TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE AGENDA

Friday, April 2, 2010
9 a.m. to 12 noon
SANDAG Board Room
401 B Street, 7th Floor
San Diego

AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

• SOUTH BAY BUS RAPID TRANSIT UPDATE

• COMPREHENSIVE FREIGHT GATEWAY STUDY: FINAL REPORT

• INDEPENDENT TAXPAYER OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE REPORT: INITIAL FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE FY 2009 TransNet FISCAL AND COMPLIANCE AUDITS

PLEASE TURN OFF CELL PHONES DURING THE MEETING

YOU CAN LISTEN TO THE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MEETING BY VISITING OUR WEB SITE AT WWW.SANDAG.ORG

MISSION STATEMENT

The 18 cities and county government are SANDAG serving as the forum for regional decision-making. SANDAG builds consensus, makes strategic plans, obtains and allocates resources, plans, engineers, and builds public transit, and provides information on a broad range of topics pertinent to the region's quality of life.

San Diego Association of Governments ・ 401 B Street, Suite 800, San Diego, CA 92101-4231
(619) 699-1900 ・ Fax (619) 699-1905 ・ www.sandag.org
Welcome to SANDAG. Members of the public may speak to the Transportation Committee on any item at the time the Committee is considering the item. Please complete a Speaker’s Slip, which is located in the rear of the room, and then present the slip to Committee staff. Also, members of the public are invited to address the Committee on any issue under the agenda item entitled Public Comments/Communications/Member Comments. Speakers are limited to three minutes. The Transportation Committee may take action on any item appearing on the agenda.

This agenda and related staff reports can be accessed at www.sandag.org under meetings on SANDAG’s Web site. Public comments regarding the agenda can be forwarded to SANDAG via the e-mail comment form also available on the Web site. E-mail comments should be received no later than noon, two working days prior to the Transportation Committee meeting. Any handouts, presentations, or other materials from the public intended for distribution at the Transportation Committee meeting should be received by the Clerk of the Board no later than 12 noon, two working days prior to the meeting.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), SANDAG will accommodate persons who require assistance in order to participate in SANDAG meetings. If such assistance is required, please contact SANDAG at (619) 699-1900 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting. To request this document or related reports in an alternative format, please call (619) 699-1900, (619) 699-1904 (TTY), or fax (619) 699-1905.
ITEM # | RECOMMENDATION
--- | ---
+1. APPROVAL OF MARCH 19, 2010, MEETING MINUTES | APPROVE

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

Members of the public shall have the opportunity to address the Transportation Committee on any issue within the jurisdiction of the Committee that is not on this agenda. Anyone desiring to speak shall reserve time by completing a “Request to Speak” form and giving it to the Clerk prior to speaking. Speakers are limited to three minutes. Committee members also may provide information and announcements under this agenda item.

CONSENT (3 through 5)

+3. 2050 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN PUBLIC OUTREACH WORKSHOPS (Anne Steinberger) | INFORMATION

As part of the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan Public Involvement Plan, SANDAG will be conducting public workshops the week of April 26, 2010, to solicit input on the initial transportation concepts and provide an update on the greenhouse gas emissions target-setting process.

+4. CALIFORNIA HIGH-SPEED TRAIN SYSTEM: LOS ANGELES TO SAN DIEGO VIA INLAND EMPIRE SECTION QUARTERLY UPDATE (Linda Culp) | INFORMATION

The California High-Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) is the state agency responsible for planning, constructing, and operating a high-speed train system serving California’s major metropolitan areas. The proposed system stretches over 800 miles and would connect San Diego, Los Angeles, the Central Valley, San Francisco, and Sacramento using a state-of-the-art, electrified system capable of speeds in excess of 200 miles per hour. SANDAG continues to monitor the work on the CHSRA. This report is the regular quarterly update to the Transportation Committee.

