

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 2011 Program

State of Connecticut  
Department of Transportation  
Bureau of Public Transportation

## Table of Contents

Program Description .....	1
Program Goals .....	2
Roles and Responsibilities .....	2
Eligible Projects and Expenses .....	3
Transportation Services for Seniors and People with Disabilities.....	3
Regional Coordinated Services.....	3
Administration Costs .....	4
Ineligible Projects and Expenses .....	4
Capital Equipment .....	4
General Public Transportation and School Transportation.....	5
Eligible Recipients/Applicants.....	5
Eligible Match.....	5
Municipal Funding Cuts .....	6
Project Selection Criteria and Method of Distributing Funds .....	6
Local Coordination Plan .....	7
Quarterly Reporting .....	7
Annual Reporting.....	8
Financial Reporting (Maintenance of Effort) .....	8
Application Checklist.....	8
SFY 2010 Grant Application Process and Timetable .....	9
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 – Authorizing Resolution .....	
Attachment 2 – Maintenance of Effort Certification .....	
Attachment 3 – 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”) as enacted made \$5 million available to municipalities in each of three state fiscal years, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009 and 2010. 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
- 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 Lisa Rivers at 860-594-2834 or [lisa.rivers@ct.gov](mailto:lisa.rivers@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. In the federal fiscal year 2009 program, there is a maximum federal grant of \$40,000 per vehicle. 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 2011. 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 2010, but is reduced \$2,000 in SFY 2011, 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 2011 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 2009 and SFY 2010 are required with this grant application. These must consist of “Actuals” for SFY 2009 and “Budgeted” and “Actuals-to-Date” for SFY 2010.

### **Financial Reporting (Maintenance of Effort)**

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, the municipality must provide a revised plan for the next fiscal year that will show how those remaining funds, as well as any new funds for which the municipality is applying, will be spent in the subsequent year on the target program. But, in order to assure a more sustainable program, a municipality cannot spend more than 150% of their annual apportionment in any given SFY. So if a municipality spent less than 50% of the funds received in SFY 2010, ConnDOT reserves the right to reduce a future apportionment in order to meet that 150% standard.

### **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 2011 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 2010 Grant Application Process and Timetable**

1.	ConnDOT forwards application package to RPOs for distribution to municipalities.	January 29, 2010
2.	The RPO collaborates with municipalities on potential for coordination.	
3.	Municipalities submit applications to the RPO.	April 2, 2010
4.	RPO submits applications to ConnDOT with any additional information on accuracy of application and coordination efforts.	April 23, 2010
5.	ConnDOT reviews applications, announces awards (letter). Applications that are not approved must be resubmitted with updated information. <sup>1</sup>	June 11, 2010
6.	ConnDOT prepares agreements/addenda for signature.	
7.	Once agreements/addenda are in place, ConnDOT will provide a first quarter payment.	July 16, 2010
8.	Grantees provide quarterly reporting to ConnDOT.	See schedule in reporting section

<sup>1</sup> 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 2009 Program Year

