

## **Impacts of SAFETEA-LU on Transit Data Requirements**

SAFETEA-LU for the most part maintained the structure of the federal Transit program. The new law has, however, created new demands for transit data. Those new data requirements relate to:

- New planning requirements;
- New apportionment formulas for new programs or previously discretionary programs;
- Codified and expanded efforts to improve the quality of data; and
- Studies.

SAFETEA-LU did not specifically address some key existing data needs, particularly in area of system condition and performance of existing fixed guideway transit systems.

### **New Planning Requirements**

SAFETEA-LU requires State DOT's to certify that grants awarded under the Elderly and Individuals with Disabilities Program (49 USC 5310), the Jobs Access Reverse Commute (JARC) program (codified as 49 USC 5316) and the newly created New Freedom program (49 USC 5317) are derived from a locally developed, coordinated public transit-human services transportation plan and that the plan is developed through a process that includes representatives of public, private, and non-profit transportation and human services providers and with participation by the public.

The specific requirements of a coordinated transportation plan have yet to be developed. The data requirements will flow from the guidance on the contents of the plan.

As FTA develops guidance on the coordinated plan, it needs to clarify the definition of "locally developed". Does this mean the Metropolitan Planning Organization in urbanized areas and Rural Planning Organizations in non-urbanized areas where states have established RPO's? How should a state without RPO's handle this requirement?

Because SAFETEA-LU requires that coordinated plans are the basis for making annual grant allocations, it is not clear how the plans are to interface with MPO planning, especially since urbanized area JARC and New Freedom allocations (plus any Sec. 5310 projects in urbanized areas) do NOT pass through MPOs, except in those larger urban areas where the MPO is a designated recipient of Sec. 5307 funds. FTA is reportedly thinking of allowing these local coordinated plans to be done in a unified mechanism (i.e., a consolidated plan that addresses all three grant programs), but it's not clear if such an approach would satisfy the statutory priorities for all three programs.

The concept of coordination with health and human services agencies is not new. One of the great challenges of the past two decades of coordination has been the lack of comprehensive fully allocated cost data on health and human services client transportation. Without these data, the full benefit of coordinating health and human services transportation with transit and

paratransit services is not entirely understood. In particular, the benefits of coordination attributable to transit and paratransit providers vs. the benefits attributable to the health and human services agencies are, for the most part, unknown. This new planning requirement may be an opportunity to better understand the potential to reduce costs and/or improve service through coordination and develop investment strategies accordingly. The National Summit on Transportation Coordination found in 2003 that one barrier to coordination was the lack of documentation of health and human service agency transportation costs.

In addition to understanding costs and benefits of coordination, understanding the unmet transportation needs of this target population is a key element in the federal transportation reauthorization process. As society ages, understanding and quantifying the need for transportation services for the elderly and for individuals with disabilities is increasingly important. Collecting the data for the planning process at the local level may begin to address the gap in national data on the transportation needs of the elderly and individuals with disabilities

The FTA website has circa 2000 guidance for coordination planning. It is best-practices oriented rather than prescriptive. In addition, the FTA website cites best practices in coordination planning developed by CTAA and United We Ride. It is not clear whether the FTA guidance will require updating now that planning is a requirement rather than a recommended practice. It is also unclear what data will be needed to support the new planning requirement.

### **New Programs and New Formulas**

SAFETEA-LU codifies and formulizes the Jobs Access Reverse Commute (JARC). The new JARC allocation formula is based on each state's and urbanized area 3-year history of Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) recipients, and on each state's and each urbanized area's population living at or below 150 percent of the federal poverty line. First of all, these TANF data do not exist. TANF allocations to states are not based on any population-driven factors; instead, they are pegged to the dollar amount of AFDC funds each state received in 1994, which has little bearing on current job access demands or outcomes.

SAFETEA-LU also created a new program called the New Freedom Program to provide transit service to disabled persons at all income levels over and above the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA). The apportionment formula for the New Freedom program is based on the decennial census' most recent calculations of persons with disabilities, by state and urbanized area. These data are easily and accurately derived.

