the assumed JARC contributions continue to be available, the 10-year funding level will be roughly \$300 million.
- In May 2008, staff completed an administrative evaluation of the interim LTP as requested by the Commission prior to releasing funds for future funding cycles. Overall, the program was found to have been administered satisfactorily, but several changes were recommended for improvements. Several of these changes are reflected in the Program Guidelines, which were reviewed by MTC's Minority Citizens Advisory Committee's Lifeline Subcommittee, the Transit Finance Working Group, Lifeline Program Administrators, and the Regional Welfare to Work Transportation Working Group. Comments received on the guidelines are attached.
- Funding for the FY 2009 – 2011 second LTP funding cycle is comprised of \$3.2 million in JARC funds, \$44.0 million in State Transit Assistance (STA) funds and \$27.5 million in Proposition 1B - Transit funds, for a three-year total of \$74.7 million. As in the interim cycle, each county has a target for each funding source, assigned by percent of poverty population as found in Table B of the Resolution.
- Issues:**
- 1) Due to state budget uncertainties for FY 2009 and 2010, MTC is recommending that Lifeline Program Administrators develop two tiers of projects. One program of projects will be forwarded to the Commission for approval in January 2009. A second program of projects will be forwarded to the Commission for approval in December 2009 following final approval of the FY 2010 state budget. Staff will return to revise the fund estimate once the funding amounts are known.
 - 2) MTC reserved \$1.5 million in STA Lifeline funding for a means-based discount fare pilot program. Fare assistance programs consistently emerge from MTC-sponsored community-based transportation plans as a top priority. Through a competitive process, MTC will select a transit operator to implement the pilot program. Given STA funding limitations, the selected operator will be responsible for exchanging STA funds for local monies to implement the pilot project. A pre- and post evaluation of the pilot program will be conducted.
- Recommendation:** Refer MTC Resolution No. 3860 to the Commission for approval.
- Attachments:** MTC Resolution No. 3860
Comments on Draft Lifeline Guidelines

Comments on Draft Lifeline Transportation Program Guidelines, Second Cycle FY 2009-2011

Comment by Topic within Guidelines	Commenter	Action
<p>Program Goals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Lifeline program should support existing transportation services as well as new or expanded services ▪ Refine the definition of where transportation gaps should be identified if outside of a community of concern ▪ Goals are overly broad 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Regional Welfare to Work Working (WtW) Group ▪ Lifeline Program Administrators (LPAs) ▪ Urban Habitat (UH) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Addressed in Guidelines ▪ Addressed in Guidelines ▪ Partially addressed in Guidelines. Other UH comments to be undertaken in ongoing discussions
<p>Program Administration</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Administration costs should not exceed 10% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ MCAC Lifeline Subcommittee 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Administration costs are still under discussion. However, any additional funding for administration will not be reserved from the second cycle Lifeline Program funds.
<p>Funding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 80% of STA funds should be allocated to transit operators to fill Lifeline Transportation Network Report gaps ▪ JARC and Proposition 1B funds should be swapped for more flexible operating funds to fill Lifeline Transportation Network Report gaps 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ UH ▪ UH 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Allocating funds directly to transit operators is a decision to be made at the county level. See Competitive Process ▪ Funds have already been swapped. Additional funds are not available for this purpose currently, but MTC will attempt to make more operating funds available in the future.
<p>Competitive Process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Make competitive process a must, with exception ▪ Reconcile “projects must be selected...” with “preference will be given” ▪ Clarify that Coordinated Plan requirement is for JARC only ▪ CMAs should select projects that fill the biggest Lifeline Transportation Network gaps ▪ Appreciate flexibility to address sustainability issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ LPAs ▪ LPAs ▪ LPAs ▪ UH ▪ Transit Finance Working Group 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Addressed in Guidelines ▪ Addressed in Guidelines ▪ Addressed in Guidelines ▪ CBTPs identify a broad array of transportation gaps and solutions, not just fixed-route transit. ▪ No action required

Comments on Draft Lifeline Transportation Program Guidelines, Second Cycle FY 2009-2011 (cont.)

