



Regional Public Transportation Authority

302 N. First Avenue, Suite 700, Phoenix, Arizona 85003

602-262-7433, Fax 602-495-0411

Board of Directors Information Summary

Agenda Item #4

Date

March 12, 2009

Subject

American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) Project Recommendations

Summary

The ARRA has several different sources of funding for transit. The funds are distributed through existing formulas and discretionary programs and several new discretionary programs. The region's list of stimulus projects has been prioritized based on the Board adopted criteria and the recommended projects are presented.

Fiscal Impact

The ARRA will bring additional federal funds into the Transit Life Cycle Program which will help offset the loss of forecasted future tax revenues.

Considerations

There are three main sources of formula funding for the region: 5307 and 5340 formula funds for the Phoenix-Mesa urbanized area, 5307 and 5340 formula funds for the Avondale urbanized area and Fixed Guideway Modernization formula funds for the Phoenix-Mesa urbanized area. The funds for each urbanized area are intended to be used in those areas and not transferred to other areas without an official process. 49 U.S.C 5336 allows for transfers of formula funds from the State's 5311 allocation to urbanized areas (under 200,000 population), for transfers from urbanized areas' (under 200,000 population) 5307 allocations to supplement the State's programs, and for transfers from urbanized areas (greater than 200,000 population) to the Governor for redistribution to urbanized areas (under 200,000 population). These transfers must be done in consultation with the designated recipients for each area.

Federal regulations require that projects that receive federal assistance must be included in a transportation improvement program (TIP), developed by the metropolitan planning organization (MPO) and included in the statewide transportation improvement

program (STIP), and approved by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA). The MPO in this region, which includes both the Phoenix-Mesa and Avondale urbanized areas, is the Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG). MAG contracts with RPTA for the programming of transit projects, as RPTA is the agency identified in statute responsible for regional public transportation system planning (A.R.S. 48-5121). The statute requires that planning efforts be coordinated with MAG's regional transportation plan.

RPTA has coordinated the regional effort for programming federal funds. In the past, RPTA has received member agency consent of established criteria and priorities to help in the programming process. These have never been officially adopted by the Board, but have been used through general agreement with member agencies. Since the passage of Proposition 400, the priority for programming federal funds has been for TLCP projects. There have been inadequate federal funds to date to fully match TLCP projects.

Typically, through the regular programming process, the projects are sent directly to MAG. MAG tentatively approves the TIP, which then enters into air quality conformity analysis. Once the analysis is complete, the TIP is formally approved by the MAG Regional Council. Because of the additional steps and analysis necessary through MAG, the RPTA Board of Directors does not take an official action on the transit projects. The official actions are taken by MAG, who has the authority and responsibility to do so as the MPO for the region. This process also eliminates redundancy as all RPTA members are represented at MAG.

ARRA Requirements – The Act requires that funds be obligated within certain time frames or be lost and redistributed to other regions. The Act clearly has a preference for projects which are ready to construct or purchase in order to get the funds into the economy. It is important to make the distinction between projects that are ready to obligate and projects that are ready to construct. In order for a project to be ready to obligate, certain federal criteria must be met. The project must be in an approved TIP/STIP and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requirements must be met. A project can be ready to obligate but still be months or years away from construction. Conversely, a project that was started only with local funds may not have followed the federal regulations and may be ready to construct but are not ready to obligate federal funds. The priority for selecting projects, especially in identifying projects to obligate the first 50 percent of the funds, is to first identify projects that are ready to obligate, then identify which of those projects are ready to construct.

Timeline for selecting projects – The ARRA has a deadline of 180 days to obligate at least 50 percent of the area's apportionment. FTA has confirmed that obligate means grant award for transit purposes. FTA published the final apportionments on March 5, which means the deadline to obligate at least 50 percent of the funds is September 1. The City of Phoenix is the designated recipient for federal transit funding and as such is responsible for the application process and funds distribution to sub-recipients. The application process must include a public hearing with 30 days prior notice, it includes a 60 day review by the US Department of Labor, a pre-submission review by FTA, and an official review by FTA after submission, among other steps. In order to meet the

September 1 award deadline, the public hearing notice would need to be published by April 12. This does not allow for any elongated deliberation process to select projects.

If not all of the funds are obligated by September 1, then the remaining funds must be obligated by March 5, 2010 in order to not be lost to the region. Following the general timeline identified earlier, the public hearing notice for those projects to obligate the remaining funds would need to be published no later than October 14, 2009. The detailed timeline for obligating funds is attached.

