

Management Plan for a State Matching Grant Program for Elderly
and Disabled Demand Responsive Transportation

Enacted in C.G.S. 13b-38bb

State Fiscal Year 2014 Program

State of Connecticut
Department of Transportation
Bureau of Public Transportation

Table of Contents

Program Description 2

Program Goals 3

Roles and Responsibilities 4

Eligible Projects and Expenses 5

 Transportation Services for Seniors and People with Disabilities..... 5

 Regional Coordinated Services 5

 Administration Costs 6

Ineligible Projects and Expenses 6

 Capital Equipment 6

 General Public Transportation and School Transportation..... 7

Eligible Recipients/Applicants..... 7

Eligible Match..... 7

 Municipal Funding Cuts 8

Project Selection Criteria and Method of Distributing Funds 8

Local Coordination Plan 9

Quarterly Reporting 9

Annual Reporting..... 10

Financial Reporting (Maintenance of Effort) 10

Application Checklist..... 10

SFY 2014 Grant Application Process and Timetable 11

Appendix A – Table of Available Allocations by Town 10

Appendix B - Coordination Models 14

Appendix C – Quarterly Reporting Form 16

Appendix D – Connecticut General Statutes 13b-38bb 17

Appendix E – Sample Application 18

 Attachment 1 – Maintenance of Effort Certification

 Attachment 2 – Grant Assignment Certification

Program Description

A review of “Elderly Transportation Services” by the Legislative Program Review and Investigations Committee in 1998 highlighted the inconsistent availability of

transportation across the state for seniors and people with disabilities. The program review committee found that:

- programs vary greatly among municipalities, with the level of service provided dependent on geographic lines, available funding, and local support;
- funding sources differ substantially depending on the municipality;
- no single funding source exists, instead funding is a patchwork of federal, state and local money;
- a local grant program would equalize funding among towns that already have dial-a-ride programs and provide opportunities for dial-ride services in towns where they are not currently available.

The Connecticut General Assembly enacted the recommended grant program in the 1999 legislative session, but funding was not appropriated until State Fiscal Year (SFY) 2006.

The senior and disabled transportation municipal grant program (hereinafter referred to as the “Municipal Grant Program”) has made \$5 million available to municipalities annually. The funds are available to any municipality and are apportioned based on the formula in the Connecticut General Statutes (C.G.S.) 13b-38bb, which states:

“Fifty per cent of such funds shall be apportioned on the basis of the share of population of persons age sixty or older in the municipality relative to the state’s total population of persons age sixty or older, as defined in the most recent federal decennial census or in estimates provided in the five-year interim by the Office of Policy and Management. Fifty percent of such funds shall be apportioned on the basis of a municipality’s square mileage relative to the state’s total square mileage.”

C.G.S. 13b-38bb also requires that municipalities apply to the state for the funds through a designated Regional Planning Organization (RPO) or transit district. The applicant must work with this regional body to determine how to use the funding most effectively in that municipality and its surrounding region. If a municipality chooses not to apply for its share, that portion will be returned to the Special Transportation Fund.

In order to be certain that state funds will not be used to supplant municipal funds, the municipality must certify their maintenance of effort annually. Grants require a local match so that the grant funds do not exceed 50% of total dial-a-ride expenditures. If a municipality is already providing transportation for seniors and person with disabilities, those funds can be used towards the matching requirement, with some restrictions. Please see the “Eligible Match” section for details.

Program Goals

- provide a uniform funding source available to all municipalities in the state,

- provide new transportation services to enhance access to the community for seniors and people with disabilities where transportation services do not exist,
- expand transportation services to enhance access to the community in areas where transportation is already available,
- encourage efficient use of scarce resources through coordination.

Roles and Responsibilities

Role of the state:

- Determine allocations for each municipality
- Prepare application package and distribute to RPOs
- Provide application and coordination assistance
- Review applications submitted by municipalities through RPOs
- Announce Awards
- Prepare and execute agreements/addenda with grantees
- Make payments in accordance with guidelines
- Collect data on program performance
- Provide data on program performance upon request
- Update and revise program guidance and documents as needed

Role of the municipality:

- Develop a program to provide transportation services to seniors and people with disabilities that meets the intent of the statutes, and complies with the program requirements
- Consider coordinating efforts
- Prepare application to RPO/Connecticut Department of Transportation (ConnDOT)
- Document matching funds
- Certify maintenance of effort
- When applicable, certify grant assignment
- Execute an agreement/addendum with ConnDOT or a coordinating entity
- Submit invoices for payment in accordance with guidelines (if appropriate)
- Provide or contract for transportation services (when appropriate) based on the municipality's own purchasing policies.
- Collect and submit data on transportation provided (if appropriate)

Role of the RPO:

- Distribute application packages to municipalities
- Provide application and coordination review and assistance
- Submit applications to State including report on responsiveness of municipalities to coordination efforts

Role of the coordinating entity (if applicable):

- Develop a program to provide transportation services to seniors and people with disabilities that meets the intent of the statutes, and complies with the program requirements
- Prepare application to RPO/ConnDOT
- Execute an agreement/addendum with ConnDOT
- Submit invoices for payment in accordance with guidelines (if appropriate)
- Provide or contract for transportation services
- Collect and submit data on transportation provided

Eligible Projects and Expenses

Transportation Services for Seniors and People with Disabilities

Projects funded by the Municipal Grant Program must serve both seniors and people with disabilities. Services that are open to the general public will not be funded, but may be coordinated with services funded by the Municipal Grant Program. While ConnDOT is not requiring that every vehicle used in this program be wheelchair accessible, the overall transportation program provided using these funds must be accessible.

ConnDOT does not require that a fare be charged for the services provided using the municipal dial-a-ride grant funds. However, if a fare is collected, it must be reported and used to offset operating costs related to the municipality's dial-a-ride program.

If the applicant is a Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5310 grant program recipient who intends to expand the services provided with their vehicle to include a new client group, they must amend the program description submitted with their original Section 5310 grant application by providing a written description of those changes to the Section 5310 program manager at ConnDOT.

Regional Coordinated Services

In order to enhance coordination efforts and maximize existing resources, the Department has expanded the eligible services category to include a regional coordinated service which allows towns to regionalize their funds through a coordinating agency. A regional coordinated transportation program would allow access by an eligible resident (i.e. Seniors or People with Disabilities) of any member town to any other member town (or destinations outside the region as determined by the involved municipalities). The involved municipalities must mutually agree to put 100% of their MGP allocation into the regional program, even though the value of the amount of service provided may be more or less than their MGP funds.

While this does not exactly fulfill the intent of the grant program that each town receive a formularized level of funding for transportation, it does meet the goal of promoting coordination and creates regional program that can better serve the mobility needs of the residents.

If you have questions on how this might work for your town or region, please contact Aimee Marques at 860-594-2840 or aimee.marques@ct.gov.

Administration Costs

Administration costs are allowed under this grant program, but they must be directly attributable to the dial-a-ride operation. Administration costs charged to the grant program may not account for more than 10% of the total grant. (See FAQs for a definition of Administration Costs.)

Ineligible Projects and Expenses

Capital Equipment

Capital equipment purchases, including vehicle purchases, are not an eligible expense. If new, wheelchair accessible equipment is required; the municipality can prepare a grant application to their RPO for FTA Section 5310 program funds, or pursue other local funding programs or resources for vehicle purchases.

The FTA Section 5310 program, administered by ConnDOT, provides funding for vehicle grants. Eligible grant recipients are private nonprofit organizations or eligible public bodies. The vehicles must be used to assist in meeting the transportation needs of elderly persons and persons with disabilities where public transportation services are unavailable, insufficient, or inappropriate.

Section 5310 program grants are federally funded 80% by FTA with 20% funded by the awarded recipient. Section 5310 grant recipients must use the funding to purchase new project equipment.

From the time of approval of a Section 5310 grant, it takes approximately 15-18 months for physical delivery of vehicles. Grants are awarded on a competitive basis. The average number of grants awarded over the past five years is approximately 26 per year, statewide.

Should you be interested in obtaining an application for the Section 5310 program or would like more information related to the program, please contact the program manager at 860-594-2912.

General Public Transportation and School Transportation

General public transportation and school transportation are not eligible expenses or match under this grant program.

Eligible Recipients/Applicants

Municipalities are eligible to receive a grant from ConnDOT for their annual allocation from the appropriated funds. If an RPO or transit district submits a coordinated regional application, the funds for the coordinating municipalities will be granted to the coordinating entity. In this case, the municipality must certify that they are assigning their grant apportionment to the coordinating entity.

Eligible Match

Funds provided to match the municipal grants must serve the same population as the municipal grant funds, that is, funding spent on general public transportation, school transportation, etc., will not be considered match. However, funds spent to serve either seniors or people with disabilities will be allowed as match, as long as the expanded services are available to both populations.