Comment by Topic within Guidelines	Commenter	Action
<p>Grant Application</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Specify that LPA modification of the grant application is okay with MTC's review and approval 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ LPAs, MCAC Lifeline Subcommittee 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Addressed in Guidelines
<p>Program Match</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Clarify the types of matching funds that can be used ▪ Provide more detail about the in-kind match 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ LPAs ▪ LPAs, WtW Group 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Addressed in Guidelines ▪ Addressed in Guidelines
<p>Project Assessment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Require inclusion of a county-based MCAC member on the local review team ▪ In addition to project-level assessment, the overall impact of the projects should be measured by regularly assessing the state of the Lifeline Transportation Network Report gaps and how well they have been permanently been filled. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ MCAC Lifeline Subcommittee ▪ UH 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Addressed in Guidelines ▪ MTC, in conjunction with stakeholders, will develop a process for assessing the progress of the Lifeline funding program
<p>Project Selection/Draft Program of Projects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Strengthen language regarding how to address inter-county gaps or incentivize them ▪ Support for statement that Lifeline funds should not supplant or replace existing sources of funds. Strengthen by encouraging CMAs to utilize non-Lifeline funding for projects, particularly bike and pedestrian projects, identified in CBTPs ▪ Clarify eligibility of non-transit capital projects 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ UH, MCAC subcommittee ▪ UH ▪ Alameda County CMA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ MTC will host a Lifeline project development workshop for transit operators. Potential inter-county projects will be discussed. ▪ With current funding sources, there is limited eligibility for bike and ped. projects. ▪ Addressed in guidelines
<p>Policy Board Adoption</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Clarify which board must approve Lifeline projects, page 5 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ MCAC Lifeline subcommittee 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Addressed in Guidelines
<p>Project Oversight</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ MTC and LPAs need to be involved in project oversight ▪ Consider adding safety and environmental performance measures for projects ▪ It is difficult for LPAs to oversee programs and finances if project invoices are reviewed and approved by another agency. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ LPAs ▪ LPAs ▪ Alameda County CMA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Guideline language clarification ▪ Staff will consider potential performance measures when developing contracts with project sponsors ▪ Addressed in Guidelines, Attachment 1

Comments on Draft Lifeline Transportation Program Guidelines, Second Cycle FY 2009-2011 (cont.)

Comment by Topic within Guidelines	Commenter	Action
<p>General Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Add a map of the Communities of Concern ▪ Clarify when funds can be spent (i.e. all in 1 year or over the 3-yr period) ▪ Use consistent language when referring to the source of project need ▪ Include language about the possibility of fund exchanges <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Variety of comments requiring clarification 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ LPAs ▪ LPAs ▪ LPAs ▪ LPAs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Alameda County CMA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Addressed in Guidelines ▪ Addressed in Guidelines ▪ Addressed in guidelines ▪ Since this is not a possibility for all counties, individual counties with this capability can include language in their county call for projects ▪ Provided directly to the CMA
<p>Attachment 1 – Funding Source Information</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Clarify eligibility for all three sources of funds 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ LPAs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Addressed in Guidelines

Some comments did not pertain directly to the Guidelines, but to larger Lifeline Transportation Program issues. These topics will be included in on-going discussions about the program.

Comments outside of Guidelines
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Basing distribution of Lifeline funds on percentage share of poverty by county does not take into consideration that people may live in one county, but travel to another for work, etc. This is justification for a universal fare.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Future evaluations of the Lifeline Program should include a “blind survey” that asks stakeholders who should administer the Lifeline Program –CMA’s or MTC
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There is a need to assess/measure the progress of the Lifeline Program (vs. performance assessment of Lifeline projects)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Performance measures – MCAC members want to be included in discussions to develop performance measures for Lifeline projects
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Means-based fare discount – fare assistance programs consistently emerge from CBTPs as a top priority. Existing Lifeline funds cannot be used directly for fare discounts or subsidies. MTC will reserve \$1.5 million in STA Lifeline funds for a means-based fare discount pilot program. Through a competitive process, a transit operator will be selected. The selected transit operator would be responsible for any exchange of funds necessary to implement the pilot given STA eligibility limitations. Staff will facilitate initial meetings with stakeholders to develop pilot program objectives, establish a workscope and refine budget requirements. A pre- and post evaluation of the pilot will be conducted.

Metropolitan Transportation Commission Programming and Allocations Committee

October 8, 2008

Item Number 2f

Resolution No. 3860, Revised

Subject: Second Cycle Lifeline Transportation Program Guidelines and Fund Estimate

Background: The Lifeline Transportation Program (LTP) is intended to result in improved mobility for low-income residents of the Bay Area, and is administered at the county level. With the Transportation 2030 long range plan adopted in 2004, MTC dedicated Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) and Proposition 42 State Transit Assistance (STA) funds to the program beginning in FY 2009. In 2005, MTC funded an \$18 million interim LTP cycle to jumpstart the program.