SAFETEA-LU Section 3033 Apportionments Based on Fixed Guideway Mileage—This section continues to freeze fixed guideway mileage at 1997 levels, but adjusts fixed guideway mileage for a small urbanized area to treat that mileage as a large urbanized area for the purpose of apportionments.

SAFETEA-LU Section 3038 Growing States and High Density Formula Factors: The section defines apportionment formulas based on:

- Forecast population for the 15 years after the most recent decennial census, as estimated by the Secretary of Commerce.
- Urbanized area population in states with population density exceeding 370 persons per square mile.

While the data set for the high density states formula factor is defined as “the most recent available”, no such requirement is defined for the high density state formula factor.

Finally, Section 3034 Apportionments of Formula Grants calls for a study of incentives which might be added to the urbanized area and other-than-urbanized area formula programs. The report language that accompanies the bill cites the Administration incentive proposal and also suggests improvements in efficiency (cost per unit of service provided), effectiveness (service utilization per unit of service provided), and cost-effectiveness (cost per unit of service utilization). This report may have significant data implications in future reauthorization bills.

## **Efforts to Improve Data Quality**

### Non-Rural Transit System Data

SAFETEA-LU establishes a new requirement for State DOT’s to submit an annual report to FTA with the following information on non-urbanized public transportation funded under Section 5311:

- Total annual revenue
- Sources of revenue
- Total annual operating costs
- Total annual capital costs
- Fleet size and type, and related facilities
- Revenue vehicle miles, and
- Ridership.

The existing reporting requirements for Section 5311 are:

- Number of vehicles
- Revenue vehicle miles
- Type of passengers
- Number of one-way trips

While the number of data elements in the new requirements are targeted to a vital few, the sheer number of subrecipient transit providers (over 1200) is significant. The burden of data collection falls primarily on State DOT’s, the statutory recipients of Non Urbanized Transit Funding. The individual rural transit operators, the subrecipients of Non-Urbanized Transit funding, have the burden of reporting the data to their respective State DOT. The relative level of administrative sophistication of those subrecipients varies greatly. In the case of a one- or two-bus system, an operator’s accounting system may not be much more than a checkbook and a tax return. Other

systems operate with the complexity and sophistication that exceeds that of some urbanized systems.

In addition, there is great variation in the amount of data currently collected from Non-Urbanized Transit program subrecipients by State DOT's today. Nearly every state collects data similar to those that now will be required under SAFETEA-LU, but there have not been efforts among the states to ensure their definitions and calculations for these data are consistent among the states. In particular, there is no uniformity of what data, if any, have been collected by states on their fleet sizes, types and facilities. In addition, the priority to coordinate various forms of public and human services transportation data further complicate these data collections and supporting definitions.

Finally, a decision on data aggregation must be made. Will the National Transit Database include data on individual subrecipients, or will the data be aggregated by county or by state? Given the wide variety in the size and complexity of rural transit operations, data on individual subrecipients would be most useful for developing true peer groups for benchmarking. Collecting disaggregate data may help us understand the geographic availability of service in rural areas, the extent of underserved and unserved populations, and to quantify the investment needed to close that gap.

#### New Starts and Small Starts Data

SAFETEA Section 3011 amends 49 USC 5309(d) and (e) where FTA is directed to ascertain "the reliability of the forecasting methods used to estimate costs and utilization" as a criteria for approving funding for New Starts and Small Starts projects, and for evaluating the acceptable local financial commitment for the proposed project. This provision will affect the documentation that is required to be included in New Start and Small Start project applications. It will require the documentation of data quality assurance procedures as well as validation of forecasting models that use the data.