Matching funds can include operating costs for the current system, eligible and reasonable in-kind services, maintenance costs, and vehicle lease costs. Examples of in-kind services include volunteer services directly related to the transportation program, and donated supplies, loaned equipment or space. If the municipality does not have a transportation program, letters of commitment from all sources of matching funds must be provided with the application.

Capital expenditures to purchase vehicles, general public transportation, and school transportation are not eligible for match, or as eligible project expenses.

Municipalities can match the Municipal Grant Program funds with local funds, and State or Federal agency funds, but may not use other Connecticut Department of Transportation or U.S. Department of Transportation funding as match.

A 50% match is required. This means that matching dollars must be *at least equal* to the amount of grant funds. Municipalities must each provide their own match to the State grant funds and submit appropriate documentation. Program match cannot be regionalized; i.e. one municipality cannot provide overmatch to offset another municipality's shortfall in matching funds.

Administrative costs such as direct salary or other costs directly attributable to the delivery of the transportation services will be allowed as eligible program costs and can

be used as match. Administrative costs may not account for more than 10% of the total grant.

In order to document the available and claimed matching funds, the applicant must submit municipal budget documents showing budget requests for transportation services for SFY 2014. The transportation funding must be for services and expenditures that have been determined eligible based on the requirements in the “Eligible Match” section.

Municipal Funding Cuts

If a municipality reduces their transportation budget, the Department would reduce the municipal grant funds available to the town by a percentage equal to the percentage reduction of municipal funds. For example, if a town budget for dial-a-ride (DAR) was \$20,000 in SFY 2012, but is reduced \$2,000 in SFY 2013, the municipal grant award would be reduced by 10%.

Also, the reduced funding level would not become the new baseline match for future years. In the example above, the baseline maintenance of effort for the SFY 2014 application would not become \$18,000, but would continue to be \$20,000. The MGP grant would not be restored in full until the municipality restores their transportation budget. If municipal transportation funds are restored incrementally in future years, MGP funds would increase accordingly.

Project Selection Criteria and Method of Distributing Funds

The basic project selection criteria for the Municipal Grant Program consist of the following:

- Assurances that both seniors and persons with disabilities will receive transportation services.
- Timely, accurate, documented financial and statistical reporting from the prior service year(s), as required.
- Availability of appropriate matching funds and supporting documents for maintenance of effort.
- Collaboration on service design with the designated regional application body.

While coordination of services can be an effective use of resources, it may not always be the least expensive method. The municipality must work with the regional body to determine what service delivery method will work best for the municipality and the region.

If an RPO determines that a municipality should be part of a coordinated transportation model and the municipality chooses to not participate, the municipality can still apply for,

and, if approved, receive their full grant apportionment. However, those municipalities that choose to not coordinate even though the RPO recommends coordination, will receive no points for coordination when applying for a Section 5310 vehicle grant.

If an application is rejected or deemed insufficient, the applicant must submit updated information for review and approval before an agreement will be prepared by ConnDOT. ConnDOT will not provide a retroactive contract start date if any delays caused by the required resubmission push the agreement approval date beyond July 1.

Local Coordination Plan

C.G.S. 13b-38bb requires coordination efforts, stating that “The regional planning organization or transit district and municipalities interested in applying for the funds shall collaborate on service design to determine how to use the funding most effectively in that municipality and its surrounding region. The commissioner shall have the authority to approve or disapprove the method for delivery of service.” Applicants must describe how they intend to meet the needs of seniors and people with disabilities. They must also indicate how they intend to coordinate resources or why they will not coordinate. The RPO must indicate whether each municipality applying for funding was willing to coordinate.

Quarterly Reporting

C.G.S Section 13b-38bb (f) states, “*A municipality, receiving a grant provided pursuant to this section, shall annually submit to the Commissioner of Transportation, on forms provided by said commissioner, the following data on such transportation programs: (1) the number of unduplicated riders; (2) the number of one-way trips; (3) the number of miles traveled; (4) the number of trip denials; (5) the number of hours vehicles are in use annually; (6) all federal, state, municipal and other revenues received and expenditures incurred in the provision of dial-a-ride services; and (7) any other information determined to be necessary by the commissioner.*”

ConnDOT requires quarterly reporting of statistical information. (*See Appendix C*)

Quarterly reporting can be sent via mail, fax or e-mail to:

Aimee Marques

Transportation Planner 2

Connecticut Department of Transportation

P.O. Box 317546

Newington, CT 06131-7546

Fax 860-594-2848

e-mail: aimee.marques@ct.gov

Phone 860-594-2840

Annual Reporting

If the municipality has a transportation program in place that the municipality proposes to use as match to the Municipal Grant Program, annual revenue and expense reporting for SFY 2012 and SFY 2013 are required with this grant application. These must consist of “Actuals” for SFY 2012 and “Budgeted” and “Actuals-to-Date” for SFY 2013.

Financial Reporting (Maintenance of Effort-MOE)

C.G.S. Section 13b-38bb (g) states, “*A municipality receiving a grant pursuant to this section shall annually submit to the Commissioner of Transportation a certification that any state grant shall be in addition to current municipality levels of spending on such programs.*”

Each municipality applying for funds must submit an annual certification that the Municipal Grant Program funds are in addition to current municipal levels of spending on transportation programs for seniors and persons with disabilities. If there have been no cuts to funding used to match the Municipal Grant Program, the chief fiscal officer for the municipality must sign version A of the Maintenance of Effort. If there is a reduction in local funding, the chief fiscal officer must sign version B of the Maintenance of Effort acknowledging that state funds will be reduced in accordance with the local funding.

ConnDOT will fund the Municipal Grant Program to the level of apportionment but must be assured that all funds will be spent on the target program. If all of the funds are not spent in the current grant fiscal year, those funds must be returned to ConnDOT or the municipality should reduce their funding request for the following year. Municipalities will no longer be allowed to use carry over funding to expand services above the annual apportionment.

Application Checklist

1. Completed application
2. **Annual certification** that the Municipal Grant Program funds are in addition to current municipal levels of spending or that there has been a reduction to spending on transportation programs for seniors and persons with disabilities. The chief fiscal officer for the municipality must sign this document.
3. **Municipal budget documents** showing budget requests for transportation services for SFY 2014 and/or letters of commitment from other sources of matching funds. The transportation funding must be for services and expenditures that have been determined eligible based on the requirements in the “Eligible Projects and Expenses” and “Eligible Match” sections.
4. If a coordinating entity is submitting the application, each municipality included in the application must certify that they are assigning their grant apportionment to the coordinating entity.

SFY 2014 Grant Application Process and Timetable

| | | |
|----|--|-----------------------------------|
| 1. | ConnDOT forwards application package to RPOs for distribution to municipalities. | January 30, 2013 |
| 2. | The RPO collaborates with municipalities on potential for coordination. | |
| 3. | Municipalities submit applications to the RPO. | April 3, 2013 |
| 4. | RPO submits applications to ConnDOT with any additional information on accuracy of application and coordination efforts. | April 17, 2013 |
| 5. | ConnDOT reviews applications, announces awards (via e-mail). Applications that are not approved must be resubmitted with updated information. ¹ | June 12, 2013 |
| 6. | ConnDOT prepares agreements or Transit Operating Documents (TOD) for signature. | June 12, 2013 |
| 7. | Once a TOD is in signed, the municipality can submit a request for payment. | July 17, 2013 |
| 8. | Grantees provide quarterly reporting to ConnDOT. | See schedule in reporting section |

¹ If an application is rejected or deemed insufficient, the applicant must submit updated information for review and approval before an agreement will be prepared by ConnDOT. ConnDOT will not provide a retroactive contract start date if any delays caused by the required resubmission push the agreement approval date beyond July 1.

