

Funding Sources Matrix

Prepared by:
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Countywide Planning and Development
Programming and Policy Analysis
Regional Programming Unit

March 14, 2002





TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

A BRIEF INTRODUCTION TO THE FUNDING SOURCE MATRIX.....	4
DEFINITION OF COLUMNS.....	5
<u>FUNDING SOURCE</u>	
I. LOCAL FUNDING SOURCES	
<u>PUBLIC FUNDS</u>	
Proposition A	6
25% Local Return	6
35% Rail Development	8
40% Discretionary Grant Program.....	8
5% Incentive Program	10
Interest.....	10
Proposition C	12
5% Security	12
10% Commuter Rail & Transit Centers	12
20% Local Return	14
25% Transit-Related Highway Improvement	14
40% Discretionary	14
Interest.....	16
Transportation Development Act (TDA)	16
Public Transportation Account (PTA) (by formula)	18
State Transit Assistance (STA) (by formula)	18
Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies (SAFE)	22
HOV Violation Fund	22
State Highway Account Budget Change Proposal (annual allocation to MTA)	22
Fare Revenues	24
Mobile Source Emission Reduction Credits (MSERCs)	24
Federal Aid Urban (FAU) Funds	24
<u>PRIVATE FUNDS</u>	
Benefit Assessments	26
Other (Advertising, Auxiliary & Charter)	26
Public/Private Joint Development	26

FINANCING MECHANISMS

Certificates of Participation	28
Commercial Paper	28
Cross Border Leases	30
Senior Lien Bonds.....	30
Subordinated Bonds	30

II. STATE FUNDING SOURCES

Traffic Congestion Relief (TCR, AB 2928).....	32
STIP Funds (State Transportation Improvement Program)/ SB45/AB1012	32
Inter-Regional Transportation Improvement Program	34
SHOPP (State Highway Operation and Protection Program).....	34
Environmental Enhancement & Mitigation	36
Article XIX Guideway Funds.....	36
Air Quality Vehicle Registration Fee (AB 2766 Discretionary Funds)	36
Petroleum Violation Escrow Account (PVEA)	38
State Gas Tax Subventions.....	38
State PUC Grade Separation Project Fund	38
Highway Bridge Rehab & Replacement (HBRR)	40
State Infrastructure Bank (SIB)/Transportation Finance Bank (TFB).....	40
Carl Moyer Memorial Air Quality Standards Attainment Program.....	42

III. FEDERAL FUNDING SOURCES

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION (FHWA)

Surface Transportation Program (STP)	44
Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP).....	44
Surface Transportation Program – State.....	44
Surface Transportation Program – Local (STP-L).....	46
Transportation Enhancement Activities – Regional (TEA).....	46
Transportation Enhancement Activities – State (TEA)	46
Federal Highway Demonstration Funds	48
Highways of National Significance (NHS).....	48
Congestion Mitigation Air Quality Program (CMAQ).....	48

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION (FTA)

Section 5307 (9) Urbanized Area Formula Funds Program.....	50
Section 5308 Clean Fuels Formula Program	50
Section 5309 (3) New Starts Discretionary Program.....	52
Section 5309 (3) Fixed Guideway Modernization Formula Funds Program.....	52

Section 5309 (3) Bus and Bus Facilities Discretionary Program.....	52
Section 5310 Elderly/Paratransit Formula Funds Program.....	54
Section 3037 Jobs Access and Reverse Commute Program (Welfare-to-Work).....	56
Section 5313 (b) Special Transit Educational Grants.....	56
Section 5314 National Planning and Research Funds Program.....	56

IV. OTHER FEDERAL AND STATE TRANSPORTATION FUNDING PROGRAMS

(not MTA funded, provided for information only)

Local Bridge Seismic Safety Retrofit Program (LBSSRP).....	58
Hazard Elimination Safety Program (HES).....	58
Railroad/Highway At-Grade Crossing	58
Safe Routes to School Program (SR2S).....	60
Pedestrian Safety Program (PSP).....	60
Bicycle Transportation Account (BTA)	60
Emergency Relief Program.....	60
Federal Discretionary Programs	62
Discretionary Bridge Program (DBP).....	62
National Corridor Planning and Development Program (NCPD).....	62
Coordinated Border Infrastructure Program (CBI).....	62
Ferry Boat Discretionary (FBD) Program.....	64
Innovative Bridge Research & Construction (IBRC) Program	64
National Historic Covered Bridge Preservation (NHCBP) Program.....	64
Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS)	66
Commercial Vehicle Intelligent Transportation System Infrastructure Deployment Program.....	66
The Interstate Maintenance Discretionary Program (IMD).....	66
Public Lands Highways (PLH) program.....	68
National Scenic Byways (NSB) Program	68
Transportation and Community and System Preservation Pilot (TCSP) program.....	68
Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act (TIFIA)	70
Value Pricing Pilot (VPP) Program	70

A BRIEF INTRODUCTION TO THE FUNDING SOURCE MATRIX

The Funding Source Matrix provides a one-stop information center for the general public on the funding sources available for transportation in Los Angeles County. Transportation finance is a complex issue with funds emanating from the federal, state, and local governments and their taxation sources. The total amount of transportation revenue over the next 25 years is estimated to be \$106.0 billion, with 73% of these revenues coming from local sources, 14% from state and 13% from federal.

The annual revenues identified in the MTA budget for 2002 amount to over \$3 billion. The primary source of MTA funds is local sales tax coupled with the gasoline tax of 18 cents of state tax and 18.4 cents of federal tax on each gallon sold. Sales tax is also charged in California on each gallon sold which provides further revenue for transportation purposes. The US Congress appropriates the Federal Highway Trust funds annually by program. The California Transportation Commission allocate portion of the State Highway account and funds are also distributed by formula and for specific programs according to statutes.

This booklet provides a breakup of the three distinct governmental sources of revenue (federal, state and local) by program and legal requirements. Programs represent a specific set of standards or criteria for a funding source that must be followed in spending the funds such as air quality enhancements or roadway widening. The layout is in the form of a two-page facing format that include the funding description, eligible uses, policies & guidelines, annual amount (\$ in millions), project selection, responsible staff, timely use of funds and additional source of information. The document is intended to assist the reader in understanding the origins of the funding and the various uses and restrictions on transportation funds. References for further research are identified as well in certain specific instances where such may help.

Beginning on page 58, a series of other federal and state transportation funding programs that are not MTA monitored, but rather CALTRANS administered, are listed. These CALTRANS and federal programs have been included for information purposes only.

DEFINITION OF COLUMNS*

<u>Column Headings</u>	<u>Definitions</u>
Funding Source:	Common name of the source of revenue or program.
Description:	A brief summary that describes the source of the revenue and how it derives from taxes or grants.
Eligible Uses:	Describe types of expenditures that qualify for support or reimbursement from the specific funding source.
Policies & Guidelines:	Describes (1) the legislative restrictions, provisions and guidelines and/or (2) the MTA guidelines for the use(s) of the specific funding source.
Annual Amount: (\$ in millions)	Represents the projected amount of funds available for programming to various projects. The amount shown is net of any amount allocated to MTA administrative expenses.
Project Selection:	Represents the MTA Department or programming function that coordinates or authorizes the selection of transportation projects for funding from the specific funding sources, and the agency responsible for approving the project.
Responsible Staff:	<p>Administration represents the person and department or agency responsible for the development and administration of the guidelines and policies governing the use(s) of the specific funding source.</p> <p>Funds Programming represents person and department or agency responsible for tracking annual amount of fund source programmed (committed) in the Long Range Transportation Plan, Call for Projects, or MTA Budget.</p> <p>Project Management when applicable represents person who manages program and program costs on a daily basis.</p> <p>Grants Management represents the lead person within Programming and Policy Analysis (P&PA) Department responsible for coordinating communication activities and filing for funds with other agencies (Caltrans and FTA).</p> <p>Accounting represents person and department responsible for recording project expenditures, tracking the specific funding sources and complying with financial reporting requirements.</p> <p>Long Range Forecast represents person and department or agency responsible for forecasting annual amount of funds available to the MTA.</p>
Timely Use of Funds (where applicable):	Funding Programs have two deadlines; one is the authority to allocate funds from the date of appropriation and the other is the time limit for the beneficiary to utilize the funds before they lapse.
Further Information:	Wherever appropriate, supporting documentation source has been provided; For programs not under the direct responsibilities of MTA, an Internet link has been provided for additional information.

* The Column Headings coincide with the column headings on each page as used throughout the matrix.

FUNDING SOURCE	DESCRIPTION	ELIGIBLE USES	POLICIES & GUIDELINES	ANNUAL AMOUNT (\$ in Millions)
----------------	-------------	---------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------

Continued on next page

<p>PROPOSITION A</p>	<p>Revenue generated from a ½ cent sales tax in L.A. County. MTA uses 5% of the overall funds received annually for administrative purposes. Prop. A funds are apportioned as follows:</p> <p>25% - Local Return Program 35% - Rail Development Program 40% - Discretionary</p> <p>The MTA is responsible for administering Prop. A funds and the interest earned.</p> <p>The Reform and Accountability Act of 1998, adopted by voters, restricted the use of these funds for underground subways.</p>	<p>Eligible uses of Prop. A funds are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Bus and Rail Transit - Capital and Operating <p>Prop A 25% funds are distributed to cities & county for transit on a "per capita" basis Prop A 35% funds have been used for the Red, Blue, Green Lines and right of way purchases for commuter rail.</p> <p>Prop A 40% funds can be used for any transit purpose. Current practice limits expenditures to bus capital and operations.</p>	<p>Prop. A funds must be used exclusively to improve transit in L.A. County.</p> <p>Jurisdictions can exchange funding between themselves.</p>	<p>Projected FY02 - \$502.0 million</p> <p>Forecast from OMB 10-Year Revenue Projection Plan: FY03 - \$546.8 m FY04 - \$566.0 m FY05 - \$588.6 m FY06 - \$618.0 m FY07 - \$648.9 m</p> <p>Funds can be leveraged by bonding and incurring annual debt service.</p>
<p>Prop A 25% Local Return Program</p>	<p>25% of Prop A revenues are distributed directly to cities in L.A. County on a population "per capita" basis and the County of L.A.</p>	<p>Prop A 25% funds are to be used exclusively for public transit including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - public bus - rail & paratransit service - public transit fare subsidy programs - TDM Programs - Trans. Systems Mgmt Improvements which exclusively benefit transit <p>Funds may be traded for other cities' general funds. Prop A 25% conditional eligible uses consist of: Ridesharing, guideway; facilities; recreational transit; bus stop imp. & maint.; park-n-ride lots; non-exclusive school service; admin.; trans. planning, engineering, design; specialized public transit; rail; synchronized signalization; TDM; congestion management; bike lanes/bikeways.</p>	<p>Prop A 25% revenues are allocated to local jurisdictions based on the relative percentage share of L.A. County population. Cities within the county have the discretion in choosing programs supported by Prop A 25% funds. However, they must be approved by MTA before project implementation. These funds must be used exclusively for public transit-related projects.</p> <p>The MTA conducts fiscal and compliance audits at the completion of each project funded with Prop A 25%.</p> <p>Cities and County need to submit annual project description forms and can establish, with MTA Board approval, capital reserves that lapse after 4 years.</p>	<p>Projected Prop A 25% FY02 - \$125.5 million</p> <p>Forecast from OMB 10-Year Revenue Projection Plan: FY03 - \$136.7 m FY04 - \$141.5 m FY05 - \$147.1 m FY06 - \$154.5 m FY07 - \$162.2 m</p>

FUNDING SOURCE	PROJECT SELECTION	RESPONSIBLE STAFF	TIMELY USE OF FUNDS (WHERE APPLICABLE)	FURTHER INFORMATION (WHERE APPROPRIATE)
PROPOSITION A	See below for specific funding allocations of proposition A.	Administration: Frank Flores, Programming & Policy Analysis (P&PA) Funds Programming: Nalini Ahuja, Local Programming (LP) Finance: Rene Decena, Accounting Long Range Forecast: Carlos Monroy, Office of Budget and Management (OMB)		
Prop A 25% Local Return Program	Local Jurisdictions	Administration: Diego Cardoso, Transportation Development and Implementation (TDI) Funds Programming: Nalini Ahuja, LP Finance: Rene Decena, Accounting Long Range Forecast: Carlos Monroy, OMB	Time Limit to Spend Funds: Year of allocation plus 3 years	Supporting Documentation: Proposition A Local Return Guidelines

FUNDING SOURCE	DESCRIPTION	ELIGIBLE USES	POLICIES & GUIDELINES	ANNUAL AMOUNT (\$ in Millions)
Prop A 35% Rail Development	35% of Prop. A revenues are used for rail development in L.A. County, as specified on the Prop. A Rail Corridor Map, and rail operations.	Prop A 35% funds are to be used Rail Development.	<p>Prop. A 35% revenues must be used exclusively on rail development projects and rail operations.</p> <p>Revenues are distributed at MTA Board's discretion. To date, funds have supported the construction and operations of the Red, Blue, and Green Lines, and right-of-way purchases for Commuter Rail.</p>	<p>Projected FY02 - \$175.7 million</p> <p>Funds can be leveraged by bonding and incurring annual debt service.</p> <p>Forecast from OMB 10-Year Revenue Projection Plan:</p> <p>FY03 - \$191.4 m FY04 - \$198.1 m FY05 - \$206.0 m FY06 - \$216.3 m FY07 - \$227.1 m</p>
Prop A 40% Discretionary Program [95% of Prop A 40%]	<p>40% of Prop. A revenues are set-aside by MTA for Discretionary Programs to operators by formula which include the following:</p> <p>Transit Operator Transit Service Expansion</p> <p>The above 3 categories annually receive shares by formula which total 95% of the 40% plus CPI.</p>	Prop A 40% Discretionary Program funds should be used for Buses (Fixed Route/Public Dial-a-Ride).	<p>Transit Operator Formula Funds Guidelines adopted April 1991 require operators to receive a "base" share (95% of the 40%) plus CPI each year based on projected receipts. The annual amount is adjusted once during the mid-year reallocation.</p> <p>Subsequent to 1991, state legislation (Calderon Bill SB 1755) requires adherence to the Transit Operator Formula Funds (formula allocation procedure) unless a ¾ vote of the MTA Board is obtained.</p>	<p>Projected FY02 - \$190.8 million</p> <p>Funds can be leveraged by bonding and incurring annual debt service.</p> <p>Forecast from OMB 10-Year Revenue Projection Plan:</p> <p>FY03 - \$207.8 m FY04 - \$215.1 m FY05 - \$223.7 m FY06 - \$234.9 m FY07 - \$246.6 m</p>

FUNDING SOURCE	PROJECT SELECTION	RESPONSIBLE STAFF	TIMELY USE OF FUNDS (WHERE APPLICABLE)	FURTHER INFORMATION (WHERE APPROPRIATE)
Prop A 35% Rail Development		Administration: Frank Flores, P&PA Funds Programming: David Yale, Regional Programming (RP) Project Management: Dave Mieger/Diego Cardoso, TDI Finance: Harvey Saulter, Accounting Long Range Forecast: Carlos Monroy, OMB	Time Limit to Spend Funds: Indefinitely	Supporting Documentation: Proposition A Ordinance
Prop A 40% Discretionary Program [95% of Prop A 40%]	Formula distribution to county bus operations for bus operations.	Administration: Frank Flores, P&PA Funds Programming and Project Management: Nalini Ahuja, LP Finance: Rene Decena, Accounting Long Range Forecast: Carlos Monroy, OMB	Time Limit to Spend Funds: Indefinite except for funds subject to the guidelines of the MTA Formula Allocation Procedure, which specifies a three-year time limit).	Supporting Documentation: Formula Allocation Procedure & Proposition A (95% of 40%) Incentive Guidelines

FUNDING SOURCE	DESCRIPTION	ELIGIBLE USES	POLICIES & GUIDELINES	ANNUAL AMOUNT (\$ in Millions)
Prop A Incentive Program [5% of Prop A 40%]	5% of the Prop. A 40% Discretionary revenues. Funds are distributed based on priorities stated in the adopted 5% of 40% guidelines. The primary users are paratransit programs.	Eligible uses for the Prop A Incentive Program funds include the following: Sub-regional Paratransit Programs, Special Transit Programs, and Community Transportation Programs.	Only the County of L.A., cities and public transit operators are eligible to apply for Prop. A 5% of 40% funds. Private operators or other agencies can only receive these funds through sponsorship by an eligible operator.	Projected FY02 - \$10.0 million Forecast from OMB 10-Year Revenue Projection Plan: FY03 - \$10.9 m FY04 - \$11.3 m FY05 - \$11.8 m FY06 - \$12.4 m FY07 - \$13.0 m
Prop A Interest	Prop A Interest revenue is generated from the interest on funds in the Prop. A Revenue Account.	Prop A Interest follows the guidelines adopted by the Board in March 1996. The funds are discretionary and allocated by the Board. However, the Board must use the Formula Allocation Procedure for the following: - Mitigate an MTA operations shortfall or existing bus operations or capital programs that historically use the Formula Allocation Procedure - The funds are utilized in an indirect manner which result in additional funds for the above mentioned categories - The Board elects to use the funds for new programs or services in conjunction with Municipal Operators and other affected jurisdictions.	Prop A Interest funds are allocated at the discretion of the MTA Board. If any portion is allocated to MTA Operations, then the municipal operators shall receive their share via the formula distribution determined by MTA policy.	\$10-20 million annually.