+5. URBAN AREA TRANSIT STRATEGY: PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND CORRIDORS/COMMUNITIES FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF MODE SHARE GOALS (Carolina Gregor and Dave Schumacher) | INFORMATION

Last month, staff provided an overview of the three transit concepts being coded and modeled as alternative transit scenarios in the development of the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan. Modeling is underway, and the performance of the networks will need to be assessed. The attached report summarizes the most recently updated performance measures and delineates a methodology for developing mode share goals for identified geographic markets. The performance of the transit networks, along with initial cost estimates, will be presented to the Transportation Committee at its April 16 meeting.
REPORTS (6 through 9)

+6. SENIOR MINI-GRANT REVIEW AND PROPOSED REVISIONS TO AWARD PROCESS (Dan Levy)

   APPROVE

   This update will provide the Transportation Committee with a report on the success of the Senior Mini-Grant program in its first two years of operation. The report also will provide recommendations on proposed amendments for the competitive process for grant awards for the next round of Senior Mini-Grants which is anticipated for later this year. The presentation will include representatives from a sample of Senior Mini-Grant recipients. The Transportation Committee is asked to approve changes to the competitive process for the award of Senior Mini-Grants as outlined in this report and as reflected in the proposed revised project evaluation criteria as shown in Attachment 2.

+7. SOUTH BAY BUS RAPID TRANSIT UPDATE (Jennifer Williamson)

   APPROVE

   This report provides an update on the environmental and outreach phase of the South Bay Bus Rapid Transit service. The Transportation Committee is asked to approve the revised milestone schedule for the South Bay Bus Rapid Transit project as shown in Attachment 4.

+8. COMPREHENSIVE FREIGHT GATEWAY STUDY: FINAL REPORT (Christina Casgar)

   RECOMMEND

   This report will highlight the findings of the San Diego and Imperial Valley Gateway Study, including forecast freight volumes to the year 2050 for both counties. On February 26, 2010, the Borders Committee discussed the final report. The Transportation Committee is asked to recommend that the Board of Directors accept the Comprehensive Freight Gateway Study for planning purposes in substantially the same form as attached.

+9. INDEPENDENT TAXPAYER OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE REPORT: INITIAL FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE FY 2009 TransNet FISCAL AND COMPLIANCE AUDITS (Hamid Bahadori, ITOC Chair; Kim Kawada)

   INFORMATION

   In accordance with the TransNet Ordinance and Board Policy No. 031, “TransNet Ordinance and Expenditure Plan Rules,” the Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee is required to share the initial findings and recommendations of the independent fiscal and compliance audits with the Transportation Committee 60 days prior to their release to resolve inconsistencies and technical issues related to the draft report and recommendations.

10. UPCOMING MEETINGS

   INFORMATION

   The next meeting of the Transportation Committee is scheduled for Friday, April 16, 2010, at 9 a.m.

11. ADJOURNMENT

   + next to an agenda item indicates an attachment
Introduction

The TransNet Extension Ordinance included a provision to create a Senior Mini-Grant program for funding specialized transportation for seniors. The first awards under the program were made in 2008, and some of the first grantees are now reaching the end of their contract period, while other successful programs are moving into their second year.

This is an opportunity for the Transportation Committee to review the first results of the program and consider the approval of proposed changes to the competitive process used to make the grants for the next round of awards. The proposed changes were developed by the Social Services Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC), a working group appointed by the Transportation Committee to advise SANDAG on social service transportation issues. This report also was presented to the Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee on March 25, 2010.

Discussion

The first round of Senior Mini-Grants was awarded on September 26, 2008, following a competitive process held during spring 2008. A total of 18 applications were received, and they were reviewed by a selection committee of outside representatives drawn from SSTAC and others working in the field of social service transportation. Thirteen applicants were awarded grants and issued contracts. A brief description of the status of each of the 13 projects is included in Attachment 1. The total value of the contracts was $1,210,957 for the first year and $1,148,333 for the second year. The estimated available sales tax revenue at the time the grants were awarded was $2,359,290 for the first two years of this funding cycle (FY 2009 and FY 2010). Since then, the estimated TransNet sales tax revenue has declined by $168,866 to $2,190,424 ($1,152,979 for FY 2009 and $1,037,445 for FY 2010). The reduced TransNet revenues will not affect the current recipients since several grants did not start until the middle of FY 2009, meaning that these contracts will extend into FY 2011 when additional TransNet funding will be available.