SAFETEA Section 3011 also adds 49 USC 5309(g)(2)(C) codifying the requirement that Transit New Starts and the newly created Small Starts Before and After Studies that were previously required to be completed by recipients of Full Funding Grant Agreements under regulations are now required to do so under law. The provision specifies that applicants for Full Funding Grant Agreements must include an Information Collection and Analysis Plan to gather the data necessary for the Before and After Analysis, and that the Before data must be collected prior to starting construction. FTA is now required to annually (First Monday of each August) summarize the results of these studies. This provision may have minor changes affecting data quality assurance, report formats, and report submission schedules. There may be a need to standardize the data reported in the individual Before and After Studies and establish a reporting cycle to allow FTA adequate time to analyze the data and produce the annual summary report.

SAFETEA also adds a new 49 USC 5309(l)(2) Contractor Performance Assessment Report . Beginning 180 days after enactment of SAFETEA-LU and annually thereafter, FTA is required to report to Congress on the accuracy and consistency of cost and ridership estimates made by each contractor to public transportation agencies developing new fixed guideway projects.

All of these efforts are aimed at improving the quality of two key data elements used to award Transit New Starts and Smalls Starts grants and to measure the both the efficiency and effectiveness of those grants.

## **Reports and Studies**

SAFETEA Section 3034 Apportionments of Formula Grants calls for a study of incentives which might be added to the urbanized area and other-than-urbanized area formula programs. Report language associated with this provision cites the Administration incentive proposal and also suggests improvements in efficiency (cost per unit of service provided), effectiveness (service utilization per unit of service provided), and cost-effectiveness (cost per unit of service utilization). In many ways this study complements the work on revenue and ridership data on New Starts and Small Starts that is mandated by the new law.

SAFTEA-LU requires the Comptroller General to submit biennial report to Congress beginning 2006 evaluating the JARC program.

SAFETEA-LU Section 3011 adds a new section 5309(d)(11) which directs FTA to prepare a report for Congress on the methodology to be used in evaluating the land use and economic impacts of non-fixed guideway or partial fixed guideway Small Starts projects within 120 days of enactment of SAFETEA-LU. The report shall address both qualitative and quantitative differences between fixed guideway and non-fixed guideway projects with respect to land use and economic development. Since the report will have been completed by the time the NCHRP meeting occurs, the focus should be on the results of the FTA report, and how the report will impact the development of program guidance and regulations.

New Section 5309 (c)(6) requires FTA to report to Congress in mid-2007 on the costs, benefits and efficiencies of a public-private partnership program for new fixed guideway projects.

SAFETEA Section 3012 adds 49 USC 5310(b)(7) which establishes a pilot program to permit up to seven states to use up to 33 percent of their Section 5310 funds to cover the operating costs of these specialized transit services and directs USDOT to report to Congress on the pilot. This provision also gives USDOT the ability to require that pilot states collect and report the data needed to prepare the report. The following report elements are specified in law:

- the extent to which funds were used to subsidize existing paratransit service provided in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA);
- whether states participating in the pilot program provided services to provide service that exceeded ADA requirements;
- whether states participating in the pilot and used the pilot program funds to provide service that exceeded ADA requirements did so to the detriment of other eligible projects;
- percentage of funds for elderly individuals;
- percentage of funds used to assist individuals with disabilities;
- the extent to which pilot states serve a wider range of elderly, low income, and persons with disabilities populations;

- whether the pilot program improves services to the elderly and individuals with disabilities;
- the extent to which the pilot states are able to expand the range of transportation alternatives available to the target population; and
- whether or not the pilot program encourages or discourages coordination with or integration of other funding sources.

The existing reporting requirements for the 5310 program are quite minimal. Very little of the data listed above currently exist. Furthermore the typical subrecipient of 5310 funding is a health and human service non-governmental organization such as a Senior Center or Sheltered Workshop. There is a wide range of administrative sophistication among these subrecipients. Those health and human services agencies with the greatest need for operating assistance are often those with the weakest administrative systems.

There are significant new quantitative and qualitative data elements that must be collected by the seven pilot states. Since this is a pilot effort, no modifications are needed to the National Transit Database (NTD). Pilot State DOT recipients and Health and Human Service subrecipients are likely to be called upon to provide the data for FTA to prepare its report to Congress.