The ARRA funds are new funds, not appropriated through the usual process. However, they are apportioned through existing formulas and programs for the specific uses of those formula programs, except that they cannot be spent on operations in any urbanized areas. Because the intended purpose for the funds is different and more immediate than the usual transit appropriations, RPTA staff working cooperatively with its members and MAG discussed some alternative criteria to help filter the list of projects to ones that met the legislative intent. The Board of Directors was briefed and given the opportunity to provide guidance on the project selection criteria. It is not the intent to have the Board adopt the list of projects, but rather to take the Board's guidance and send the project list to MAG for adoption as is done for the normal programming process.

The Board of Directors approved a set of criteria for use in recommending projects for ARRA funding through the formula programs. The criteria were applied to the full list of projects and the remaining eligible projects were evaluated. The criteria are attached for information. Although not an adopted criterion, there was some concern at the Board that funds would be spent on facilities for which no operating funds were available. This was considered during the project review. Following is a summary of the recommendations for project funding by funding source.

Avondale Urbanized Area Formula Funds – The preliminary apportionment of funds for the Avondale area is \$1,333,602. There are not any Prop 400 projects that are ready to go in the Avondale area. In order to obligate the funds in a timely manner, the recommendation is to fund non-Prop 400 projects. The Goodyear Park-and-Ride is 30 percent complete with design work and should be ready to begin construction by July 2009. Avondale would like to do some preliminary work for a future park-and-ride in Avondale. The recommendation is to fund Avondale's site selection and preliminary design, with the remaining funds to the Goodyear Park-and-Ride for construction.

<i>Project</i>	<i>Amount Requested</i>	<i>Amount Recommended</i>
Avondale park-and-ride site selection	\$250,000	\$250,000
Goodyear park-and-ride construction	\$13,137,928	\$1,083,602
<i>Total</i>	<i>\$13,387,928</i>	<i>\$1,333,602</i>

Fixed Guideway Modernization – There is a small apportionment of funds through this program for the Phoenix-Mesa urbanized area. The funds must be spent on specific projects that are related to the area’s fixed guideway system, which includes the high occupancy vehicle lanes on freeways. Park-and-ride facilities that feed into the freeway system are eligible projects. The recommendation is to allocate these funds, \$640,070, to the Happy Valley Park-and-Ride in north Phoenix.

<i>Project</i>	<i>Amount Requested</i>	<i>Amount Recommended</i>
Happy Valley Park-and-Ride	\$14,606,108	\$640,070

Phoenix-Mesa Urbanized Area Formula Funds – The preliminary apportionment to the Phoenix Mesa urbanized area is \$64,421,217 through the FTA Section 5307 formula.

The first recommendation for the projects remaining on the list is to upgrade existing facilities to ensure that they are ready for future service. The Mesa maintenance facility, the Phoenix South maintenance facility, the East Valley maintenance facility and Central Station are all existing facilities in the TLCP that require some upgrades to ensure they are at full readiness for future growth. These projects will not significantly increase operating expenses and have the potential to decrease ongoing operating expenses incurred by members agencies that purchase bus service. Funding these projects now (all are accelerations of TLCP projects except the East Valley Bus Operations and Maintenance facility upgrades) will ensure that the facilities are ready when the economy turns around and the region is able to increase the amount of transit service. However, the Phoenix South facility upgrade is not at the same state of readiness as the other projects and may not meet the intent of the Act. It is recommended to not allocate funds to this project now, but to continue work on the project to make it ready should additional funds be available in the future.

The Mesa facility expansion requested \$10 million for the expansion. The TLCP has programmed \$11.9 million. It is recommended that the full request amount of \$10 million be allocated to this project.

The East Valley facility was constructed recently with local, regional and federal funds. However, due to fiscal constraints, the facility was not constructed to the full scope. The requested \$7.2 million would upgrade the facility to the full scope that was designed. Although no additional funds are programmed in the TLCP, it is recommended to allocate the full amount requested.

Upgrades to Central Station are programmed in the TLCP at approximately \$7.8 million. Phoenix has requested \$10 million to upgrade the facility. It is recommended that this project be allocated the full amount requested.

The regional park-and-ride lots on the light rail line were constructed with regional and federal funds. Shade canopies were not constructed due to fiscal constraints. The \$15 million request would build shade canopies to protect vehicles during the summer months especially. It is recommended that a little more than half of the requested funds be allocated to this project.

The Arizona Avenue bus rapid transit project is unlikely to receive federal funds through any other program. It may qualify for Very Small Starts funds, but is on the low end of the performance criteria. With any significant competition for funds, it is very unlikely that the project would receive a federal grant award. It is recommended that \$15 million be allocated from ARRA funds to this project. This amount will fund the existing design for station construction and intersection upgrades. Additional design work may be needed for additional elements to expend the full TLCP allocation. Those elements cannot be included in ARRA funding because there may be environmental issues depending on the outcome of the design process.