The Senior Mini-Grant program was conceived to provide transportation for seniors whose special needs cannot be met by conventional transit and the parallel Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) service for the disabled. Many active seniors are ineligible for the ADA service (curb-to-curb service or service that only provides assistance to get passengers off the vehicle and to the curb) and are
unable to use regular transit service. The inability to use regular transit may be the result of a lack of service or because the senior needs additional assistance with conducting routine errands (e.g., shopping, carrying items, entering facilities, etc.). Door-through-door (e.g., assistance is provided with packages or directly into passengers’ home or destination) or door-to-door (assistance provided up to front door of the destination) services supported by the Senior Mini-Grant program can provide that needed additional assistance. Mobility and travel training also are eligible programs for grants, as the training can enable seniors who are unfamiliar with regular transit service to begin using the service when it is available.

Each Senior Mini-Grant recipient is required to provide data on their project using standardized methods and tools developed by SANDAG to monitor performance. These tools include a grant progress report form, a quarterly project report form, a standardized invoice form, and quarterly data reporting. Every 12-month period of a multiyear contract, the grant recipient is evaluated on its performance; if the grant recipient’s performance demonstrates satisfactory and timely progress, it would receive a recommendation to continue the project and receive reimbursement for services rendered. Currently, all grantees have reached the 12-month milestone and have met this requirement. SANDAG also retains the option to terminate any program that fails to meet promised performance targets or fails to show progress toward the promised targets. Attachment 1 includes a brief summary of each of the grants awarded in the first competitive process. To date, the 13 Senior Mini-Grant program grant recipients have provided a variety of innovative transportation services for seniors throughout the region and have provided seed monies that are intended to have long-term benefit for improving the quality of life for senior citizens.

**Proposed Changes to Award Process**

The following changes being proposed to the Senior Mini-Grant award process were developed by SSTAC based on the experience to date and are summarized in Attachment 2:

Needs Accommodation Policy – SSTAC recognized the importance of allowing projects to apply for Senior Mini-Grant funding even if a proposed service does carry some passengers who may not be over age 60. To ensure the continued integrity of the program, SSTAC has recommended inclusion of needs accommodation requirements as follows:

“SANDAG recognizes that efficiencies in service delivery can be gained through coordination, and therefore, SANDAG promotes any activities that may result in the reduction of transportation service duplication. Projects funded by the Senior Mini-Grant program may transport people who are not over age 60, as long as the majority of the passengers are seniors, and the service is designed to cater to the special needs of seniors. To ensure the integrity of the program is maintained, projects funded through the Senior Mini-Grant program must meet the following requirements:

- **Specifically designed to meet the special needs of seniors (defined as persons over the age of 60);**
- **Innovative program design;**
- **Seniors account for at least 80 percent of total ridership;**
- **Trip priority given to senior passengers; and**

2
If persons under age 60 are transported, the grantee must keep records of the ages of all persons being transported and submit these records to SANDAG.

If a Senior Mini-Grant-funded program provides transportation services on an individual basis, such as subsidizing a ride through a volunteer driver program or a voucher program, Senior Mini-Grant funds cannot be used toward the individual rides taken by non-seniors, although non-seniors using these programs (but not funded by the Senior Mini-Grant) may benefit from the use of the system.”

Grant Minimum/Maximum Amounts - For the first competitive grant cycle, SANDAG did not set grant minimum or maximum amounts. The resulting submissions included a wide range of grant request amounts. Experience has shown that each grant takes a considerable effort from the time of the submission until a contract is executed and a notice to proceed is issued. Having a minimum grant amount would help minimize administrative costs incurred by the Senior Mini-Grant program and would maximize the amount of funds available for grants. SSTAC analyzed the grant request amounts awarded in the first cycle and has recommended setting the grant minimum amount at $30,000. SSTAC also recommended a grant maximum amount at $200,000 per year to reinforce that this is a program of “mini-grants” and clarify that larger awards are not possible.

Grant Cycles - Holding a competitive process and awarding funds each year creates administrative burden. In response, SSTAC has recommended reducing the grant cycles to award two-year grant agreements every other year. Efforts will be made to align the cycle with the federal New Freedom program for those projects that serve disabled seniors and wish to apply for Senior Mini-Grant funds as a match to New Freedom funding.

Evaluation Criteria - SSTAC looked at changes to the criteria used to evaluate Senior Mini-Grant proposals in light of changes made to the evaluation criteria for the federal Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) program in fall 2008. SSTAC viewed the changes made to the JARC evaluation criteria favorably and has recommended mirroring the JARC criteria when developing the new Senior Mini-Grant criteria. The changes made to the JARC criteria last fall included:

- Incorporating a new minimum eligibility requirement that would only allow projects to apply for grant funding if they are derived from either the very-high-priority or high-priority lists in the Coordinated Plan.¹ This requirement eliminated the “Project Need” evaluation criterion and redistributed the 20 points previously allocated to “Project Need” to other evaluation criteria.