### **Carry-Over Data Issue**

The National Transit Database has data for urbanized systems on fleet size and age, which is a critical data element in calculating investment needs at the national level. The National Transit Database also has data on track mileage, the number of stations for rail systems, and the number of maintenance facilities for all modes. These data elements, on their own, are far too limited to assess national investment needs to maintain transit systems condition and performance.

Since 1999, FTA has gathered a considerable amount of data on transit assets to supplement what is reported to the NTD. This work has included onsite engineering surveys of bus and rail vehicles, bus and rail maintenance facilities, and rail stations. Between 1999 and 2004, FTA inspected 1,179 transit vehicles, 165 maintenance facilities (42 rail facilities from 13 agencies and 123 bus facilities from 43 agencies) and 135 rail stations (94 heavy rail stations from 10 agencies and 41 light rail stations from 7 agencies). Rail and bus vehicles surveys were based on examinations of roughly 60 different sub-components of the vehicles and stations and maintenance facilities surveys on examinations of between 80 to 130 components. The data collected by these surveys have been used to reestimate decay curves used in the Transit Economic Requirements Model (TERM), which were originally based on data primarily from the Chicago Transit Authority (CTA).

Preliminary inspections of train control systems at 6 systems are currently underway, and the decay curves of these assets will be reestimated based on these surveys. Additional surveys of systems will most likely be continued in 2006, to improve the robustness of the decay curve estimation. Data on track conditions have also been requested from a handful of systems. Based on the information received, FTA will decide how to proceed to improve its decay curves for track and track condition estimates.

The NTD data available for estimating transit asset conditions includes a one time collection of transit asset data by the NTD Asset Condition Reporting Module in 2002. Participation was voluntary. Several large operators chose not to participate, and not all agencies that participated submitted a complete set of information. The ACM data covers all asset types, excluding revenue vehicles. The ACM provided the following information, which is used to estimate transit asset conditions: (1) asset type, (2) asset age and quantity, (3) asset replacement cost, (4) the year in which the asset replacement cost is denominated, and (5) the percentage of the asset (e.g., facility) used by the reporting agency to provide transit services. In some cases, information reported to the ACM on the condition of an asset and its useful life was used to estimate the current age of the asset, which is used as input into TERM. The ACM data was used to update approximately 15 percent of TERM asset data used in the upcoming 2004 report (with 2002 data).

FTA has also collected asset data with special requests. Data from 15 agencies, which did not report to the ACM, was collected in 2003 and 2004 and used to update the TERM asset inventory. In 2005, data was collected from 12 additional agencies and is being incorporated into TERM.

Substantial revisions have also made to replacement cost estimates for rail assets based on information collected by two recent FTA studies, *Light Rail Transit Capital Cost Survey, October 2003*, and *Heavy Rail Transit Capital Cost Survey, June 2004*, which updated earlier studies undertaken in 1991 and 1994, respectively.

The transit capital investment needs reported in 2004 Conditions and Performance Report will be based on asset deterioration schedules and data updates through 2003, and the 2006 Report will be based on revisions and updates through 2005.

**Appendix  
Transit Section by Section Analysis**

**Section 3008 Urbanized Area Formula Grants**

Section 3008 (b)(1) Associated Capital Maintenance

Section 3008 (b)(1) amends the definition of “associated capital maintenance items” to include reconstruction of equipment of material, subject to the same fair market value as other associated capital maintenance items.

Data Implication: Modify the instructions for reporting associated capital maintenance to the National Transportation Data Base.

Existing and Status:

New Data Needs: Minor change in reporting requirements.

Data Program Options:

Changing Roles of Partners: No substantial change.

Performance Expectations: NTDB reporting instructions should be updated.

Section 3008(c) Transition for Operators in Areas that were Rural and are Now Urbanized

Section 3008(c) General Authority- expands the universe of transit properties eligible for the transition to large urbanized areas provisions, where transit properties may continue to use Section 5307 funds to defray operating costs. SAFTEA-LU permits systems that received Section 5311 rural funding in FY 2002 and were in rural areas under the 1990 census, but are now in urbanized areas with a population greater than 200,000 (UZA’s).