FUNDING SOURCE	PROJECT SELECTION	RESPONSIBLE STAFF	TIMELY USE OF FUNDS (WHERE APPLICABLE)	FURTHER INFORMATION (WHERE APPROPRIATE)
Prop A Incentive Program [5% of Prop A 40%]	Priorities within adopted guidelines with paratransit programs being the primary users.	Administration: Jim McLaughlin, Regional Service Planning (RSP) Funds Programming: Nalini Ahuja, LP Project Management: Jay Fuhrman, RSP Finance: Rene Decena, Accounting Long Range Forecast: Carlos Monroy, OMB	Time Limit to Spend Funds: Indefinite except for funds subject to the guidelines of the MTA Formula Allocation Procedure, which specifies a three-year time limit).	Supporting Documentation: Formula Allocation Procedure & Proposition A 5% of 40% Incentive Guidelines
Prop A Interest	MTA Board through annual budget process and formula allocation procedure	Administration: Michelle Caldwell, OMB Funds Programming: Carlos Monroy, OMB Project Management: Frank Shapiro, OMB Finance: Josie Nicasio, Accounting Long Range Forecast: Carlos Monroy, OMB		

FUNDING SOURCE	DESCRIPTION	ELIGIBLE USES	POLICIES & GUIDELINES	ANNUAL AMOUNT (\$ in Millions)
PROPOSITION C	<p>Revenues are generated from L.A. County's ½ cent sales tax for public transit purposes. MTA uses 1.5% of the overall funds received annually for administrative purposes. In accordance with MTA policies and Prop C Ordinance, revenues will be used as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 5% Rail & Bus Security - 10% Commuter Rail/Transit Centers - 25% Transit-related Improvements to Streets and Highways - 20% Local Return - 40% Discretionary <p>The Reform and Accountability Act of 1998, adopted by voters, restricted the use of funds for underground subways.</p>	<p>Prop C expenditures are to be used to maintain, improve and expand public transit as well as reduce congestion and increase mobility in L.A. County. Funds cannot be traded between jurisdictions. Eligible uses for Prop C funds include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Transit and Paratransit activities, including rail, bus, and advanced technologies - Fare subsidies - Commuter rail - Transit centers - Park-and-Ride lots - Rail and Bus safety and security - Transportation Systems Management and Transportation Demand Management 	<p>Proposition C Ordinance specifies that revenues must be used for "public transit purposes."</p>	<p>Projected Prop. C Revenue in FY02 - \$ 520.4 million</p> <p>Forecast from OMB 10-Year Revenue Forecast: FY03 - \$566.8 million FY04 - \$586.6 million FY05 - \$610.1 million FY06 - \$640.6million FY07 - \$672.6 million</p> <p>Funds can be leveraged by bonding and incurring annual debt service.</p>
Prop C 5% Security	<p>5% of Prop. C revenue is used to improve and expand rail and bus security.</p>	<p>Eligible uses for Prop C 5% funds include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - New Rail Line Security - Security Incentives - Transit Services and Facilities - Security Improvement - Special Demonstration Projects - Security Contingency Reserve Projects 	<p>The MTA may allocate Prop C 5% funds to eligible projects at its discretion.</p> <p>90% of Prop C 5% goes through an allocation process in accordance with the Calderon Bill based on unlinked passenger trips. The remaining 10% goes to the MTA for internal security-related purposes.</p>	<p>Projected FY02 - \$26.0 million</p> <p>Forecast from OMB 10-Year Revenue Forecast: FY03 - \$28.3 million FY04 - \$29.3 million FY05 - \$30.5 million FY06 - \$32.0 million FY07 - \$33.6 million</p>
Prop C 10% Commuter Rail & Transit Centers	<p>10% of Prop C revenue is used for construction of Commuter Rail and Transit Centers in L.A. County.</p>	<p>Eligible uses for Prop C 10% funds include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Capital & Operating costs for Commuter Rail, Freeway Bus Stops, Transit Centers & Park-n-Ride Lots - Administrative & Planning Costs - Environmental Clearance - Mitigation Costs - Rehabilitation and Expansion of Eligible projects 	<p>Prop. C 10% funds are allocated to the Southern California Regional Rail Authority (SCRRA) for operations, and maintenance of the Metrolink commuter rail system in Los Angeles County. If additional Prop. C 10% funds are available, they are allocated through the MTA Call for Projects to other eligible agencies and projects.</p>	<p>Projected FY02 - \$ 52.0 million</p> <p>Forecast from OMB 10-Year Revenue Forecast: FY03 - \$56.7 million FY04 - \$58.7 million FY05 - \$61.0 million FY06 - \$64.1 million FY07 - \$67.3 million</p> <p>Funds can be leveraged by bonding and incurring annual debt service.</p>

FUNDING SOURCE	PROJECT SELECTION	RESPONSIBLE STAFF	TIMELY USE OF FUNDS (WHERE APPLICABLE)	FURTHER INFORMATION (WHERE APPROPRIATE)
PROPOSITION C	MTA Budget Process	Administration: Frank Flores, P&PA Funds Programming: Nalini Ahuja, LP Project Management: Frank Shapiro, OMB Finance: Rene Decena, Accounting Long Range Forecast: Carlos Monroy, OMB		Proposition C Ordinance
Prop C 5% Security	MTA Budget Process	Administration: Jim McLaughlin, RSP Funds Programming: Nalini Ahuja, LP Project Management: Rufus Cayetano, LP Finance: Basil Panas, Accounting Long Range Forecast: Carlos Monroy, OMB	Time Limit to Spend Funds: 3 years	Supporting Documentation: Formula Allocation Procedure
Prop C 10% Commuter Rail & Transit Centers	Transportation Development & Implementation (TDI) Approximately \$4-5 million per year is assigned to the Call For Projects.	Administration: Jim McLaughlin, RSP Funds Programming: Patricia Chen, LP Finance: Basil Panas, Accounting Long Range Forecast: Carlos Monroy, OMB	Time Limit to Spend Funds: Indefinite except when the funds are subject to the guidelines of the Call for Projects MOU, which specifies a forty-two month time limit. Although funds need to be expended within 42 months from July 1 of the fiscal year in which the funds are programmed, other stipulations may apply as well.	Supporting Documentation: Call for Projects MOU Proposition C Ordinance

FUNDING SOURCE	DESCRIPTION	ELIGIBLE USES	POLICIES & GUIDELINES	ANNUAL AMOUNT (\$ in Millions)
Prop C 20% Local Return	20% of Prop. C revenue is used for a Local Return Program that distributes the funds to public transit, Congestion Management Programs, bikeways and bike lanes, street improvements supporting public transit service, Pavement Management System projects, paratransit, and related services to meet the Federal requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).	<p>Eligible uses for Prop C 20% funds include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Public Transit Services: Operating Costs are for fixed route & paratransit. Capital Costs are for vehicles and equipment. - Transit Related TDM/TSM Improvements - Fare Subsidy Programs - Safety & Security Programs <p>Conditionally Eligible Uses: Ridesharing, right-of-way imp.; facilities; recreational transit; bus stop imp. & maint.; park-n-ride lots; non-exclusive school service; admin.; transp. Planning, engineering, design; specialized public transit; rail; synchronized signalization; TDM; congestion mgmt.; bike lanes/bikeways/; street imp. & maint.</p>	Per the Prop C Ordinance, the MTA is required to distribute the "Local Return" funds directly to the cities on a "per capita" basis. To expend the Prop. C 20% funds, local jurisdictions must submit a three-year plan to the MTA Board of Directors. The projects will receive funding if they meet the statutory requirement of being for "public transit purposes."	<p>Projected FY02 - \$104.1 million</p> <p>Forecast from OMB 10-Year Revenue Forecast: FY03 - \$113.4 million FY04 - \$117.3 million FY05 - \$122.0 million FY06 - \$128.1 million FY07 - \$134.5 million</p>
Prop C 25% Transit Related Highway Improvement	25% of the Prop. C revenue is used for countywide transit-related streets and highways improvements.	<p>Eligible uses for Prop C 25% funds include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - HOV/Transitways - Incident Management programs - Park-n-Ride facilities - Signal Coordination/TSM Improvements on arterial streets used by transit - Grade Separation - Arterial Widening - Interchanges - Ridesharing 	Prop. C 25% funds are for new or improved facilities that reduce congestion. The sponsoring agency must provide for the ongoing maintenance and operation of the improvement(s).	<p>Projected FY02 - \$130.1 million</p> <p>Forecast from OMB 10-Year Revenue Forecast: FY03 - \$141.7 million FY04 - \$146.7 million FY05 - \$152.5 million FY06 - \$160.2 million FY07 - \$168.2 million</p> <p>Funds can be leveraged by bonding and incurring annual debt service.</p>
Prop C 40% Discretionary	<p>40% of the Prop. C revenue is used to improve and expand rail and bus transit services in L.A. County.</p> <p>Examples are: Foothill Mitigation, Transit Service Expansion, Discretionary Base Restructuring, Bus System Imp, Over Crowding Relief, Bus Security Enhancements, and Consent Decree.</p>	<p>Eligible uses for Prop C 40% funds include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Technology improvements - System Capacity Expansion - Operating - System Capacity Expansion - Capital - Safety and Security Improvements <p>Funds from this revenue source cannot be used for highways.</p>	Prop. C 40% funds are to be the "Funds of Last Resort". They are only available after all other reasonable funding opportunities have been exhausted. They are to be applied in accordance with the objectives, program priorities, and guidelines adopted by the Board. These funds will not be used for capital improvements for the Metro Rail project between Union Station and Hollywood.	<p>Projected FY02 - \$208.2 million</p> <p>Forecast from OMB 10-Year Revenue Forecast: FY03 - \$226.7 million FY04 - \$234.7 million FY05 - \$244.0 million FY06 - \$256.2 million FY07 - \$269.1 million</p> <p>Funds can be leveraged by bonding and incurring annual debt service.</p>

FUNDING SOURCE	PROJECT SELECTION	RESPONSIBLE STAFF	TIMELY USE OF FUNDS (WHERE APPLICABLE)	FURTHER INFORMATION (WHERE APPROPRIATE)
Prop C 20% Local Return	Local Jurisdictions TDI administers project applications.	Administration: Diego Cardoso, TDI Funds Programming: Nafini Ahuja, LP Project Management: Dolores Roybal, TDI Finance: Rene Decena, Accounting Long Range Forecast: Carlos Monroy, OMB	Time Limit to Spend Funds: Year of allocation plus 3 years	Supporting Documentation: Proposition C Local Return Guidelines
Prop C 25% Transit Related Highway Improvement	Call for Projects TDI evaluates applications and develops recommendation for funding through the Call for Projects process.	Administration: Renee Berlin, TDI Ray Maekawa, TDI Funds Programming: Wanda Knight, RP Project Management: Ken Cude, TDI Long Range Forecast: Carlos Monroy, OMB	Time Limit to Spend Funds: Indefinite except for funds subject to the guidelines of the MTA Formula Allocation Procedure, which specifies a three-year time limit).	Supporting Documentation: Call for Projects MOU Proposition C Ordinance
Prop C 40% Discretionary	MTA Board through annual budget process.	Administration: Frank Flores, P&PA Funds Programming: David Yale, RP Long Range Forecast: Carlos Monroy, OMB	Time Limit to Spend Funds: Indefinite except for funds subject to the guidelines of the MTA Formula Allocation Procedure, which specifies a three-year time limit).	Supporting Documentation: Call for Projects MOU Proposition C Ordinance

FUNDING SOURCE	DESCRIPTION	ELIGIBLE USES	POLICIES & GUIDELINES	ANNUAL AMOUNT (\$ in Millions)
Prop C Interest	Interest on Prop. C revenues are reserved for allocation by the MTA Board.	<p>Prop C Interest follows the guidelines adopted by the Board in March 1996. The funds are discretionary and appropriated by the Board. However, the Board must use the formula allocation processes for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - mitigate an MTA operations shortfall or existing programs for bus operations or capital that historically use the formula allocation process - the funds are utilized in an indirect manner which result in additional funds for the above mentioned categories - the Board elects to use the funds for new programs or services in conjunction with Municipal Operators and other affected jurisdictions. 	Funds allocated at the discretion of the MTA Board. If any portion is allocated to MTA Operations, then the municipal operators shall receive their fair share via the formula distribution set by MTA policy.	\$10-20 million annually.
<p>Transportation Development Act (TDA)</p> <p>Articles 3, 4, and 8</p>	<p>The Transportation Development Act (TDA) creates a Local Transportation Fund (LTF) in each county in which a ¼-cent of the state sales tax is deposited annually. These funds are allocated to the counties based on the amount of sales tax collected from all of the counties. The MTA allocates TDA funds to Municipal Operators based on established criteria and formulas.</p> <p>The funds are held by the County of Los Angeles and distributed pursuant to the adopted annual MTA budget and Formula Allocation Procedure. The MTA Accounting Department informs the County of Los Angeles when expenditures are to be made from the LTF.</p> <p>Each year, Los Angeles County deducts an amount, as needed, from the overall funds received for administrative costs of the program. Up to 1% of the revenues from the annual LTF allocation can be used by the MTA and ¾% by SCAG for transportation planning and programming, although, SCAG may not exceed \$1 million in revenues for this purpose.</p>	<p>TDA funds are used to support the following programs:</p> <p>TDA Article 3: <i>Bicycle & Pedestrian Facilities:</i> Up to 2% of total available TDA funds are allocated based on population.</p> <p>TDA Article 4: <i>Public Transportation Systems:</i> Subject to the Formula Allocation Procedure (FAP) based on vehicle service miles and fare revenue. Up to 93% of total available TDA funds are allocated to municipal transit operators, Transit Districts, and Joint Powers Authorities.</p> <p>TDA Article 8: <i>Public Transit Services Provided Under Contract:</i> Allocation is based on population. Up to 4.8% of total available TDA funds are used for transit and paratransit programs to fulfill unmet transit needs in areas that are not serviced by the MTA. If there are no unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet, TDA Art. 8 funds may be used for streets and roads improvements.</p> <p>A limited percentage may be used for administrative costs. Requires annual public hearing.</p>	<p>TDA Article 3: Funds used for bicycle & pedestrian facilities throughout L.A. County.</p> <p>TDA Article 4: Used for bus capital or operating expenses. Funds are often used as local match to FTA Section 5309 [3] and 5307 [9] funds. TDA Art. 4 funds are available only to "eligible" municipal operators.</p> <p>TDA Article 4.5: These funds are available for community transit services for those transit riders who cannot use conventional transit services, such as handicapped. This program is not utilized because Prop. A incentive is serving this purpose instead.</p> <p>TDA Article 8: Available for transit and paratransit. If there are no unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet, funds may be used for streets and roads improvements.</p>	<p>Projected FY02 TDA Article 3 - \$5.4 m TDA Article 4 - \$249.8 m TDA Article 8 - \$14.5 m</p> <p>Forecast from OMB 10-Year Revenue Projection Plan (All Articles):</p> <p>FY03 - \$268.8 m FY04 - \$278.5 m FY05 - \$289.8 m FY06 - \$304.6 m FY07 - \$320.2 m</p>

FUNDING SOURCE	PROJECT SELECTION	RESPONSIBLE STAFF	TIMELY USE OF FUNDS (WHERE APPLICABLE)	FURTHER INFORMATION (WHERE APPROPRIATE)
Prop C Interest	MTA Board	Administration: Michelle Caldwell, OMB Funds Programming: Nalini Ahuja, LP Finance: Josie Nicasio, Accounting Long Range Forecast: Carlos Monroy, OMB Project Management: Ray Maekawa, TDI Renee Berlin, TDI		
Transportation Development Act (TDA) Articles 3, 4, and 8	Local jurisdictions receive funding in accordance with legally mandated uses. (See Policies & Guidelines section)	Administration: - TDA Art. 3 Diego Cardoso, TDI - TDA Art 4 Nalini Ahuja, LP - TDA Art. 8 Diego Cardoso, TDI Funds Programming: - TDA Art 3 Nalini Ahuja, LP - TDA Art 4 Nalini Ahuja, LP - TDA Art. 8 Nalini Ahuja, LP Finance: Josie Nicasio, Accounting Long Range Forecast: Carlos Monroy, OMB		