- Additionally, each criterion was further divided into five-point sub-criteria. Evaluating the proposals against these smaller scoring increments requires a greater focus on all the various aspects within each criterion, making the evaluation process more objective. The proposed Senior Mini-Grant evaluation criteria are included in Attachment 2, and reflect the recommendations of the SSTAC.

Mandatory Recipient Meetings - Communication among the Senior Mini-Grant recipients is vital in the performance of the program. To ensure that an appropriate level of information exchange is occurring, SSTAC has recommended requiring all Senior Mini-Grant recipients to attend at least two

¹ The Coordinated Plan, or Coordinated Public Transportation and Human Services Transportation Plan is a federally mandated document prepared by SANDAG. The purpose of the plan is to establish funding priority for federal transportation grant programs and to ensure that a framework exists to encourage coordination among the various transportation providers in San Diego.
of the four of the Council on Access and Mobility (CAM) meetings annually. CAM provides a regional forum for transportation coordination efforts among social service agencies. Additionally, SSTAC has recommended annually holding an additional workshop exclusively for Senior Mini-Grant recipients for sharing information on best practices.

Data Reporting Requirements - SANDAG staff developed two reporting forms at the suggestion of SSTAC. These forms will be applicable to the JARC and New Freedom programs in addition to the Senior Mini-Grant program. The first report is the grant progress report form, which must be submitted with each invoice. The purpose of this form is to provide information so SANDAG can ensure that grant funds are being spent effectively and grantees are demonstrating adequate project progress compared to the amount of funds expended. The second report is the quarterly project report form. The purpose of this form is to collect information for reporting on individual projects and the grant program as a whole to the Federal Transit Administration, SSTAC, the ITOC, and for inclusion in the Coordinated Plan. Each grantee is required to fill out a quarterly report and submit quarterly performance data for each type of service provided by JARC, New Freedom, or Senior Mini-Grant.

Staff has worked closely with SSTAC as the various recommendations were being developed and concurs with the proposed changes outlined above. The proposed changes will help clarify program eligibility, minimize administrative costs, and improve ongoing monitoring of the Senior Mini-Grant program.

The Transportation Committee is requested to approve the proposed changes to the award evaluation criteria outlined in this report.

**Next Steps**

The next competitive process has not yet been scheduled, but will be coordinated with JARC and New Freedom awards that are tentatively planned to be held before the end of calendar year 2010.

CHARLES “MUGGS” STOLL
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachments: 1. Summary of Senior Mini-Grant Projects Awarded
               2. Proposed Senior Mini-Grant Evaluation Criteria

Key Staff Contact: Dan Levy, (619) 699-6942, dle@sandag.org
Summary of Senior Mini-Grant Projects Awarded

The ridership and budget data provided in the summaries is based on information provided by the recipients since the service was started. Since all of the services did not begin operations in the same month the number of months of data will vary by project and by the date on which invoices and progress reports are submitted.

1. North County Transit District (NCTD) Mobility/Travel Training Program
   This program was awarded up to $156,957 in funding for FY 2009 and FY 2010. The training programs help individuals learn how to use the NCTD Rider’s Guide and its contents, create and plan travel options, and receive individualized or group training where a trainee navigates the NCTD transit system. To date, 21 individual travel trainings have been completed. The Senior Transit Buddy Program, a component of Mobility/Travel Training, has 24 volunteers, providing training to 60 seniors.

2. All Congregations Together (ACT) ComLink Transportation Project
   This project was awarded up to $333,660 in Senior Mini-Grant funding through FY 2009 and FY 2010. This program was planned to provide shuttle service for nonemergency medical and social trips for residents of five senior centers in Chula Vista and National City. Two of the five senior centers have utilized the transportation service, although ACT has extensively marketed the service to all five centers. For this reason, ACT recently added two new senior centers to provide senior transportation. ACT continues to partner with resident/facility managements to administer a voucher program at $4.00 per trip. During the first six months of the TransNet grant, ACT has provided 229 one-way passenger trips.