Data Implication:

Existing and Status: Census data are available.

New Data Needs: None

Data Program Options:

Changing Roles of Partners:

Performance Expectations:

### Section 3008(d) Grant Recipient Requirements: Transit Enhancements

While subsection (d) eliminates the takedown for Transit Enhancements, it requires Section 5307 recipients to report annually on expenditures on Transit Enhancements.

Data Implication: New data requirement

Existing and Status: NTDB does not require recipients to report investments in Enhancement activities as a separate line item.

New Data Needs: Documentation of investment in Transit Enhancements.

Data Program Options: Modify the reporting requirements to the NTDB.

Changing Roles of Partners: Urbanized transit operators will be required to separately account for Transit Enhancement activities. Under TEA-21, a portion of 5307 funds were reserved by FTA for Enhancement projects only.

Performance Expectations: May consist of a certification statement in annual report to NTDB or may require separate accounting and specific reporting of funds used for enhancement activities. Note that Enhancement Activities are often not stand-alone projects, but elements of larger projects (e.g., the creation of a park-like pedestrian plaza as part of a larger project to refurbish a commuter rail station.). This may require a breakout of expenditures from larger projects.

## Section 3011 Capital Investment Grants

Section 3011 (a) modifies Section 5309 Capital Investment Grants, providing funds for New Starts, Fixed Guideway Modernization, and Bus and Bus Related Facilities..

Small Starts: New 49 USC 5309(d) creates a “Small Starts” program for fixed guideway projects costing less than \$75 million. The exemption for projects costing less than \$25 million is eliminated. The Small Starts program will provide funding for Bus Rapid Transit projects, where signal prioritization and Automated Vehicle Location (AVL) systems are combined with enhanced bus shelters to provide a level of transit service approaching that of a light rail system, without the significant capital investment. Such systems may include bus-only lanes for a portion of the service.

Data Implication: Reduction in data required to justify, analyze and approve grants for projects costing less than \$75 million and more than \$25 million.

Existing and Status: The five criteria used to rate proposed Small Starts projects are a subset of the data required for the existing Transit New Starts program.

New Data Needs: The provision creates new data reporting requirements for fixed guideway projects costing less than \$25 million.

Data Program Options: Rulemaking or guidance?

Changing Roles of Partners: This program is likely to attract applicants that previously relied on urbanized formula funds or Bus Discretionary Program funding to support their projects.

Performance Expectations:

Forecasting Methods: In Sections 5309(d) and (e) FTA is directed to ascertain “the reliability of the forecasting methods used to estimate costs and utilization” as a criteria for approving funding for New Starts and Small Starts projects, and for evaluating the acceptable local financial commitment for the proposed project.

Data Implication: New yardstick for FTA to evaluate funding proposed New Start and Small Start projects.

Existing and Status: Affects documentation to be included in New Start and Small Start project applications.

New Data Needs: Documentation of data quality assurance procedures as well as validation of forecasting models that use the data.

Data Program Options: FTA must issue revised policy guidance within 120 days of enactment. The promulgation of this guidance is subject to public comment.

Changing Roles of Partners:

Performance Expectations

Study on Land Use and Economic Impacts: New Section 5309(d)(11): directs FTA to prepare a report for Congress on the methodology to be used in evaluating the land use and economic impacts of non-fixed guideway or partial fixed guideway Small Starts projects within 120 days of enactment of SAFETEA-LU. The report shall address both qualitative and quantitative differences between fixed guideway and non-fixed guideway projects with respect to land use and economic development.

Data Implication: Since the report will have been completed by the time the NCHRP meeting occurs, the focus should be on the results of the FTA report, and how the report will impact the development of program guidance and regulations.