FUNDING SOURCE	DESCRIPTION	ELIGIBLE USES	POLICIES & GUIDELINES	ANNUAL AMOUNT (\$ in Millions)
<p>Public Transportation Account (PTA)</p> <p>formerly called (Transportation Planning & Development - TP&D)</p> <p>(Considered local due to formula allocation)</p>	<p>Under SB45 implemented on January 1, 1998, the Public Transportation Account (PTA) replaced the Transportation Planning & Development Account (TP&D). The PTA is a trust fund intended for transportation planning and mass transportation purposes.</p> <p>PTA derives its revenue from sales and uses taxes on diesel fuel and gasoline as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) 4 & 3/4 % sales tax on diesel fuel 2) 4 & 3/4 % sales tax on 9 cents of the state excise tax on gasoline 3) "Spillover": Sales tax revenues on all sales (including gas) exceed sales tax revenues on all sales (excluding gas) 	<p>State and Local Mass Transportation related expenditures.</p>	<p>50% of PTA funds are directed to the State Transit Assistance (STA) program.</p> <p>The remaining 50% is for statewide highway and specified transportation uses excluding rolling stock.</p>	<p>Projected FY02 - \$554.8 million Statewide including STA.</p> <p>Fund Estimate from 2000 STIP (Statewide):</p> <p>FY03 - \$383.3 m</p> <p>FY04 - \$457.6 m</p> <p>FY05 - \$462.1 m</p> <p>FY06 - \$519.4 m</p> <p>FY07 - \$538.5 m</p>
<p>State Transit Assistance (STA)</p> <p>(Considered local due to formula allocation)</p>	<p>Fifty % of the Public Transportation Account (PTA) funds are allocated to the State Transit Assistance (STA) fund by the State Controller.</p> <p>One half of the above 50% is allocated to the MTA based on the ratio of L.A. County's population to the State's population (the population share). The other half of the 50% is allocated to the MTA based on the ratio of the total County transit operators' fare revenues to total revenues of transit operators in the State (the operator revenue share).</p> <p>Assembly Bill 2928 annually increased STA funds by approximately \$8.75 million to Los Angeles County.</p>	<p>STA funds are allocated to local transportation agencies and are eligible for public transit capital and operations programs.</p> <p>The operator revenue share is used for transit operations or capital. The population share is used for transit operations or roads.</p>	<p>The MTA allocates STA funds to the municipal operators on a formula basis (Formula Allocation Procedure). Transit operators must be eligible for TDA Art. 4 to receive STA funds. In addition, transit claims must be consistent with the Short Range Transit Plan and the Short Range Trans. Improvement Program.</p> <p>The operators must also meet either one of the following standards (eligibility test) to receive STA funds:</p> <p>(Continued on the next page)</p>	<p>Projected FY02 - \$ 59.7 million (Entire L.A. County)</p> <p>Forecast from OMB 10-Year Revenue Forecast</p> <p>FY03 - \$39.5 m</p> <p>FY04 - \$38.0 m</p> <p>FY05 - \$38.5 m</p> <p>FY06 - \$39.1 m</p> <p>FY07 - \$39.6 m</p> <p>MTA portion</p> <p>Projected FY02 - \$ 52.7 million</p> <p>Forecast from OMB 10-Year Revenue Forecast</p> <p>FY03 - \$41.1 m</p> <p>FY04 - \$33.9 m</p> <p>FY05 - \$33.0 m</p> <p>FY06 - \$33.6 m</p> <p>FY07 - \$34.0 m</p>

FUNDING SOURCE	PROJECT SELECTION	RESPONSIBLE STAFF	TIMELY USE OF FUNDS (WHERE APPLICABLE)	FURTHER INFORMATION (WHERE APPROPRIATE)
Public Transportation Account (PTA) formerly called (Transportation Planning & Development - TP&D)	Not Applicable	Administration: David Yale, RP Funds Programming: Nalini Ahuja, LP Finance: Rene Decena, Accounting Long Range Forecast: Carlos Monroy, OMB	Time Limit to Spend Funds: 3 years	Supporting Documentation: Formula Allocation Procedure
State Transit Assistance (STA)	Formula allocation by MTA Board policy	Administration: Frank Flores, P&PA Funds Programming: Nalini Ahuja, LP Grants Management: Charlene Lorenzo, Regional Grants Management and Administration (RGM&A) Finance: Rene Decena, Accounting Long Range Forecast: Carlos Monroy, OMB Eligibility Test: Nalini Ahuja, LP	Time Limit to Spend Funds: 3 years	Supporting Documentation: Formula Allocation Procedure

FUNDING SOURCE	DESCRIPTION	ELIGIBLE USES	POLICIES & GUIDELINES	ANNUAL AMOUNT (\$ in Millions)
State Transit Assistance (STA)			<p>1. The operator's total operating cost per revenue vehicle hour in the latest year for which audited data are available does not exceed the sum of the preceding year's total operating cost per revenue vehicle hour and an amount equal to the product of the percentage change in the Consumer Price Index (CPI) for the same period multiplied by the preceding year's total operating cost per revenue vehicle hour.</p> <p>2. The operator's average total operating cost per revenue vehicle hour in the latest three year for which audited data are available does not exceed the sum of the average of the total operating cost per revenue vehicle hour in the three years preceding the latest year for which audited data are available and an amount equal to the product of the average percentage change in the Consumer Price Index (CPI) for the same period multiplied by the average total operating cost per revenue vehicle hour in the same three years.</p>	

FUNDING SOURCE	PROJECT SELECTION	RESPONSIBLE STAFF	TIMELY USE OF FUNDS (WHERE APPLICABLE)	FURTHER INFORMATION (WHERE APPROPRIATE)
----------------	-------------------	-------------------	--	---

State Transit Assistance (STA)				
--------------------------------	--	--	--	--

FUNDING SOURCE	DESCRIPTION	ELIGIBLE USES	POLICIES & GUIDELINES	ANNUAL AMOUNT (\$ in Millions)
Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies (SAFE)	SAFE revenues are generated from a \$1.00 annual registration fee on vehicles in L.A. County. These funds support emergency call boxes on L.A. County freeway system.	Eligible uses for SAFE funds are: - Motorist Aid - Operation & maintenance of call boxes - Freeway Service Patrol - Incident Management	Policies and guidelines for SAFE are developed by the State and implemented by the Los Angeles County SAFE. This is a separate independent agency from the MTA.	Projected FY02 - \$12.8 million
HOV Violation Fund (Preferential Traffic Lane Violation)	Revenues are generated from fines collected in L.A. County for violations of High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes and for crossing over the parallel double-double solid yellow lines. The MTA collects 1/3 of the first \$100 if the violation occurs in cities within L.A. County and 1/2 if the violation occurs in non-incorporated areas of the County.	The Freeway Service Patrol Program (FSP) -- tow trucks only on freeways. The service provides tow trucks on freeways and is operated during peak hour mid-day travel and weekend services on heavily congested freeways. HOV Violation Funds are eligible for other uses but MTA is using the funds for the FSP program.	Improve traffic flow operations on the state highway system within Los Angeles County.	Projected FY02 - \$0.3 million Funds based on volume of violations.
State Highway Account Budget Change Proposal (BCP) for Freeway Service Patrol Program (Considered local after annual allocation to MTA)	This is a line item in the California State Budget allocated annually to the Freeway Service Patrol (FSP) program. MTA budgets an anticipated projection each year.	The Freeway Service Patrol Program (FSP) -- tow trucks only on freeways. The service provides tow trucks on freeways and is operated during peak hour mid-day travel and weekend services on heavily congested freeways.	FSP funds are allocated by the State of California. The MTA contracts with tow truck operators for the service and the funds are programmed in the annual budget. The State requires the MTA to contribute a 25% local match.	Projected FY02 - \$5.4 m Forecast is from OMB 10-Year Revenue Forecast Plan: FY03 - \$5.2 m FY04 - \$5.2 m FY05 - \$5.2 m FY06 - \$5.4 m FY07 - \$5.4 m

FUNDING SOURCE	PROJECT SELECTION	RESPONSIBLE STAFF	TIMELY USE OF FUNDS (WHERE APPLICABLE)	FURTHER INFORMATION (WHERE APPROPRIATE)
Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies (SAFE)	SAFE Board	Administration: State, Caltrans, California Highway Patrol (CHP) Funds Programming and Project Management: Byron Lee, Highway Operations Support Finance: Basil Panas, Accounting Long Range Forecast: Byron Lee, Highway Operations Support		
HOV Violation Fund (Preferential Traffic Lane Violation)	Caltrans, CHP, MTA Budget process	Administration: State, Caltrans, CHP Funds Programming and Project Management: Byron Lee, Highway Operations Support Finance: Basil Panas, Accounting Long Range Forecast: Byron Lee, Highway Operations Support		
State Highway Account Budget Change Proposal (BCP) for Freeway Service Patrol Program	Caltrans, CHP and MTA	Administration: State, Legislator Funds Pgm, and Proj. Mgmt: Byron Lee, Highway Operations Support Finance: Basil Panas, Accounting Long Range Forecast: Byron Lee, Highway Operations Support		

FUNDING SOURCE	DESCRIPTION	ELIGIBLE USES	POLICIES & GUIDELINES	ANNUAL AMOUNT (\$ in Millions)
Fare Revenues	Funds derived from MTA bus and rail system fare revenues and other route/service generators.	Discretion of MTA Board. Current application is for bus and rail as allocated in the annual MTA budget.	<p>New fare structure and policy are planned beginning in FY02.</p> <p>This fare policy will focus on increasing overall fare revenue, while maintaining or increasing ridership. For example, fare increases may be targeted to selected riders or time periods to optimize the balance of fare revenue increases with ridership maintenance and distance traveled.</p>	<p>Projected FY02 - \$ 243.3 million</p> <p>Forecast is from OMB 10-Year Revenue Forecast Plan: FY03 - \$260.7 m FY04 - \$272.0 m FY05 - \$286.2 m FY06 - \$292.2 m FY06 - \$302.6 m</p>
Mobile Source Emission Reduction Credits (MSERCs)	Under South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rule 1612, MTA generates MSERCs when it operates alternative fuel buses with engines that are cleaner than State requirements. These MSERCs can be sold on SCAQMD's emissions trading market to stationary sources. MSERCs can also be converted into RECLAIM Trading Credits (RTCs), which are sold to larger stationary sources on the open market.	Bus and rail transit operations (fuel, parts, labor, etc.).	MSERCs are generated through SCAQMD and typically marketed for sale through approved emissions trading brokers.	Variable based on market demand for MTA's MSERCs.
Federal Aid Urban (FAU) Cash	These funds were derived as a result of exchange of prior funds from 2 cities under the FAU/Prop A Exchange program.	These funds are used for any Board approved project ineligible for any other funding sources	The Funds are allocated under the "Call for Projects"	\$13.0 million in carryover funds

FUNDING SOURCE	PROJECT SELECTION	RESPONSIBLE STAFF	TIMELY USE OF FUNDS (WHERE APPLICABLE)	FURTHER INFORMATION (WHERE APPROPRIATE)
Fare Revenues	Not Applicable	Administration: Jim Cudlip, Revenue Department. Funds Programming: Frank Shapiro, OMB Project Management: Jim Cudlip, Revenue Department Finance: Basil Panas, Accounting Long Range Forecast: Carlos Monroy, OMB		
Mobile Source Emission Reduction Credits (MSERCs)	Not Applicable	Administration: Doug Kim, Long Range Planning (LRP) Funds Programming: Gladys Lowe, RGM&A Project Management: Doug Kim, LRP Finance: Basil Panas, Accounting Long Range Forecast: Doug Kim, LRP		
Federal Aid Urban (FAU) Cash	Call for Projects	Administration: Mona Jones, RP	NA	

FUNDING SOURCE	DESCRIPTION	ELIGIBLE USES	POLICIES & GUIDELINES	ANNUAL AMOUNT (\$ in Millions)
----------------	-------------	---------------	-----------------------	-----------------------------------

PRIVATE FUNDS				
Benefit Assessments	Special benefit assessments are levied on local property owners by the MTA to help raise funds for financing the Metro Rail Red Line system. In the A1 Downtown District, assessments are levied on commercial properties that are located within a ½ mile radius of Metro Red Line Stations and a 1/3 mile radius for the A2 Westlake/MacArthur Park District.	Metro Rail Red Line Stations in A1 and A2 Districts.	Policies and guidelines for assessments are developed by the MTA.	<p>Actual FY02 - \$14.44 m</p> <p>Forecast is based on OMB 10-Year Revenue Forecast Plan: FY03 - \$11.12 m FY04 - \$12.78 m FY05 - \$19.27 m FY06 - \$19.34 m FY07 - \$19.41 m</p> <p>Annual assessment income directly pays for interest and principal payments on approximately \$162 million in assessment district bonds that were sold in 1992.</p>
Other (Advertising and Auxiliary)	Fees collected for advertising, chartering, leasing, Rideshare, Department of Justice grants, & MTA Lite Program.	Transit Capital and Operations costs.	Annually determined in the MTA Operating Budget.	<p>Actual FY02 - \$63.4 m</p> <p>Forecast is based on OMB 10-Year Revenue Projection Plan (12/99): FY03 - \$59.5 m FY04 - \$82.2 m FY05 - \$71.8 m FY06 - \$79.6 m FY07 - \$60.6 m</p>
Public/Private Joint Development	Revenues are generated from public/private participation in joint developments of rail lines and rail stations.	Real Estate Development on MTA-owned property and also on rental property development to increase revenue from tenant rent.	No specific guidelines approved by the MTA. Potential uses under consideration include restricting revenue use to fund future expenses of rail facilities. Another potential is enhancements that increase rental revenue for MTA-owned real estate.	From \$0.7 to \$1.0 million annually, increasing in future years by CPI and as new developments are added.

FUNDING SOURCE	PROJECT SELECTION	RESPONSIBLE STAFF	TIMELY USE OF FUNDS (WHERE APPLICABLE)	FURTHER INFORMATION (WHERE APPROPRIATE)
----------------	-------------------	-------------------	--	---

PRIVATE FUNDS				
Benefit Assessments	Benefit Assessment Division (Currently only on Metro Rail Red Line Segment 1)	Administration and Funds Programming: David Sikes, RGM&A Long Range Forecast: James Allen, RGM&A Finance: Basil Panas, Accounting		
Other (Advertising and Auxiliary)	MTA Bus Operations	Administration: Richard Hunt, Transit Operations Funds Programming: Gary Spivack, Transit Operations Finance: Basil Panas, Accounting MTA Budget and Forecast: Carlos Monroy, OMB		
Public/Private Joint Development	MTA Board	Administration: Carol Inge, TDI Funds Programming: Carlos Monroy, OMB Project Management: Phil Ganezer, TDI Long Range Forecast: Velma Marshall, Real Estate		

FUNDING SOURCE	DESCRIPTION	ELIGIBLE USES	POLICIES & GUIDELINES	ANNUAL AMOUNT (\$ in Millions)
----------------	-------------	---------------	-----------------------	-----------------------------------

FINANCING MECHANISMS – This Financial Mechanisms section shows the amount of current annual debt repayments made. Additional revenues can be created by issuing debt in accordance with the MTA Debt Policy.

Certificates of Participation (COP)*	A COP is a lease obligation whose term should approximately match the average life of the assets being leased. A COP is not a debt obligation, as it is subject to annual appropriations and/or abatement. Thus, the lease payments are considered operating expenses and not debt service. COPs are most appropriate for use where more senior lien, lower cost, debt obligations are not available. A COP could be either taxable or tax-exempt.	It is MTA practice to use these instruments to finance large lease projects, primarily rail system rolling stock purchase, bus purchases and bus/rail facility construction.	MTA debt policy, adopted in October 1998 and amended on November 18, 1999, November 16, 2000 and October 18, 2001, is the controlling instrument, with references to the Federal Grant procedures.	Annually, the MTA pays \$31 million towards COPs at declining amounts through FY10, with no further payments thereafter. Three of the four COPs mature in FY04 and the fourth transaction continues with a \$16 million annual payment through FY10.
Commercial Paper (CP)*	A short-term taxable or tax-exempt debt instrument with maturities ranging from 1 to 270 days. New notes are usually issued to replace the maturing notes, creating a revolving credit facility. Typically the MTA eventually retires the notes by refunding them into a long-term fixed-rate bond, but the notes could also be retired using other revenues sources such as grant funds or proceeds from the sale of an asset.	Used to finance capital costs related to acquisition, construction and equipment for bus, rail and other transit related capital projects. The debt service from MTA's Tax-exempt CP program is planned to be paid from Proposition A 35% Rail Funds. The tax-exempt CP program is secured by a pledge of 75% of the Prop. A revenues (35% Rail plus 40% Discretionary). The debt service from MTA's Taxable CP program is planned to be paid primarily from Proposition C 40% Funds. The taxable CP program is secured by a pledge of 80% of the Prop. C revenues (All revenues, less the 20% Local Return).	MTA debt policy adopted in October 1998 and amended on November 18, 1999, November 16, 2000 and October 18, 2001. Commercial Paper is frequently used as interim funding for capital projects, later being refunded into the permanent financing source, typically a long-term bond issue. Currently, the taxable CP program is capped at \$150 million and the tax-exempt program is capped at \$350 million.	Annual Cash payment is approximately \$ 4 Million for Taxable CP program, and approximately \$8.5 million for the Tax-exempt CP program.

* This source of revenue is derived by issuing debt instruments that allow for immediate borrowing of cash. The repayment of the debt occurs over a period of 12-30 years. The length of the debt depends on the life cycle of the projects or equipment for which the debt is being incurred.