3. Alpha Project Senior Transportation Program
   This program provides transportation to low-income seniors in downtown San Diego and the North County communities of Oceanside and Escondido and was awarded up to $391,612 in Senior Mini-Grant funding through FY 2009 and FY 2010. To date, Alpha Project has provided more than 4,428 one-way trips in North County and the City of San Diego.

4. City of La Mesa Rides4Neighbors Program
   This program is a volunteer driver service in Mt. Helix and neighboring communities; Spring Valley; parts of El Cajon and Lemon Grove; San Carlos and Del Cerro. In January 2009 the program introduced another specialized transportation alternative - Discount Taxi Scrip. Eligible older adults and residents with disabilities in La Mesa and neighboring communities have the option of purchasing a Yellow Cab taxi scrip booklet at half price, $10 per booklet. This program was awarded up to $160,000 in Senior Mini-Grant funding through FY 2009 and FY 2010. In 2009, Rides4Neighbors provided 5,357 total one-way passenger trips. Of these trips, 2,106 were one-way taxicab trips, and 3,251 were provided by the volunteer driver program.

5. City of Oceanside Solutions for Seniors on the Go Program
   This program offers three options to facilitate the transportation needs of seniors. The options are: curb-to-curb taxi scrip subsidies, door-to-door shuttle transportation, and door-through-door volunteer driver and destination assistance transportation. It was awarded up to $339,587
in Senior Mini-Grant funding through FY 2009 and FY 2010. In the first seven months of the TransNet grant, Seniors on the Go has provided 3,993 one-way passenger trips (which includes 1,621 from the shuttle service and 2,372 from the taxi vouchers).

6. **City of Vista Out & About Vista Program**

   A two-part service makes up this program: a Senior Shuttle service that provides door-to-door bus service and a volunteer driver component that utilizes volunteers in the community to provide transportation in privately owned vehicles. This program was awarded up to $76,464 in Senior Mini-Grant funding through FY 2009. In the first six months of the TransNet grant, Out & About Vista provided 4,330 one-way passenger trips.

7. **ElderHelp Volunteer Driver Program**

   This program provides transportation service to low-income seniors in the Mid-City area of San Diego. This program was awarded up to $228,531 in Senior Mini-Grant funding through FY 2009 and FY 2010 to expand services. ElderHelp has grown from 33 seniors in January 2009 to 107 seniors by January 2010, providing more than 1,037 one-way trips. Eighty seniors are currently enrolled in the Seniors A Go Go program, the name of the Volunteer Driver service operated by ElderHelp.

8. **Full Access and Coordinated Transportation (FACT) Senior Ride Reimbursement Program**

   This program subsidizes rides for seniors on the FACT coordinated transportation system based on the rider’s need for support, including curb-to-curb, door-to-door, or door-through-door services. FACT reimburses service providers for medical-related and shopping trips for seniors living in the North County Pilot Project area, which includes the entire 1,020 square mile service area of NCTD as well as Fallbrook and Ramona. This program was awarded up to $66,240 in Senior Mini-Grant funding through FY 2009 and FY 2010. The FACT Business Plan, approved in December 2009, provides an operational roadmap, schedule of scaled growth, and evaluation procedures that will be used to measure performance. As FACT begins to schedule trips, the number of “customers served” will be measured in two different ways, by trips and by referrals. Currently, the number of customers served is obtained through referrals from the STRIDE Web site, which receives about 100 Web hits per day. The very first rides funded by this grant were provided in the month of March, 2010.

9. **ITN San Diego’s Volunteer Driver Program**

   This program was awarded up to $75,000 in Senior Mini-Grant funding through FY 2009 and FY 2010. ITN San Diego is an affiliate community of the ITNAmerica network, a national nonprofit transportation system designed for adults 60 years or older. During the first 13 months of the TransNet grant, ITN San Diego has provided more than 1,600 rides. As part of its operational sustainability, ITN San Diego’s Road Scholarship program allows volunteers to provide rides and earn transportation credits, which can be donated to a senior for a free ride or saved for their own future use. Additionally, ITNRides was incorporated into ITN San Diego ride operations, enabling the affiliate community program access to expertise through a centralized logistical management and monitoring network. The grant awarded to ITN was seed funding to help with operational start up, and further grant applications are not expected.
10. **Jewish Family Service’s Rides & Smiles Program**

This program is a volunteer-based transportation service for seniors in the North County Inland communities of San Diego. It was awarded up to $149,411 in Senior Mini-Grant funding through FY 2009 and FY 2010. During the first nine months of the TransNet grant, Rides & Smiles has provided 5,104 volunteer rides with 150 enrolled and screened volunteers.