Existing and Status:

New Data Needs:

Data Program Options:

Changing Roles of Partners:

Performance Expectations

Before and After Studies: New 5309(g)(2)(C) Transit New Starts and Small Starts Before and After Studies that were previously required to be completed by recipients of Full Funding Grant Agreements under regulations are now required to do so under law. The provision specifies that applicants for Full Funding Grant Agreements must include an Information Collection and Analysis Plan to gather the data necessary for the Before and After Analysis, and that the Before data must be collected prior to starting construction. FTA is now required to annually (First Monday of each August) summarize the results of these studies.

Data Implication: Minor changes affecting data QA, report formats, and report submission schedules.

Existing and Status: How do data elements required in law compare to existing guidance?

New Data Needs: There may be a need to standardize the data reported in the individual Before and After Studies and establish a reporting cycle to allow FTA adequate time to analyze the data and produce the annual summary report.

Data Program Options:

Changing Roles of Partners: Affects primarily FTA.

Performance Expectations: Guidance?

Contractor Performance Assessment Report: New Section 5309(l)(2) Contractor Performance Assessment Report : beginning 180 days after enactment of SAFETEA-LU and annually thereafter, FTA is required to report to Congress on the accuracy and consistency of cost and ridership estimates made by each contractor to public transportation agencies developing new fixed guideway projects.

Data Implication:

Existing and Status:

New Data Needs:

Data Program Options:

Changing Roles of Partners

Performance Expectations

Public Private Partnerships Report: Section 5309 (c)(6) requires FTA to report to Congress in mid-2007 on the costs, benefits and efficiencies of a public-private partnership program for new fixed guideway projects.

Data Implication

Existing and Status

New Data Needs

Data Program Options

Changing Roles of Partners

Performance Expectations

## **Section 3012- Elderly and Individuals with Disabilities Program.**

Legislative Provision: Section 3012 amends 23 USC Section 5310 Elderly and Individuals with Disabilities Program.

### **New Local Planning Requirement**

Subsection (b)(2) requires State DOT's to certify that Section 3012 projects are derived from a locally developed, coordinated public transit-human services transportation plan and that the plan is developed through a process that includes representatives of public, private, and non-profit transportation and human services providers and with participation by the public. Note that this requirement also applies to Section 3018 Jobs Access Reverse Commute (JARC) and 3019 New Freedom programs.

Data Implication: The specific requirements of a coordinated transportation plan have yet to be developed. The data requirements will flow from the guidance on the contents of the plan.

Changing Roles of Partners: In developing guidance on the coordinated plan, the definition of "locally developed" needs clarification. Does this mean the Metropolitan Planning Organization in urbanized areas and Rural Planning Organizations in non-urbanized areas where states have established RPO's? How should a state without RPO's handle this requirement?

The concept of coordination with health and human services agencies is not new. One of the great challenges of the past two decades of coordination has been the lack of comprehensive fully allocated cost data on health and human services client transportation. Without these data, the full benefit of coordinating health and human services transportation with transit and paratransit services is not entirely understood. In particular, the benefits of coordination attributable to transit and paratransit providers vs. the benefits attributable to the health and human services agencies are, for the most part, unknown. This new planning requirement may be an opportunity to better understand the potential to reduce costs and/or improve service through coordination and develop investment strategies accordingly. The National Summit on Transportation Coordination found in 2003 that one barrier to coordination was the lack of documentation of health and human service agency transportation costs.

In addition to understanding costs and benefits of coordination, understanding the unmet transportation needs of this target population is a key element in the federal transportation reauthorization process. As society ages, understanding and quantifying the need for transportation services for the elderly and for individuals with disabilities is increasingly important. Collecting the data for the planning process at the local level may begin to address the gap in national data on the transportation needs of the elderly and individuals with disabilities

The FTA website has circa 2000 guidance for coordination planning. It is best-practices oriented rather than prescriptive. In addition, the FTA website cites best practices in coordination planning developed by CTAA and United We Ride. It is not clear whether the FTA guidance

will require updating now that planning is a requirement rather than a recommended practice. It is also unclear what data will be needed to support the new planning requirement.