FUNDING SOURCE	PROJECT SELECTION	RESPONSIBLE STAFF	TIMELY USE OF FUNDS (WHERE APPLICABLE)	FURTHER INFORMATION (WHERE APPROPRIATE)
----------------	-------------------	-------------------	--	---

<p>FINANCING MECHANISMS – This Financial Mechanisms section shows the amount of current annual debt repayments made. Additional revenues can be created by issuing debt in accordance with the MTA Debt Policy.</p>				
Certificates of Participation (COP)*	Finance Trans. Dev. & Imp. (TDI) Municipal Operators	Administration: Terry Matsumoto, Finance Executive Officer Funds Programming and Project Management: Mike Smith, Treasury		
Commercial Paper (CP)*	Finance	Administration: Terry Matsumoto, Finance Executive Officer Funds Programming and Project Management: Mike Smith, Treasury		

FUNDING SOURCE	DESCRIPTION	ELIGIBLE USES	POLICIES & GUIDELINES	ANNUAL AMOUNT (\$ in Millions)
Cross Border Leases*	A taxable transaction in which the title to the leased asset is held by the foreign domiciled lessor, at least for foreign tax purposes. The lessor typically receives certain tax benefits such as tax credits and accelerated depreciation in its domicile tax jurisdiction. Lessor is then willing to provide what amounts to a low cost loan on the equity component of the lease.	Used to derive financial benefits through the sale or transfer of title to buses or rail vehicles to a foreign domiciled lessor. The benefits of this type transaction are sensitivity to interest rates, business climate and changes in, or pending changes, to tax laws. These leases can be used to provide low cost financing, but, more typically, the assets are separately paid for and are subsequently cross border leased in a structure which is tied to a defeasance mechanism. The defeasance mechanism generates all of the lease payments, including the purchase option, and results in a residual amount of the lease proceeds being left over as an up-front benefit to the MTA.	MTA debt policy that was adopted in October 1998 and amended on November 18, 1999, November 16, 2000 and October 18, 2001.	Actual FY02 - \$22.3 m Forecast is based on MTA Debt service Schedule: FY03 - \$11.5 m FY04 - \$14.9 m FY05 - \$14.9 m FY06 - \$14.8 m FY07 - \$17.2 m
Senior Lien Bonds*	A long-term debt obligation, typically tax-exempt, which has a senior claim against the revenue pledged as a source of repayment to the bondholders, which is typically Proposition A or Proposition C sales tax revenues.	Capital costs of Rail Transit Programs -- i.e., right-of-way, engineering costs, construction costs, and rolling stock (transit vehicles).	MTA debt policy adopted in October 1998 and amended on November 18, 1999, November 16, 2000 and October 18, 2001. Used primarily to finance rail construction, some operating capital and the Call for Projects. May not be used to finance operating expenses.	Actual FY02 - \$138.6 m Forecast is based on MTA Debt service Schedule: FY03 - \$138.6 m FY04 - \$138.6 m FY05 - \$138.6 m FY06 - \$138.6 m FY07 - \$138.6 m
Subordinated Bonds*	A long-term debt obligation, typically tax-exempt, which has a pledge which is subordinate (by one or more lien levels) to the senior lien pledge.	Used to finance capital costs related to acquisition, construction and equipment for bus, rail and other transit-related capital projects.	MTA debt policy adopted in October 1998 and amended on November 18, 1999, November 16, 2000 and October 18, 2001. Used primarily to finance rail construction and some operating capital projects. May not be used to finance operating expenses. Subordinated obligations carry a higher interest cost compared to senior lien bonds.	Actual FY02 - \$5.1 m Forecast is based on MTA Debt service Schedule: FY03 - \$5.4 m FY04 - \$5.4 m FY05 - \$5.4 m FY06 - \$5.4 m FY07 - \$5.4 m

* This source of revenue is derived by issuing debt instruments that allow for immediate borrowing of cash. The repayment of the debt occurs over a period of 12-30 years. The length of the debt depends on the life cycle of the projects or equipment for which the debt is being incurred.

FUNDING SOURCE	PROJECT SELECTION	RESPONSIBLE STAFF	TIMELY USE OF FUNDS (WHERE APPLICABLE)	FURTHER INFORMATION (WHERE APPROPRIATE)
Cross Border Leases*	Finance	<p>Administration: Terry Matsumoto, Finance Executive Officer</p> <p>Funds Programming: Michelle Caldwell, Deputy Executive Officer of Finance (Budget)</p> <p>Project Management: Mike Smith, Treasury</p>		
Senior Lien Bonds*	Finance	<p>Administration: Terry Matsumoto, Finance Executive Officer</p> <p>Funds Programming and Project Management: Mike Smith, Treasury</p>		
Subordinated Bonds*	Finance	<p>Administration: Terry Matsumoto, Finance Executive Officer</p> <p>Funds Programming and Project Management: Mike Smith, Treasury</p>		

FUNDING SOURCE	DESCRIPTION	ELIGIBLE USES	POLICIES & GUIDELINES	ANNUAL AMOUNT (\$ in Millions)
----------------	-------------	---------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------

II. STATE FUNDING SOURCES

<p>Traffic Congestion Relief (TCR) Program</p>	<p>The Traffic Congestion Relief Program provides about \$6.8 billion in new statewide funding for transportation. The new funding for transportation includes \$1.5 billion in direct general funds from the FY 2000-01 budget surplus, plus about \$5.3 billion over six years from transferring all remaining state sales tax on gasoline and diesel fuel from the General Fund to transportation.</p>	<p>About \$5 billion for 141 designated projects listed in AB 2928, with the intent to relieve congestion, improve commerce, and improve connections among transportation modes. About \$1 billion to counties and cities for maintenance, rehabilitation, reconstruction, or damage repair on local streets and roads. About \$600 million for the STIP, \$300 million for the PTA, and \$5 million to the High Speed Rail Authority for environmental studies.</p>	<p>Assembly Bill 2928 and implementing guidelines of CTC enacted in September 2000.</p>	<p>Los Angeles County and its local jurisdictions receive \$1,744,150 over a six-year period beginning in FY02.</p> <p>Projected FY02 - \$63.4 m Forecast is based on 10-Year Revenue Projection Plan (08/01): FY03 - \$59.5 m FY04 - \$82.2 m FY05 - \$71.8 m FY06 - \$79.6 m FY07 - \$60.6 m</p>
<p>State Transportation Improvement Program (SB-45 reform) 75% of funds</p> <p>(See Inter-regional Transportation Improvements Program for 25% of funds on the next page)</p> <p>AB1012-amendment to STIP process</p>	<p>The STIP is a multi-year capital improvement program of transportation projects on and off the State Highway System, funded with revenues from the State Highway Account and other funding sources. Primary funding source is the \$0.18/gal state gasoline tax although federal funding is also used to fund the STIP. SB-45 repealed the following, effective Jan. 1, 1998: FCR, TCI, TSM, Commuter & Urban Rail Program, Mass Transit Guideway Program. Intercity rail corridors eligible for state funding. Repealed State-Local Transportation Partnership Program (SLTPP) effective Jul 1, 1999. Shortened the STIP cycle from 7 years to 4 years, but has an interim 6 year STIP cycle in 1998 to transition to the 4 year STIP in 2000. Under AB2928, the 2002 STIP and later biennial STIPs will cover 5-year cycles.</p> <p>Allows for advancement of STIP funds that will become available in years beyond the current STIP period for design work only on future projects. The CTC limits advancements to 25% from the first two years of the next unprogrammed STIP period. This advanced funding is repaid generally through reduced allocation in future years.</p>	<p>75% is allocated for the Regional Improvement Program for capital acquisition and construction of state highways, freeways, local roads, public transit, pedestrian & bike facilities, grade separation, TDM, soundwall, intermodal facilities and safety projects. These funds can be used anywhere in the county. Cannot be used for operations.</p> <p>It is expected this process will accelerate project delivery and completion since design work can be completed in STIP period before actual construction.</p>	<p>CTC & MTA Board of Directors</p> <p>CTC A 4-year maximum loan program allows borrowing against future year STIP allocations should a regional area so desire. The loan is subject to interest.</p>	<p>MTA receives approximately \$220.0 m annually from the 75% Regional Improvement Program.</p> <p>25% of estimated allocation of the first two years beyond the current STIP. This amounts to approximately \$65 million initially to the MTA.</p>

FUNDING SOURCE	PROJECT SELECTION	RESPONSIBLE STAFF	TIMELY USE OF FUNDS (WHERE APPLICABLE)	FURTHER INFORMATION (WHERE APPROPRIATE)
----------------	-------------------	-------------------	--	---

II. STATE FUNDING SOURCES

<p>Traffic Congestion Relief (TCR) Program</p>	<p>Governor and State Legislature. Actual projects were listed in legislation, AB 2928.</p>	<p>Administration: David Yale, RP Funds Programming: Gladys Lowe, RGM&A Project Management: Charlene Lorenzo, RGM&A Finance: Rene Decena, Accounting Long Range Forecast: Gloria Anderson, RP</p>	<p>Time Limit to Obligate/Allocate Funds: initial applications for projects must be submitted by July 6, 2002, thereafter implementing agency must seek an allocation and start the first phase of work during the fiscal year scheduled. Time Limit to Spend Funds: 5 years to spend funds from date of allocation</p>	<p>Supporting Documentation: (CTC) Guidelines for Traffic Congestion Relief Program adopted September 28, 2000 and include state surplus funds only, no federal funds are involved</p>
<p>State Transportation Improvement Program (SB-45 reform) 75% of funds (See Inter-regional Transportation Improvements Program for 25% of funds on the next page)</p> <p>AB1012- amendment to STIP process</p>	<p>The 75% Regional Improvement Program projects are nominated and programmed by County Commissions (MTA). The CTC must either adopt or reject the entire program. MTA programs these funds through the Call for Projects.</p> <p>MTA Board of Directors with CTC review</p>	<p>Administration: Frank Flores, P&PA Funds Programming: David Yale, RP Charlene Lorenzo, RGM&A Project Management: Ray Maekawa, TDI Renee Berlin, TDI Finance: Rene Decena, Accounting Long Range Forecast: CTC and Caltrans</p> <p>Administration: Frank Flores, P&PA Funds Programming: David Yale, RP Project Management: Charlene Lorenzo, RGM&A Long Range Forecast: CTC and Caltrans Finance: Rene Decena, Accounting</p>	<p>Time Limit to Obligate/Allocate Funds: Available for allocation only until the end of the fiscal year identified in STIP</p> <p>Time Limit to Spend Funds: by the end of the second fiscal year following the fiscal year in which the funds were allocated (2 years)</p>	<p>Supporting Documentation: STIP Guidelines--funds commonly called Regional Improvement Program (RIP) funds and include federal funds--STIP Letter of Agreement (LOA) if applicable</p>

FUNDING SOURCE	DESCRIPTION	ELIGIBLE USES	POLICIES & GUIDELINES	ANNUAL AMOUNT (\$ in Millions)
Inter-Regional Improvement Program	<p>25% of STIP funds under the Interregional Improvement Program is allocated for Interregional Improvements consisting of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - interregional roads or - intercity rail projects under Caltrans programming authority <p>Revenues are comprised of state and federal gas tax revenues.</p>	Capacity-enhancing highway improvements administered by Caltrans. Intercity rail capital improvements.	<p>Caltrans develops all policies and guidelines.</p> <p>60% (60% of the 25%) of the funds are required to be used for interregional roads or intercity rail projects that are outside the boundaries of an urbanized area with a population of more than 50,000 and for inter-city rail projects. A minimum of 15% must be used for intercity rail.</p> <p>The remaining 40% (40% of 25%) can be for projects that are needed to facilitate interregional movement of people and goods. Projects may include state highways, intercity rail, mass transit guideway, or grade separation projects (projects can be inside urbanized areas).</p>	<p>Variable, but generally ranges from \$10-15 million annually for projects in Los Angeles County.</p> <p>\$431,758,000 statewide from FY2000 through FY2006, according to the FY2000 Fund Estimate.</p>
SHOPP (State Highway Operation and Protection Program)	Capital program used for state highway rehabilitation, operation and safety improvements by Caltrans. Revenues are comprised of state and federal gas taxes.	Rehabilitation, operation, and safety improvements to the state highway system.	MTA only forecasts. Caltrans programs.	<p>Per '2000 SHOPP' published May 12, 2000 and approved by CTC:</p> <p>FY02 - \$173.0 m FY03 - \$173.0 m FY04 - \$173.0 m FY05 - \$173.0 m</p>

FUNDING SOURCE	PROJECT SELECTION	RESPONSIBLE STAFF	TIMELY USE OF FUNDS (WHERE APPLICABLE)	FURTHER INFORMATION (WHERE APPROPRIATE)
Inter-Regional Improvement Program	Nominated by Caltrans and/or MTA, selected by the CTC.	Administration: David Yale, RP Funds Programming: CTC Project Management: Renee Berlin, TDI Ray Maekawa, TDI Finance: Rene Decena, Accounting		
SHOPP (State Highway Operation and Protection Program)	Caltrans District 7 MTA does not manage or program these funds.	Administration: CALTRANS David Yale, RP Funds Programming: Caltrans Project Management: Ray Maekawa, TDI Ken Cude, TDI		

FUNDING SOURCE	DESCRIPTION	ELIGIBLE USES	POLICIES & GUIDELINES	ANNUAL AMOUNT (\$ in Millions)
Environmental Enhancement & Mitigation (EEM)	Revenues are for the mitigation of negative environmental effects of transportation.	<p>Projects eligible for funding may include, but are not limited to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - highway landscaping, - provision of roadside recreational opportunities - projects to mitigate the impact of proposed transportation facilities or to enhance the environment. 	<p>To be eligible, projects must be over and above any mitigation required in the environmental document for the transportation project. The MTA coordinates and promotes the use of these funds in Los Angeles County.</p> <p>Statewide discretionary program – No Los Angeles County guarantee or targets</p>	<p>FY02 - \$1.0 m (per Financial Model 8/14/01)</p> <p>Projection based on Financial Forecasting Model:</p> <p>FY03 - \$1.0 m FY04 - \$1.0 m FY05 - \$1.0 m</p>
Article XIX Guideway Funds (For information only; no longer a funding source)	Revenues are generated from the state gasoline excise tax. Article XIX of the California State Constitution allows the gasoline excise tax to be used for public mass transit fixed guideway construction only (rail transit capital projects) if voters of county enact Prop. 5 allowing that use. Prop. 5 received a majority vote in L.A. County in 1972.	<p>Rail Transit Capital Projects.</p> <p>Article XIX of the State Constitution states that the State gas tax can only be used for streets and highways and not for transit purposes. Since Proposition 5 was enacted, transit uses are allowed in LA County for these funds.</p>	<p>Funds are programmed through the STIP and used at MTA discretion.</p> <p>Through Prop. 5, transit projects need to be in the STIP to receive funding and the funding is now part of the regional choice program of SB 45.</p>	Now funded through CTIP (SB45 Regional Choice Program)
Air Quality Vehicle Registration Fee (AB 2766 Discretionary Funds)	AB2766 authorizes an annual \$4 per vehicle surcharge in motor vehicle registration fees in Southern California to fund clean air vehicles and programs. Total funding of \$40 million annually, of which \$13 million is programmed by an eight-member committee known as the Mobile Source Air Pollution Reduction Review Committee (MSRC).	Projects that reduce mobile source emissions, including Bus, Highway, Transportation Demand Management.	30% of the revenues are awarded at the discretion of the MSRC for programs that reduce air pollution. Funds are allocated on an annual basis through a competitive call for projects.	Of the \$13 million allocated annually in Southern California's, awards to MTA vary since the program is discretionary.

