



COLORADO
Department of Transportation

Division of Transit & Rail

4201 E. Arkansas Ave., Rm. 227
Denver, CO 80222

DATE: April 19, 2017
TO: Transportation Commission
FROM: Mark Imhoff, Director - Division of Transit & Rail
SUBJECT: FTA 5311 Distribution Methodology Recommendation

Purpose

The purpose of this memo is to provide the recommended FTA 5311 distribution methodology and seek Transportation Commission approval for one year (CY 2018); an April Workshop will be held prior to the requested Action.

Action Requested

Approve the attached resolution to establish a FTA 5311 Distribution Methodology, and authorize the CY 2018 distribution; future years to be further evaluated before TC authorization to distribute.

Background

FTA Section 5311 funds are an important source of funds allocated, currently, to thirty rural general public transportation agencies across the state. The majority of the funds, nearly 70 percent, are used for annual transit operations. The remainder are used for capital projects, intercity transportation, and CDOT administration.

In response to an increasing demand for federal operating funds, CDOT staff, in conjunction with CASTA, formed a 5311 Subcommittee of the Transit & Rail Advisory Committee (TRAC) in October 2016 to assist in creating a new methodology for distributing Section 5311 operating funds. The Subcommittee consists of ten members from around the state and is chaired by the Co-Executive Director of the Colorado Association of Transit Agencies (CASTA). A full roster is provided in Attachment A, with notes on the relevance of their participation and indicating those that represent agencies that will experience reductions in funding. No agencies that are slated for increases, nor new agencies, were represented on the Subcommittee.

Transportation Commission established policies, as reviewed with the TC at the October Transit Policy Workshop, have guided the development of a funding distribution methodology. These policies include:

- Fair and Equitable: The funding methodology should be fair and equitable.
- Transparent: The methodology should be documented, clear, and understandable.
- Stable: The methodology should allow transit operators to plan for future revenues.
- Available to All Eligible Providers: The methodology should account for current and new transit providers.
- Reward Performance: The methodology should promote good performance.

The Subcommittee had several general findings as listed below:

- Grants funding has become skewed and disproportional over time.
- Equity is an important and primary value. The Subcommittee gave equity serious consideration, however, the recent input suggests equity deserves further consideration. The recommendation attempts to fund the first year's distribution, and continue the equity evaluation to identify acceptable provisions for future year distributions.
- The categorization framework is useful to group transit agencies with like characteristics.

The Subcommittee evaluated several alternatives over the course of their meetings:

- Base funding plus "Bonus Points" for performance, coverage or funding characteristics.
- Level of Service; operating metrics, vehicle miles and hours.
- Percent of budget by size category. This is the framework for the recommended distribution methodology.
- Percent of budget plus "Bonus Points": This option is a combination of options 1 and 3. Again, the Subcommittee found it unrealistic and non-transparent to identify and quantify additional factors.



The Subcommittee has reached consensus, and CDOT staff concurs, on the distribution methodology for Section 5311 operating funds, one year (2018) of distribution, and monitoring by the Subcommittee to occur for the CY 2018 distribution, and further modification recommendations for 2019 and beyond. The methodology presented at the March 15 TC Workshop has been modified based upon input received at the Workshop and input received after a supplemental memo of March 24. CDOT needs to have the new funding distribution methodology finalized in April to ensure local agency contract execution by January 1, 2018: call for projects; application period; review evaluate and award; contract preparation and execution.

Details

The Subcommittee came to resolution in early March on a recommended methodology for the distribution of annual FTA 5311 operating funds. This recommendation was presented to the TC at a March 15th Workshop, the TRAC on March 17th, and STAC on March 24th. In the days following additional discussions and input suggested that the methodology had not adequately addressed a couple significant circumstances that should be rectified and/or incorporated into distribution methodology. The Subcommittee met again on April 5, discussed the items below, and has modified the recommendation accordingly. They also recommend on-going deliberations over the coming months to delve deeper into these elements and report back to the TC with its findings and recommendations for incorporation in future year's distribution.