Appendix A

| Allocation by Municipality of Funding for the Municipal Dial-a-Ride Program for Seniors and People with Disabilities | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|---------|---------------|----------|------------|-----------|-----------|------------|---------------------|
| SFY 2014 Program Year - based on 2010 Census | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Municipality | 60-64 | 65-69 | 70-74 | 75-79 | 80-84 | over 85 | Total Percent | | Allocation | Sq. Miles | Percent | | Total Apportionment |
| | | | | | | | over 60 | of Total | | | Sq. Miles | Allocation | |
| Andover | 206 | 120 | 81 | 47 | 43 | 47 | 544 | 0.077% | \$1,916 | 15.6 | 0.311% | \$7,779 | \$9,694 |
| Ansonia | 1001 | 762 | 546 | 443 | 422 | 419 | 3,593 | 0.506% | \$12,654 | 6.2 | 0.124% | \$3,091 | \$15,745 |
| Ashford | 260 | 177 | 116 | 70 | 59 | 57 | 739 | 0.104% | \$2,603 | 40.3 | 0.804% | \$20,095 | \$22,697 |
| Avon | 1250 | 806 | 644 | 537 | 465 | 547 | 4,249 | 0.599% | \$14,964 | 23.5 | 0.469% | \$11,718 | \$26,682 |
| Barkhamsted | 273 | 197 | 128 | 90 | 52 | 51 | 791 | 0.111% | \$2,786 | 39 | 0.778% | \$19,446 | \$22,232 |
| Beacon Falls | 394 | 314 | 179 | 122 | 80 | 88 | 1,177 | 0.166% | \$4,145 | 9.8 | 0.195% | \$4,887 | \$9,032 |
| Berlin | 1362 | 960 | 684 | 636 | 625 | 569 | 4,836 | 0.681% | \$17,032 | 27 | 0.539% | \$13,463 | \$30,495 |
| Bethany | 353 | 266 | 161 | 131 | 128 | 97 | 1,136 | 0.160% | \$4,001 | 21.6 | 0.431% | \$10,770 | \$14,771 |
| Bethel | 1096 | 769 | 476 | 426 | 339 | 357 | 3,463 | 0.488% | \$12,196 | 17 | 0.339% | \$8,477 | \$20,673 |
| Bethlehem | 315 | 197 | 108 | 94 | 77 | 63 | 854 | 0.120% | \$3,008 | 19.7 | 0.393% | \$9,823 | \$12,831 |
| Bloomfield | 1584 | 1197 | 968 | 825 | 787 | 972 | 6,333 | 0.892% | \$22,304 | 26.4 | 0.527% | \$13,164 | \$35,468 |
| Bolton | 342 | 257 | 184 | 114 | 104 | 68 | 1,069 | 0.151% | \$3,765 | 15.5 | 0.309% | \$7,729 | \$11,494 |
| Bozrah | 160 | 142 | 75 | 73 | 53 | 52 | 555 | 0.078% | \$1,955 | 20 | 0.399% | \$9,972 | \$11,927 |
| Branford | 2123 | 1570 | 1070 | 905 | 865 | 977 | 7,510 | 1.058% | \$26,449 | 27.9 | 0.556% | \$13,912 | \$40,361 |
| Bridgeport | 6068 | 4382 | 3192 | 2528 | 2124 | 2262 | 20,556 | 2.896% | \$72,395 | 17.5 | 0.349% | \$8,726 | \$81,121 |
| Bridgewater | 174 | 157 | 92 | 68 | 57 | 42 | 590 | 0.083% | \$2,078 | 16.3 | 0.325% | \$8,128 | \$10,205 |
| Bristol | 3414 | 2483 | 1810 | 1661 | 1438 | 1634 | 12,440 | 1.752% | \$43,812 | 27 | 0.539% | \$13,463 | \$57,275 |
| Brookfield | 1006 | 799 | 515 | 375 | 335 | 297 | 3,327 | 0.469% | \$11,717 | 19.8 | 0.395% | \$9,873 | \$21,590 |
| Brooklyn | 428 | 350 | 290 | 195 | 137 | 209 | 1,609 | 0.227% | \$5,667 | 28.7 | 0.572% | \$14,311 | \$19,977 |
| Burlington | 593 | 426 | 189 | 156 | 98 | 88 | 1,550 | 0.218% | \$5,459 | 30.6 | 0.610% | \$15,258 | \$20,717 |
| Canaan | 94 | 59 | 59 | 39 | 43 | 101 | 395 | 0.056% | \$1,391 | 33.4 | 0.666% | \$16,654 | \$18,045 |
| Canterbury | 380 | 238 | 129 | 97 | 69 | 56 | 969 | 0.137% | \$3,413 | 40 | 0.798% | \$19,945 | \$23,358 |
| Canton | 702 | 526 | 335 | 261 | 215 | 232 | 2,271 | 0.320% | \$7,998 | 25 | 0.499% | \$12,466 | \$20,464 |
| Chaplin | 129 | 102 | 83 | 45 | 38 | 33 | 430 | 0.061% | \$1,514 | 19.8 | 0.395% | \$9,873 | \$11,387 |
| Cheshire | 1844 | 1200 | 748 | 667 | 680 | 807 | 5,946 | 0.838% | \$20,941 | 33 | 0.658% | \$16,455 | \$37,396 |
| Chester | 316 | 222 | 113 | 89 | 162 | 243 | 1,145 | 0.161% | \$4,033 | 15.9 | 0.317% | \$7,928 | \$11,961 |
| Clinton | 975 | 720 | 473 | 332 | 244 | 244 | 2,988 | 0.421% | \$10,523 | 17.2 | 0.343% | \$8,576 | \$19,100 |
| Colchester | 840 | 574 | 359 | 289 | 220 | 284 | 2,566 | 0.361% | \$9,037 | 48.7 | 0.971% | \$24,283 | \$33,320 |
| Colebrook | 105 | 80 | 51 | 39 | 26 | 29 | 330 | 0.046% | \$1,162 | 33 | 0.658% | \$16,455 | \$17,617 |
| Columbia | 404 | 300 | 199 | 130 | 109 | 101 | 1,243 | 0.175% | \$4,378 | 21.8 | 0.435% | \$10,870 | \$15,248 |
| Cornwall | 127 | 86 | 71 | 58 | 45 | 37 | 424 | 0.060% | \$1,493 | 46.8 | 0.933% | \$23,336 | \$24,829 |
| Coventry | 776 | 537 | 292 | 198 | 161 | 141 | 2,105 | 0.297% | \$7,413 | 37.3 | 0.744% | \$18,599 | \$26,012 |
| Cromwell | 910 | 571 | 379 | 396 | 390 | 548 | 3,194 | 0.450% | \$11,249 | 13.5 | 0.269% | \$6,731 | \$17,980 |
| Danbury | 3882 | 2701 | 1893 | 1579 | 1329 | 1476 | 12,860 | 1.812% | \$45,291 | 44 | 0.878% | \$21,939 | \$67,230 |
| Darien | 899 | 771 | 481 | 388 | 373 | 365 | 3,277 | 0.462% | \$11,541 | 14.9 | 0.297% | \$7,429 | \$18,971 |