FUNDING SOURCE	PROJECT SELECTION	RESPONSIBLE STAFF	TIMELY USE OF FUNDS (WHERE APPLICABLE)	FURTHER INFORMATION (WHERE APPROPRIATE)
Environmental Enhancement & Mitigation (EEM)	State Resources Agency ranks projects; CTC selects final projects for funding.	Administration: David Yale, RP Funds Programming: Gladys Lowe, RGM&A Project Management: Charlene Lorenzo, RGM&A Finance: Basil Panas Accounting		
Article XIX Guideway Funds (For information only; no longer a funding source)	MTA Board	Administration: David Yale, RP Funds Programming: David Yale, RP Finance: Basil Panas Accounting		
Air Quality Vehicle Registration Fee (AB 2766 Discretionary Funds)	Cities and Counties AQMD MSRC	Administration: Doug Kim, LRP Funds Programming: Doug Kim, LRP Grants Management: Brian Boudreau, RGM&A Long Range Forecast: Doug Kim, LRP		

FUNDING SOURCE	DESCRIPTION	ELIGIBLE USES	POLICIES & GUIDELINES	ANNUAL AMOUNT (\$ in Millions)
Petroleum Violation Escrow Account (PVEA)	PVEA revenues are generated from the Exxon & Stripper Well settlement.	Eligible uses for PVEA funds are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Energy conservation plans - Energy outreach programs - innovative and new programs that result in energy savings and/or displaced or non-renewable fuel 	PVEA funds are disbursed to the State by the federal government and deposited in the Federal Trust in the State Treasury. A continuously appropriated fund. Individual projects require specific legislation at the state level.	Variable allocated by legislators on a project basis.
State Gas Tax and Motor Vehicle Fee Subventions – Sections 2105, 2106, 2107, 2107.5 of The Streets and Highways Code	These funds are directly disbursed to the cities from the state.	Street and highway projects that will increase capacity and for busways and repaving. Cannot be used to purchase transit vehicles.	The city must be in conformance with the Congestion Management Plan (CMP) requirements. The MTA must certify the cities' CMPs. If the MTA does not certify the CMP, then the subventions will not be transferred to the city.	Approximately \$220 million annually distributed in Los Angeles County by the State Controller
State PUC Grade Separation Project Fund	The fund provides 80% of the cost to modify an existing railroad/roadway crossing (by grade separation, relocation or other means). The railroad pays 10%, and the local jurisdiction (applicant) pays 10%. The fund provides 50% of the cost of grade separating a <u>new</u> rail/roadway crossing. The local jurisdiction is responsible for paying the remaining 50% (the railroad is not required to pay any of the local share, but the local jurisdiction can seek some or all of this share from the railroad if it chooses).	Rail grade separations.	Applications are made to the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC), which applies a formula based on criteria to rank projects in priority order. Vehicle volume and number of train/vehicle accidents with injuries are the principal prioritization criteria.	About \$15 m/yr. statewide

FUNDING SOURCE	PROJECT SELECTION	RESPONSIBLE STAFF	TIMELY USE OF FUNDS (WHERE APPLICABLE)	FURTHER INFORMATION (WHERE APPROPRIATE)
Petroleum Violation Escrow Account (PVEA)	State legislation adopting slate of Legislature member requests	Administration: Doug Kim, LRP Funds Programming: Doug Kim, LRP Finance: Basil Panas, Accounting Long Range Forecast: Doug Kim, LRP	Time Limit to Obligate/Allocate Funds: Varies, based on the individual contracts between the California Energy Commission and the contractors	Supporting Documentation: Policy guidelines by California Energy Commission
State Gas Tax and Motor Vehicle Fee Subventions – Sections 2105, 2106, 2107, 2107.5 of The Streets and Highways Code	Cities and county choose projects.	Cities and county within Los Angeles County.		
State PUC Grade Separation Project Fund	CPUC ranking determines funding.	Cities and county who make requests. CPUC staff.		

FUNDING SOURCE	DESCRIPTION	ELIGIBLE USES	POLICIES & GUIDELINES	ANNUAL AMOUNT (\$ in Millions)
Highway Bridge Rehabilitation and Replacement (HBRR) Program	TEA-21 (federal) funds administered by Caltrans with varying local match requirements that depend on project type.	Bridges	<p>PROJECT TYPE (FED/LOCAL SHARE):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Seismic Retro (88.53%/11.47%) - Replacement Project (80%/20%) - Rehab. Project (80%/20%) - Bridge Painting (88.53%/11.47%) - Low Water crossing (80%/20%) - Barrier Rail Replacement (88.53%/11.47%) - Special Bridge Program (80%/20%) 	<p>Approximately \$307.5 million statewide for California. Los Angeles County receives approximately \$86 million (based on 28% of statewide total) on an annual basis.</p> <p>No MTA funding received from this program.</p>
State Infrastructure Bank (SIB)/ Transportation Finance Bank (TFB)/California Transportation Infrastructure Bank (CTIB) Revolving Loan Program	<p>TEA-21 established a new State Infrastructure Bank (SIB) pilot program. California was authorized to set up infrastructure revolving funds eligible to be capitalized with FY 98-03 Federal transportation funds.</p> <p>\$3 million was provided to California to initially fund its Transportation Finance Bank (TFB) which is implemented as a revolving loan program to provide short-term financing to public entities and public/private partnerships with the intent of accelerating the delivery of transportation projects.</p> <p>Credit enhancements to lower interest rates and improve marketability or liquidity of bond issues and loans at subsidized rates and/or with flexible repayment are available.</p>	<p>General Eligibility Requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Projected revenue flow sufficient to establish a minimum of 1.15 x debt service coverage - Design-build or fixed procurement contract - Litigation opinion by counsel - Financial plan recommended by competent third party - Project approval by MTA and placement in Regional Transportation Plan <p>Loan Eligibility:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - National Highway System - Surface Transportation Program - Interstate resurfacing, restoration, rehab and reconstruction - Highway bridge replacement and rehabilitation - Interstate reimbursements 	<p>Eligible Borrowers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Local public entities and public/private partnerships - Any local Transportation Planning Agency or County Transportation Commission - Private project sponsors - State DOTs and Highway Departments <p>Applicants will be required to put up \$100,000, \$10,000 of which is non-refundable and used to defray bank expenses in processing the application. Any unexpended amount over \$10,000 will be refunded to the applicant.</p> <p>Loan Requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Highway construction projects must be eligible for assistance under Title 23, United States Code (USC). - Transit capital projects must meet the requirements of Section 5302, Title 49, USC. This includes planning, programming, design, engineering, administrative, and construction. 	Caltrans intends to fund the TFB with \$100 million in credit that can, if necessary, be redeemed from California's future allotments of federal transportation funds.

FUNDING SOURCE	PROJECT SELECTION	RESPONSIBLE STAFF	TIMELY USE OF FUNDS (WHERE APPLICABLE)	FURTHER INFORMATION (WHERE APPROPRIATE)
Highway Bridge Rehabilitation and Replacement (HBRR) Program	Seismic retrofit projects have had the highest priority in recent years, claiming most of the available HBRR funding. The remainder of the funding is allocated to other eligible projects on a first-come first-served basis. Applications are made to Caltrans Local District 7 Office, which forwards them to Caltrans headquarters/CTC for approval.	Caltrans		
State Infrastructure Bank (SIB)/ Transportation Finance Bank (TFB)/California Transportation Infrastructure Bank (CTIB) Revolving Loan Program	MTA, SCAG, Caltrans, CTC, California Economic Development Finance Authority (CEDFA)	Administration: Frank Flores, P&PA Funds Programming and Project Management: David Yale, RP Caltrans Finance: Basil Panas Accounting		

FUNDING SOURCE	DESCRIPTION	ELIGIBLE USES	POLICIES & GUIDELINES	ANNUAL AMOUNT (\$ in Millions)
Carl Moyer Memorial Air Quality Standards Attainment Program	State generated fund established in the annual State budget. The funds are allocated through the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD)	Eligible uses include buses, heavy-duty trucks, marine vessels, agricultural pumps, and related heavy-duty vehicles.	Funds are limited to the purchase of clean fuel heavy-duty vehicles and infrastructure or the retrofitting of older diesel engines with newer diesel technology. Funds are allocated by SCAQMD on a discretionary basis.	Annual amount - \$50 million in FY02. Approximately \$26.4 million for Southern California, including \$7 million for transit buses. Awards to MTA vary since the program is discretionary.

FUNDING SOURCE	PROJECT SELECTION	RESPONSIBLE STAFF	TIMELY USE OF FUNDS (WHERE APPLICABLE)	FURTHER INFORMATION (WHERE APPROPRIATE)
Carl Moyer Memorial Air Quality Standards Attainment Program	SCAQMD authorizes funding on a discretionary basis	Administration: Doug Kim, LRP Funds Programming: Doug Kim, LRP Grants Management: Brian Boudreau, RGM&A Long Range Forecast: Doug Kim, LRP	Time Limit to Obligate/Allocate Funds: Eighteen months Time Limit to Spend Funds: 2 years after obligation	Supporting Documentation: California Environmental Protection Agency's Air Resources Board (ARB)

FUNDING SOURCE	DESCRIPTION	ELIGIBLE USES	POLICIES & GUIDELINES	ANNUAL AMOUNT (\$ in Millions)
----------------	-------------	---------------	-----------------------	-----------------------------------

III. FEDERAL FUNDING SOURCES

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION (FHWA)

Surface Transportation Program (STP)	<p>A transportation program administered by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Caltrans. TEA-21 legislation requires states to distribute STP funds in the following manner:</p> <p>10% - Safety construction 10% - Transportation Enhancement Activities 50% - Regional STP, STP Local, & rural areas guaranteed return. 30% - State discretionary.</p>	<p>Construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation, resurfacing, restoration and operational improvements for roads or highways which are not functionally classified as local or rural minor collectors (including interstate highways and bridges), capital costs for transit projects eligible for Federal Transit Act assistance and publicly-owned intracity or intercity bus terminals & facilities, carpool projects, fringe & corridor parking facilities, bicycle and pedestrian walkways, highway & transit safety improvement & programs, Transportation Enhancement Activities.</p>	<p>CTC and Caltrans</p> <p>Federal participation is 88.53% with 11.47% local match required.</p>	<p>Funds part of State Highway Account (SHA)</p> <p>Included in SB45 CTIP funding levels.</p> <p>Approximately \$680 million statewide for California.</p>
Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP)	<p>Portion of STP funds which are programmed by the MTA as LA County's Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA). 50% of State STP funds become the RSTP program.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation, resurfacing, restoration and operational improvements for highways (including interstate highways and bridges), - Capital costs for transit projects eligible for assistance under the Federal Transit Act and publicly-owned intra-city or intercity bus terminals and facilities, carpool projects, fringe and corridor parking facilities, bicycle and pedestrian walkways, highway and transit safety improvement & programs, Transportation Enhancement Activities 	<p>MTA allocates RSTP funds to eligible projects based on inclusion in the Long Range Transportation Plan and through the competitive Call for Projects process.</p> <p>Federal participation is 88.53% with 11.47% local match required.</p>	<p>Actual FY02 - \$94.1 m</p> <p>Forecast based on Financial Forecasting Model (8/14/01):</p> <p>FY03 - \$96.1 m FY04 - \$97.4 m FY05 - \$98.8 m</p>
Surface Transportation Program - State	<p>30% of STP funds which are retained for the State to use at its discretion.</p>	<p>See SHOPP above.</p>	<p>Policies and guidelines are set by the CTC.</p>	<p>Part of the State Highway Account (SHA) and Fund Estimate</p>

FUNDING SOURCE	PROJECT SELECTION	RESPONSIBLE STAFF	TIMELY USE OF FUNDS (WHERE APPLICABLE)	FURTHER INFORMATION (WHERE APPROPRIATE)
----------------	-------------------	-------------------	--	---

III. FEDERAL FUNDING SOURCES

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION (FHWA)

Surface Transportation Program (STP)	CTC	Administration: Frank Flores, P&PA Funds Programming: David Yale, RP Grants Management: Brian Boudreau, RGM&A Finance: Josie Nicasio, Accounting		
Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP)	MTA Board Call for Projects process	Administration: Frank Flores, P&PA Funds Programming: David Yale, RP Grants Management: Brian Boudreau, RGM&A Finance: Josie Nicasio, Accounting	Time Limit to Obligate/Allocate Funds: 1 year to use obligation authority from start of fiscal year of appropriation Time Limit to Spend Funds: 3 federal fiscal years including the federal fiscal year apportioned	Supporting Documentation: AB 1012 guidelines and legislation, Call for Projects Letter of Agreement (LOA) if funds assigned
Surface Transportation Program - State	Project selection is through the CTC via the STIP process and Fund Estimate.	Administration: Frank Flores, P&PA Funds Programming: David Yale, RP Finance: Josie Nicasio, Accounting		

FUNDING SOURCE	DESCRIPTION	ELIGIBLE USES	POLICIES & GUIDELINES	ANNUAL AMOUNT (\$ in Millions)
Surface Transportation Program Local (STP-L)	This portion of STP funds is apportioned on a per capita basis to each of the 88 jurisdictions in the County including the County of Los Angeles as a subset of the Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP)	Construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation, resurfacing, restoration and operational improvements for highways (including interstate highways and bridges), capital costs for transit projects eligible for assistance under the Federal Transit Act and publicly-owned intracity or intercity bus terminals and facilities, carpool projects, fringe and corridor parking facilities, bicycle and pedestrian walkways, highway and transit safety improvement & programs.	Guidelines established by the U.S. Department of Transportation and the MTA (STP-L lapsing policy).	\$29.8 million allocated annually by formula to local jurisdictions. Allocation reduces RSTP available funds.
Regional - Transportation Enhancement Activities (TEA)	<p>10% of STP funds are reserved for the TEA program. Of this amount, 75% is allocated to local regional agencies and 25% is reserved for the State TEA program.</p> <p>This program funds the design and construction of improvements which beautify or enhance the interface between transportation systems and adjacent communities.</p>	Projects eligible for TEA funds include: Pedestrian facilities; acquisition of scenic or historic sites or easement; funding of scenic or historic highway programs; archaeological planning and research; landscaping and other scenic beautification; rehabilitation and operation of historic transportation buildings, structures, or facilities; acquisition of abandoned rail rights-of-way for public use; control of or removal of outdoor advertising; and the mitigation of water pollution due to highway run-off; provision of safety and educational activities for pedestrians and bicyclists; establishment of transportation museums.	Caltrans and CTC established policies and guidelines for the TEA program that were adopted on October 28, 1998 by the CTC.	MTA's share of the 75% portion annually allocated is approximately \$11.5 million.
State - Transportation Enhancement Activities (TEA)	25% portion of the total TEA funds available from the Surface Transportation Program.	<p>See Regional TEA above.</p> <p>The funds are divided between</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Statewide Environmental Enhancement Share (11%) - The Conservation Lands Share (3%) - The Caltrans Share (11%) 	CTC adopted program October 28, 1998.	The Statewide 25% portion is approximately \$17 million

FUNDING SOURCE	PROJECT SELECTION	RESPONSIBLE STAFF	TIMELY USE OF FUNDS (WHERE APPLICABLE)	FURTHER INFORMATION (WHERE APPROPRIATE)
Surface Transportation Program Local (STP-L)	Local jurisdictions as permitted by the FHWA and MTA	Administration: Frank Flores, P&PA Funds Programming and Project Management: Hal Suetsugu, RP Gigi Burns, RP	Time Limit to obligate Funds: 3 federal fiscal years including the federal fiscal year apportioned	Supporting Documentation: MTA STP-L Lapsing Policy CALTRANS Local Programs Procedures by the CALTRANS Office of Local Assistance Program
Regional - Transportation Enhancement Activities (TEA)	MTA ranks projects in the Call for Projects. Approved in FTIP	Administration: Frank Flores, P&PA Funds Programming: Carol Dedeaux, RGM&A Finance: Josie Nicasio, Accounting	Time Limit to Obligate/Allocate Funds: 1 year to use obligation authority from start of fiscal year of appropriation Time Limit to Spend Funds: 3 years to allocate/obligate funds with one time extension made at least a year in advance. After 4 years funds go back to federal government	Supporting Documentation: AB 1012 guidelines and legislation, Call for Projects Letter of Agreement (LOA) if funds assigned
State - Transportation Enhancement Activities (TEA)	Caltrans, CTC and State Resources Agency State Call for Projects	Administration: Frank Flores, P&PA Funds Programming: CTC Accounting: Josie Nicasio, Controller	Time Limit to Obligate/Allocate Funds: 1 year to use obligation authority from start of fiscal year of appropriation Time Limit to Spend Funds: 3 years to allocate/obligate funds with one time extension made at least a year in advance. After 4 years funds go back to federal government.	Supporting Documentation: AB 1012 guidelines and legislation, Call for Projects Letter of Agreement (LOA) if funds assigned

FUNDING SOURCE	DESCRIPTION	ELIGIBLE USES	POLICIES & GUIDELINES	ANNUAL AMOUNT (\$ in Millions)
Federal Highway Demonstration Funds	Federally authorized funding for projects designated in the 1991 ISTEA and subsequently reauthorized in TEA-21.	May be used for project development, right-of-way and construction for designated projects.	Must follow state guidelines for reimbursement of project expenses from the State Highway Account. No direct MTA involvement occurs.	In Los Angeles County, 36 TEA-21 projects totaling \$306 million over six years, averaging \$50 million per year.
Highways of National Significance (NHS)	Federal Highway program administered by Caltrans for Highways of National Significance, to be determined by the Metropolitan Planning Organization.	All capital highway uses on the eligible system.	Programmed by the CTC through the STIP process.	Approximately \$561.7 million statewide for California. Los Angeles County receives approximately \$157 million (based on 28% of statewide total).
Congestion Mitigation & Air Quality Program (CMAQ)	Program designed to fund projects that contribute to the attainment of national ambient air quality standards with a focus on ozone and carbon monoxide. Projects in this program must be consistent with a State Implementation Plan (SIP) that has been approved pursuant to the Clean Air Act. Funds may not be provided for projects that result in construction of new capacity available to single occupant vehicles.	Typical projects include: public transit improvements, high occupancy vehicle lanes, employer-based transportation management plans and incentives, traffic flow improvement programs, fringe parking facilities servicing multiple occupancy vehicles, shared-ride services, and bicycle and pedestrian facilities.	Funds are distributed through the State Highway Account by Caltrans based on established formula. Federal participation is 88.53% with 11.47% local match required.	Actual FY02 - \$129.1 m Forecast based on (8/14/01) financial forecasting model: FY03 - \$130.9 m FY04 - \$125.1 m FY05 - \$112.8 m