The elements for further evaluation include:

- The balanced equity relationship between very rural areas that focus on “essential service” transportation (e.g. medical visits), and larger mountain communities with recreational based economies that put a significant focus on employee commuter service and recreational trips.
 - This was discussed by the Subcommittee throughout the process. The Percent of Budget approach was felt to address this issue with large agencies getting smaller percentages of their budget covered by 5311 funds, and smaller agencies getting larger percentages of their budgets covered. However, the recent input received indicates there continues to be unease with the methodology results related to equity. The Subcommittee acknowledges and agrees to look further into equity fairness and report back to the Transportation Commission.
- Transit organizations/agencies that serve a multi-county region. These organizations provide more comprehensive service, and realize economies of scale in coverage, fleet and funding. By nature, grouping counties together increases the size of the umbrella organization, versus multiple individual counties. The recommended 5311 distribution methodology assigns categories by size, thus the multi-county organizations potentially would receive less funding as a result. The Subcommittee feels this aspect should be explored further and deeper, and that a fair and equitable solution can be found within the overall framework of the recommended distribution methodology.
 - NECALG is a multi-county agency and would experience one of the largest decreases in annual funding under the earlier recommended distribution methodology. The Subcommittee is now recommending that NECALG be “held harmless” for at least year one (2018) as a multi-county agency, allowing time for the Subcommittee to further evaluate and recommend how multi-county agencies in general should be covered in the distribution methodology in future years. In this way the Subcommittee will define and recommend a multi-county provision that is fair and equitable to all agencies, and that encourages and does not penalize multi-county agencies for the 2019 distribution methodology and beyond.
- Historical events that have added to an agency's current funding level. The Subcommittee feels that if extenuating circumstances exist they should be explored for remedy, but that strict oversight is needed, and only extreme circumstances should be granted.
 - Durango Transit is an organization where historical events have added to their current funding level, and an exception is recommended. Under SAFTEA-LU (2005) the FTA had a formula funding pool for each state titled Job Access Reverse Commute (JARC). The program was restrictive to providing job access for low income areas, and very few Colorado transit agencies applied for the funds. Durango saw an opportunity to expand service to their new Mercy Hospital through low income parts of La Plata County and adjacent to the Southern Ute Reservation. They received an \$87,500 JARC grant in 2015. The MAP-21 Act (2012) eliminated the JARC program, although “grandfathered” grants carried forward for several years, which funded the Durango 2015 JARC grant. If CDOT had eliminated the funding stream to Durango in 2016, they would have had to eliminate the service. Instead CDOT increased the Durango 5311 grant to compensate. The Subcommittee is sensitive to the size of Durango's potential loss of funds under the 5311 distribution methodology, and has opted to recognize the Durango JARC/Mercy Hospital dilemma. The Subcommittee recommendation is to include the Durango Mercy Hospital service with the “hold harmless” designation. The result is that \$87,500 is “held harmless”, and the



Durango Transit base which would be subject to reductions is decreased by \$87,500, thus easing the impact/decrease which will occur through the 5311 Distribution Methodology 5-year transition period.

5311 Distribution Methodology Subcommittee Recommendation

Taking into account last month’s TC Workshop on the 5311 methodology, and resulting continued analysis of the policies behind the recommended methodology, staff requests the TC approve the attached resolution with a revised recommendation to establish an updated 5311 Distribution Methodology, and authorize the CY 2018 distribution only, with future years to be further evaluated before TC authorization to distribute. Details of the Subcommittee recommendation follow:

- Approve the Subcommittee recommended FTA 5311 Distribution Methodology framework of Percent of Budget by Size Category.
 - Categorize Agencies by Size: Agencies will be assigned to one of five categories (see table below) based on a combination of four factors: vehicle miles, vehicle hours, ridership, and budget size of agency.
 - Percentage of Budget: Each category will be assigned a budget factor which is multiplied by the operating budget of each agency within the category to determine the grant level. The table below shows the five categories and their associated budget factors. As shown in the table, agencies in the Very Small category will receive a grant equal to 50 percent of their operating budget, while agencies in the Very Large category will receive a grant equal to 3 to 4 percent of their budget (3 percent up to \$10M, 4 percent over \$10M).