Municipality	60-64	65-69	70-74	75-79	80-84	over 85	Total over 60	Percent of Total	Allocation	Sq. Miles	Percent Sq. Miles	Allocation	Total Apportionment
Andover	109	63	62	51	35	23	343	0.057%	\$1,425	15.6	0.311%	\$7,779	\$9,203
Ansonia	703	622	680	700	501	368	3,574	0.594%	\$14,846	6.2	0.124%	\$3,091	\$17,938
Ashford	141	101	82	71	50	38	483	0.080%	\$2,006	40.3	0.804%	\$20,095	\$22,101
Avon	805	609	610	531	323	298	3,176	0.528%	\$13,193	23.5	0.469%	\$11,718	\$24,910
Barkhamstead	158	115	90	73	50	25	511	0.085%	\$2,123	39.0	0.778%	\$19,446	\$21,569
Beacon Falls	182	135	129	115	79	48	688	0.114%	\$2,858	9.8	0.195%	\$4,887	\$7,744
Berlin	749	749	795	691	493	301	3,778	0.628%	\$15,693	27.0	0.539%	\$13,463	\$29,156
Bethany	197	175	188	141	70	46	817	0.136%	\$3,394	21.6	0.431%	\$10,770	\$14,164
Bethel	645	537	449	406	257	198	2,492	0.414%	\$10,352	17.0	0.339%	\$8,477	\$18,828
Bethlehem	130	112	124	77	75	52	570	0.095%	\$2,368	19.7	0.393%	\$9,823	\$12,191
Bloomfield	1,042	975	971	895	674	743	5,300	0.881%	\$22,016	26.4	0.527%	\$13,164	\$35,179
Bolton	228	162	175	110	77	54	806	0.134%	\$3,348	15.5	0.309%	\$7,729	\$11,077
Bozrah	90	85	78	79	50	39	421	0.070%	\$1,749	20.0	0.399%	\$9,972	\$11,721
Branford	1,303	1,119	1,186	1,063	831	644	6,146	1.021%	\$25,530	27.9	0.556%	\$13,912	\$39,441
Bridgeport	4,621	3,933	3,810	3,523	2,548	2,198	20,633	3.428%	\$85,707	17.5	0.349%	\$8,726	\$94,433
Bridgewater	118	76	68	45	29	24	360	0.060%	\$1,495	16.3	0.325%	\$8,128	\$9,623
Bristol	2,276	2,187	2,187	1,941	1,426	1,184	11,201	1.861%	\$46,528	27.0	0.539%	\$13,463	\$59,991
Brookfield	684	532	441	314	222	175	2,368	0.393%	\$9,836	19.8	0.395%	\$9,873	\$19,709
Brooklyn	305	231	196	214	128	153	1,227	0.204%	\$5,097	28.7	0.572%	\$14,311	\$19,407
Burlington	264	207	155	118	62	56	862	0.143%	\$3,581	30.6	0.610%	\$15,258	\$18,839
Canaan	67	57	30	32	14	21	221	0.037%	\$918	33.4	0.666%	\$16,654	\$17,572
Canterbury	165	127	115	92	64	40	603	0.100%	\$2,505	40.0	0.798%	\$19,945	\$22,450
Canton	382	290	229	204	164	168	1,437	0.239%	\$5,969	25.0	0.499%	\$12,466	\$18,435
Chaplin	87	55	46	51	21	10	270	0.045%	\$1,122	19.8	0.395%	\$9,873	\$10,994
Cheshire	960	834	848	724	595	591	4,552	0.756%	\$18,909	33.0	0.658%	\$16,455	\$35,363
Chester	125	114	123	113	141	152	768	0.128%	\$3,190	15.9	0.317%	\$7,928	\$11,118
Clinton	528	447	356	334	212	135	2,012	0.334%	\$8,358	17.2	0.343%	\$8,576	\$16,934
Colchester	394	346	310	260	222	195	1,727	0.287%	\$7,174	48.7	0.971%	\$24,283	\$31,457
Colebrook	73	68	48	30	39	22	280	0.047%	\$1,163	33.0	0.658%	\$16,455	\$17,618
Columbia	205	164	145	119	70	42	745	0.124%	\$3,095	21.8	0.435%	\$10,870	\$13,965
Cornwall	73	81	61	44	36	30	325	0.054%	\$1,350	46.8	0.933%	\$23,336	\$24,686
Coventry	366	311	247	187	140	98	1,349	0.224%	\$5,604	37.3	0.744%	\$18,599	\$24,202
Cromwell	488	443	424	435	382	395	2,567	0.427%	\$10,663	13.5	0.269%	\$6,731	\$17,394
Danbury	2,644	2,219	1,939	1,681	1,265	1,132	10,880	1.808%	\$45,194	44.0	0.878%	\$21,939	\$67,134
Darien	720	603	628	534	380	291	3,156	0.524%	\$13,110	14.9	0.297%	\$7,429	\$20,539
Deep River	186	172	158	121	101	63	801	0.133%	\$3,327	14.2	0.283%	\$7,080	\$10,408
Derby	505	456	459	492	374	278	2,564	0.426%	\$10,651	5.3	0.106%	\$2,643	\$13,293
Durham	241	184	172	114	86	71	868	0.144%	\$3,606	23.3	0.465%	\$11,618	\$15,224
East Granby	252	165	121	134	77	42	791	0.131%	\$3,286	17.4	0.347%	\$8,676	\$11,962
East Haddam	306	253	201	169	121	142	1,192	0.198%	\$4,951	57.6	1.149%	\$28,721	\$33,672
East Hampton	413	319	283	198	138	113	1,464	0.243%	\$6,081	36.8	0.734%	\$18,349	\$24,431
East Hartford	2,117	1,971	1,981	1,747	1,149	885	9,850	1.637%	\$40,916	18.7	0.373%	\$9,324	\$50,240