FUNDING SOURCE	PROJECT SELECTION	RESPONSIBLE STAFF	TIMELY USE OF FUNDS (WHERE APPLICABLE)	FURTHER INFORMATION (WHERE APPROPRIATE)
Federal Highway Demonstration Funds	Projects selected by Congress upon recommendation of local jurisdictions.	Congressional Earmarks: Claudette Moody, Government Relations Administration: Ray Maekawa, TDI Caltrans Funds Programming: Caltrans Recipient Jurisdictions		
Highways of National Significance (NHS)	Projects selected by the CTC through the STIP and SHOPP programs.	Administration: Ray Maekawa, TDI Funds Programming: Caltrans		
Congestion Mitigation & Air Quality Program (CMAQ)	MTA Board of Directors Call for Projects	Administration: Frank Flores, P&PA Funds Programming: David Yale, RP Grants Management: Brian Boudreau, RGM&A Finance: Josie Nicasio, Accounting	Time Limit to Obligate/Allocate Funds: 1 year to use obligation authority from start of fiscal year of appropriation Time Limit to Spend Funds: 3 federal fiscal years including the federal fiscal year apportioned	Supporting Documentation: AB 1012 guidelines and legislation, Call for Projects Letter of Agreement (LOA) if funds assigned

FUNDING SOURCE	DESCRIPTION	ELIGIBLE USES	POLICIES & GUIDELINES	ANNUAL AMOUNT (\$ in Millions)
FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION (FTA)				
Section 5307 Urbanized Area Formula Funds Program	<p>Funds appropriated by Congress on an annual basis. Section 5307 is an Urbanized Area Formula Program allocated on a formula basis which makes Federal sources available to urbanized areas and to the Governors for transit capital and operating assistance in urbanized areas and for transportation-related planning.</p> <p>For an urbanized area of 200,000 or more in population as designated by the Bureau of Census, the funds are apportioned and flow directly to a designated recipient. While an urbanized area of 50,000 to 200,000 in population is subject to state allocations and Caltrans distribution.</p>	<p>The Urbanized Area Formula Program funds are restricted to Bus and Rail capital and Preventive Maintenance. These funds are also allocated on a formula basis to each urbanized area in the nation. Locally, 85% is distributed by formula and 15% is distributed by discretion.</p> <p>In addition, 1% of the overall funds received annually are used for Transit Enhancement projects. Such uses include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Historic preservation - Bus shelters - Landscaping - Public art - Pedestrian access and walkways 	<p>National guidelines and formula allocation developed by the FTA.</p> <p>Section 5307 has an 80% federal participation with a 20% local match. However, federal participation is 83% if the local agency purchases buses that are compliant with the ADA and the Clean Air Act. The local match can be as low as 10% in certain instances, such as innovative environmental standards.</p>	<p>Projected FY02 = \$174.1 million</p> <p>Forecast based on Financial Forecasting Model (8/14/01) for entire County of Los Angeles:</p> <p>FY03 - \$184.4 m FY04 - \$187.0 m FY05 - \$189.6 m</p>
Section 5308 Clean Fuels Formula Program	<p>This program supports the global warming initiative by providing an opportunity to accelerate the introduction of advanced bus propulsion technologies into the mainstream of the nation's transit fleets. When the authorization in this formula grants account is combined with the authorization in the Discretionary Grants account, a total of \$1 billion is authorized for the Clean Fuels Formula Grant Program during the TEA-21 period.</p>	<p>Eligible projects include the purchasing or leasing of clean fuel buses and facilities, and the improvement of existing facilities to accommodate clean fuel buses.</p> <p>Clean fuel buses include those powered compressed natural gas, liquefied natural gas, biodiesel fuels, batteries, alcohol-based fuels, hybrid electric, fuel cell, certain clean diesel, and other low emissions technology.</p>	<p>The FTA develops policies and guidelines. Available funds will be allocated among the eligible grant applications using a formula based on area's nonattainment rating, number of buses, and bus passenger-miles.</p> <p>For the last two years, Congress has allocated funds as part of Section 5309 Bus and Bus Facilities the last two years.</p> <p>Section 5309 has an 80% federal participation with a 20% local match. However, federal participation is 83% if the local agency purchases buses that are compliant with the ADA and the Clean Air Act.</p>	<p>Congress has distributed these funds annually during the TEA-21 period as part of Section 5309 discretionary program.</p> <p>Projected FY02 = \$2.7 million</p> <p>Forecast based on Financial Forecasting Model (8/14/01) for entire County of Los Angeles:</p> <p>FY04 - \$2.7 m FY05 - \$3.0 m FY06 - \$4.0 m</p>

FUNDING SOURCE	PROJECT SELECTION	RESPONSIBLE STAFF	TIMELY USE OF FUNDS (WHERE APPLICABLE)	FURTHER INFORMATION (WHERE APPROPRIATE)
FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION (FTA)				
Section 5307 Urbanized Area Formula Funds Program	Funds distributed by MTA's Formula Allocation Procedure and included in MTA Budget.	Administration: Frank Flores, P&PA Funds Programming: David Yale, RP Grants Management: Brian Boudreau, RGM&A Finance: Josie Nicasio, Accounting	Time Limit to Obligate/Allocate Funds: 4 years (includes year of appropriation) Time Limit to Spend Funds: indefinitely	Supporting Documentation: US Code Title 49 Section 5307
Section 5308 Clean Fuels Formula Program	MTA Capital Budget process.	Administration: Frank Flores, P&PA Funds Programming and Grants Management: Brian Boudreau, RGM&A Finance: Josie Nicasio, Accounting		

FUNDING SOURCE	DESCRIPTION	ELIGIBLE USES	POLICIES & GUIDELINES	ANNUAL AMOUNT (\$ in Millions)
Section 5309 New Starts Discretionary Program	These are funds from the FTA Capital Program and are to be used for capital projects that will benefit the county's transit systems. The funds come from revenues generated by 18.3 cent federal excise tax on a gallon of gasoline.	Funds are used for rail transit capital improvements.	Developed by FTA based on Full Funding Grant Agreements negotiated between the MTA and FTA. Federal participation is 80% with 20% local match.	Projected FY02 - \$55.2m Forecast based on Financial Forecasting Model 7-14-00: FY03 - \$58.5 m FY04 - \$70.0 m FY05 - \$99.3 m FY06 - \$99.3 m FY07 - \$70.0 m
Section 5309 Fixed Guideway Modernization Formula Funds Program	These are funds from the FTA Capital Program and are to be for capital projects that will benefit the county's transit systems. Fixed guideway modernization funds are allocated by formula in Section 5309 of the Federal Transit Act. The formula is based on the number of miles of existing fixed guideways (busways or railways) and passenger miles traveled in the urbanized area. A fixed guideway must be operating for 7 years before it can begin to receive allocations.	Funds can be used for fixed guideway transit capital improvements and vehicles used on those systems.	The FTA develops policies and guidelines. Federal participation is 80% with 20% local match.	Projected FY02 - \$21.6m Forecast based on Financial Forecasting Model 8-14-01: FY03 - \$26.6 m FY04 - \$27.0 m FY05 - \$27.4 m
Section 5309 Bus and Bus Facilities Discretionary Program	These are funds from the FTA Capital Program and are to be for capital projects that will benefit the county's transit systems. In a typical year, approximately half of Section 5309 funds are spent for construction or rehabilitation of facilities and half for acquisition of vehicles.	Funds can be used for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the purchase of buses for fleet and service expansion - bus-related equipment - paratransit vehicles - construction of bus-related facilities - transfer facilities, bus malls, and transportation centers - bus preventive maintenance - passenger amenities such as passenger shelters and bus stop signs 	The FTA develops policies and guidelines. Federal participation is 80% with 20% local match.	\$3-5 million annually by Congress on a discretionary basis.

FUNDING SOURCE	PROJECT SELECTION	RESPONSIBLE STAFF	TIMELY USE OF FUNDS (WHERE APPLICABLE)	FURTHER INFORMATION (WHERE APPROPRIATE)
Section 5309 New Starts Discretionary Program	MTA Board of Directors	Administration: Frank Flores, P&PA Funds Programming: David Yale, RP Grants Management: Brian Boudreau, RGM&A Finance: Josie Nicasio, Accounting	Time Limit to Obligate/Allocate Funds: 3 years (includes year of appropriation) Time Limit to Spend Funds: indefinitely	Supporting Documentation: US Code Title 49 Section 5309
Section 5309 Fixed Guideway Modernization Formula Funds Program	MTA Capital Budget process.	Administration: Frank Flores, P&PA Funds Programming and Grants Management: Brian Boudreau, RGM&A Finance: Josie Nicasio, Accounting Long Range Forecast: Carlos Monroy, OMB	Time Limit to Obligate/Allocate Funds: 4 years (includes year of appropriation) Time Limit to Spend Funds: indefinitely	Supporting Documentation: US Code Title 49 Section 5309
Section 5309 Bus and Bus Facilities Discretionary Program	Congress	Administration: Frank Flores, P&PA Funds Programming and Grants Management: Brian Boudreau, RGM&A Finance: Josie Nicasio, Accounting	Time Limit to Obligate/Allocate Funds: 3 years (includes year of appropriation) Time Limit to Spend Funds: indefinitely	Supporting Documentation: US Code Title 49 Section 5309

FUNDING SOURCE	DESCRIPTION	ELIGIBLE USES	POLICIES & GUIDELINES	ANNUAL AMOUNT (\$ in Millions)
Section 5310 Elderly/ Paratransit Formula Funds Program (Local Non-Profit Organization)	Section 5310 of the Federal Transit Act declares that elderly persons and persons with disabilities shall have the same right as other persons to utilize mass transportation facilities and services.	The FTA pays for 80% of the vehicle cost and the social service agency pays the remaining 20% of the cost.	National Guidelines developed by FTA. State Guidelines developed by Caltrans. Local guidelines developed by MTA. Non-profit organizations apply annually through a local process.	\$2 million annually for Los Angeles County.
Section 5310 Elderly/ Paratransit Formula Funds Program (Contracted Paratransit)	Section 5310 of the Federal Transit Act declares that elderly persons and persons with disabilities shall have the same right as other persons to utilize mass transportation facilities and services.	Currently Access Services, Inc. (ASI)- Federal participation is 88.53% with 11.47% local match.	National Guidelines developed by FTA. Access Services, Inc., (ASI) applies annually for a Federal grant to fund contracted paratransit service.	Access Services, Inc. (ASI) receives approximately \$41 million in annual RSTP funding through MTA. This funding is flexed by Caltrans with the concurrence of FHWA to the Section 5310 program. MTA recommends to Caltrans the annual flexing of the funds from FHWA to FTA.

FUNDING SOURCE	PROJECT SELECTION	RESPONSIBLE STAFF	TIMELY USE OF FUNDS (WHERE APPLICABLE)	FURTHER INFORMATION (WHERE APPROPRIATE)
Section 5310 Elderly/ Paratransit Formula Funds Program (Local Non-Profit Organization)	MTA Board of Directors select projects with recommendations submitted by MTA Countywide Planning.	Administration: Jim McLaughlin, RSP Funds Programming: Ellen Blackman, RSP Grants Management: Brian Boudreau, RGM&A Finance: Josie Nicasio, Accounting Long Range Forecast: Scott Greene, RSP	Time Limit to Obligation Authority/Allocate Funds: 1 years (includes year of appropriation) Time Limit to Spend Funds: 3 federal fiscal years including the federal fiscal year apportioned	Supporting Documentation: US Code Title 49 Section 5310
Section 5310 Elderly/ Paratransit Formula Funds Program (Contracted Paratransit)	MTA Board of Directors	Administration: Jim McLaughlin, RSP Funds Programming: Scott Greene, RSP Grants Management: Brian Boudreau, RGM&A Finance: Josie Nicasio, Accounting Long Range Forecast: Scott Greene, RSP		

FUNDING SOURCE	DESCRIPTION	ELIGIBLE USES	POLICIES & GUIDELINES	ANNUAL AMOUNT (\$ in Millions)
<p>Section 3037 Jobs Access and Reverse Commute Program (Welfare-to- Work)</p>	<p>MTA has received two separate earmarks for funds from the FTA's JARC program. Both require 50% match with local funds. Both will likely receive matching funds from L.A. County Department of Public Social Services (DPSS).</p> <p>First grant will be used for the Unanticipated Transportation Needs Service (U-Trans), a project aimed at providing as-needed rides to qualified Welfare-to-Work participants.</p> <p>Second grant will be used for a shuttle and vanpool program for work, day care and health care trips.</p> <p>Third grant will evaluate the needs of late night transit in high need areas and implement a demonstration project of this service.</p>	<p>FTA requires a coordinated human services/transportation planning process involving state or local agencies, non-profit organizations, and designated recipients under FTA Section 5307 Program.</p> <p>JARC funds can be used for marketing, transit vouchers, shuttles, and employer provided transportation such as shuttles, ridesharing, carpooling, and transit passes and benefits; also other programs supporting carpooling, shared-ride use, such as jitneys or special paratransit service.</p> <p>For welfare recipients and eligible low-income individuals. Reverse commute services by adding bus, train, care and vanpooling, van routes or service, or purchase or lease of a van or bus dedicated to shuttling employees from main residence to workplace and return.</p>	<p>If matching funds are from DPSS, then they must be used for programs aimed at CalWORKs' participants. Must target transportation needs as identified in CalWORKs Transportation Needs Assessment.</p>	<p>First FTA grant is for \$1 million over two years with equal amount in local match. Total of \$1 million per year with combined funding sources.</p> <p>Second FTA grant is for \$3.5 million over two years with similar local match. Total of \$3.5 million per year with combined funding sources.</p> <p>Third FTA grant is for \$2 million over two years with 50% local match. Total of \$2 million per year with combined funding sources.</p> <p>FY03: \$2.0 M</p>
<p>Federal Transit Act (49 USC) Section 5313(b) For State Planning and Research Program</p>	<p>Funded under the Transit Planning and Research Department, funds are to be used for state planning and research.</p>	<p>Statewide planning and other technical assistance activities (including supplementing the technical assistance program provided through the Metropolitan Planning Formula Program), planning support for nonurbanized areas, research, development and demonstration projects, fellowships for training in the public transportation field, university research, and human resource development.</p>	<p>Funds are allocated by formula based on information received from the latest census and the State's urbanized area as compared to the urbanized area of "all" states. However, a State must receive at least 0.5 % of the amount apportioned under this subsection.</p> <p>The Federal share is 80 % and the local share is 20 %.</p>	<p>Funds are allocated from the federal government to SCAG. Any funds that the MTA receives are indirect and due only to a joint effort between the MTA and SCAG.</p>
<p>Sec. 5314. - National planning and research programs</p>	<p>This program is intended to help Mass Transportation providers comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act</p>	<p>The program can be in the form of mass transportation-related technical assistance, demonstration programs, research, public education, and other activities.</p>	<p>Not more than 25 % of the amounts is available to the Secretary for special demonstration initiatives, subject to terms the Secretary considers consistent with this program</p>	<p>\$3 M nationwide</p>

FUNDING SOURCE	PROJECT SELECTION	RESPONSIBLE STAFF	TIMELY USE OF FUNDS (WHERE APPLICABLE)	FURTHER INFORMATION (WHERE APPROPRIATE)
Section 3037 Jobs Access and Reverse Commute Program (Welfare-to-Work)	U-TRANS involved collaborative effort between MTA, DPSS and the Access to Jobs Sub-Group. The Shuttle and Vanpool proposal involved collaborative effort between MTA, DPSS, and the Transportation Inter-Agency Task Force. An RFP will be issued for specific projects under this proposal.	Administration: Jim McLaughlin, RSP Funds Programming: Desiree Portillo-Rabinov, RSP Grants Administration: Armineh Saint, RGM&A	Time Limit to Spend Funds: 2 federal fiscal years from the start of the project	
Federal Transit Act (49 USC) Section 5313(b) For State Planning and Research Program	Not Applicable	Administration: Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) Funds Programming: SCAG Consultation Staff at MTA: Frank Flores, P&PA David Sikes, RGM&A		
Sec. 5314. - National planning and research programs	To the extent practicable, the Secretary shall carry out this paragraph through a contract with a national nonprofit organization serving individuals with disabilities that has a demonstrated capacity to carry out the activities.	Funds Programming: Ellen Blackman, RSP		

FUNDING SOURCE	DESCRIPTION	ELIGIBLE USES	POLICIES & GUIDELINES	ANNUAL AMOUNT (\$ in Millions)
----------------	-------------	---------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------

**IV. OTHER FEDERAL AND STATE TRANSPORTATION FUNDING PROGRAM
(not MTA funded, provided for information only)**

Local Bridge Seismic Safety Retrofit Program (LBSSRP)	LBSSRP is a part of the statewide Seismic Safety Retrofit Program. The purpose of this program is to provide funding assistance to local agencies for remedying structural seismic design deficiencies of public bridges on local streets and roads in California.	Bridge retrofitting only. Reimbursable work includes consultant selection, seismic analysis leading to strategy, environmental, right of way, PS&E, construction, construction engineering and local agency overhead.	Local bridge retrofit projects developed under the mandated Seismic Safety Retrofit Program are funded fully (100%) with a combination of Federal and State funds.	The primary funding sources are the local share of the Federal HBRR funds with State Highway Account funds providing the required match to the federal funds.
Hazard Elimination Safety Program (HES)	HES is a federal safety program that provides funds for safety improvements on all public roads and highways. These funds serve to eliminate or reduce the number and/or severity of traffic accidents at locations selected for improvement.	Local safety projects financed with HES funds may be located on any road functionally classified as "local road or rural minor collector" or higher.	The first category of projects qualifying for HES funds is based on a calculated Safety Index. The second category is for those projects qualifying based on Work Type priority. Safety Index projects receive approximately 25 % of available HES funds, whereas Work Type priority projects receive approximately 75 %.	The annual program funding level is approximately \$10 million. The Federal reimbursement is 90% or 100%, depending upon the category of work.
Railroad/ Highway At-Grade Crossing	The purpose of the Railroad/Highway At-Grade Crossing Program is to reduce the number and severity of highway accidents by eliminating hazards to vehicles and pedestrians at existing railroad crossings. (23 U.S.C. 130),	Installation and upgrade of railroad protection systems to a state-of-the-art condition at grade crossings, such as installation and upgrade of railroad protection systems grade crossing eliminations via: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Relocation or realignment of highway(s) · Relocation or realignment of railroad(s) · Closure of crossing(s) 	Federal funding for the Railroad/Highway Grade Crossing Program is derived from the annual apportionment for the Surface Transportation Program (STP). Ten % of the annual STP apportionment is reserved for the safety programs defined by Sections 130, (railroad/highway crossing improvements) and 152 (hazard elimination projects). The non-Federal share of 10% of project costs is normally the responsibility of the local agency with jurisdiction for the highway/railroad grade crossing.	The estimated program funding at the Federal level for the Railroad/Highway Grade Crossing Program is \$10 million per year nationally. The Federal share payable is 90%.