Appendix A

| Municipality | 60-64 | 65-69 | 70-74 | 75-79 | 80-84 | over 85 | Total Percent | | Allocation | Sq. Miles | Percent | | Total Apportionment |
|---------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|---------|---------------|----------|------------|-----------|-----------|------------|---------------------|
| | | | | | | | over 60 | of Total | | | Sq. Miles | Allocation | |
| Deep River | 350 | 236 | 138 | 126 | 88 | 97 | 1,035 | 0.146% | \$3,645 | 14.2 | 0.283% | \$7,080 | \$10,726 |
| Derby | 728 | 549 | 420 | 354 | 305 | 387 | 2,743 | 0.386% | \$9,660 | 5.3 | 0.106% | \$2,643 | \$12,303 |
| Durham | 456 | 353 | 191 | 151 | 133 | 115 | 1,399 | 0.197% | \$4,927 | 23.3 | 0.465% | \$11,618 | \$16,545 |
| East Granby | 314 | 237 | 193 | 135 | 77 | 86 | 1,042 | 0.147% | \$3,670 | 17.4 | 0.347% | \$8,676 | \$12,346 |
| East Haddam | 645 | 444 | 265 | 186 | 132 | 159 | 1,831 | 0.258% | \$6,449 | 57.6 | 1.149% | \$28,721 | \$35,169 |
| East Hampton | 871 | 557 | 372 | 248 | 192 | 178 | 2,418 | 0.341% | \$8,516 | 36.8 | 0.734% | \$18,349 | \$26,865 |
| East Hartford | 2674 | 2041 | 1566 | 1275 | 1086 | 1077 | 9,719 | 1.369% | \$34,229 | 18.7 | 0.373% | \$9,324 | \$43,553 |
| East Haven | 1796 | 1336 | 950 | 948 | 829 | 1073 | 6,932 | 0.977% | \$24,413 | 12.6 | 0.251% | \$6,283 | \$30,696 |
| East Lyme | 1209 | 1077 | 779 | 547 | 482 | 459 | 4,553 | 0.641% | \$16,035 | 34.8 | 0.694% | \$17,352 | \$33,387 |
| East Windsor | 674 | 538 | 416 | 310 | 266 | 219 | 2,423 | 0.341% | \$8,533 | 26.8 | 0.535% | \$13,363 | \$21,897 |
| Eastford | 150 | 77 | 56 | 37 | 38 | 28 | 386 | 0.054% | \$1,359 | 28.6 | 0.570% | \$14,261 | \$15,620 |
| Easton | 470 | 363 | 239 | 204 | 153 | 171 | 1,600 | 0.225% | \$5,635 | 28.8 | 0.574% | \$14,360 | \$19,995 |
| Ellington | 918 | 693 | 392 | 313 | 232 | 198 | 2,746 | 0.387% | \$9,671 | 34.8 | 0.694% | \$17,352 | \$27,023 |
| Enfield | 2216 | 1920 | 1453 | 1417 | 1038 | 935 | 8,979 | 1.265% | \$31,623 | 33.8 | 0.674% | \$16,853 | \$48,476 |
| Essex | 546 | 427 | 288 | 252 | 210 | 300 | 2,023 | 0.285% | \$7,125 | 12.2 | 0.243% | \$6,083 | \$13,208 |
| Fairfield | 3005 | 2374 | 1638 | 1553 | 1477 | 1878 | 11,925 | 1.680% | \$41,998 | 30.6 | 0.610% | \$15,258 | \$57,256 |
| Farmington | 1643 | 1170 | 811 | 781 | 703 | 869 | 5,977 | 0.842% | \$21,050 | 28.7 | 0.572% | \$14,311 | \$35,361 |
| Franklin | 124 | 112 | 70 | 50 | 27 | 29 | 412 | 0.058% | \$1,451 | 20 | 0.399% | \$9,972 | \$11,423 |
| Glastonbury | 2189 | 1512 | 1058 | 783 | 767 | 818 | 7,127 | 1.004% | \$25,100 | 52.5 | 1.047% | \$26,178 | \$51,278 |
| Goshen | 275 | 177 | 123 | 93 | 68 | 56 | 792 | 0.112% | \$2,789 | 45.6 | 0.909% | \$22,737 | \$25,527 |
| Granby | 746 | 475 | 360 | 284 | 232 | 188 | 2,285 | 0.322% | \$8,047 | 41.3 | 0.824% | \$20,593 | \$28,641 |
| Greenwich | 3468 | 2794 | 2173 | 1819 | 1540 | 1742 | 13,536 | 1.907% | \$47,672 | 50.6 | 1.009% | \$25,230 | \$72,902 |
| Griswold | 669 | 457 | 246 | 253 | 174 | 146 | 1,945 | 0.274% | \$6,850 | 37.6 | 0.750% | \$18,748 | \$25,598 |
| Groton | 1943 | 1522 | 1077 | 969 | 829 | 930 | 7,270 | 1.024% | \$25,604 | 38.3 | 0.764% | \$19,097 | \$44,701 |
| Guilford | 1840 | 1384 | 817 | 665 | 493 | 554 | 5,753 | 0.810% | \$20,261 | 47.7 | 0.951% | \$23,784 | \$44,046 |
| Haddam | 585 | 466 | 275 | 152 | 125 | 136 | 1,739 | 0.245% | \$6,124 | 46.7 | 0.931% | \$23,286 | \$29,410 |
| Hamden | 3309 | 2207 | 1765 | 1645 | 1541 | 2013 | 12,480 | 1.758% | \$43,953 | 33 | 0.658% | \$16,455 | \$60,407 |
| Hampton | 162 | 95 | 52 | 43 | 34 | 35 | 421 | 0.059% | \$1,483 | 25.3 | 0.505% | \$12,615 | \$14,098 |
| Hartford | 5256 | 3646 | 2655 | 1983 | 1391 | 1428 | 16,359 | 2.305% | \$57,614 | 18.4 | 0.367% | \$9,175 | \$66,789 |
| Hartland | 146 | 118 | 43 | 59 | 30 | 36 | 432 | 0.061% | \$1,521 | 34.5 | 0.688% | \$17,203 | \$18,724 |
| Harwinton | 439 | 328 | 187 | 145 | 124 | 122 | 1,345 | 0.189% | \$4,737 | 31.4 | 0.626% | \$15,657 | \$20,394 |
| Hebron | 620 | 368 | 232 | 138 | 89 | 106 | 1,553 | 0.219% | \$5,469 | 37.5 | 0.748% | \$18,698 | \$24,168 |
| Kent | 248 | 174 | 156 | 108 | 99 | 96 | 881 | 0.124% | \$3,103 | 49.5 | 0.987% | \$24,682 | \$27,785 |
| Killingly | 967 | 683 | 563 | 437 | 332 | 402 | 3,384 | 0.477% | \$11,918 | 50 | 0.997% | \$24,931 | \$36,849 |
| Killingworth | 570 | 384 | 255 | 170 | 146 | 91 | 1,616 | 0.228% | \$5,691 | 36 | 0.718% | \$17,950 | \$23,642 |

Appendix A

| Municipality | 60-64 | 65-69 | 70-74 | 75-79 | 80-84 | over 85 | Total Percent | | Allocation | Sq. Miles | Percent | | Total Apportionment |
|------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|---------|---------------|----------|------------|-----------|-----------|------------|---------------------|
| | | | | | | | over 60 | of Total | | | Sq. Miles | Allocation | |
| Lebanon | 475 | 315 | 180 | 151 | 103 | 89 | 1,313 | 0.185% | \$4,624 | 56.1 | 1.119% | \$27,973 | \$32,597 |
| Ledyard | 910 | 689 | 454 | 326 | 266 | 185 | 2,830 | 0.399% | \$9,967 | 40.5 | 0.808% | \$20,194 | \$30,161 |
| Lisbon | 280 | 219 | 132 | 100 | 73 | 90 | 894 | 0.126% | \$3,149 | 16.5 | 0.329% | \$8,227 | \$11,376 |
| Litchfield | 676 | 521 | 353 | 275 | 228 | 281 | 2,334 | 0.329% | \$8,220 | 57.3 | 1.143% | \$28,571 | \$36,791 |
| Lyme | 237 | 190 | 120 | 91 | 95 | 72 | 805 | 0.113% | \$2,835 | 33 | 0.658% | \$16,455 | \$19,290 |
| Madison | 1366 | 1008 | 732 | 591 | 507 | 480 | 4,684 | 0.660% | \$16,496 | 36.3 | 0.724% | \$18,100 | \$34,596 |
| Manchester | 3248 | 2257 | 1544 | 1201 | 1170 | 1455 | 10,875 | 1.532% | \$38,300 | 27.2 | 0.543% | \$13,563 | \$51,863 |
| Mansfield | 754 | 605 | 411 | 349 | 323 | 344 | 2,786 | 0.392% | \$9,812 | 45.2 | 0.902% | \$22,538 | \$32,350 |
| Marlborough | 475 | 319 | 151 | 121 | 83 | 119 | 1,268 | 0.179% | \$4,466 | 23.5 | 0.469% | \$11,718 | \$16,183 |
| Meriden | 3305 | 2235 | 1593 | 1430 | 1195 | 1381 | 11,139 | 1.569% | \$39,230 | 24 | 0.479% | \$11,967 | \$51,197 |
| Middlebury | 502 | 408 | 272 | 212 | 201 | 209 | 1,804 | 0.254% | \$6,353 | 18 | 0.359% | \$8,975 | \$15,329 |
| Middlefield | 274 | 207 | 145 | 145 | 119 | 91 | 981 | 0.138% | \$3,455 | 13.3 | 0.265% | \$6,632 | \$10,087 |
| Middletown | 2415 | 1798 | 1315 | 1056 | 989 | 1127 | 8,700 | 1.226% | \$30,640 | 42.9 | 0.856% | \$21,391 | \$52,031 |
| Milford | 3494 | 2644 | 1726 | 1517 | 1336 | 1362 | 12,079 | 1.702% | \$42,540 | 23.5 | 0.469% | \$11,718 | \$54,258 |
| Monroe | 1143 | 782 | 619 | 489 | 390 | 319 | 3,742 | 0.527% | \$13,179 | 26.4 | 0.527% | \$13,164 | \$26,342 |
| Montville | 1086 | 855 | 611 | 521 | 370 | 308 | 3,751 | 0.528% | \$13,210 | 43.9 | 0.876% | \$21,890 | \$35,100 |
| Morris | 178 | 132 | 74 | 51 | 68 | 46 | 549 | 0.077% | \$1,933 | 18.8 | 0.375% | \$9,374 | \$11,308 |
| Naugatuck | 1729 | 1191 | 813 | 619 | 543 | 640 | 5,535 | 0.780% | \$19,493 | 16.2 | 0.323% | \$8,078 | \$27,571 |
| New Britain | 3260 | 2175 | 1622 | 1469 | 1577 | 1889 | 11,992 | 1.689% | \$42,234 | 13.3 | 0.265% | \$6,632 | \$48,866 |
| New Canaan | 1126 | 813 | 574 | 516 | 457 | 427 | 3,913 | 0.551% | \$13,781 | 23.3 | 0.465% | \$11,618 | \$25,399 |
| New Fairfield | 811 | 614 | 417 | 272 | 199 | 155 | 2,468 | 0.348% | \$8,692 | 25.3 | 0.505% | \$12,615 | \$21,307 |
| New Hartford | 521 | 333 | 213 | 134 | 104 | 87 | 1,392 | 0.196% | \$4,902 | 38.3 | 0.764% | \$19,097 | \$24,000 |
| New Haven | 5072 | 3737 | 2709 | 2040 | 1716 | 1794 | 17,068 | 2.404% | \$60,111 | 21.1 | 0.421% | \$10,521 | \$70,632 |
| New London | 1230 | 816 | 571 | 466 | 435 | 476 | 3,994 | 0.563% | \$14,066 | 7.3 | 0.146% | \$3,640 | \$17,706 |
| New Milford | 1666 | 1152 | 777 | 560 | 469 | 469 | 5,093 | 0.717% | \$17,937 | 64.4 | 1.284% | \$32,111 | \$50,048 |
| Newington | 2018 | 1540 | 1166 | 964 | 939 | 1028 | 7,655 | 1.078% | \$26,960 | 13.2 | 0.263% | \$6,582 | \$33,542 |
| Newtown | 1492 | 1143 | 770 | 638 | 507 | 451 | 5,001 | 0.705% | \$17,613 | 60.4 | 1.205% | \$30,117 | \$47,730 |
| Norfolk | 126 | 109 | 72 | 58 | 40 | 36 | 441 | 0.062% | \$1,553 | 46.7 | 0.931% | \$23,286 | \$24,839 |
| North Branford | 970 | 725 | 550 | 405 | 399 | 443 | 3,492 | 0.492% | \$12,298 | 26.8 | 0.535% | \$13,363 | \$25,661 |
| North Canaan | 200 | 152 | 132 | 107 | 94 | 142 | 827 | 0.117% | \$2,913 | 19.6 | 0.391% | \$9,773 | \$12,686 |
| North Haven | 1600 | 1252 | 1064 | 902 | 780 | 794 | 6,392 | 0.900% | \$22,512 | 21 | 0.419% | \$10,471 | \$32,983 |
| North Stonington | 371 | 280 | 191 | 143 | 117 | 65 | 1,167 | 0.164% | \$4,110 | 56.3 | 1.123% | \$28,073 | \$32,183 |
| Norwalk | 4553 | 3356 | 2399 | 2029 | 1633 | 1536 | 15,506 | 2.184% | \$54,610 | 27.7 | 0.552% | \$13,812 | \$68,422 |
| Norwich | 2238 | 1505 | 1073 | 944 | 874 | 901 | 7,535 | 1.061% | \$26,537 | 27.1 | 0.541% | \$13,513 | \$40,050 |
| Old Lyme | 623 | 528 | 341 | 336 | 216 | 209 | 2,253 | 0.317% | \$7,935 | 27.1 | 0.541% | \$13,513 | \$21,447 |