The Happy Valley Park-and-Ride currently has funds in awarded grants and in the TIP. An additional \$10.6 million is requested to construct the facility to the full design scope. The full request amount includes funds currently programmed. It is recommended that this project be allocated the full amount not currently included in awarded grants. The amount recommended along with the funds in the Fixed Guideway Modernization apportionment equal the requested \$14.6 million for the project.

<i>Project</i>	<i>Amount Requested</i>	<i>Amount Recommended</i>
Mesa facility expansion	\$10,000,000	\$10,000,000
East Valley facility expansion	\$7,200,000	\$7,200,000
Central Station upgrades	\$10,000,000	\$10,000,000
Park-and-Ride shade canopies	\$15,000,000	\$8,255,179
Arizona Avenue Bus Rapid Transit	\$21,920,000	\$15,000,000
Happy Valley Park-and-Ride	\$14,606,108	\$13,966,038
<i>Total</i>	<i>\$78,726,108</i>	<i>\$64,421,217</i>

Future funding – The projects recommended fully obligate the funds apportioned to the region. Further, these are all projects that can commit and spend the funds relatively quickly. This will put the region in an excellent position to receive additional funds from areas that cannot obligate their apportionments. Should the region receive additional funds, either flexed from highway funds or redistributed from other regions, it is recommended that the funds be applied to projects on the current lists for the following purposes: to fully fund any partially funded requests for recommended projects, and to unfunded projects that are ready to go. At such time as additional funds are identified, the list of remaining projects, including the list of projects with NEPA status B or C, will be re-evaluated for readiness and prioritized.

Distribution by Jurisdiction – The recommendation allocates funds to six different agencies. However, both RPTA and METRO will utilize allocated funds within member jurisdictions. The total number of jurisdictions that will receive funds either directly or indirectly is 7. Allocations were further distributed using programmed expenditures by city for RPTA’s Arizona Avenue BRT project and using an allocation based on track miles for METRO’s park-and-ride project. Given those estimated distributions, the following table summarizes the recommended amounts by jurisdiction.

<i>Jurisdiction</i>	<i>Allocation</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Avondale	\$250,000	0.38%
Chandler	\$9,375,000	14.12%
Gilbert	\$615,000	0.93%
Goodyear	\$1,083,602	1.63%
Mesa	\$17,323,927	26.09%
Phoenix	\$30,143,682	45.40%
Tempe	\$7,603,678	11.45%
Total	\$66,394,889	

The staff recommendation follows the Board adopted criteria for project selection. There are a limited number of projects which should ease the grant process and minimize the additional reporting requirements of the ARRA. Although only a few cities benefit directly, all of the projects are important to the regional public transportation system and the system will see benefits as a whole. The projects also provide some relief to the TLCP financial model by bringing in federal revenues that were unanticipated. This benefits all members by helping to ensure that future projects can be implemented. One drawback to the adopted criteria is that the Prop 400 requirement eliminates potentially worthy projects from consideration. Facilities that were constructed with local and federal funds prior to Prop 400 were higher in priority for those cities than the projects that are funded through Prop 400. Existing facilities, such as the park-and-ride at Pecos/40th St. in Phoenix, may need upgrades or expansion and could be a higher priority for the system than fully constructing another facility that is funded in Prop 400. The Board could consider allocating funds for facilities that existed prior to Prop 400.

Alternative distributions – The Budget and Finance Subcommittee did not take an action on the staff recommendation. Instead, the Chair asked staff to develop alternative distribution methods that would allocate the ARRA funds to all jurisdictions and allow the jurisdictions to prioritize their own projects. The Chair asked for distribution formulas by population, by revenue miles operated and by TLCP jurisdictional equity percentage. The alternative formulas were developed for distribution to RPTA members only and for all cities. The six resultant distributions are attached, with a comparison to the distribution for the current staff recommendation.

The alternative distribution methodologies would allow for funds to be allocated to more cities to ensure that funds are spent throughout the entire regional. However, there are some drawbacks. Not all cities have projects that are ready to obligate federal funds. Some of those cities may not be able to get projects ready to obligate within the 180 days or possibly not even within the year. Those cities would have to will their funds to another city or to a specific project in another city or risk losing the funds entirely. Many cities may have projects that are not ready now, but could be ready by October to meet the year obligation requirement. If many cities want to be included in the second half of the obligation window, it may mean that there are not enough projects to obligate the first 50 percent.