In July 2008, the Commission approved the Guidelines for the Second Cycle of the program, with estimated funding of \$74.7 million over the three years from FY2009 to FY2011. This estimate was based on the January state budget proposal. Now that the final state budget has been released, the state funding numbers in the Lifeline program are being updated. Due to the loss of funding in the State Transit Assistance (STA) and Spillover funds, the second cycle Lifeline program estimates are being revised downward by approximately \$8.5 million. The new three-year total is \$66.2 million. Pages 7-8 of Attachment A to the resolution reflect these changes. Lifeline Program Administrators in each county, and other interested stakeholders, are being notified of the changes.

Because some uncertainty in the state budget was anticipated, MTC had recommended that Lifeline Program Administrators develop two tiers of projects. One program of projects will be forwarded to the Commission for approval in January 2009. A second program of projects will be forwarded to the Commission for approval in December 2009 following final approval of the FY 2010 state budget.

Issues: The factors for determining the distribution of Proposition 1B funds throughout the state are set annually by the State Controller in the weeks following passage of the state budget. The estimate contained herein assumes that the FY2008 factors will be used again in determining FY09 share; however, this is subject to confirmation from the Controller. Should the factors change, staff will return with a revised estimate of the amount of Proposition 1B funds available for the Lifeline program in FY09.

Recommendation: Refer MTC Resolution No. 3860, Revised to the Commission for approval.

Attachments: MTC Resolution No. 3860, Revised

Metropolitan Transportation Commission Programming and Allocations Committee

September 9, 2009

Item Number 2e

Resolution No. 3860, Revised

Subject: Second Cycle Lifeline Transportation Program Guidelines and Fund Estimate

Background: The Lifeline Transportation Program (LTP) is intended to result in improved mobility for low-income residents of the Bay Area, and is administered at the county level. With the Transportation 2030 long range plan adopted in 2004, MTC dedicated Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) and Proposition 42 State Transit Assistance (STA) funds to the program beginning in FY 2009. An interim three-year funding cycle was initiated for FY 2005 – FY 2008 to jump-start the program.

In July 2008, the Commission approved the Second Cycle Lifeline Program Guidelines, with estimated funding of \$74.7 million over the three years from FY 2009 to FY 2011. Due to uncertainty in the state budget, MTC recommended that county Lifeline Program Administrators develop two tiers of projects. The first tier was forwarded to the Commission for approval in January 2009. A second tier program of projects will be forwarded to the Commission for approval in December 2009.

Due to the loss of STA and spillover funds, the Tier 1 program was reduced accordingly and STA funding for Tier 2 was eliminated altogether, bringing the three-year program to \$48.7 million.

Recommended Action: Staff proposes to revise the Lifeline fund estimate to add (1) a one-time augmentation of \$3.9 million in STA population-based funds to the Lifeline Program consistent with STA distribution in the STA Consolidated Policy and with the September 2009 proposed revision to the MTC Fund Estimate, and (2) add \$2.8 million in FY 2010 JARC Large Urbanized Area funds which MTC staff expects to be available under the extension of SAFETEA. This one-time augmentation of \$7 million of Tier 2 funding brings the total available for the three-year program to \$55.8 million.

Issues: Due to the one-time nature of this augmentation and no foreseeable restoration of STA funds in the near term, agencies should consider focusing these funds on service that can be sustained for the next several years rather than spreading the funding across many services that will need to be terminated if no alternative source of revenue becomes available. The revised Lifeline Program Guidelines provide counties the ability to apply these funds either to projects competitively selected under Tier 1, or to use non-JARC funds in Tier 2 to sustain existing Lifeline-eligible transit services threatened by state budget cuts. The deadline for counties to submit Tier 2 or revised Tier 1 programs of projects is

extended one month to October 2009 to accommodate programming the new funds.

The factors for determining the distribution of Proposition 1B funds throughout the state are set annually by the State Controller. Staff assumes that the FY 2009 factors will be used again in determining FY 2010 share; however, this is subject to confirmation from the Controller.

Recommendation: Refer MTC Resolution No. 3860, Revised to the Commission for approval.

Attachments: MTC Resolution No. 3860, Revised