Category	Budget Factor
Very Small	50%
Small	45%
Medium	21%
Large	14%
Very Large	3-4%

- Include a transition plan to ease the impact on transit agencies ultimately receiving increases or decreases in funding; the Subcommittee suggests a five year transition plan with 3%, 3%, 5%, 6%, 7% increases or decreases each year.
- “Hold harmless” a subset of seven (7) agencies or programs, and maintain their current funding levels. These agencies serve areas with a high level of low-income population or other extenuating circumstances such as very low levels of service, covering a large area or a previous JARC grant. Because they are so small, these accommodations have little effect on other agencies. In addition, hold NECALG harmless for at least one year until a provision can be defined addressing multi-county agencies.
- Authorize one year of funding (2018) with the first year of the transition plan (+/-3%) for distribution.
- Require the Subcommittee and staff to monitor the 2018 5311 distribution process and potential improvements. Appoint one Transportation Commissioner to join the Subcommittee for continuing deliberations to include, but not be limited to:
 - Balance equity relationships; see above.
 - Multi-county organization provision beginning in year two (2019); see above.
 - Historical events affecting funding; see above.
- Report back from the Subcommittee on the 2018 process and results, and any further recommendations for 2019 and beyond; first quarter 2018.
- Authorize 2019 5311 Distribution Methodology with any modifications by April 2018.

The tables in Attachments B & C portray the recommended methodology. Attachment B provides a table showing the effects of the recommended methodology, based upon the current FY 2017 funding level:

- The first two columns of Attachment B show the five categories of agencies (Very Small to Very Large), the percent of their budget that would be covered by a 5311 Award, and the Organizations included in each category. The color coding depicts “new” systems expected to enter the program (blue), and those



systems that are "held harmless" at their current level or guaranteed a modest increase up to the category budget level (orange).

- Column 3, Attachment B, provides the latest verifiable operating cost by organization (2015 National Transit Database). This column adds context since the methodology is based on Annual Budget.
- Column 4, Attachment B, shows the actual CY 2017 Award; under current operation.
- Columns 5 & 6, Attachment B, show the awards that the proposed methodology would generate for "Year 1" of the five year transition plan, and the difference from the actual CY 2017 award.
- Columns 7 & 8, Attachment B, (watermarked as "To Be Determined" to reflect the need to revisit and update as necessary for 2019 and beyond), show the awards that the proposed methodology would generate for "Year 6" (the first year after the conclusion of the five year transition plan), and the difference from the actual CY 2017 award. Year 6 depicts the award levels that would carry forward.

Attachment C further depicts the effects of the transition period:

- Attachment C presents the full five year transition plan by agency, including Year 6; years 2-6 are watermarked "To Be Determined" to reflect the need to revisit and update as necessary for 2019 and beyond.
- The final column in Attachment C identifies the "Cliff", up or down, that each agency would experience at the end of the transition period in Year 6.
- The bottom row of Attachment C identifies the funds (decreasing over time) that would be needed from the 5311 capital pool (\$1M/year) to fund the five year transition plan.

Endorsements by Others

- 5311 Distribution Methodology Subcommittee - Final recommendation to TC; April 5, 2017, unanimous.
- Transit & Rail Advisory Committee (TRAC) - Endorsement; March 17, 2017, unanimous. Note: TRAC endorsed the recommendation prior to the above mentioned enhancements; Staff will report back to TRAC on the final 5311 Distribution Methodology.
- State Transportation Advisory Committee (STAC) - Endorsement; March 24, 2017, unanimous. Note: STAC endorsed the recommendation prior to the above mentioned enhancements; Staff will report back to STAC on the final 5311 Distribution Methodology.

Options and Recommendations

1. Approve the earlier Subcommittee recommendation for the 5311 Distribution Methodology, including the full five year transition plan. This is not recommended because input received suggested that not all policy issues had been adequately addressed. The Subcommittee has since made substantive changes to their recommendation which is portrayed in option 2 below.
2. Approve the Subcommittee revised recommendation for the 5311 Distribution Methodology framework as presented above and portrayed in Attachments B & C, including the authorization for the 2018 distribution; future years pending further evaluation as described above. Staff concurs with the Subcommittee recommendation.
3. Approve the 5311 distribution for 2018 utilizing last year's methodology. This is not recommended because it does not allow for new qualified entrants, it does not begin to address discrepancies in funding levels, and is largely subjective and lacking transparency.

Next Steps

- CDOT to release CY 2018 FTA Section 5311 Operating Call for Projects - late April.
- Subcommittee to meet over the summer to address outstanding items. Any material modifications or additions will come back to the TC for consideration.
- Execute contracts for CY 2018 operations by January 1, 2018.