Other funding opportunities – If the region can obligate and spend the apportioned funds, then there is an opportunity to receive additional funds re-distributed from regions that could not obligate. In addition, there are discretionary and competitive opportunities in the ARRA for projects that meet certain criteria. These opportunities include funds through the U.S. Department of Energy, the U.S. Department of Homeland Security and the U.S. Department of Transportation. These additional opportunities are summarized in an attachment.

Prior Committee Action

Transit Management Committee – March 4, 2009 for action
 Motion to consider alternative distribution methods failed 5-9
 Motion to approve staff recommendation passed 9-5
Budget and Finance Subcommittee – March 5, 2009 for action
 No action on staff recommendation
 Chair asked staff to look at alternative distribution methods
Board of Directors – March 19, 2009 for information and possible action

Recommendation

It is recommended that the Board forward the staff recommendations to the Maricopa Association of Governments for inclusion in the Transportation Improvement Program.

Contact Person

Paul Hodgins
Manager, Capital Programming
602-262-7433

Attachments

Board approved criteria for project selection
Timeline to obligate funds
5307 Avondale urbanized area projects
5307 Phoenix-Mesa urbanized area projects, NEPA status A
5309 Phoenix-Mesa Fixed Guideway Modernization projects
Alternative distribution by population – RPTA Members only
Alternative distribution by population – All cities
Alternative distribution by revenue miles – RPTA Members only
Alternative distribution by revenue miles – All cities
Alternative distribution by jurisdictional equity distribution – RPTA Members only
Alternative distribution by jurisdictional equity distribution – All cities
Discretionary and competitive funding opportunities
Powerpoint presentation

Criteria For Economic Recovery Package Project Selection Adopted by the Board of Directors – February 19, 2009

- Prop 400 projects
- Construction Projects or Projects that generate significant local job creation
- Ready to go projects (timing)
 - AA or BA
 - Construction ready
- Project size (larger is better)
- Projects that may not qualify for federal funds
- Projects that typically receive less federal funding

Timeline for Obligating Federal Funds

FTA published apportionments in Federal Register	3/5/2009	
	<u>First 50%</u>	<u>Remainder</u>
Publish notice of public hearing (30 days notice)	4/12/2009	10/14/2009
Proceed with TIP/STIP amendment		
Gather information for application		
Obtain grant number		
Enter info into FTA grant system (TEAM)		
Conduct public hearing	5/12/2009	11/13/2009
Finalize grant application (21 days)	5/13/2009	11/14/2009
Obtain concurrence of MPO		
FTA pre-submission review (30 days)	6/3/2009	12/5/2009
Ensure all info is included		
Allows for additional info based on FTA questions		
Submit grant application (60 days)	7/3/2009	1/4/2010
FTA review period		
DOL review and certification		
Grant award/obligation deadline	9/1/2009	3/5/2010

American Recovery and Reinvestment Act

Project List - Avondale Urbanized Area

5307 Formula Funds

NEPA Code - A

TIP Code - A or B

Agency	Project Location	Project Description	TLCF Amount	Total Request	Recommended Allocation	Supplanting	Contract Award Date	Project Completion Date
Goodyear	I-10/Litchfield Rd	Park and Ride construction	\$0	\$13,137,928	\$1,083,602	Yes	Jul 2009	Mar 2010
Avondale	Avondale Blvd/I-10	Park and Ride site selection	\$0	\$250,000	\$250,000	No		Apr 2010
Project Totals			\$0	\$13,387,928	\$1,333,602			

NOTE

Contract award date is for construction contracts and was estimated by the agency and used as a guide for readiness.

American Recovery and Reinvestment Act
 Project List - Phoenix/Mesa Urbanized Area

5307 Formula Funds

NEPA Code - A

TIP Code - A or B

Agency	Project Location	Project Description	TLCF Amount	Total Request	Recommended Allocation	Supplanting	Contract Award Date	Project Completion Date
VMR	Light Rail	Park-and-Ride Shade Canopies	\$19,034,540	\$15,000,000	\$8,255,179	No	Jun 2009	Dec 2009
Tempe	East Valley Operations and Maintenance Facility	Expansion/Upgrade	\$0	\$7,200,000	\$7,200,000	No	Jun 2009	Sep 2010
RPTA	Mesa Operations and Maintenance Facility	Expansion	\$11,940,747	\$10,000,000	\$10,000,000	No	Jul 2009	Feb 2010
RPTA	Arizona Avenue	Bus Rapid Transit capital improvements	\$22,510,057	\$21,920,000	\$15,000,000	Yes	Oct 2009	Jun 2010
Phoenix	Happy Valley/I-17	Park and Ride construction	\$4,575,569	\$14,606,108	\$13,966,038	No	Nov 2009	Dec 2010
Phoenix	Central Station	Upgrade and rehabilitate	\$7,794,504	\$10,000,000	\$10,000,000	No	Feb 2010	Sep 2010
Phoenix	Phoenix South Operations and Maintenance Facility	Upgrade and rehabilitate	\$11,940,747	\$30,000,000		No	Sep 2010	Dec 2011
Project Totals			\$77,796,164	\$108,726,108	\$64,421,217			