## Appendix A

<b>Municipality</b>	<b>60-64</b>	<b>65-69</b>	<b>70-74</b>	<b>75-79</b>	<b>80-84</b>	<b>over 85</b>	<b>Total over 60</b>	<b>Percent of Total</b>	<b>Allocation</b>	<b>Sq. Miles</b>	<b>Percent Sq. Miles</b>	<b>Allocation</b>	<b>Total Apportionment</b>
East Haven	1,134	1,146	1,181	1,038	783	524	5,806	0.965%	\$24,118	12.6	0.251%	\$6,283	\$30,400
East Lyme	776	631	671	469	301	212	3,060	0.508%	\$12,711	34.8	0.694%	\$17,352	\$30,063
East Windsor	464	359	368	304	219	194	1,908	0.317%	\$7,926	26.8	0.535%	\$13,363	\$21,289
Eastford	66	56	60	44	31	26	283	0.047%	\$1,176	28.6	0.570%	\$14,261	\$15,436
Easton	312	283	247	232	129	76	1,279	0.213%	\$5,313	28.8	0.574%	\$14,360	\$19,673
Ellington	460	362	341	279	167	109	1,718	0.285%	\$7,136	34.8	0.694%	\$17,352	\$24,489
Enfield	1,887	1,913	1,641	1,215	819	612	8,087	1.344%	\$33,593	33.8	0.674%	\$16,853	\$50,446
Essex	309	273	262	267	218	250	1,579	0.262%	\$6,559	12.2	0.243%	\$6,083	\$12,642
Fairfield	2,147	2,084	2,197	1,980	1,576	1,510	11,494	1.910%	\$47,745	30.6	0.610%	\$15,258	\$63,003
Farmington	894	869	866	789	602	548	4,568	0.759%	\$18,975	28.7	0.572%	\$14,311	\$33,286
Franklin	92	73	59	52	31	19	326	0.054%	\$1,354	20.0	0.399%	\$9,972	\$11,327
Glastonbury	1,321	1,019	1,001	893	576	570	5,380	0.894%	\$22,348	52.5	1.047%	\$26,178	\$48,526
Goshen	158	125	100	82	62	41	568	0.094%	\$2,359	45.6	0.909%	\$22,737	\$25,097
Granby	399	336	298	226	166	117	1,542	0.256%	\$6,405	41.3	0.824%	\$20,593	\$26,998
Greenwich	2,920	2,551	2,384	1,988	1,419	1,374	12,636	2.100%	\$52,489	50.6	1.009%	\$25,230	\$77,719
Griswold	339	332	313	248	181	148	1,561	0.259%	\$6,484	37.6	0.750%	\$18,748	\$25,232
Groton	1,291	1,178	1,175	1,061	703	712	6,120	1.017%	\$25,422	38.3	0.764%	\$19,097	\$44,519
Guilford	982	787	687	514	369	391	3,730	0.620%	\$15,494	47.7	0.951%	\$23,784	\$39,278
Haddam	324	214	172	155	86	66	1,017	0.169%	\$4,225	46.7	0.931%	\$23,286	\$27,510
Hamden	2,130	2,056	2,281	2,272	1,760	1,685	12,184	2.024%	\$50,611	33.0	0.658%	\$16,455	\$67,066