Attachment

Attachment A: TRAC Subcommittee Roster

Attachment B: Draft Methodology Results

Attachment C: Draft Transition Plan



Attachment A: 5311 Distribution Methodology - TRAC Subcommittee Members

✓ **Note: Unanimous support for the recommended methodology.**

- Ann Rajewski - Subcommittee Chair; TRAC Chair; and Co-Executive Director of the Colorado Association of Transit Agencies (CASTA)
 - ✓ Note: CASTA held Member briefings after each Subcommittee meeting to brief and give a forum for further input.
- Will Jones - TRAC Member; CASTA Vice President; and Transit Manager for City of Greeley
 - ✓ Note: Greeley currently is not a 5311 recipient, but is exploring future rural service that potentially could be eligible.
- Vince Rogalski - TRAC Member; and STAC Chair
 - ✓ Note: STAC represents the general view point of the TPRs and MPOs.
- Larry Worth - TRAC Member; Rural Transit Advocate
 - ✓ Note: Mr. Worth brings insight to the Subcommittee regarding small rural organizations. He is the former Executive Director for NECALG.
- Amber Blake - CASTA President; and Director of Transportation & Sustainability for Durango City
 - ✓ Note: Durango will experience the largest reduction.
- Dan Blankenship - CEO, Roaring Fork Transportation Authority (Glenwood Springs)
 - ✓ Note: RFTA is the largest rural transit agency in the country, the largest Colorado 5311 recipient, and an agency that will experience a small reduction.
- Frank Bruno - CEO, Via Mobility Services (Boulder)
 - ✓ Note: Via Mobility is one of the larger reduction organizations.
- Jonathan Flint - Transit Manager, Steamboat Springs Transit
 - ✓ Note: Steamboat Springs Transit is one of the larger reduction agencies.
- Nate Vander Broek - Transit Director, South Central Council of Governments (SCCOG)
 - ✓ Note: SCCOG is a small transit agency that is being “held harmless” due serving a low income area.
- Sarah Curtis - Executive Director, All Points Transit (Montrose)
 - ✓ Note: All Points Transit is a medium agency that is being “held harmless” due serving a low income area.

ATTACHMENT B: METHODOLOGY RESULTS

Blue font are anticipated new systems.

Orange font are systems it is recommended the current funding levels at a minimum be maintained.