FUNDING SOURCE	PROJECT SELECTION	RESPONSIBLE STAFF	TIMELY USE OF FUNDS (WHERE APPLICABLE)	FURTHER INFORMATION (WHERE APPROPRIATE)
----------------	-------------------	-------------------	--	---

**IV. OTHER FEDERAL AND STATE TRANSPORTATION FUNDING PROGRAM
(not MTA funded, provided for information only)**

Local Bridge Seismic Safety Retrofit Program (LBSSRP)	This mandated program is limited to those bridges that are determined to be Category 1- bridges that may collapse in a seismic event and potentially threaten public safety.	Los Angeles County; Lead agency for local bridges in Los Angeles County.		http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/seispage/guide07seism.pdf
Hazard Elimination Safety Program (HES)	Local agencies compete for HES funds by submitting candidate safety projects to Caltrans for review and analysis. Caltrans prioritizes these projects statewide, and releases an annual HES Program Plan that identifies the projects that are approved for funding.	CALTRANS	Local agencies are required to provide an update of project schedules and costs on January 1 and July 1 of each year for all projects in the three-year program that have not been awarded. Local agencies that fail to provide these semi-annual updates on schedules and costs will have their projects dropped from the program.	http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/lpp/LPP97-04.pdf
Railroad/ Highway At-Grade Crossing	The funding of the projects will be on a first come first served basis from October 1 until July 1 of each fiscal year. If an agreement is not requested by July 1, and the funding balance is available, projects from the next fiscal year will be eligible for advanced funding. The funding for this program must be obligated by June 30 of each year, otherwise the unobligated funds will be reverted back to the State Highway Account.	CALTRANS	Caltrans, Division of Local Assistance transmits the Joint CPUC/CALTRANS approved funding list to Caltrans districts, local agencies, railroads, CPUC and MPOs by July 1 of each year. Local agencies and railroad companies are required to provide an update of project schedules and costs on January 1 and July 1 of each year. Local agencies that fail to provide these semi-annual updates will result in their projects being dropped from the program.	http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/lpp/LPP97-05.pdf

FUNDING SOURCE	DESCRIPTION	ELIGIBLE USES	POLICIES & GUIDELINES	ANNUAL AMOUNT (\$ in Millions)
Safe Routes to School Program (SR2S)	The Safe Routes to School (SR2S) program is in its third year of a five-year (having been extended by 3 years) demonstration period that resulted from the passage and signing of Assembly Bill 1475 (Soto) in 1999. SR2S funds are federal transportation safety funds.	Sidewalk improvements, Traffic calming & speed reduction, Pedestrian/bicycle crossing improvements, On-street bicycle facilities, Off-street bicycle/pedestrian facilities, Traffic diversion improvements.	SR2S is a construction program. However, costs for programs or activities related to education, enforcement or encouragement are eligible for reimbursement when those costs are related to the construction improvement and incidental to the overall cost of the project.	The total amount of SR2S funds that are requested by an applicant for a project should not exceed \$500,000. The federal reimbursement ratio for all projects will be 90%. The annual program funding level is around \$20 million nationally.
Pedestrian Safety Program (PSP)	The PSP is a single-year program that resulted from Assembly Bill 2522 (Shelley) and is funded from State Transportation funds. Caltrans makes grants available to local governmental agencies based on the results of a statewide competition that requires submission of proposals for funding and rates those proposals on set criteria	Used for construction improvements and traffic safety or enforcement activities.	All project applications must include a public education component. Projects that require continuous operational costs, such as enhanced traffic enforcement activities or crossing guards at school cross walks, must identify the duration of these services.	The maximum amount of PSP funds that an applicant can request for a project is \$400,000. The reimbursement ratio for all projects will be 100%. Applications that contain total project costs that exceed \$400,000 must identify elements of the project that are being financed with other sources and exclude those elements from the scope of this funding request. The annual fund program level is \$8 million.
Bicycle Transportation Account (BTA)	The BTA is intended to provide funds for bicycle transportation, which is recognized as an important and low cost mode of public transportation	Projects that improve safety and convenience for bicycle commuters.	To be eligible for funding, cities and counties must have an adopted Bicycle Transportation Plan that complies with Streets and Highways Code Section 891.2 and has been approved by the appropriate regional Trans. plng. agency and CALTRANS	For 2002/03, the amount is \$ 7.2 million statewide. Applicant should provide a local match of at least 10 % of the total cost. The max amount received is 25% of total outlay
Emergency Relief Program	The ER program is a special program from the Highway Trust fund for the repair and reconstruction of Federal-aid highways and roads on Federal lands, which have suffered serious damage as a result of natural disasters or catastrophic failures from an external cause.	The funds are to be used for the reconstruction of roads, streets and bridges on Federal-aid highways, Federal domain roads and trails that are damaged by floods, earthquakes, hurricanes or other catastrophes.	Federal-aid highways are defined as all functionally classified roads except those roads functionally classified as local roads or rural minor collectors. For damage to roads not on Federal-aid highway, local agencies should seek disaster assistance from the State Office of Emergency Services (OES) and the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA).	Currently, the maximum amount available to a single State cannot exceed \$100M per disaster. The Federal reimbursement share of an eligible Emergency Relief project is the normal reimbursement ratio (88.53% on local highways) for the highway facility on which the ER project is located.

FUNDING SOURCE	PROJECT SELECTION	RESPONSIBLE STAFF	TIMELY USE OF FUNDS (WHERE APPLICABLE)	FURTHER INFORMATION (WHERE APPROPRIATE)
Safe Routes to School Program (SR2S)	<p>The rating factors and criteria are</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification and demonstration of needs • Potential for proposed improvement to correct or improve the problem • Potential for encouraging increased walking and bicycling among students • Consultation and support for project by school-based associations, local traffic engineers, local elected officials, law enforcement agencies, school officials, and other community groups • Potential for timely implementation of project 	<p>Caltrans District staff will solicit candidate SR2S projects from local agencies within their District boundaries.</p>		<p>http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/lam/p24sr2s.pdf</p>
Pedestrian Safety Program (PSP)	<p>Factors used to rate a project are</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Needs of the applicant as demonstrated by a high rate of pedestrian injuries or fatalities • Potential of the proposal for reducing pedestrian injuries and fatalities • Potential of the proposal for encouraging increased walking • Proposed public education efforts to encourage pedestrian safety and awareness • Consultation and support for project by local traffic engineers, local elected officials, law enforcement agencies, and other government or community groups • Potential for timely implementation of project 	<p>Caltrans District staff will solicit candidate PSP projects from local agencies within their District boundaries.</p>	<p>Applicants are required to provide an update of project schedules and costs on July 1 of each year for each project that has not been awarded a construction contract by that date. Applicants that fail to provide these annual status reports may have their projects dropped from the program.</p>	<p>http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/psp/PSPguidelines.pdf</p>
Bicycle Transportation Account (BTA)	<p>The local agency must submit the BTP to the appropriate Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) or Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) for review and certification that it complies with Section 891.2 of the Streets and Highways Code and the Regional Transportation plan (RTP). Following regional approval, the BTP is submitted to Caltrans Bicycle Facilities Unit for review and approval</p>	<p>The Bicycle Facilities Unit (BFU) in the CALTRANS Local Assistance Program.</p>		<p>http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/bta.htm</p>
Emergency Relief Program	<p>Prerequisites for all disaster programs: The governing body of a local agency should declare that a "local emergency" exists within its jurisdictional boundaries. CALTRANS, in cooperation with the FHWA and local agency Engineers, will conduct a route-by-route windshield survey of all Federal-aid highways if the initial telephone survey indicates that appreciable damage has occurred.</p>	<p>LOCAL AGENCY, CALTRANS and State Office of Emergency Services</p>	<p>A local agency must declare itself in a "State of Local Emergency" within ten (10) calendar days of the actual disaster occurrence. Failure to declare a local emergency within the 10-day calendar period may jeopardize the local agency's opportunity of obtaining financial assistance under the various disaster programs.</p>	<p>http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/lam/prog_g/g11er.pdf</p>

FUNDING SOURCE	DESCRIPTION	ELIGIBLE USES	POLICIES & GUIDELINES	ANNUAL AMOUNT (\$ in Millions)
----------------	-------------	---------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------

FEDERAL DISCRETIONARY PROGRAM				
Discretionary Bridge Program (DBP)	The HBRRP includes a Discretionary Bridge Program (DBP) component for the replacement or rehabilitation of high-cost highway bridges and for the seismic retrofit of highway bridges.	The replacement or rehabilitation of a deficient bridge that is located on a Federal-aid highway and has an estimated cost of more than \$10 million, or a cost that is twice the amount of HBRRP funds apportioned to the State in which the bridge is located. Projects for the seismic retrofit of non-deficient highway bridges are also eligible.	Projects selected for funding under this program are funded at an 80 % Federal share and are subject to obligation limitation. For FY 2000, available funding was reduced to 87.1 % of the authorized amount, however, 100 % obligation authority was provided with the allocated funds. The available funding may also be decreased in FY 2001 - FY 2003.	The allocation for FY 2002 is \$100 Million nationally with \$25 Million for seismic retrofit projects
National Corridor Planning and Development Program (NCPD)	The purpose of the National Corridor Planning and Development Program is to provide allocations to States and metropolitan planning organizations for coordinated planning, design, and construction of corridors of national significance, economic growth, and international or interregional trade.	Feasibility studies; Comprehensive corridor planning and design activities; Location and routing studies; Multistate and intrastate coordination for corridors; Environmental review or construction after review by the Secretary of a development and management plan for the corridor or useable section of the corridor. Eligibility is limited to: The 21 corridors identified in ISTEA, the 8 added in the 1995 National Highway Designation Act, and the 14 added by the 1998 TEA-21, as well as any modifications to these corridors made in succeeding legislation.	The Federal share for projects funded through these programs is 80% (sliding scale applies). Obligations for each of these two programs will be limited each year by the requirements of Section 1102 (Obligation Ceiling) of the TEA-21.	The NCPD and CBI programs are funded by a single funding source. The combined authorized funding for these two programs is \$140 million in each year nationally from FY 1999 to FY 2003
Coordinated Border Infrastructure Program (CBI)	The purpose of the Coordinated Border Infrastructure Program is to improve the safe movement of people and goods at or across the border between the United States and Canada and the border between the United States and Mexico.	Improvements to existing transportation and supporting infrastructure that facilitate cross border vehicle and cargo movements. Construction of highways and related safety and safety enforcement facilities that will facilitate vehicle and cargo movements related to international trade. Operational improvements, including improvements relating to electronic data interchange and use of telecommunications, to expedite cross border vehicle and cargo movement. Modifications to regulatory procedures to expedite cross border vehicle and cargo movements. International coordination of planning, programming, and border operation with Canada and Mexico relating to expediting cross border vehicle and cargo movements. Activities of Federal inspection agencies.	The Federal share for projects funded through these programs is 80% (sliding scale applies). Obligations for each of these two programs will be limited each year by the requirements of Section 1102 (Obligation Ceiling) of the TEA-21.	The NCPD and CBI programs are funded by a single funding source. The combined authorized funding for these two programs is \$140 million in each year from FY 1999 to FY 2003

FUNDING SOURCE	PROJECT SELECTION	RESPONSIBLE STAFF	TIMELY USE OF FUNDS (WHERE APPLICABLE)	FURTHER INFORMATION (WHERE APPROPRIATE)
----------------	-------------------	-------------------	--	---

FEDERAL DISCRETIONARY PROGRAM

Discretionary Bridge Program (DBP)	<p>The Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1982, Section 161, directed the Secretary of Transportation to establish a rating factor for each DBP candidate based on seven items that must be considered as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sufficiency Rating • Average Daily Traffic • Average Daily Truck Traffic • Defense Highway Status • States' Unobligated HBRRP Balance • Total Project Cost (TPC) • Special Considerations 	State transp. dept. responsibilities are to coordinate with State, local, and Federal agencies within the State to develop viable candidate projects; Submit the applications to the local FHWA division office on time so that the submission deadline can be met. Other responsible offices are FHWA division office and Office of Bridge Technology.		http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/bridge/discret.htm
National Corridor Planning and Development Program (NCPD)	The most important criterion is the extent to which the annual volume of commercial vehicle traffic at the border stations or ports of entry of each State has increased since the date of enactment of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) and is expected to increase in the future.	A State or metropolitan planning organization receiving an allocation shall develop, and submit to the Secretary for review, a development and management plan for the corridor or a useable component.		http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/hep10/corridor/index.html
Coordinated Border Infrastructure Program (CBI)	Expected reduction in commercial and other motor vehicle travel time through an international border crossing as a result of the project; Improvements in vehicle and highway safety and cargo security related to motor vehicles crossing a border with Canada or Mexico; Strategies to increase the use of existing, underutilized border crossing facilities and approaches; Leveraging of Federal funds including use of innovative financing, combination of such funds with funding provided under other Sections of the TEA-21 and combination with other sources of Federal, State, local or private funding; Degree of multinational involvement in the project and demonstrated coordination with other Federal agencies responsible for the inspection on vehicles, cargo, and persons crossing international borders and their counterpart agencies in Canada and Mexico.	A State or MPO receiving an allocation shall develop, and submit to the Secretary for review, a development and management plan for the corridor or a useable component. Other agencies responsible are FHWA division office and FHWA headquarters program office		http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/hep10/corridor/index.html

FUNDING SOURCE	DESCRIPTION	ELIGIBLE USES	POLICIES & GUIDELINES	ANNUAL AMOUNT (\$ in Millions)
Ferry Boat Discretionary (FBD) Program	A special funding category for the construction of ferryboats and ferry terminal facilities was created by Section 1064 of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (1991 ISTEA, Public Law 102-240). Section 1207 of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21, Public Law 105-178) reauthorized the FBD funding category through FY 2003.	Competitive FBD funds are available for improvements to ferry boats or ferry boat terminals where: The ferry facility is providing a link on a public road (other than Interstate) or the ferry facility is providing passenger only ferry service; The ferry and/or ferry terminal to be constructed or improved is either publicly owned, publicly operated, or a public authority has majority ownership interest where it is demonstrated that the ferry operation provides substantial public benefits; The ferry does not operate in international water except for Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Alaska and for ferries between a State and Canada.	The Federal share of the costs for any project eligible under this program is 80 %.	\$38 million in each of fiscal years 1999 through 2003 for the construction of ferry boats and ferry terminals.
Innovative Bridge Research & Construction (IBRC) Program	The program is intended to demonstrate the application of innovative material technology in the construction of bridges and other structures and has two components. The larger component provides funds for repair, rehabilitation, replacement or new construction of bridges and other structures using innovative materials. The smaller component is intended to support research and technology transfer activities related to the program's goals.	The project may be on any public roadway, including State and locally funded projects. Funds are available for costs of preliminary engineering, costs of repair, rehabilitation or construction of bridges or other structures and costs of project performance evaluation including instrumentation and performance monitoring of the structure following construction. Proprietary Products - As this is a research and experimental program, it is in the public interest that proprietary and sole source products may be included in the projects, but they must be clearly identified and described. These funds may be used for the Federal share of the cost of the repairs, rehabilitation, replacement or new construction on the "innovative materials" portion of the project.	It is the goal to fund as many projects as possible at a 100 % Federal share. However, some projects may be funded at a lower Federal share. Although these funds are subject to obligation limitation, 100 % obligation authority is provided with the allocation of funds for the selected projects.	It is expected that approximately \$17 million will be available for candidate construction projects in FY 2002 nationally.
National Historic Covered Bridge Preservation (NHCBP) Program	The program provides funding to assist the States in their efforts to preserve, rehabilitate, or restore the Nation's historic covered bridges. For the purposes of this program, the term "historic covered bridge" means a covered bridge that is listed or eligible for listing on the National Register for Historic Places.	Funds are available for bridge projects that meet one or more of the program goals. The project may be on any public roadway, including Federal, State and locally funded projects. Funds are available for costs of preliminary engineering, costs of rehabilitation, preservation, and arson and vandalism prevention activities. Funds are also available for evaluating any innovative portion of the restoration work not to exceed 2 years, and for preparation of a case study report.	The Federal share of project cost is 80 %.	TEA-21 authorized \$10 million from the Federal General fund for each of the FY's 1999 through 2003 to carry out this program. These funds must be appropriated before they become available.