Hampton	58	58	58	52	18	18	262	0.044%	\$1,088	25.3	0.505%	\$12,615	\$13,704
Hartford	3,875	3,192	2,743	2,353	1,662	1,638	15,463	2.569%	\$64,232	18.4	0.367%	\$9,175	\$73,406
Hartland	54	76	53	42	27	16	268	0.045%	\$1,113	34.5	0.688%	\$17,203	\$18,316
Harwington	231	198	178	161	97	64	929	0.154%	\$3,859	31.4	0.626%	\$15,657	\$19,516
Hebron	278	165	132	123	67	33	798	0.133%	\$3,315	37.5	0.748%	\$18,698	\$22,013
Kent	147	118	111	95	88	96	655	0.109%	\$2,721	49.5	0.987%	\$24,682	\$27,403
Killingly	704	564	499	426	331	368	2,892	0.481%	\$12,013	50.0	0.997%	\$24,931	\$36,944
Killingworth	233	227	179	134	108	65	946	0.157%	\$3,930	36.0	0.718%	\$17,950	\$21,880
Lebanon	260	204	170	127	81	73	915	0.152%	\$3,801	56.1	1.119%	\$27,973	\$31,774
Ledyard	585	454	395	248	146	77	1,905	0.317%	\$7,913	40.5	0.808%	\$20,194	\$28,107
Lisbon	148	142	123	111	54	35	613	0.102%	\$2,546	16.5	0.329%	\$8,227	\$10,774
Litchfield	386	343	337	304	248	181	1,799	0.299%	\$7,473	57.3	1.143%	\$28,571	\$36,044
Lyme	120	110	127	70	52	42	521	0.087%	\$2,164	33.0	0.658%	\$16,455	\$18,619
Madison	835	703	682	483	356	288	3,347	0.556%	\$13,903	36.3	0.724%	\$18,100	\$32,003
Manchester	1,883	1,587	1,783	1,734	1,444	1,215	9,646	1.603%	\$40,069	27.2	0.543%	\$13,563	\$53,631
Mansfield	456	457	469	419	279	215	2,295	0.381%	\$9,533	45.2	0.902%	\$22,538	\$32,071
Marlborough	184	128	108	93	63	79	655	0.109%	\$2,721	23.5	0.469%	\$11,718	\$14,438
Meriden	2,061	2,013	1,854	1,846	1,383	1,115	10,272	1.707%	\$42,669	24.0	0.479%	\$11,967	\$54,636
Middlebury	308	276	246	225	177	143	1,375	0.228%	\$5,712	18.0	0.359%	\$8,975	\$14,687
Middlefield	168	186	186	139	85	61	825	0.137%	\$3,427	13.3	0.265%	\$6,632	\$10,059
Middletown	1,613	1,346	1,334	1,179	983	944	7,399	1.229%	\$30,735	42.9	0.856%	\$21,391	\$52,126
Milford	2,169	1,956	1,939	1,802	1,233	866	9,965	1.656%	\$41,394	23.5	0.469%	\$11,718	\$53,111
Monroe	781	664	560	381	235	185	2,806	0.466%	\$11,656	26.4	0.527%	\$13,164	\$24,820
Montville	755	635	530	404	254	189	2,767	0.460%	\$11,494	43.9	0.876%	\$21,890	\$33,383