Because SAFTEA-LU requires that coordinated plans are the basis for making annual grant allocations, it's not clear how the plans are to interface with MPO planning, especially since urbanized areas' JARC and New Freedom allocations (plus any Sec. 5310 projects in urbanized areas) do NOT pass through MPOs, except in those larger urban areas where the MPO is a designated recipient of Sec. 5307 funds. FTA is reportedly thinking of allowing these local coordinated plans to be done in a unified mechanism (i.e., a consolidated plan that addresses all three grant programs), but it's not clear if such an approach would satisfy the programs' statutory priorities.

### Operating Costs for Transportation for the Elderly and Individuals with Disabilities

Subsection (b)(7) establishes a pilot program to permit up to seven states to use up to 33 percent of their Section 5310 funds to cover the operating costs of these specialized transit services and directs USDOT to report to Congress on the pilot.

Data Implication: This provision gives USDOT the ability to require that pilot states collect and report the data needed to prepare the report. The following report elements are specified in law:

- the extent to which funds were used to subsidize existing paratransit service provided in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA);
- whether states participating in the pilot program provided services to provide service that exceeded ADA requirements;
- whether states participating in the pilot and used the pilot program funds to provide service that exceeded ADA requirements did so to the detriment of other eligible projects;
- percentage of funds for elderly individuals;
- percentage of funds used to assist individuals with disabilities;
- the extent to which pilot states serve a wider range of elderly, low income, and persons with disabilities populations;
- whether the pilot program improves services to the elderly and individuals with disabilities;
- the extent to which the pilot states are able to expand the range of transportation alternatives available to the target population; and
- whether or not the pilot program encourages or discourages coordination with or integration of other funding sources.

Existing and Status: The reporting requirements for the 5310 program are quite minimal. Very little of the data listed above currently exist. Furthermore the typical subrecipient of 5310 funding is a health and human service non-governmental organization such a Senior Center or Sheltered Workshop. There is a wide range of administrative sophistication among these subrecipients. Those health and human services agencies with the greatest need for operating assistance are often those with the weakest administrative systems.

New Data Needs: There are significant new quantitative and qualitative data elements that must be collected by the seven pilot states.

Data Program Options: Since this is a pilot effort, no modifications are needed to the NTDB.

Changing Roles of Partners: Pilot State DOT recipients and Health and Human Service subrecipients are likely to be called upon to provide the data for FTA to prepare its report to Congress.

Performance Expectations

## Section 3013 Non- Urbanized Transportation

Legislative Provision: Section 3013 modifies Section 5311 Formula Grants for Other Than Urbanized Areas. New 5311(b)(4) requires recipients (State DOT's) to submit an annual report to FTA with the following information on federally funded non-urbanized public transportation:

- Total annual revenue
- Sources of revenue
- Total annual operating costs
- Total annual capital costs
- Fleet size and type, and related facilities
- Revenue vehicle miles, and
- Ridership.

Data Implication: An increase in data reporting requirements.

Existing and Status: Existing required reporting consists of:

- Number of vehicles
- Revenue vehicle miles
- Type of passengers
- Number of one-way trips

New Data Needs: An increase in data reporting requirements for a significant number of subrecipients.

Data Program Options: While the number of data elements required by SAFETEA-LU are targeted to a vital few, the sheer number of subrecipients (over 1200) is significant.

Changing Roles of Partners: The burden of data collection falls primarily on State DOT's, which are the statutory recipients of Non Urbanized Transit Funding. The individual rural transit operators, which are the subrecipients of Non-Urbanized Transit funding, have the burden of reporting the data to their respective State DOT. The relative level of administrative sophistication of Rural Transit Program subrecipients varies greatly. In the case of a one- or two-bus system, an operator's accounting system may not be much more than a checkbook and a tax return. Other systems operate with the complexity and sophistication that exceeds that of urbanized systems.