	Organization	Operating Budget*	2017 Current Award	Proposed Methodology			
				Year 1 Award	Difference from 2017	Proposed Year 6 Award	Proposed Difference from 2017
Very Small (50%) \$320,000	Dolores Co. Seniors	\$134,415	\$35,680	\$36,750	\$1,070	\$67,000	\$31,320
	Archuleta County	\$150,000	\$0	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$75,000
	City of La Junta	\$171,216	\$68,950	\$71,019	\$2,069	\$86,000	\$17,050
	Montezuma Co. Seniors	\$181,283	\$64,190	\$66,116	\$1,926	\$91,000	\$26,810
		\$636,914	\$168,820	\$248,885	\$80,065	\$319,000	\$150,180
Small (45%) \$2,100,000	Durango - Mercy Hospital	\$175,000	\$87,500	\$87,500	\$0	\$87,500	\$0
	Neighbor-to-Neighbor (Salida)	\$199,235	\$100,000	\$97,000	-\$3,000	\$90,000	-\$10,000
	Teller Senior Coalition	\$200,000	\$100,000	\$97,000	-\$3,000	\$91,000	-\$9,000
	East Central COG	\$249,961	\$182,190	\$182,190	\$0	\$182,190	\$0
	Lake County	\$264,000	\$95,000	\$97,850	\$2,850	\$120,000	\$25,000
	Clear Creek County	\$300,000	\$90,000	\$92,700	\$2,700	\$136,000	\$46,000
	Prowers County	\$331,120	\$173,100	\$173,100	\$0	\$173,100	\$0
	Upper Arkansas Area COG	\$384,000	\$192,900	\$198,687	\$5,787	\$230,000	\$37,100
	South Central COG	\$439,181	\$293,630	\$293,630	\$0	\$293,630	\$0
	Cripple Creek	\$445,324	\$158,620	\$163,379	\$4,759	\$202,000	\$43,380
	Via Mobility (Boulder)	\$540,913	\$333,380	\$323,379	-\$10,001	\$245,000	-\$88,380
	Seniors Resource Center	\$549,617	\$291,880	\$283,124	-\$8,756	\$249,000	-\$42,880
	SUCAP (Ignacio)	\$555,487	\$163,222	\$163,222	\$0	\$163,222	\$0
		\$4,633,838	\$2,261,422	\$2,252,760	-\$8,662	\$2,262,642	\$1,220
Medium (21%) \$1,400,000	SRDA (Pueblo)	\$588,206	\$68,200	\$70,246	\$2,046	\$122,000	\$53,800
	Black Hawk / Central City	\$646,000	\$0	\$134,000	\$134,000	\$134,000	\$134,000
	Gunnison Valley RTA	\$729,837	\$187,100	\$181,487	-\$5,613	\$151,000	-\$36,100
	Glenwood Springs	\$1,071,999	\$246,170	\$238,785	-\$7,385	\$222,000	-\$24,170
	All Points Transit (Montrose)	\$1,121,513	\$238,000	\$238,000	\$0	\$238,000	\$0
	Northeastern Co ALG	\$1,270,472	\$487,200	\$487,200	\$0	\$263,000	-\$224,200
	Crested Butte	\$1,332,854	\$228,200	\$235,046	\$6,846	\$276,000	\$47,800
		\$6,760,881	\$1,454,870	\$1,584,764	\$129,894	\$1,406,000	-\$48,870
Large (14%) \$2,000,000	San Miguel Co	\$1,020,214	\$110,000	\$113,300	\$3,300	\$142,000	\$32,000
	Durango	\$2,140,324	\$826,300	\$801,511	-\$24,789	\$299,000	-\$527,300
	Winter Park	\$2,400,000	\$150,000	\$154,500	\$4,500	\$335,000	\$185,000
	Breckenridge	\$2,456,003	\$159,240	\$164,017	\$4,777	\$343,000	\$183,760
	Snowmass	\$3,118,323	\$238,450	\$245,604	\$7,154	\$435,000	\$196,550
	Steamboat Springs	\$3,189,504	\$537,290	\$521,171	-\$16,119	\$445,000	-\$92,290
		\$14,324,368	\$2,021,280	\$2,000,103	-\$21,177	\$1,999,000	-\$22,280
Very Large (3-4%) \$1,900,000	Eagle County	\$9,046,026	\$309,000	\$318,270	\$9,270	\$362,000	\$53,000
	Summit County	\$9,405,640	\$482,040	\$467,579	-\$14,461	\$376,000	-\$106,040
	Mtn Village Tram & Bus	\$4,067,368	\$150,100	\$154,603	\$4,503	\$163,000	\$12,900
	RFTA (Glenwood Springs)	\$29,200,650	\$1,014,550	\$984,114	-\$30,437	\$976,000	-\$38,550
		\$51,719,684	\$1,955,690	\$1,924,565	-\$31,125	\$1,877,000	-\$78,690

*Based on 2015 National Transit Database

To Be Determined

Attachment C: Transition Plan

Grant Size in Year:

<u>Service</u>	<u>2017 Current</u>	<u>Proposed</u>	<u>Size</u>	<u>Grant Size in Year:</u>						<u>"Cliff" in Year 6</u>
	<u>Award</u>	<u>Year 6 Award</u>	<u>Category</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	
Dolores Co. Seniors	\$35,680	\$67,000	Very Small	\$36,750	\$38,588	\$41,289	\$45,005	\$49,956	\$67,000	\$17,044
Archuleta County	\$0	\$75,000	Very Small	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$0
Montezuma Co. Seniors	\$64,190	\$91,000	Very Small	\$66,116	\$69,421	\$74,281	\$80,966	\$89,873	\$91,000	\$1,127
City of La Junta	\$68,950	\$86,000	Very Small	\$71,019	\$74,569	\$79,789	\$86,000	\$86,000	\$86,000	\$0
Cripple Creek	\$158,620	\$202,000	Small	\$163,379	\$171,548	\$183,556	\$200,076	\$202,000	\$202,000	\$0
Durango - Mercy Hospital	\$87,500	\$87,500	Small	\$87,500	\$87,500	\$87,500	\$87,500	\$87,500	\$87,500	\$0
Lake County	\$95,000	\$120,000	Small	\$97,850	\$102,743	\$109,934	\$119,829	\$120,000	\$120,000	\$0
Teller Senior Coalition	\$100,000	\$91,000	Small	\$97,000	\$94,090	\$91,000	\$91,000	\$91,000	\$91,000	\$0
Neighbor-to-Neighbor (Salida)	\$100,000	\$90,000	Small	\$97,000	\$94,090	\$90,000	\$90,000	\$90,000	\$90,000	\$0
East Central COG	\$182,190	\$182,190	Small	\$182,190	\$182,190	\$182,190	\$182,190	\$182,190	\$182,190	\$0
Upper Arkansas Area COG	\$192,900	\$230,000	Small	\$198,687	\$208,621	\$223,225	\$230,000	\$230,000	\$230,000	\$0
Clear Creek County	\$90,000	\$136,000	Small	\$92,700	\$97,335	\$104,148	\$113,522	\$126,009	\$136,000	\$9,991
Prowers County	\$173,100	\$173,100	Small	\$173,100	\$173,100	\$173,100	\$173,100	\$173,100	\$173,100	\$0
Seniors Resource Center	\$291,880	\$249,000	Small	\$283,124	\$274,630	\$260,898	\$249,000	\$249,000	\$249,000	\$0
South Central COG	\$293,630	\$293,630	Small	\$293,630	\$293,630	\$293,630	\$293,630	\$293,630	\$293,630	\$0
Via Mobility (Boulder)	\$333,380	\$245,000	Small	\$323,379	\$313,677	\$297,993	\$277,891	\$252,192	\$245,000	-\$7,192
SUCAP (Ignacio)	\$163,222	\$163,222	Small	\$163,222	\$163,222	\$163,222	\$163,222	\$163,222	\$163,222	\$0
Gunnison Valley RTA	\$187,100	\$151,000	Medium	\$181,487	\$176,042	\$167,240	\$151,000	\$151,000	\$151,000	\$0
SRDA (Pueblo)	\$68,200	\$122,000	Medium	\$70,246	\$73,758	\$78,921	\$86,024	\$95,487	\$122,000	\$26,513
Black Hawk / Central City	\$0	\$134,000	Medium	\$134,000	\$134,000	\$134,000	\$134,000	\$134,000	\$134,000	\$0
All Points Transit (Montrose)	\$238,000	\$238,000	Medium	\$238,000	\$238,000	\$238,000	\$238,000	\$238,000	\$238,000	\$0
Glenwood Springs	\$246,170	\$222,000	Medium	\$238,785	\$231,621	\$222,000	\$222,000	\$222,000	\$222,000	\$0
Crested Butte	\$228,200	\$276,000	Medium	\$235,046	\$246,798	\$264,000	\$276,000	\$276,000	\$276,000	\$0
Northeastern Co ALG	\$487,200	\$263,000	Medium	\$487,200	\$472,584	\$449,955	\$417,528	\$379,950	\$263,000	-\$116,950
Breckenridge	\$159,240	\$343,000	Large	\$164,017	\$172,218	\$184,273	\$200,858	\$222,952	\$343,000	\$120,048
San Miguel Co	\$110,000	\$142,000	Large	\$113,300	\$118,965	\$127,293	\$138,749	\$142,000	\$142,000	\$0
Durango	\$826,300	\$299,000	Large	\$801,511	\$777,466	\$753,592	\$686,891	\$625,071	\$299,000	-\$326,071
Winter Park	\$150,000	\$335,000	Large	\$154,500	\$162,225	\$173,581	\$189,203	\$210,015	\$335,000	\$124,985
Steamboat Springs	\$537,290	\$445,000	Large	\$521,171	\$505,836	\$480,259	\$446,641	\$445,000	\$445,000	\$0
Snowmass	\$238,450	\$435,000	Large	\$245,604	\$257,884	\$275,936	\$300,770	\$333,854	\$435,000	\$101,146
Eagle County	\$309,000	\$362,000	Very Large	\$318,270	\$334,184	\$357,576	\$362,000	\$362,000	\$362,000	\$0
Summit County	\$482,040	\$376,000	Very Large	\$467,579	\$453,551	\$430,874	\$400,713	\$376,000	\$376,000	\$0
Mtn Village Tram & Bus	\$150,100	\$163,000	Very Large	\$154,603	\$162,333	\$163,000	\$163,000	\$163,000	\$163,000	\$0
RFTA (Glenwood Springs)	\$1,014,550	\$976,000	Very Large	\$984,114	\$976,000	\$976,000	\$976,000	\$976,000	\$976,000	\$0
AWARD TOTALS	\$7,862,082	\$7,863,642		\$8,011,077	\$8,007,120	\$7,991,331	\$7,951,084	\$7,913,001	\$7,863,642	
DIFFERENCE FROM BUDGET				-\$61,077	-\$57,120	-\$41,331	-\$1,084	\$36,999	\$86,358	