## Appendix A

<b>Municipality</b>	<b>60-64</b>	<b>65-69</b>	<b>70-74</b>	<b>75-79</b>	<b>80-84</b>	<b>over 85</b>	<b>Total over 60</b>	<b>Percent of Total</b>	<b>Allocation</b>	<b>Sq. Miles</b>	<b>Percent Sq. Miles</b>	<b>Allocation</b>	<b>Total Apportionment</b>
Morris	112	77	99	75	43	33	439	0.073%	\$1,824	18.8	0.375%	\$9,374	\$11,198
Naugatuck	998	809	873	821	647	483	4,631	0.769%	\$19,237	16.2	0.323%	\$8,078	\$27,314
New Britain	2,246	2,263	2,696	2,825	1,891	1,607	13,528	2.248%	\$56,194	13.3	0.265%	\$6,632	\$62,826
New Canaan	824	709	697	527	374	313	3,444	0.572%	\$14,306	23.3	0.465%	\$11,618	\$25,924
New Fairfield	573	396	313	214	153	128	1,777	0.295%	\$7,381	25.3	0.505%	\$12,615	\$19,997
New Hartford	256	162	140	132	56	53	799	0.133%	\$3,319	38.3	0.764%	\$19,097	\$22,416
New Haven	3,561	3,035	2,951	2,681	2,020	1,984	16,232	2.697%	\$67,426	21.1	0.421%	\$10,521	\$77,947
New London	731	694	735	654	554	470	3,838	0.638%	\$15,943	7.3	0.146%	\$3,640	\$19,583
New Milford	955	742	622	495	327	385	3,526	0.586%	\$14,647	64.4	1.284%	\$32,111	\$46,758
Newington	1,472	1,308	1,386	1,229	878	709	6,982	1.160%	\$29,003	13.2	0.263%	\$6,582	\$35,584
Newtown	889	701	511	383	296	298	3,078	0.511%	\$12,786	60.4	1.205%	\$30,117	\$42,903
Norfolk	94	64	60	56	27	22	323	0.054%	\$1,342	46.7	0.931%	\$23,286	\$24,627
North Branford	603	458	495	370	306	272	2,504	0.416%	\$10,401	26.8	0.535%	\$13,363	\$23,764
North Canaan	146	126	122	138	107	144	783	0.130%	\$3,253	19.6	0.391%	\$9,773	\$13,026
North Haven	1,156	1,056	1,075	1,007	694	458	5,446	0.905%	\$22,622	21.0	0.419%	\$10,471	\$33,093
North Stonington	212	177	157	97	59	29	731	0.121%	\$3,037	56.3	1.123%	\$28,073	\$31,109
Norwalk	3,390	2,977	2,727	2,225	1,407	1,265	13,991	2.325%	\$58,117	27.7	0.552%	\$13,812	\$71,929
Norwich	1,251	1,290	1,330	1,282	895	748	6,796	1.129%	\$28,230	27.1	0.541%	\$13,513	\$41,743
Old Lyme	401	405	283	269	167	116	1,641	0.273%	\$6,817	27.1	0.541%	\$13,513	\$20,329
Old Saybrook	560	600	553	439	289	345	2,786	0.463%	\$11,573	18.3	0.365%	\$9,125	\$20,698
Orange	602	700	682	574	386	296	3,240	0.538%	\$13,459	17.6	0.351%	\$8,776	\$22,234
Oxford	303	244	218	178	130	87	1,160	0.193%	\$4,819	33.0	0.658%	\$16,455	\$21,273
Plainfield	542	447	413	331	263	221	2,217	0.368%	\$9,209	42.7	0.852%	\$21,291	\$30,500
Plainville	730	667	635	613	392	328	3,365	0.559%	\$13,978	9.6	0.191%	\$4,787	\$18,765
Plymouth	436	338	366	339	280	150	1,909	0.317%	\$7,930	22.4	0.447%	\$11,169	\$19,099
Pomfret	135	99	109	86	60	57	546	0.091%	\$2,268	40.6	0.810%	\$20,244	\$22,512
Portland	372	328	303	259	200	186	1,648	0.274%	\$6,846	23.7	0.473%	\$11,817	\$18,663
Preston	281	185	200	144	75	52	937	0.156%	\$3,892	31.3	0.624%	\$15,607	\$19,499
Prospect	398	330	270	235	171	147	1,551	0.258%	\$6,443	14.3	0.285%	\$7,130	\$13,573
Putnam	322	316	320	331	271	303	1,863	0.310%	\$7,739	20.1	0.401%	\$10,022	\$17,761
Redding	368	274	223	164	80	98	1,207	0.201%	\$5,014	32.2	0.642%	\$16,056	\$21,069
Ridgefield	1,001	841	635	473	318	316	3,584	0.596%	\$14,888	34.8	0.694%	\$17,352	\$32,240
Rocky Hill	733	671	729	700	466	392	3,691	0.613%	\$15,332	13.9	0.277%	\$6,931	\$22,263
Roxbury	117	100	84	61	33	17	412	0.068%	\$1,711	27.4	0.546%	\$13,662	\$15,374
Salem	106	78	69	47	31	28	359	0.060%	\$1,491	29.9	0.596%	\$14,909	\$16,400
Salisbury	230	177	158	187	150	187	1,089	0.181%	\$4,524	60.6	1.209%	\$30,217	\$34,740
Scotland	56	46	32	30	22	9	195	0.032%	\$810	18.3	0.365%	\$9,125	\$9,935
Seymour	546	527	544	519	395	236	2,767	0.460%	\$11,494	14.7	0.293%	\$7,330	\$18,824
Sharon	158	160	134	115	95	118	780	0.130%	\$3,240	60.3	1.203%	\$30,067	\$33,307
Shelton	1,692	1,469	1,330	1,170	878	825	7,364	1.224%	\$30,589	31.4	0.626%	\$15,657	\$46,246
Sherman	210	154	129	96	78	49	716	0.119%	\$2,974	23.5	0.469%	\$11,718	\$14,692
Simsbury	910	824	726	625	374	357	3,816	0.634%	\$15,851	34.5	0.688%	\$17,203	\$33,054
Somers	426	351	268	203	148	81	1,477	0.245%	\$6,135	28.7	0.572%	\$14,311	\$20,446
South Windsor	984	951	747	555	339	308	3,884	0.645%	\$16,134	28.5	0.568%	\$14,211	\$30,345