Appendix A

| Municipality | 60-64 | 65-69 | 70-74 | 75-79 | 80-84 | over 85 | Total Percent | | Allocation | Percent | | | Total Apportionment |
|---------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|---------|---------------|----------|------------|-----------|-----------|------------|---------------------|
| | | | | | | | over 60 | of Total | | Sq. Miles | Sq. Miles | Allocation | |
| Old Saybrook | 838 | 721 | 557 | 513 | 415 | 388 | 3,432 | 0.483% | \$12,087 | 18.3 | 0.365% | \$9,125 | \$21,212 |
| Orange | 924 | 664 | 495 | 527 | 487 | 491 | 3,588 | 0.505% | \$12,636 | 17.6 | 0.351% | \$8,776 | \$21,412 |
| Oxford | 888 | 645 | 435 | 277 | 192 | 163 | 2,600 | 0.366% | \$9,157 | 33 | 0.658% | \$16,455 | \$25,611 |
| Plainfield | 794 | 582 | 473 | 349 | 249 | 267 | 2,714 | 0.382% | \$9,558 | 42.7 | 0.852% | \$21,291 | \$30,850 |
| Plainville | 1109 | 835 | 614 | 487 | 400 | 415 | 3,860 | 0.544% | \$13,594 | 9.6 | 0.191% | \$4,787 | \$18,381 |
| Plymouth | 738 | 496 | 342 | 268 | 215 | 246 | 2,305 | 0.325% | \$8,118 | 22.4 | 0.447% | \$11,169 | \$19,287 |
| Pomfret | 232 | 197 | 114 | 84 | 65 | 63 | 755 | 0.106% | \$2,659 | 40.6 | 0.810% | \$20,244 | \$22,903 |
| Portland | 618 | 430 | 319 | 266 | 236 | 214 | 2,083 | 0.293% | \$7,336 | 23.7 | 0.473% | \$11,817 | \$19,153 |
| Preston | 318 | 272 | 199 | 137 | 126 | 79 | 1,131 | 0.159% | \$3,983 | 31.3 | 0.624% | \$15,607 | \$19,590 |
| Prospect | 590 | 485 | 301 | 258 | 202 | 179 | 2,015 | 0.284% | \$7,097 | 14.3 | 0.285% | \$7,130 | \$14,227 |
| Putnam | 564 | 380 | 274 | 254 | 228 | 303 | 2,003 | 0.282% | \$7,054 | 20.1 | 0.401% | \$10,022 | \$17,077 |
| Redding | 646 | 429 | 274 | 233 | 248 | 359 | 2,189 | 0.308% | \$7,709 | 32.2 | 0.642% | \$16,056 | \$23,765 |
| Ridgefield | 1444 | 1005 | 761 | 626 | 511 | 479 | 4,826 | 0.680% | \$16,996 | 34.8 | 0.694% | \$17,352 | \$34,349 |
| Rocky Hill | 1388 | 901 | 652 | 622 | 546 | 772 | 4,881 | 0.688% | \$17,190 | 13.9 | 0.277% | \$6,931 | \$24,121 |
| Roxbury | 231 | 187 | 101 | 58 | 49 | 38 | 664 | 0.094% | \$2,339 | 27.4 | 0.546% | \$13,662 | \$16,001 |
| Salem | 270 | 193 | 83 | 48 | 39 | 35 | 668 | 0.094% | \$2,353 | 29.9 | 0.596% | \$14,909 | \$17,261 |
| Salisbury | 360 | 301 | 223 | 167 | 124 | 198 | 1,373 | 0.193% | \$4,836 | 60.6 | 1.209% | \$30,217 | \$35,052 |
| Scotland | 130 | 94 | 52 | 32 | 22 | 14 | 344 | 0.048% | \$1,212 | 18.3 | 0.365% | \$9,125 | \$10,336 |
| Seymour | 986 | 651 | 431 | 398 | 375 | 495 | 3,336 | 0.470% | \$11,749 | 14.7 | 0.293% | \$7,330 | \$19,079 |
| Sharon | 249 | 197 | 138 | 123 | 94 | 116 | 917 | 0.129% | \$3,230 | 60.3 | 1.203% | \$30,067 | \$33,297 |
| Shelton | 2648 | 2018 | 1469 | 1197 | 1013 | 1206 | 9,551 | 1.345% | \$33,637 | 31.4 | 0.626% | \$15,657 | \$49,294 |
| Sherman | 254 | 227 | 151 | 100 | 61 | 68 | 861 | 0.121% | \$3,032 | 23.5 | 0.469% | \$11,718 | \$14,750 |
| Simsbury | 1431 | 977 | 697 | 607 | 484 | 588 | 4,784 | 0.674% | \$16,849 | 34.5 | 0.688% | \$17,203 | \$34,051 |
| Somers | 601 | 501 | 334 | 267 | 192 | 179 | 2,074 | 0.292% | \$7,304 | 28.7 | 0.572% | \$14,311 | \$21,615 |
| South Windsor | 1490 | 1107 | 839 | 834 | 593 | 598 | 5,461 | 0.769% | \$19,233 | 28.5 | 0.568% | \$14,211 | \$33,444 |
| Southbury | 1435 | 1193 | 837 | 975 | 1002 | 1228 | 6,670 | 0.940% | \$23,491 | 40.9 | 0.816% | \$20,394 | \$43,884 |
| Southington | 2919 | 2344 | 1572 | 1313 | 1122 | 1092 | 10,362 | 1.460% | \$36,493 | 36.9 | 0.736% | \$18,399 | \$54,893 |
| Sprague | 142 | 117 | 82 | 59 | 44 | 28 | 472 | 0.066% | \$1,662 | 13.8 | 0.275% | \$6,881 | \$8,543 |
| Stafford | 696 | 467 | 369 | 236 | 255 | 308 | 2,331 | 0.328% | \$8,209 | 60.8 | 1.213% | \$30,316 | \$38,526 |
| Stamford | 6170 | 4497 | 3309 | 2907 | 2624 | 2756 | 22,263 | 3.136% | \$78,407 | 39.9 | 0.796% | \$19,895 | \$98,302 |
| Sterling | 186 | 134 | 69 | 50 | 32 | 20 | 491 | 0.069% | \$1,729 | 27.2 | 0.543% | \$13,563 | \$15,292 |
| Stonington | 1379 | 1064 | 794 | 686 | 612 | 635 | 5,170 | 0.728% | \$18,208 | 42.7 | 0.852% | \$21,291 | \$39,499 |
| Stratford | 3100 | 2383 | 1793 | 1622 | 1550 | 1626 | 12,074 | 1.701% | \$42,523 | 18.7 | 0.373% | \$9,324 | \$51,847 |
| Suffield | 889 | 658 | 419 | 406 | 338 | 393 | 3,103 | 0.437% | \$10,928 | 43.1 | 0.860% | \$21,491 | \$32,419 |
| Thomaston | 472 | 309 | 240 | 187 | 144 | 167 | 1,519 | 0.214% | \$5,350 | 12 | 0.239% | \$5,983 | \$11,333 |