NOTE

Contract award date is for construction contracts and was estimated by the agency and used as a guide for readiness.

**American Recovery and Reinvestment Act
 Project List - Phoenix/Mesa Urbanized Area
 Fixed Guideway Modernization**

NEPA Code - A
 TIP Code - A or B

Agency	Project Location	Project Description	TLCF Amount	Total Request	Recommended Allocation	Supplanting	Contract Award Date	Project Completion Date
VMR	CPEV LRT	Park-and-Ride Shade Canopies	\$19,034,540	\$15,000,000		No	Jun 2009	Dec 2009
Phoenix	Happy Valley/I-17	Park and Ride	\$4,575,569	\$14,606,108	\$640,070	No	Nov 2009	Dec 2010
Project Totals			\$53,230,457	\$128,658,769	\$640,070			

NOTE

Contract award date is for construction contracts and was estimated by the agency and used as a guide for readiness.

ARRA 2009
Estimated Formula Funds Distributed by Population
RPTA Members Only

	<u>Population</u>	<u>Population Share</u>	<u>Formula Allocation</u>	<u>Recommended Allocation</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Avondale Urbanized Area					
<i>Avondale</i>	76,648	56.324%	\$751,140	\$250,000	\$501,140
<i>Goodyear</i>	59,436	43.676%	\$582,460	\$1,083,602	-\$501,142
Litchfield Park		0.000%	\$0	\$0	\$0
Totals	136,084		\$1,333,602		
Phoenix-Mesa Urbanized Area					
Apache Junction		0.000%	\$0	\$0	\$0
<i>Chandler</i>	244,376	6.631%	\$4,314,200	\$9,375,000	-\$5,060,800
<i>El Mirage</i>	33,647	0.913%	\$594,000	\$0	\$594,000
<i>Gilbert</i>	214,820	5.829%	\$3,792,420	\$615,000	\$3,177,420
<i>Glendale</i>	248,435	6.741%	\$4,385,860	\$0	\$4,385,860
Guadalupe		0.000%	\$0	\$0	\$0
<i>Maricopa County</i>	243,624	6.611%	\$4,300,930	\$0	\$4,300,930
<i>Mesa</i>	459,682	12.473%	\$8,115,210	\$17,323,927	-\$9,208,717
Paradise Valley		0.000%	\$0	\$0	\$0
<i>Peoria</i>	155,557	4.221%	\$2,746,200	\$0	\$2,746,200
<i>Phoenix</i>	1,561,485	42.370%	\$27,566,390	\$30,143,682	-\$2,577,292
<i>Scottsdale</i>	242,337	6.576%	\$4,278,210	\$0	\$4,278,210
<i>Surprise</i>	108,761	2.951%	\$1,920,060	\$0	\$1,920,060
<i>Tempe</i>	172,641	4.685%	\$3,047,800	\$7,603,678	-\$4,555,878
Tolleson		0.000%	\$0	\$0	\$0
Youngtown		0.000%	\$0	\$0	\$0
Totals	3,685,365		\$65,061,287		
Non-Urbanized Area					
<i>Buckeye</i>	50,143				
Carefree	3,948				
Cave Creek	5,132				
Fountain Hills	25,995				
Gila Bend	1,899				
<i>Queen Creek</i>	23,329				
Wickenburg	6,442				
Totals	116,888				