## Appendix A

<b>Municipality</b>	<b>60-64</b>	<b>65-69</b>	<b>70-74</b>	<b>75-79</b>	<b>80-84</b>	<b>over 85</b>	<b>Total over 60</b>	<b>Percent of Total</b>	<b>Allocation</b>	<b>Sq. Miles</b>	<b>Percent Sq. Miles</b>	<b>Allocation</b>	<b>Total Apportionment</b>
Southbury	703	827	1,010	1,109	824	1,071	5,544	0.921%	\$23,029	40.9	0.816%	\$20,394	\$43,423
Southington	1,779	1,530	1,466	1,289	908	644	7,616	1.265%	\$31,636	36.9	0.736%	\$18,399	\$50,035
Sprague	114	94	90	70	59	36	463	0.077%	\$1,923	13.8	0.275%	\$6,881	\$8,804
Stafford	387	287	360	286	244	231	1,795	0.298%	\$7,456	60.8	1.213%	\$30,316	\$37,773
Stamford	4,547	4,252	4,019	3,314	2,349	2,241	20,722	3.443%	\$86,077	39.9	0.796%	\$19,895	\$105,972
Sterling	90	77	53	44	31	26	321	0.053%	\$1,333	27.2	0.543%	\$13,563	\$14,896
Stonington	876	796	799	685	458	387	4,001	0.665%	\$16,620	42.7	0.852%	\$21,291	\$37,911
Stratford	2,153	2,164	2,367	2,168	1,647	1,247	11,746	1.952%	\$48,792	18.7	0.373%	\$9,324	\$58,116
Suffield	516	469	460	385	314	286	2,430	0.404%	\$10,094	43.1	0.860%	\$21,491	\$31,585
Thomaston	271	242	220	221	143	83	1,180	0.196%	\$4,902	12.0	0.239%	\$5,983	\$10,885
Thompson	377	331	308	257	167	119	1,559	0.259%	\$6,476	48.7	0.971%	\$24,283	\$30,759
Tolland	513	354	275	167	110	104	1,523	0.253%	\$6,326	40.4	0.806%	\$20,144	\$26,471
Torrington	1,275	1,298	1,342	1,387	1,085	1,071	7,458	1.239%	\$30,980	40.0	0.798%	\$19,945	\$50,925
Trumbull	1,558	1,510	1,399	1,275	917	813	7,472	1.242%	\$31,038	23.5	0.469%	\$11,718	\$42,756
Union	24	16	23	22	14	7	106	0.018%	\$440	29.9	0.596%	\$14,909	\$15,349
Vernon	1,137	1,032	922	833	605	514	5,043	0.838%	\$20,948	18.6	0.371%	\$9,274	\$30,223
Voluntown	69	79	58	59	26	19	310	0.052%	\$1,288	39.7	0.792%	\$19,795	\$21,083
Wallingford	1,589	1,446	1,478	1,376	1,074	1,172	8,135	1.352%	\$33,792	39.8	0.794%	\$19,845	\$53,637
Warren	59	55	43	37	33	19	246	0.041%	\$1,022	28.0	0.558%	\$13,961	\$14,983
Washington	184	188	148	120	63	50	753	0.125%	\$3,128	38.7	0.772%	\$19,297	\$22,425
Waterbury	3,840	3,584	3,639	3,661	2,747	2,414	19,885	3.304%	\$82,600	28.2	0.562%	\$14,061	\$96,661
Waterford	925	890	918	802	583	451	4,569	0.759%	\$18,979	36.7	0.732%	\$18,299	\$37,279
Watertown	846	774	753	667	470	386	3,896	0.647%	\$16,184	29.8	0.594%	\$14,859	\$31,043