Appendix A

| Municipality | 60-64 | 65-69 | 70-74 | 75-79 | 80-84 | over 85 | Total | | | Percent | | | Total |
|---------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|---------|---------|----------|-------------|-----------|-----------|-------------|-------------|
| | | | | | | | over 60 | of Total | Allocation | Sq. Miles | Sq. Miles | Allocation | |
| Thompson | 544 | 449 | 313 | 242 | 203 | 173 | 1,924 | 0.271% | \$6,776 | 48.7 | 0.971% | \$24,283 | \$31,059 |
| Tolland | 886 | 656 | 421 | 267 | 196 | 197 | 2,623 | 0.370% | \$9,238 | 40.4 | 0.806% | \$20,144 | \$29,382 |
| Torrington | 2093 | 1540 | 1087 | 1007 | 961 | 1265 | 7,953 | 1.120% | \$28,009 | 40 | 0.798% | \$19,945 | \$47,954 |
| Trumbull | 1956 | 1592 | 1277 | 1275 | 1082 | 1361 | 8,543 | 1.203% | \$30,087 | 23.5 | 0.469% | \$11,718 | \$41,805 |
| Union | 73 | 58 | 30 | 26 | 15 | 20 | 222 | 0.031% | \$782 | 29.9 | 0.596% | \$14,909 | \$15,691 |
| Vernon | 1741 | 1408 | 957 | 805 | 658 | 725 | 6,294 | 0.887% | \$22,167 | 18.6 | 0.371% | \$9,274 | \$31,441 |
| Voluntown | 152 | 113 | 56 | 54 | 38 | 29 | 442 | 0.062% | \$1,557 | 39.7 | 0.792% | \$19,795 | \$21,352 |
| Wallingford | 2793 | 2019 | 1400 | 1261 | 1265 | 1491 | 10,229 | 1.441% | \$36,025 | 39.8 | 0.794% | \$19,845 | \$55,870 |
| Warren | 124 | 111 | 61 | 47 | 33 | 23 | 399 | 0.056% | \$1,405 | 28 | 0.558% | \$13,961 | \$15,367 |
| Washington | 325 | 242 | 174 | 140 | 94 | 85 | 1,060 | 0.149% | \$3,733 | 38.7 | 0.772% | \$19,297 | \$23,030 |
| Waterbury | 5233 | 3880 | 2838 | 2512 | 2101 | 2612 | 19,176 | 2.701% | \$67,535 | 28.2 | 0.562% | \$14,061 | \$81,596 |
| Waterford | 1270 | 1060 | 772 | 710 | 643 | 740 | 5,195 | 0.732% | \$18,296 | 36.7 | 0.732% | \$18,299 | \$36,596 |
| Watertown | 1509 | 1082 | 783 | 670 | 544 | 558 | 5,146 | 0.725% | \$18,123 | 29.8 | 0.594% | \$14,859 | \$32,982 |
| West Hartford | 3772 | 2445 | 1993 | 1872 | 1912 | 2598 | 14,592 | 2.056% | \$51,391 | 22.2 | 0.443% | \$11,069 | \$62,460 |
| West Haven | 3058 | 2045 | 1373 | 1209 | 1124 | 1161 | 9,970 | 1.405% | \$35,113 | 10.6 | 0.211% | \$5,285 | \$40,398 |
| Westbrook | 522 | 468 | 307 | 235 | 215 | 181 | 1,928 | 0.272% | \$6,790 | 16.2 | 0.323% | \$8,078 | \$14,868 |
| Weston | 609 | 443 | 234 | 188 | 148 | 102 | 1,724 | 0.243% | \$6,072 | 20.8 | 0.415% | \$10,371 | \$16,443 |
| Westport | 1576 | 1296 | 881 | 751 | 670 | 628 | 5,802 | 0.817% | \$20,434 | 22.4 | 0.447% | \$11,169 | \$31,603 |
| Wethersfield | 1672 | 1326 | 1097 | 1066 | 1019 | 1001 | 7,181 | 1.012% | \$25,290 | 13 | 0.259% | \$6,482 | \$31,773 |
| Willington | 342 | 246 | 131 | 116 | 87 | 67 | 989 | 0.139% | \$3,483 | 34.8 | 0.694% | \$17,352 | \$20,835 |
| Wilton | 1003 | 754 | 501 | 432 | 362 | 441 | 3,493 | 0.492% | \$12,302 | 26.8 | 0.535% | \$13,363 | \$25,665 |
| Winchester | 734 | 510 | 393 | 335 | 276 | 269 | 2,517 | 0.355% | \$8,864 | 34 | 0.678% | \$16,953 | \$25,818 |
| Windham | 1195 | 847 | 563 | 521 | 469 | 507 | 4,102 | 0.578% | \$14,447 | 28 | 0.558% | \$13,961 | \$28,408 |
| Windsor | 1983 | 1372 | 939 | 749 | 626 | 745 | 6,414 | 0.904% | \$22,589 | 31.1 | 0.620% | \$15,507 | \$38,096 |
| Windsor Locks | 691 | 522 | 430 | 437 | 351 | 346 | 2,777 | 0.391% | \$9,780 | 9.2 | 0.183% | \$4,587 | \$14,368 |
| Wolcott | 898 | 770 | 573 | 433 | 356 | 408 | 3,438 | 0.484% | \$12,108 | 20.6 | 0.411% | \$10,272 | \$22,380 |
| Woodbridge | 648 | 480 | 316 | 284 | 271 | 367 | 2,366 | 0.333% | \$8,333 | 19.3 | 0.385% | \$9,623 | \$17,956 |
| Woodbury | 811 | 584 | 393 | 283 | 226 | 217 | 2,514 | 0.354% | \$8,854 | 36.8 | 0.734% | \$18,349 | \$27,203 |
| Woodstock | 523 | 385 | 225 | 188 | 142 | 125 | 1,588 | 0.224% | \$5,593 | 61.6 | 1.229% | \$30,715 | \$36,308 |
| | | | | | | | 709,854 | 100.000% | \$2,500,000 | 5013.8 | 100.000% | \$2,500,000 | \$5,000,000 |

Appendix B

Coordination

Coordinated transportation systems are an essential element to keeping older adults and people with disabilities independent and actively connected to their communities. A lack of coordinated services leads to confusion, making it difficult for people to navigate the maze of transportation services. Forging partnerships and effectively coordinating resources can result in increased access and improved services. This is evidenced in examples of successful senior transportation models which are grounded in collaboration and include partnerships with the human services network.

Informal Coordination Model

- Voluntary process whereby providers plan their services to not overlap with services provided by other agencies or to fill gaps in service.
- Meetings or other mechanisms where providers share details about their services so that each agency can voluntarily make its program operate consistently or in coordination with the programs of the other agencies.
- Any two or more agencies who voluntarily allow each other's clients to use each other's transportation programs.
- Any agency, which shares its service delivery capabilities with another agency in order to maximize the efficiency or cost effectiveness of both agencies. (Examples could include: agencies pooling their funds to buy vehicles at a better price, sharing the use or maintenance of vehicles, or splitting the duties associated with driver training.)

Formal Coordination Model

- In a lead agency model, one agency takes on the responsibility for providing transportation for several other agencies. The lead agency may be an existing provider of other services or may be solely responsible for transportation services.
- In a brokerage model, the overall management of the system is consolidated, but the fleets are not consolidated. The broker is responsible for setting up a system to provide transportation for several human services programs. Actual operation of the program is dispersed among participating carriers.
- In an administrative agency model, a public agency assumes the responsibility for coordination and provision of transportation. In most cases, the public agency is a regional transportation authority with general responsibility for public transportation in the service area.

Benefits of Coordination

- Offer more rides to more people; serving a greater number of people within current resources.

Appendix B

- Eliminate duplication and inefficiency.
- Avoid or reduce the amount of service cutbacks that might otherwise be necessary.
- Attract new money by demonstrating wise use of scarce resources and responsiveness to community need.