FUNDING SOURCE	PROJECT SELECTION	RESPONSIBLE STAFF	TIMELY USE OF FUNDS (WHERE APPLICABLE)	FURTHER INFORMATION (WHERE APPROPRIATE)
Ferry Boat Discretionary (FBD) Program	Expeditious completion of project State priorities Leveraging of private or other public funding Amount of FBD funding National geographic distribution of funding within the FBD program	State transportation agency coordinates with State and local agencies within the State to develop viable candidate projects. Other responsible offices are FHWA division office and FHWA headquarters program office		http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/discretionary/pifb0103.htm
Innovative Bridge Research & Construction (IBRC) Program	Projects which will meet one or more of the goals of the program in Section 503(b) Projects which will incorporate materials and/or products that are readily available Projects ready for or near the construction phase will be given priority consideration Projects with designs that are repeatable or have wide spread application Projects that leverage Federal funds with other significant public or private resources will be given preference	State transportation department coordinate with State, local, and Federal agencies within the State to develop viable candidate projects. Other responsible offices are FHWA division office and FHWA headquarters program office.		http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/discretionary/pifb0103.htm and http://ibrc.fhwa.dot.gov
National Historic Covered Bridge Preservation (NHCBP) Program	Candidate projects will be selected utilizing input from a panel formed by the FHWA. Those which best meet the intent of this program will receive the highest priority. Applicants may want to provide additional information to explain how the project meets the intent of the program. Projects ready for or near the construction phase will be given priority consideration. Projects that leverage Federal funds with other significant public or private resources will be given preference. Projects, which further the aims of the Historic Bridge Management Plan and/or the State Historic Preservation Plan with the endorsement of the SHPO, will be given priority consideration. Projects proposing complete restoration and rehabilitation will be given priority over projects proposing only the installation of fire/vandalism protection systems or projects that propose to move the bridge to a preservation location.	Each State, in cooperation with the FHWA Division Office, is requested to prioritize their candidate projects giving reasons for the priority. The FHWA will attempt to equitably distribute funds to applicant States in accordance with the States' priorities, however, it is to be expected that high cost project requests may be funded at less than 100 % of a State's requested amount.		http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/bridge/cbrfc.htm#elig

FUNDING SOURCE	DESCRIPTION	ELIGIBLE USES	POLICIES & GUIDELINES	ANNUAL AMOUNT (\$ in Millions)
Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS)	Provides funding to State and local partnerships that are determined to be qualified to participate based on the selection criteria contained within TEA-21. Funding would support integration (not components) of metropolitan area travel management intelligent infrastructure. It will also support the deployment of integrated intelligent infrastructure in rural areas.	To accelerate the integration and interoperability of intelligent transportation systems (ITS) across system, jurisdiction and modal boundaries, in metropolitan and rural areas, to improve transportation efficiency, promote safety (including safe freight movement), increase traffic flow (including the flow of intermodal travel at ports of entry), reduce emissions of air pollutants, improve traveler information, enhance alternative transportation modes, build on existing intelligent transportation system projects or promote tourism.	The Federal share derived from ITS funding shall not exceed 50% and total Federal funds cannot exceed 80%, and the funds are subject to the Federal-aid Highways annual obligation limitation. Subject to the overall obligation limitation for Federal-aid Highways; however, 100 % obligation limitation is provided with the allocation of funds for the selected projects.	The TEA-21 authorized \$85 million for FY 2002.
Commercial Vehicle Intelligent Transportation System Infrastructure Deployment Program	Provides funding to State applicants for the deployment of Commercial Vehicle Information Systems and Networks (CVISN). This program will be focused on achieving the goal of "deployment of CVISN in the majority of States by September 30, 2003" as directed by TEA-21. This will provide for the delivery of real-time safety information to roadside inspectors to more precisely target unsafe carriers; the creation of systems to facilitate electronic processing of registration, tax credentials and permits; and the electronic clearance of commercial vehicles past weigh stations along highways.	Any State with a completed business plan would be eligible for funding. The first step would be the completion of a series of CVISN Deployment Workshops, which will assist the State in the development of top-level design, and a State CVISN Project Plan. This project plan will then be used to guide the implementation of CVISN in that State. States that have completed both CVISN business and project plans would be ready for full CVISN deployment funding.	The Federal share derived from ITS funding shall not exceed 50% and total Federal funds cannot exceed 80%, and the funds are subject to the Federal-aid Highways annual obligation limitation. The program is subject to the overall obligation limitation for Federal-aid Highways; however, 100 % obligation limitation is provided with the allocation of funds for the selected projects.	The TEA-21 authorized \$33.5 million for FY02 and FY03 respectively.
The Interstate Maintenance Discretionary Program (IMD)	Program provides funding for resurfacing, restoration, rehabilitation and reconstruction (4R) work, including added lanes to increase capacity, on most existing Interstate System routes	Resurfacing, restoring, rehabilitating and reconstructing (4R) work, including added lanes, on the Interstate System. However, not eligible for allocation of IMD funds are projects on any highway designated as a part of the Interstate System under Section 139 of 23 U.S.C., as in effect before the enactment of TEA-21 and any toll road on the Interstate System not subject to an agreement under Section 119(e) of 23 U.S.C., as in effect on December 17, 1991.	The amount of available funding is impacted by obligation limitation imposed on the Federal-aid highway program under the provisions of TEA-21 Section 1102(f), Redistribution of Certain Authorized Funds. The normal pro-rata Federal share of the costs for any project eligible under this program is 90 %. However, the Federal share is 80 % on projects or the portion of the work involving added single-occupancy vehicle lanes to increase capacity.	\$100 M is set aside nationally for FY 2002. Funds would not be allocated to a State that had, in the preceding fiscal year, transferred either National Highway System (NHS) or Interstate Maintenance (IM) funds to the Surface Transportation Program (STP) apportionment.

FUNDING SOURCE	PROJECT SELECTION	RESPONSIBLE STAFF	TIMELY USE OF FUNDS (WHERE APPLICABLE)	FURTHER INFORMATION (WHERE APPROPRIATE)
Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS)	Demonstrate a strong commitment to cooperation among agencies, jurisdictions, and the private sector, as evidenced by signed memoranda of understanding that clearly define the responsibilities and relations of all parties to a partnership arrangement, including institutional relationships and financial agreements needed to support integrated deployment; For other criteria, please look up the website under Qualification Criteria.	FHWA headquarters program office		http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/discretionary/pi_itsip.htm
Commercial Vehicle Intelligent Transportation System Infrastructure Deployment Program	Any project the cost of which exceeds \$10 million [23 U.S.C. 118(c)(3)]. A project on any high volume route in an urban area or high truck-volume route in a rural area [23 U.S.C. 118(c)(3)]. Priority may be given to funding a transportation project relating to an international quadrennial Olympic or Paralympic event, or a Special Olympics International event if the project meets the extraordinary needs associated with such events and is otherwise eligible for assistance with IMD funds [Section 1223, TEA-21].	ITS America, in its role as a utilized Federal Advisory Committee to the Department of Transportation, will convene a panel of experts to assess applicants' qualifications to participate in the CVISN Program based on the project selection criteria contained within TEA-21. Those applications that demonstrate an ability to meet the criteria established by TEA-21 will be considered as potential candidates for funding.		http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/discretionary/pi_itscv.htm
The Interstate Maintenance Discretionary Program (IMD)	Any project the cost of which exceeds \$10 million [23 U.S.C. 118(c)(3)]. A project on any high volume route in an urban area or high truck-volume route in a rural area [23 U.S.C. 118(c)(3)]. Priority may be given to funding a transportation project relating to an international quadrennial Olympic or Paralympic event, or a Special Olympics International event if the project meets the extraordinary needs associated with such events and is otherwise eligible for assistance with IMD funds [Section 1223, TEA-21].	State transportation agency responsible for coordinating with local governments and MPOs within the State to develop viable candidate projects. Other responsible organizations include FHWA division office and FHWA headquarters program office		http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/discretionary/piim0103.htm

FUNDING SOURCE	DESCRIPTION	ELIGIBLE USES	POLICIES & GUIDELINES	ANNUAL AMOUNT (\$ in Millions)
Public Lands Highways (PLH) program	To improve access to and within the Federal lands of the nation.	Transportation planning, research, engineering, and construction of the highways, roads, and parkways, or of transit facilities within the Federal public lands. The funds shall be allocated among those States having un-appropriated or unreserved public lands, nontaxable Indian lands or other Federal reservations, on the basis of need in such States	Federal share of the costs for any project eligible under this program is 100 %.	An amount of \$83.6 million is set aside nationally for FY 2002. FHWA administration expenses reduce this available funding, which may be up to 1.5 %. Approximately \$65-\$70 million will be available for candidate projects each of fiscal years 2001 through 2003.
National Scenic Byways (NSB) Program	To recognize and enhance roads which have outstanding scenic, historic, cultural, natural, recreational, and archaeological qualities, and support State scenic byway initiatives.	Planning, design and development of state scenic byways program; Development and implementation of a corridor management plan; Safety improvements to a state scenic byway, National Scenic Byway or All-American Road because of increased traffic due to designation; Construction of byway facilities; Improvements to enhance recreation area access from byways; Protecting historical, archeological and cultural resources adjacent to byways; Developing and providing tourism information to the public about byways; and Developing and implementing scenic byway marketing plans.	In accordance with 23 U.S.C. 162(f), the Federal share of the costs for any project eligible under this program is 80 %. The Scenic Byways discretionary funds are subject to obligation limitation; however, 100 % obligation authority is provided with the allocation of funds for the selected projects. There must be a minimum of 20-% in matching funds available for the project when the grant application is submitted. This matching requirement can be satisfied in whole or in part with State, local government, private sector, or Federal land management agency funds. Additionally, third party in-kind donations can be credited toward the State's share of the project cost.	Approximately \$25.5M million will be available nationally for candidate projects in FY 2002. The amount of available funding is impacted by any obligation limitation imposed on the Federal-aid highway program under the provisions of TEA-21 Section 1102(f), Redistribution of Certain Authorized Funds. After these reductions, it is expected that approximately \$21 million will be available for candidate projects each of fiscal years 2000 through 2003.
Transportation and Community and System Preservation Pilot (TCSP) program	A comprehensive initiative of research and grants to investigate the relationships between transportation and community and system preservation and private sector-based initiatives.	State agencies, metropolitan planning organizations and units of local governments that are recognized by a State are eligible recipients of TCSP grant funds. This would include towns, cities, public transit agencies, air resources boards, school boards, and park districts but not neighborhood groups or developers. Non-governmental organizations that have projects they wish to see funded under this program are encouraged to partner with an eligible recipient as the project sponsor.	There is no Federal share requirement under this program. Activities are eligible for full Federal funding, however subject to obligation limitation.	Funding for the TCSP is \$25 million per year nationally for FY's 2000 through 2003

FUNDING SOURCE	PROJECT SELECTION	RESPONSIBLE STAFF	TIMELY USE OF FUNDS (WHERE APPLICABLE)	FURTHER INFORMATION (WHERE APPROPRIATE)
Public Lands Highways (PLH) program	The Secretary shall give preference to those projects which are significantly impacted by Federal land and resource management activities which are proposed by a State which contains at least 3 % of the total public lands in the Nation (includes CA)	State transportation agency responsible for coordinating with local governments and MPOs within the State to develop viable candidate projects. Other responsible organizations include FHWA division office and FHWA headquarters program office		http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/discretionary/pipl0103.htm
National Scenic Byways (NSB) Program	Statutory criteria includes Projects on routes designated as either an All-American Road (AAR) or a NSB. Projects that would make routes eligible for designation as either an AAR or a NSB Projects associated with developing State scenic byway programs. Other criteria includes: State & byway priorities Project benefits Timely expenditure of previously awarded scenic byway funds Leveraging of private or other public funding	A person from a local byway group or the State Scenic Byways Coordinator that is responsible for writing the grant application. Applicant will coordinate with the State Scenic Byways Agency to develop viable grant projects. Other responsible parties include the FHWA division office and the FHWA headquarter program office.		http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/discretionary/pi_sbywy.htm
Transportation and Community and System Preservation Pilot (TCSP) program	Proposals that improve the efficiency of the transportation system; reduce environmental impacts of transportation; reduce the need for costly future public infrastructure investments; ensure efficient access to jobs, services, and centers of trade; and examine private sector development patterns and investments that support these goals.	There are no specific responsibilities attributed to State Transportation Agencies. Grants may be awarded through the traditional Federal-aid mechanism or directly to grantees. Responsible parties include the FHWA division office and the FHWA headquarter program office.		http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/discretionary/pi_tcsp.htm

FUNDING SOURCE	DESCRIPTION	ELIGIBLE USES	POLICIES & GUIDELINES	ANNUAL AMOUNT (\$ in Millions)
Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act (TIFIA)	TIFIA is a program which will provide Federal credit assistance (e.g., direct loans, loan guarantees, and lines of credit) to large-scale transportation projects of national significance. The program is intended to stimulate additional investment in large-scale transportation infrastructure projects by encouraging private sector participation, advancing construction schedules, and sharing risks between public and private sectors more efficiently and equitably.	Any type of highway projects and transit capital projects are eligible for Federal assistance through surface transportation programs under Title 23 or chapter 53 of Title 49 U.S.C. In addition, international bridges and tunnels; inter-city passenger bus and rail facilities and vehicles (including Amtrak and magnetic levitation systems); and publicly owned intermodal freight transfer facilities (except seaports or airports) on or adjacent to the National Highway System are also eligible.	The amount of Federal credit assistance may not exceed 33 % of total project costs. The authorization amounts are subject to obligation limitation; however, 100 % obligation authority is provided with the allocation of funds for the selected projects. The obligation limitation reduces the available funding for the program.	The funds authorized under TIFIA is \$ 102M for fiscal year 2001 with a Max. Nominal Amount of Credit of \$ 2,400M. A total of \$530 million of contract authority is provided to pay the "subsidy cost" of supporting Federal credit under TIFIA, that is, to cover the risk of losses. Annual caps totaling \$10.6 billion limit the nominal amount of credit instruments issued.
Value Pricing Pilot (VPP) Program	It is an experimental program aimed at learning the potential of different value pricing approaches for reducing congestion. Value pricing, also known as congestion pricing or peak-period pricing, entails fees or tolls for road use which vary by level of congestion. Fees are typically assessed electronically to eliminate delays associated with manual toll collection facilities.	Eligible Project Types include Areawide Value Pricing Value Pricing on a Single Highway Facility, Route or Corridor Value Pricing on Single or Multiple Highway Lanes Pre-project Studies and Experiments Innovative Pilot Tests	The Federal share of the costs for any project eligible under this program is 80 %. The Value Pricing Pilot Program funds are subject to obligation limitation. The obligation limitation reduces the available funding for the program under the provisions of TEA-21 Section 1216 (a).	TEA-21 provides for \$11 million for each of fiscal years 2000 through 2003.

FUNDING SOURCE	PROJECT SELECTION	RESPONSIBLE STAFF	TIMELY USE OF FUNDS (WHERE APPLICABLE)	FURTHER INFORMATION (WHERE APPROPRIATE)
Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act (TIFIA)	Qualified projects meeting the initial threshold eligibility criteria will be evaluated by the Secretary and selected based on the extent to which they generate economic benefits, leverage private capital, promote innovative technologies, and meet other program objectives. Each project must receive an investment grade rating on its senior debt obligations before its Federal credit assistance may be fully funded	Projects must be included in the STIP; however, submissions are not required to come through the State Transportation Dept. Responsibilities of the State Transp. Dept. would be determined on a specific project basis. Other Responsible parties are FHWA division, and headquarter program office.		http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/discretionary/pipf0103.htm
Value Pricing Pilot (VPP) Program	Proposals with greatest potential to reduce congestion and advance current knowledge of price effects, operations, enforcement, revenue generation, equity mitigation and monitoring/evaluation mechanisms will be given the highest priority. Priority will be given to promising but untried innovations, including technical, technological, operational and institutional. Projects with strong evaluation programs, significant commitment by implementing organizations and evidence of stakeholder support are encouraged.	State transportation agency coordinate with State, local, and Federal agencies within the State to develop viable proposed projects and submit applications to the local FHWA division office. Other Responsible parties are FHWA division, and headquarter program office.	Funds allocated by the Secretary to a State under this section shall remain available for obligation by the State for a period of three years after the last day of the fiscal year for which funds are authorized.	http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/discretionary/pi_value.htm