West Hartford	2,515	2,399	2,655	2,577	2,221	2,527	14,894	2.475%	\$61,868	22.2	0.443%	\$11,069	\$72,938
West Haven	1,905	1,776	1,843	1,702	1,224	897	9,347	1.553%	\$38,827	10.6	0.211%	\$5,285	\$44,112
Westbrook	307	280	280	236	185	98	1,386	0.230%	\$5,757	16.2	0.323%	\$8,078	\$13,835
Weston	400	354	280	160	108	67	1,369	0.227%	\$5,687	20.8	0.415%	\$10,371	\$16,058
Westport	1,207	1,070	1,085	840	473	415	5,090	0.846%	\$21,143	22.4	0.447%	\$11,169	\$32,313
Wethersfield	1,295	1,400	1,515	1,416	984	850	7,460	1.240%	\$30,988	13.0	0.259%	\$6,482	\$37,470
Willington	165	150	127	82	46	55	625	0.104%	\$2,596	34.8	0.694%	\$17,352	\$19,948
Wilton	718	561	501	366	340	377	2,863	0.476%	\$11,893	26.8	0.535%	\$13,363	\$25,256
Winchester	431	429	379	333	253	232	2,057	0.342%	\$8,545	34.0	0.678%	\$16,953	\$25,498
Windham	672	671	693	584	472	450	3,542	0.589%	\$14,713	28.0	0.558%	\$13,961	\$28,675
Windsor	1,171	935	926	933	699	597	5,261	0.874%	\$21,854	31.1	0.620%	\$15,507	\$37,361
Windsor Locks	503	561	515	472	256	184	2,491	0.414%	\$10,347	9.2	0.183%	\$4,587	\$14,935
Wolcott	620	561	501	425	316	189	2,612	0.434%	\$10,850	20.6	0.411%	\$10,272	\$21,122
Woodbridge	411	362	383	318	213	235	1,922	0.319%	\$7,984	19.3	0.385%	\$9,623	\$17,607
Woodbury	420	335	309	253	168	128	1,613	0.268%	\$6,700	36.8	0.734%	\$18,349	\$25,050
Woodstock	248	247	218	179	155	98	1,145	0.190%	\$4,756	61.6	1.229%	\$30,715	\$35,471
<b>Total</b>	<b>131,652</b>	<b>117,565</b>	<b>114,009</b>	<b>101,096</b>	<b>73,249</b>	<b>64,273</b>	<b>601,844</b>	<b>100.000%</b>	<b>\$2,500,000</b>	<b>5013.8</b>	<b>100.000%</b>	<b>\$2,500,000</b>	<b>\$5,000,000</b>

Age - Census 2000 SF1

## **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 2011**

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

For Services Operating in State Fiscal Year 2011

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: \_\_\_\_\_



## 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

---

Party who is authorized to sign SFY 2011 Addendum

(Please provide a new Authorizing Resolution (*See Attachment 1*) **ONLY** if the individual who will be signing the SFY 2011 addendum did not have authority to sign the initial SFY 2010 Agreement/Addendum).