Appendix C

Quarterly Reporting for the Municipal Grant Program

Name of Municipality _____
 Date of Submittal _____
 Program Year _____

| | One-Way Passenger Trips | Vehicle Miles Traveled | Trip Denials | Vehicle Hours | Annual Clients Served | |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|--------------|---------------|---|--|
| July 1 - September 30 | | | | | # of People with Disabilities under 60 | |
| | | | | | # of People with Disabilities over 60 | |
| | | | | | # of Seniors (over 60) not reported above | |
| | | | | | Total | |
| October 1 - December 31 | | | | | # of People with Disabilities under 60 | |
| | | | | | # of People with Disabilities over 60 | |
| | | | | | # of Seniors (over 60) not reported above | |
| | | | | | Total | |
| January 1 - March 31 | | | | | # of People with Disabilities under 60 | |
| | | | | | # of People with Disabilities over 60 | |
| | | | | | # of Seniors (over 60) not reported above | |
| | | | | | Total | |
| April 1 - June 30 | | | | | # of People with Disabilities under 60 | |
| | | | | | # of People with Disabilities over 60 | |
| | | | | | # of Seniors (over 60) not reported above | |
| | | | | | Total | |
| Annual Total | | | | | | |

1. A one-way passenger trip should be recorded each time a passenger boards a vehicle.
2. Under the Municipal Grant Program, Senior is defined as 60+ years of age.
3. A client served is an individual who receives transportation service. For example, one client served may generate 10 one-way trips in a week.
4. In the Annual Clients Served column, no person should be reported in more than one category. This column should be cumulative and increase every quarter ONLY by the number of new clients served in the quarter. For example, if 100 clients received transportation services in the first quarter, then 20 additional clients were transported in the second quarter, the second quarter report would have a total of 120.

Appendix D

Connecticut General Statutes 2005

Sec. 13b-38bb. State matching grant program for elderly and disabled demand responsive transportation. Allocations. Requirements. Data collection. (a) Not later than January 1, 2000, then not later than October 1, 2000, and annually after October 1, 2000, the Commissioner of Transportation, within available General Fund appropriations, shall establish a state matching grant program, in accordance with the provisions of this section, which shall be available to any municipality upon application of such municipality. Such grants shall be expended by such municipalities for elderly and disabled demand responsive transportation programs that shall be available to persons age sixty or older.

(b) Not later than thirty days after the commissioner determines an allocation amount, the commissioner shall notify municipalities of the availability of such amount.

(c) Municipalities shall apply to the state through a designated regional planning organization or transit district for funding allocations. The regional planning organization or transit district and municipalities interested in applying for the funds shall collaborate on service design to determine how to use the funding most effectively in that municipality and its surrounding region. The commissioner shall have the authority to approve or disapprove the method for delivery of service.

(d) The maximum amount allocated to a municipality shall be determined by the commissioner in accordance with the following formula: Fifty per cent of such funds shall be apportioned on the basis of the share of the population of persons age sixty or older in the municipality relative to the state's total population of persons age sixty or older, as defined in the most recent federal decennial census or in estimates provided in the five-year interim by the Office of Policy and Management. Fifty per cent of such funds shall be apportioned on the basis of a municipality's square mileage relative to the state's total square mileage.

(e) Each municipality applying for such grant funds shall provide a fifty per cent match to such funds. If a municipality chooses not to apply for such funds, its portion shall revert to the General Fund.

(f) A municipality, receiving a grant provided pursuant to this section, shall annually submit to the Commissioner of Transportation, on forms provided by said commissioner, the following data on such transportation programs: (1) The number of unduplicated riders; (2) the number of one-way trips; (3) the number of miles traveled; (4) the number of trip denials; (5) the number of hours vehicles are in use annually; (6) all federal, state, municipal and other revenues received and expenditures incurred in the provision of dial-a-ride services; and (7) any other information determined to be necessary by the commissioner.

(g) A municipality receiving a grant pursuant to this section shall annually submit to the Commissioner of Transportation a certification that any state grant shall be in addition to current municipality levels of spending on such programs.

(h) Any funds appropriated for the purposes of this section shall not be expended for any other purpose.

(P.A. 99-265, S. 4; P.A. 00-148, S. 22; P.A. 02-123, S. 5.)

History: P.A. 00-148 made technical changes, amended Subsec. (a) by making the state matching grant a program, amended Subsec. (b) by replacing "a grant" with "an allocation", added new Subsec. (c) re application process for allotted funds and redesignated Subsecs. (c) to (g), inclusive, as Subsecs. (d) to (h), inclusive; P.A. 02-123 amended Subsec. (c) to eliminate references to "within the transportation service region, as established in section 13b-38m," and "allocated to municipalities within that transportation service region" and to change "municipality and region" to "municipality and its surrounding region", effective June 7, 2002.

Appendix E
Application SFY 2014

Application For A State Matching Grant For Elderly And Disabled Demand
Responsive Transportation

For Services Operating in State Fiscal Year 2014

1. **General Information**

Legal name of applicant

Grant amount applying for: \$ _____

Address

Nine-digit Federal Employer Identification Number: _____ - _____ - _____

Please check one of the following:

_____ Municipality _____ Transit District _____ Regional Planning Organization

Please check one of the following:

_____ Repeat applicant _____ New applicant

Contact information for questions on the application.

Name: _____

Title: _____

Telephone number: (_____) _____ - _____

Fax number: (_____) _____ - _____

Email Address: _____

2. **Questions**

a) If the applicant is a **municipality**, does your municipality currently provide or contract for dial-a-ride transportation services?

_____ yes _____ no

(Dial-a-ride transportation is defined as a type of transit service where individual passengers can request transportation from a specific location to another specific location at a certain time. Transit vehicles providing dial-a-ride service do not follow a fixed route, but travel throughout the community transporting passengers between their specific requested origins and destinations. These services usually, but not always, require advance reservations. The terms demand-response and dial-a-ride can be used interchangeably.)

b) If the application is a **coordinated program**, please list the coordinating entity and all the municipalities included in the application and indicate whether those towns already provide or contract for dial-a-ride transportation services.

| Municipality | No service | Contract for Service | Provide Service |
|--------------|------------|----------------------|-----------------|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

New Applicants Only

Party authorized to enter into agreement with State

Name: _____

Title: _____

Telephone number: (_____) _____ - _____

Fax number: (_____) _____ - _____

c) Please describe how seniors and persons with disabilities currently receive transportation services in each municipality included in the grant application. For example, are volunteer drivers used, does the senior center provide the service, are town-owned vehicles used, what types of services are provided, etc?

d) How will this change with the addition of the grant funds? Please describe the actual service that will be provided. Will the town or a municipal based agency provide transportation services? Will the service be contracted out?

e) What is the proposed start date for the new or expanded transportation services?

f) How much is service estimated to increase annually (how many more hours of service or passenger trips will be provided)?

g) How does the municipality propose to coordinate their transportation needs and services within a greater region? If none, what efforts were made to examine the feasibility or cost effectiveness of coordination?

h) How will the municipality inform the target population about the availability of new or expanded transportation services?

Repeat Applicants Only

Response to these questions is **REQUIRED**:

- c) Please describe the services that will provide using these grant funds. These services may help other towns when they ask me of some ideas.
- d) How does the municipality propose to coordinate their transportation needs and services within a greater region? If none, what efforts were made to examine the feasibility or cost effectiveness of coordination?
- e) How will the municipality inform the target population about the availability of new or expanded transportation services?

Response to these questions is **OPTIONAL**:

- f) What other transportation needs do your riders require that are not being met? If possible, please describe ideas of how these needs could be met.
- g) If any SFY 2013 funds were unspent, please specify the amount and explain/describe how these funds will be used in SFY 2014. *Please note: any unspent funds must be drawn down first.*
- h) Have you seen an increase in ridership since the beginning of the Municipal Grant Program? Do the same people ride more frequently or are there new riders?
- i) How has this grant money helped your transportation services over the past years?
- j) What are some obstacles faced by your service and what do you think could help with these obstacles?

All Applicants
(Complete Pages 4-9)

3. Proposed Dial-a-Ride Budget for SFY 2014

Estimate annual expenses and revenue for the proposed transportation program using the following categories. This budget should include all existing and anticipated funds. Total System Expenses and Total Revenue **MUST** match. If there is a surplus or deficit, provide explanation.

| | Vehicle Operations | Vehicle Maintenance | General Administration | TOTAL |
|---------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|------------------------|-------|
| LABOR | | | | |
| Operators' Salaries & Wages | | | | |
| Other Salaries | | | | |
| FRINGE BENEFITS | | | | |
| SERVICES | | | | |
| MATERIALS & SUPPLIES | | | | |
| Fuel & Lubricants | | | | |
| Tires & Tubes | | | | |
| Other Materials & Supplies | | | | |
| Purchased Transportation | | | | |
| Other Expenses (explain): | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL SYSTEM EXPENSES | | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| REVENUE: | | | | |
| Donations | | | | |
| Municipal | | | | |
| Federal (non-USDOT) | | | | |
| ConnDOT Municipal Grant | | | | |
| Unspent SFY 2013 Municipal Grant Funds* | | | | |
| Other State (explain) | | | | |
| Subtotal | | | | |
| Fares | | | | |
| ConnDOT | | | | |
| USDOT | | | | |
| Subtotal | | | | |
| TOTAL REVENUE | | | | |

*Repeat Applicants Only

4. **Dial-a-Ride Budget for SFY 2013**

Provide the estimated annual expenses and revenues for the municipality’s current transportation program using the following categories. This budget should include all existing and anticipated funds.