ARRA 2009
Estimated Formula Funds Distributed by Population
All Cities and Towns

	<u>Population</u>	<u>Population Share</u>	<u>Formula Allocation</u>	<u>Recommended Allocation</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Avondale Urbanized Area					
<i>Avondale</i>	76,648	54.292%	\$724,040	\$250,000	\$474,040
<i>Goodyear</i>	59,436	42.100%	\$561,450	\$1,083,602	-\$522,152
Litchfield Park	5,093	3.608%	\$48,110	\$0	\$48,110
Totals	141,177		\$1,333,602		
Phoenix-Mesa Urbanized Area					
<i>Apache Junction</i>	276	0.007%	\$4,830	\$0	\$4,830
<i>Chandler</i>	244,376	6.570%	\$4,274,690	\$9,375,000	-\$5,100,310
<i>El Mirage</i>	33,647	0.905%	\$588,560	\$0	\$588,560
<i>Gilbert</i>	214,820	5.776%	\$3,757,690	\$615,000	\$3,142,690
<i>Glendale</i>	248,435	6.679%	\$4,345,690	\$0	\$4,345,690
<i>Guadalupe</i>	5,990	0.161%	\$104,780	\$0	\$104,780
<i>Maricopa County</i>	243,624	6.550%	\$4,261,540	\$0	\$4,261,540
<i>Mesa</i>	459,682	12.359%	\$8,040,880	\$17,323,927	-\$9,283,047
<i>Paradise Valley</i>	14,444	0.388%	\$252,660	\$0	\$252,660
<i>Peoria</i>	155,557	4.182%	\$2,721,050	\$0	\$2,721,050
<i>Phoenix</i>	1,561,485	41.982%	\$27,313,920	\$30,143,682	-\$2,829,762
<i>Scottsdale</i>	242,337	6.515%	\$4,239,030	\$0	\$4,239,030
<i>Surprise</i>	108,761	2.924%	\$1,902,480	\$0	\$1,902,480
<i>Tempe</i>	172,641	4.642%	\$3,019,880	\$7,603,678	-\$4,583,798
<i>Tolleson</i>	6,833	0.184%	\$119,520	\$0	\$119,520
<i>Youngtown</i>	6,522	0.175%	\$114,080	\$0	\$114,080
Totals	3,719,430		\$65,061,287		
Non-Urbanized Area					
<i>Buckeye</i>	50,143				
<i>Carefree</i>	3,948				
<i>Cave Creek</i>	5,132				
<i>Fountain Hills</i>	25,995				
<i>Gila Bend</i>	1,899				
<i>Queen Creek</i>	23,329				
<i>Wickenburg</i>	6,442				
Totals	116,888				

ARRA 2009
Estimated Formula Funds Distributed by Revenue Miles
RPTA Members Only

	<u>Revenue</u>		<u>Formula</u>	<u>Recommended</u>	<u>Difference</u>
	<u>Miles</u>	<u>Miles Share</u>	<u>Allocation</u>	<u>Allocation</u>	
Avondale Urbanized Area					
<i>Avondale</i>	257,578	90.503%	\$1,206,950	\$250,000	\$956,950
<i>Goodyear</i>	27,029	9.497%	\$126,650	\$1,083,602	-\$956,952
<i>Litchfield Park</i>		0.000%	\$0	\$0	\$0
Totals	284,607		\$1,333,602		
Phoenix-Mesa Urbanized Area					
<i>Apache Junction</i>		0.000%	\$0	\$0	\$0
<i>Chandler</i>	1,091,750	3.265%	\$2,124,380	\$9,375,000	-\$7,250,620
<i>El Mirage</i>	0	0.000%	\$0	\$0	\$0
<i>Gilbert</i>	481,646	1.441%	\$937,210	\$615,000	\$322,210
<i>Glendale</i>	1,742,317	5.211%	\$3,390,280	\$0	\$3,390,280
<i>Guadalupe</i>		0.000%	\$0	\$0	\$0
<i>Maricopa County</i>	38,603	0.115%	\$75,110	\$0	\$75,110
<i>Mesa</i>	2,871,496	8.588%	\$5,587,480	\$17,323,927	-\$11,736,447
<i>Paradise Valley</i>		0.000%	\$0	\$0	\$0
<i>Peoria</i>	44,382	0.133%	\$86,360	\$0	\$86,360
<i>Phoenix</i>	18,549,651	55.478%	\$36,094,730	\$30,143,682	\$5,951,048
<i>Scottsdale</i>	2,154,033	6.442%	\$4,191,410	\$0	\$4,191,410
<i>Surprise</i>	42,688	0.128%	\$83,060	\$0	\$83,060
<i>Tempe</i>	6,419,455	19.199%	\$12,491,260	\$7,603,678	\$4,887,582
<i>Tolleson</i>		0.000%	\$0	\$0	\$0
<i>Youngtown</i>		0.000%	\$0	\$0	\$0
Totals	33,436,019		\$65,061,287		
Non-Urbanized Area					
<i>Buckeye</i>	0				
<i>Carefree</i>	0				
<i>Cave Creek</i>	0				
<i>Fountain Hills</i>	4,755				
<i>Gila Bend</i>	179,270				
<i>Queen Creek</i>	0				
<i>Wickenburg</i>	97,386				
Totals	281,411				