11. **Peninsula Shepherd Senior Center’s Senior Transportation Program**

This program provides volunteer driver and weekly shuttle service transportation to ambulatory seniors in the communities of Point Loma, Ocean Beach, and Midway/Sports Arena. It was awarded up to $86,021 in Senior Mini-Grant funding through FY 2009 and FY 2010. During the first seven months of the TransNet grant, this program has provided 1,054 volunteer driver one-way rides, and 735 rides provided by the shuttle van service in which 184 trips were taken.

12. **Redwood Elderlink’s Out & About Program**

This program is the senior transportation service arm of the Redwood Senior Homes and Service. It was awarded up to $104,006 in Senior Mini-Grant funding through FY 2009 and FY 2010. During the first six months of the TransNet grant, Redwood Elderlink provided 142 one-way trips.

13. **Travelers Aid Society’s SenioRide Program**

This program provides senior transportation service throughout San Diego County, with most requests received within central San Diego. It also provides taxi scrip service throughout the Yellow Cab coverage area. This program was awarded up to $191,801 in Senior Mini-Grant funding through FY 2009 and FY 2010. The recipient has experienced some delays in project start up, but expects to fully begin implementation of the program, including a Web site that launched in February 2010.
Proposed TransNet Senior Mini-Grant Evaluation Criteria

Project Scoring Criteria

The following information and scoring criteria will be used to score and rate project applications for the Senior Mini-Grant Program.

I. Project Need ........................................................................................................................................ 20 points

The project should directly address transportation gaps and/or barriers identified in the 2008—2011 Short Range Transit Plan and Coordinated Public Transit and Human Services Transportation Plan (The Coordinated Plan), and demonstrate how the project was derived from the strategies identified in the Coordinated Plan.

J. Goals and Objectives .......................................................................................................................... 10 points

Project application should clearly state the overall program goals and objectives. Project should serve appropriate communities and populations.

K. Implementation Plan ........................................................................................................................... 15 points

For projects seeking funds to support program operations, applicants must provide a well-defined service operations plan, including days and hours of operation for operating grants. The applicant must describe implementation steps and timelines for carrying out the plan. The project application should indicate the number of persons expected to be served, and the number of trips (or other units of service) expected to be provided. The service operations plan should identify key personnel assigned to this project and their qualifications. Project sponsors should demonstrate their institutional capability to carry out the service delivery aspect of the project as described.

For projects seeking funds for capital purposes, the applicant must provide a solid rationale for use of Senior Mini-Grant funds for this purpose, and demonstrate that no other sources of funds are appropriate to meet this need. Also, provide an implementation plan and timelines for completing the capital project.

L. Coordination and Program Outreach ............................................................................................... 15 points

Proposed projects will be evaluated based on their ability to coordinate with other community transportation and/or social service resources. Project sponsors should clearly identify project stakeholders, and how they will keep stakeholders involved and informed throughout the project.

Minimum Eligibility Requirement: Projects must address a very high or high priority in the adopted Coordinated Plan in order to be eligible for Senior Mini-Grant Funding.
A. Goals and Objectives .............................................................................................................. 15 points

1. Will the project serve the appropriate population? Does the proposal provide pertinent demographic data and/or maps?
2. Will the proposed program increase or enhance the availability of transportation for seniors?
3. To what extent is the proposed project consistent with the goals and objectives of the Senior Mini-Grant program?

B. Implementation Plan ........................................................................................................... 15 points

1. How thorough is the implementation plan? Does the proposal include project tasks, timelines, benchmarks, key milestones, key personnel, deliverables, and routes and schedules as applicable? Do the implementation plan and timeline seem feasible?
2. Does the applicant demonstrate the technical ability to manage the project? Has the applicant effectively implemented a project using federal or state funds in the recent past; has the applicant managed similar projects; has the applicant had sufficient experience in providing services for seniors? Does the agency have adequate staff resources to handle the project? If applicable, are drivers properly trained? If applicable, does the agency display the ability to maintain vehicles?
3. Does the project relate to other services or facilities provided by the agency or firm? Does the implementation plan correspond with the project goals/objectives?