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone number: (\_\_\_\_\_) \_\_\_\_\_ - \_\_\_\_\_

**Fax number:** (\_\_\_\_\_) \_\_\_\_\_ - \_\_\_\_\_

c) Please explain/describe your proposed scope of services. How does this differ from last year's proposal? *Please note: you can continue to provide the scope of service provided in the first year or the scope can be adjusted.*

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?

f) What was the actual start date of the new or expanded transportation services?

g) If any SFY 2010 funds were unspent, please specify the amount and explain/describe how these funds will be used in SFY 2011. *Please note: any unspent funds must be drawn down first.*

**All Applicants**  
(Complete Pages 4-9)

**3. Proposed Dial-a-Ride Budget for SFY 2011**

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
<b>LABOR</b>				
Operators' Salaries & Wages				
Other Salaries				
<b>FRINGE BENEFITS</b>				
<b>SERVICES</b>				
<b>MATERIALS &amp; SUPPLIES</b>				
Fuel & Lubricants				
Tires & Tubes				
Other Materials & Supplies				
Purchased Transportation				
Other Expenses (explain):				
<b>TOTAL SYSTEM EXPENSES</b>				

<b>REVENUE:</b>				
Donations				
Municipal				
Federal (non-USDOT)				
ConnDOT Municipal Grant				
Unspent SFY 2010 Municipal Grant Funds*				
Other State (explain)				
<b>Subtotal</b>				
Fares				
ConnDOT				
USDOT				
<b>Subtotal</b>				
<b>TOTAL REVENUE</b>				

\*Repeat Applicants Only

4. **Dial-a-Ride Budget for SFY 2010**

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
<b>LABOR</b>				
Operators' Salaries & Wages				
Other Salaries				
<b>FRINGE BENEFITS</b>				
<b>SERVICES</b>				
<b>MATERIALS &amp; SUPPLIES</b>				
Fuel & Lubricants				
Tires & Tubes				
Other Materials & Supplies				
Purchased Transportation				
Other Expenses (explain):				
<b>TOTAL SYSTEM EXPENSES</b>				

<b>REVENUE:</b>				
Donations				
Municipal				
Federal (non-USDOT)				
ConnDOT Municipal Grant				
Unspent SFY 2009 Municipal Grant Funds*				
Other State (explain)				
<b>Subtotal</b>				
Fares				
ConnDOT				
USDOT				
<b>Subtotal</b>				
<b>TOTAL REVENUE</b>				

\* Repeat Applicants Only

**5. Dial-a-Ride Program Data to Date for SFY 2010**

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 \_\_\_\_\_, 2010.

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

<b>REVENUE:</b>				
Donations				
Municipal				
Federal (non-USDOT)				
ConnDOT Municipal Grant				
Unspent SFY 2009 Municipal Grant Funds*				
Other State (explain)				
<b>Subtotal</b>				
Fares				
ConnDOT				
USDOT				
<b>Subtotal</b>				
<b>TOTAL REVENUE</b>				

\*Repeat Applicant Only

6. **Actual Dial-a-Ride Program Data for SFY 2009**

Report actual expenses and revenues for the municipal transportation program for SFY 2009 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
<b>LABOR</b>				
Operators' Salaries & Wages				
Other Salaries				
<b>FRINGE BENEFITS</b>				
<b>SERVICES</b>				
<b>MATERIALS &amp; SUPPLIES</b>				
Fuel & Lubricants				
Tires & Tubes				
Other Materials & Supplies				
Purchased Transportation				
Other Expenses (explain):				
<b>TOTAL SYSTEM EXPENSES</b>				

<b>REVENUE:</b>				
Donations				
Municipal				
Federal (non-USDOT)				
ConnDOT Municipal Grant				
Unspent SFY 2008 Municipal Grant Funds*				
Other State (explain)				
<b>Subtotal</b>				
Fares				
ConnDOT				
USDOT				
<b>Subtotal</b>				
<b>TOTAL REVENUE</b>				

\* 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 2011

	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 2010

	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 2009

	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 2011, 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 2011 (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 2 – 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 2011, 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 3 – 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