ARRA 2009
Estimated Formula Funds Distributed by Revenue Miles
All Cities and Towns

	<u>Revenue</u>		<u>Formula</u>	<u>Recommended</u>	<u>Difference</u>
	<u>Miles</u>	<u>Miles Share</u>	<u>Allocation</u>	<u>Allocation</u>	
Avondale Urbanized Area					
<i>Avondale</i>	257,578	90.503%	\$1,206,950	\$250,000	\$956,950
<i>Goodyear</i>	27,029	9.497%	\$126,650	\$1,083,602	-\$956,952
Litchfield Park	0	0.000%	\$0	\$0	\$0
Totals	284,607		\$1,333,602		
Phoenix-Mesa Urbanized Area					
<i>Apache Junction</i>	0	0.000%	\$0	\$0	\$0
<i>Chandler</i>	1,091,750	3.247%	\$2,112,820	\$9,375,000	-\$7,262,180
<i>El Mirage</i>	0	0.000%	\$0	\$0	\$0
<i>Gilbert</i>	481,646	1.433%	\$932,110	\$615,000	\$317,110
<i>Glendale</i>	1,742,317	5.183%	\$3,371,840	\$0	\$3,371,840
<i>Guadalupe</i>	63,518	0.189%	\$122,920	\$0	\$122,920
<i>Maricopa County</i>	38,603	0.115%	\$74,710	\$0	\$74,710
<i>Mesa</i>	2,871,496	8.541%	\$5,557,100	\$17,323,927	-\$11,766,827
<i>Paradise Valley</i>	69,422	0.206%	\$134,350	\$0	\$134,350
<i>Peoria</i>	44,382	0.132%	\$85,890	\$0	\$85,890
<i>Phoenix</i>	18,549,651	55.176%	\$35,898,470	\$30,143,682	\$5,754,788
<i>Scottsdale</i>	2,154,033	6.407%	\$4,168,620	\$0	\$4,168,620
<i>Surprise</i>	42,688	0.127%	\$82,610	\$0	\$82,610
<i>Tempe</i>	6,419,455	19.095%	\$12,423,340	\$7,603,678	\$4,819,662
<i>Tolleson</i>	49,862	0.148%	\$96,500	\$0	\$96,500
<i>Youngtown</i>	0	0.000%	\$0	\$0	\$0
Totals	33,618,822		\$65,061,287		
Non-Urbanized Area					
<i>Buckeye</i>	0				
<i>Carefree</i>	0				
<i>Cave Creek</i>	0				
<i>Fountain Hills</i>	4,755				
<i>Gila Bend</i>	179,270				
<i>Queen Creek</i>	0				
<i>Wickenburg</i>	97,386				
Totals	281,411				

ARRA 2009
Estimated Formula Funds Distributed by TLCP Jurisdictional Equity
RPTA Members Only

	<u>JE \$\$</u>	<u>JE Share</u>	<u>Formula Allocation</u>	<u>Recommended Allocation</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Avondale Urbanized Area					
<i>Avondale</i>	\$ 23,760,688	85.613%	\$1,141,740	\$250,000	\$891,740
<i>Goodyear</i>	\$ 3,992,949	14.387%	\$191,870	\$1,083,602	-\$891,732
<i>Litchfield Park</i>		0.000%	\$0	\$0	\$0
Totals	\$ 27,753,637		\$1,333,602		
Phoenix-Mesa Urbanized Area					
<i>Apache Junction</i>	\$ -	0.000%	\$0	\$0	\$0
<i>Chandler</i>	\$ 146,149,676	5.387%	\$3,504,880	\$9,375,000	-\$5,870,120
<i>El Mirage</i>	\$ 3,487,914	0.129%	\$83,650	\$0	\$83,650
<i>Gilbert</i>	\$ 94,467,482	3.482%	\$2,265,470	\$615,000	\$1,650,470
<i>Glendale</i>	\$ 108,008,538	3.981%	\$2,590,200	\$0	\$2,590,200
<i>Guadalupe</i>		0.000%	\$0	\$0	\$0
<i>Maricopa County</i>	\$ 10,073,686	0.371%	\$241,580	\$0	\$241,580
<i>Mesa</i>	\$ 365,252,929	13.463%	\$8,759,300	\$17,323,927	-\$8,564,627
<i>Paradise Valley</i>		0.000%	\$0	\$0	\$0
<i>Peoria</i>	\$ 34,244,991	1.262%	\$821,250	\$0	\$821,250
<i>Phoenix</i>	\$ 1,495,131,065	55.110%	\$35,855,440	\$30,143,682	\$5,711,758
<i>Scottsdale</i>	\$ 160,727,464	5.924%	\$3,854,480	\$0	\$3,854,480
<i>Surprise</i>	\$ 3,577,547	0.132%	\$85,790	\$0	\$85,790
<i>Tempe</i>	\$ 291,860,477	10.758%	\$6,999,240	\$7,603,678	-\$604,438
<i>Tolleson</i>		0.000%	\$0	\$0	\$0
<i>Youngtown</i>		0.000%	\$0	\$0	\$0
Totals	\$ 2,712,981,769		\$65,061,287		
Non-Urbanized Area					
<i>Buckeye</i>	\$ 1,120,089				
<i>Carefree</i>	\$ -				
<i>Cave Creek</i>	\$ -				
<i>Fountain Hills</i>					
<i>Gila Bend</i>					
<i>Queen Creek</i>	\$ 942,073				
<i>Wickenburg</i>					
Totals	\$ 2,062,162				