C. Coordination and Program Outreach ................................................................................ 15 points

1. Does the proposal describe how key stakeholders will remain involved and informed throughout the process? Does the proposal include three letters of support from stakeholders for the grant application?
2. How thorough are the applicant’s proposed strategies for marketing the project and promoting public awareness?
3. To what extent does the project demonstrate coordination among various entities? (5 points maximum - 1 point per type of coordination) Shared use of vehicles; Dispatching or scheduling; Maintenance; Backup transportation; Staff training programs; Joint procurement of services and supplies; Active participation in local social service transportation planning process; Coordination of client trips with other transportation agencies.

D. Performance Indicators ..................................................................................................... 15 points

There will be three different performance indicators that will be evaluated to measure the effectiveness of the project in meeting the identified goals. They are as follows: Cost Efficiency, measured by the operating cost per vehicle service hour; Cost Effectiveness, measured by the operating costs per passenger; and Service Effectiveness, measured by passengers utilization expressed as a percentage of available seats. These three performance indicators will be worth a maximum of 5 points each and will be based on the matrices below:
### Cost Efficiency
**Operating Cost in Dollars per Vehicle Service Hour**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Proposed/1st year</th>
<th>2nd year</th>
<th>3rd year</th>
<th>4+ year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>&gt; 70</td>
<td>&gt; 65</td>
<td>&gt; 60</td>
<td>&gt; 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>65 &lt; x ≤ 70</td>
<td>60 &lt; x ≤ 65</td>
<td>55 &lt; x ≤ 60</td>
<td>50 &lt; x ≤ 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>60 &lt; x ≤ 65</td>
<td>55 &lt; x ≤ 60</td>
<td>50 &lt; x ≤ 55</td>
<td>45 &lt; x ≤ 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>≤ 60</td>
<td>≤ 55</td>
<td>≤ 50</td>
<td>≤ 45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Cost Effectiveness
**Operating Cost in Dollars per Passenger**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Proposed/1st year</th>
<th>2nd year</th>
<th>3rd year</th>
<th>4+ year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>&gt; 32</td>
<td>&gt; 29</td>
<td>&gt; 26</td>
<td>&gt; 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>29 &lt; x ≤ 32</td>
<td>26 &lt; x ≤ 29</td>
<td>23 &lt; x ≤ 26</td>
<td>20 &lt; x ≤ 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>26 &lt; x ≤ 29</td>
<td>23 &lt; x ≤ 26</td>
<td>20 &lt; x ≤ 23</td>
<td>17 &lt; x ≤ 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>≤ 26</td>
<td>≤ 23</td>
<td>≤ 20</td>
<td>≤ 17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Service Effectiveness
**Passenger Utilization in Percentages**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Proposed/1st year</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd year</th>
<th>3rd year</th>
<th>4+ year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>&lt; 15</td>
<td>&lt; 20</td>
<td>&lt; 25</td>
<td>&lt; 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15 ≤ x &lt; 25</td>
<td>20 ≤ x &lt; 30</td>
<td>25 ≤ x &lt; 35</td>
<td>30 ≤ x &lt; 40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>25 ≤ x &lt; 35</td>
<td>30 ≤ x &lt; 40</td>
<td>35 ≤ x &lt; 45</td>
<td>40 ≤ x &lt; 50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>≥ 35</td>
<td>≥ 40</td>
<td>≥ 45</td>
<td>≥ 50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**E. Program Effectiveness** ................................................................. 10 points

1. Does the applicant describe methodologies and procedures for ongoing monitoring and evaluation of the project or service, and steps to be taken if original goals are not achieved?
2. Is the grant request amount appropriate given the priority being addressed by the project?
F. Operational Sustainability................................................................. 5 points

1. Does the applicant demonstrate a long-term commitment to the project to continue the effort beyond the availability of the requested grant resources? Is this applicant financially capable of sustaining operations after the initial grant funding is expended?

G. Innovation.................................................................................. 10 points

1. Is the proposed project an innovative solution to addressing the need, and could the innovations be applied to other services in the region?
2. Are there elements of the project that are environmentally sustainable (including the use of alternative fuels and clean air vehicles)?

H. Project Budget ........................................................................ 15 points

1. Was a clearly defined budget submitted for the proposed project?
2. Does the project appear to be feasible as described?
3. Is the source of matching funds stable?