Total System Expenses and Total Revenue should match. If there is a surplus or deficit, please explain.

| | Vehicle Operations | Vehicle Maintenance | General Administration | TOTAL |
|---------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|------------------------|-------|
| LABOR | | | | |
| Operators' Salaries & Wages | | | | |
| Other Salaries | | | | |
| FRINGE BENEFITS | | | | |
| SERVICES | | | | |
| MATERIALS & SUPPLIES | | | | |
| Fuel & Lubricants | | | | |
| Tires & Tubes | | | | |
| Other Materials & Supplies | | | | |
| Purchased Transportation | | | | |
| Other Expenses (explain): | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL SYSTEM EXPENSES | | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| REVENUE: | | | | |
| Donations | | | | |
| Municipal | | | | |
| Federal (non-USDOT) | | | | |
| ConnDOT Municipal Grant | | | | |
| Unspent SFY 2012 Municipal Grant Funds* | | | | |
| Other State (explain) | | | | |
| Subtotal | | | | |
| Fares | | | | |
| ConnDOT | | | | |
| USDOT | | | | |
| Subtotal | | | | |
| TOTAL REVENUE | | | | |

* Repeat Applicants Only

5. Dial-a-Ride Program Data to Date for SFY 2013

Provide actual year-to-date expenses and revenues for the current municipal transportation program using the following categories. Total System Expenses and Total Revenue **MUST** match. If there is a surplus or deficit, provide explanation.

Actual Data through _____, 2013.

| | Vehicle Operations | Vehicle Maintenance | General Administration | TOTAL |
|---------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|------------------------|-------|
| LABOR | | | | |
| Operators' Salaries & Wages | | | | |
| Other Salaries | | | | |
| FRINGE BENEFITS | | | | |
| SERVICES | | | | |
| MATERIALS & SUPPLIES | | | | |
| Fuel & Lubricants | | | | |
| Tires & Tubes | | | | |
| Other Materials & Supplies | | | | |
| Purchased Transportation | | | | |
| Other Expenses (explain): | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL SYSTEM EXPENSES | | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| REVENUE: | | | | |
| Donations | | | | |
| Municipal | | | | |
| Federal (non-USDOT) | | | | |
| ConnDOT Municipal Grant | | | | |
| Unspent SFY 2012 Municipal Grant Funds* | | | | |
| Other State (explain) | | | | |
| Subtotal | | | | |
| Fares | | | | |
| ConnDOT | | | | |
| USDOT | | | | |
| Subtotal | | | | |
| TOTAL REVENUE | | | | |

*Repeat Applicant Only

6. Actual Dial-a-Ride Program Data for SFY 2012

Report actual expenses and revenues for the municipal transportation program for SFY 2011 using the following categories.

Total System Expenses and Total Revenue should match. If there is a surplus or deficit, please explain.

| | Vehicle Operations | Vehicle Maintenance | General Administration | TOTAL |
|---------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|------------------------|-------|
| LABOR | | | | |
| Operators' Salaries & Wages | | | | |
| Other Salaries | | | | |
| FRINGE BENEFITS | | | | |
| SERVICES | | | | |
| MATERIALS & SUPPLIES | | | | |
| Fuel & Lubricants | | | | |
| Tires & Tubes | | | | |
| Other Materials & Supplies | | | | |
| Purchased Transportation | | | | |
| Other Expenses (explain): | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL SYSTEM EXPENSES | | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| REVENUE: | | | | |
| Donations | | | | |
| Municipal | | | | |
| Federal (non-USDOT) | | | | |
| ConnDOT Municipal Grant | | | | |
| Unspent SFY 2011 Municipal Grant Funds* | | | | |
| Other State (explain) | | | | |
| Subtotal | | | | |
| Fares | | | | |
| ConnDOT | | | | |
| USDOT | | | | |
| Subtotal | | | | |
| TOTAL REVENUE | | | | |

* Repeat Applicants Only

7. In-Kind Contribution Detail

In-Kind is defined as a dollar value of non-cash contributions (which directly benefit a project) by the grantee or another party other than the funder (volunteer services, equipment use, facilities use, staff time or other resources, as distinguishable from a monetary grant.)

1. Proposed In-Kind for SFY 2014

| | Vehicle Operations | Vehicle Maintenance | General Administration | TOTAL |
|------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|------------------------|-------|
| In-Kind (Name Source): | | | | |
| Volunteer: | | | | |
| Equipment: | | | | |
| Facility: | | | | |
| Staff: | | | | |
| Fuel: | | | | |
| Other (explain): | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | | | | |

2. In-Kind budgeted for SFY 2013

| | Vehicle Operations | Vehicle Maintenance | General Administration | TOTAL |
|------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|------------------------|-------|
| In-Kind (Name Source): | | | | |
| Volunteer: | | | | |
| Equipment: | | | | |
| Facility: | | | | |
| Staff: | | | | |
| Fuel: | | | | |
| Other (explain): | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | | | | |

3. Actual In-Kind for SFY 2012

| | Vehicle Operations | Vehicle Maintenance | General Administration | TOTAL |
|------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|------------------------|-------|
| In-Kind (Name Source): | | | | |
| Volunteer: | | | | |
| Equipment: | | | | |
| Facility: | | | | |
| Staff: | | | | |
| Fuel: | | | | |
| Other (explain): | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | | | | |

8. Other Required Information

- a) If the municipality does not have a transportation program, there must be letters of commitment from all sources of matching funds.

- b) Each municipality applying for funds must submit an annual certification that the State Municipal Grant Program funds are in addition to current municipal levels of spending on transportation programs for seniors and persons with disabilities. The Chief Fiscal Officer (CFO) for the municipality must sign this document. (*See Attachment 2*) If budgets for transportation programs for seniors and persons with disabilities will remain unchanged for sfy 2014, the CFO must fill out and sign version A of Attachment 2. If budgets for transportation programs for seniors and persons with disabilities will be reduced, the CFO must fill out and sign version B of Attachment 2.

- c) Municipal budget documents must be provided showing budget requests for transportation services for SFY 2014 (proposed budget/budget requests are acceptable). The transportation funding must be for services and expenditures that have been determined eligible based on the requirements in the “Eligible Match” and “Eligible Projects and Expenses” section.

- d) In a regionally coordinated system, a municipality must certify that they are assigning their grant apportionment to the coordinating entity. (*See Attachment 3*)

Attachment 1 – Maintenance of Effort Certification **All Applicants**

The Chief Fiscal Officer (CFO) for the municipality must sign the maintenance of effort certification. If municipal budgets for transportation programs for seniors and persons with disabilities will remain unchanged (or increase) for SFY 2014, the CFO must fill out and sign version A of Attachment 2. If municipal budgets for transportation programs for seniors and persons with disabilities will be reduced, the CFO must fill out and sign version B of Attachment 2.

Maintenance of Effort Certification (Version A)

The municipality of ***Municipality*** hereby certifies that State of Connecticut 13b-38bb Elderly and Disabled Demand Responsive Municipal Grant Program funds are in addition to current municipal levels of spending on transportation programs for Seniors and Persons with Disabilities.

Typed Name

Title (Chief Fiscal Officer)

Signature

Maintenance of Effort Certification (Version B)

The municipality of ***Municipality*** will be reducing municipal levels of spending on transportation programs for Seniors and Persons with Disabilities by ***Percentage*** and acknowledges that State of Connecticut 13b-38bb Elderly and Disabled Demand Responsive Municipal Grant Program funds will be reduced accordingly.

Typed Name

Title (Chief Fiscal Officer)

Signature

Attachment 2 – Grant Assignment Certification

Grant Assignment Certification

The municipality of ***Municipality*** is participating in a consolidated application for State of Connecticut 13b-38bb Elderly and Disabled Demand Responsive Municipal Grant Program through the ***Municipality, Transit District or Regional Planning Organization***. The municipality of ***Municipality*** hereby assigns its grant apportionment from the State program to ***Municipality, Transit District or Regional Planning Organization***, who will coordinate the operation of service.

Typed Name

Title (CEO)

Signature