ARRA 2009

Estimated Formula Funds Distributed by TLCP Jurisdictional Equity

All Cities and Towns

	<u>JE \$\$</u>	<u>JE Share</u>	<u>Formula Allocation</u>	<u>Recommended Allocation</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Avondale Urbanized Area					
Avondale	\$ 23,760,688	75.994%	\$1,013,460	\$250,000	\$763,460
Goodyear	\$ 3,992,949	12.771%	\$170,310	\$1,083,602	-\$913,292
Litchfield Park	\$ 3,512,813	11.235%	\$149,830	\$0	\$149,830
Totals	\$ 31,266,450		\$1,333,602		
Phoenix-Mesa Urbanized Area					
Apache Junction	\$ -	0.000%	\$0	\$0	\$0
Chandler	\$ 146,149,676	5.361%	\$3,487,680	\$9,375,000	-\$5,887,320
El Mirage	\$ 3,487,914	0.128%	\$83,230	\$0	\$83,230
Gilbert	\$ 94,467,482	3.465%	\$2,254,350	\$615,000	\$1,639,350
Glendale	\$ 108,008,538	3.962%	\$2,577,490	\$0	\$2,577,490
Guadalupe	\$ 110,099	0.004%	\$2,630	\$0	\$2,630
Maricopa County	\$ 10,073,686	0.369%	\$240,400	\$0	\$240,400
Mesa	\$ 365,252,929	13.397%	\$8,716,300	\$17,323,927	-\$8,607,627
Paradise Valley	\$ 8,260,309	0.303%	\$197,120	\$0	\$197,120
Peoria	\$ 34,244,991	1.256%	\$817,210	\$0	\$817,210
Phoenix	\$ 1,495,131,065	54.840%	\$35,679,430	\$30,143,682	\$5,535,748
Scottsdale	\$ 160,727,464	5.895%	\$3,835,560	\$0	\$3,835,560
Surprise	\$ 3,577,547	0.131%	\$85,370	\$0	\$85,370
Tempe	\$ 291,860,477	10.705%	\$6,964,880	\$7,603,678	-\$638,798
Tolleson	\$ 4,758,604	0.175%	\$113,560	\$0	\$113,560
Youngtown	\$ 254,648	0.009%	\$6,080	\$0	\$6,080
Totals	\$ 2,726,365,429		\$65,061,287		
Non-Urbanized Area					
Buckeye	\$ 1,120,089				
Carefree	\$ -				
Cave Creek	\$ -				
Fountain Hills	\$ 1,308,537				
Gila Bend	\$ 2,094,075				
Queen Creek	\$ 942,073				
Wickenburg	\$ 339,324				
Totals	\$ 5,804,098				

Discretionary and Competitive Funding Opportunities

U.S. Department of Transportation - Multi-modal program

Provides \$1.5 billion to new competitive program

Criteria to be established by May 18, 2009

All transportation modes eligible

Minimum \$20 million project size

Maximum \$300 million awarded to any one state

Federal Transit Administration - 5309 New Starts

Provides \$750 million to existing discretionary program

Existing or nearly ready Full Funding Grant Agreements eligible

METRO has \$38 million in eligible costs that may receive funding

Federal Transit Administration - Energy program

Provides \$100 million to new competitive program

Criteria not yet established

For projects that reduce transit agency's energy consumption

U.S. Department of Energy - Energy Efficiency and Conservation Block Grants

Provides \$3.2 billion for block grant program

\$2.8 billion distributed by formula

\$400 million through competitive grants

Cities are eligible

U.S. Department of Homeland Security - Transportation Security grants

Provides \$150 million for competitive grants through existing program