In addition, there is great variation in the amount of data currently collected from Non-Urbanized Transit program subrecipients by State DOT's today. Nearly every state collects data similar to those that now will be required under SAFETEA-LU, but there have not been efforts among the states to ensure their definitions and calculations for these data are consistent among the states. In particular, there is no uniformity of what data, if any, have been collected by states on their fleet sizes, types and facilities. In addition, the priority to coordinate various forms of public and human services transportation further complicate these data collections and supporting definitions.

New York State has a substantial state-funded transit program in non-urbanized communities, providing both capital and operating funds. In exchange for this higher level of support, subrecipients are required to report as part of their biennial applications for Section 5311 funding, detailed income statement and balance sheet data (previous calendar year actuals vs. Year 1 and Year 2 estimates).

Performance Expectations

## **Section 3016 Research**

Legislative Provision: Section 3016 National Research and Technology Programs amends section 5314 National research programs to establishes in paragraph (6) Medical Transportation Demonstration Grants to provide \$3 million for individuals to access dialysis treatments. USDOT is required under paragraph (F) to report to Congress on the results of the projects funded under the program.

Data Implication: Unknown. The provision did not provide details on the contents of the report.

Existing and Status:

New Data Needs:

Data Program Options:

Changing Roles of Partners:

Performance Expectations:

## **Section 3016 Alternative Fuels Study**

Section 3016 subsection (c) directs the Secretary to conduct a study on the incentives necessary to increase the use of alternative fuels in public transit vehicles, including buses, fixed guideway vehicles, and ferries.

Data Implication: benefits of alt fuel use, opportunities to purchase alt fuels for transit operation, existing barriers that discourage the purchase of alt fuels for transit, and the necessary support needed to encourage the additional use of alt fuels for transit vehicle operation.

Existing and Status:

New Data Needs:

Data Program Options:

Changing Roles of Partners:

Performance Expectations:

## Section 3018 Jobs Access Reverse Commute (JARC)

Legislative Provision: Section 3018 codifies the Jobs Access Reverse Commute (JARC) Program in title 49 and establishes a formula for distributing JARC funds.

Data Implications:   New Formula factors  
                          New planning process  
                          Comptroller General Report to Congress required

- New Formula Factors

Existing and Status:

The JARC allocation formula established in SAFETEA-LU is calculated based on states' and urbanized areas 3-year histories of Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) recipients, and on states' and urbanized areas' populations living at or below 150 percent of the federal poverty line. First of all, the TANF data do not exist. Second, TANF allocations to states are not based on any population-driven factors; instead, they are pegged to the dollar amount of AFDC funds each state received in 1994, which has little bearing on current job access demands or outcomes.

- New Planning Process: While states and recipients have long been encouraged to coordinate federal funding transit programs with health and human service agency transportation programs, SAFTEA-LU requires that projects selected for JARC funding are derived from a locally developed, coordinated public, private and nonprofit transportation and human services public transit-human services transportation plan. See discussion of this issue under Section 3012.

- Reports to Congress:

Comptroller General required to submit biennial report to Congress beginning 2006 evaluating the grant program.

USDOT required to submit to Congress in 2007 a study on the effectiveness of JARC program and the effectiveness of recipients (states) making grants to subrecipients.

New Data Needs:

Data Program Options:

Changing Roles of Partners:

Performance Expectations:

## **Section 3019 New Freedom Program**

Legislative Provision: Codifies new program as Section 5317 to provide transit service to disabled persons at all income levels over and above the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA).

Data Implication: The apportionment formula for the New Freedom program is based on the decennial census' most recent calculations of persons with disabilities, by state and urbanized area. These data are easily and accurately derived.

In addition, beginning in FY 2007, recipients will be required to certify the projects were derived from a locally developed, coordinated public transit-human services transportation plan that was developed through a process that involved the public, private, and nonprofit transportation and human service providers. See discussion under Section 3012 above.

Existing and Status:

New Data Needs:

Data Program Options:

Changing Roles of Partners:

Performance Expectations:

### **Section 3028 Investigations of Safety Hazards and Security Risks**

This section expands FTA investigation authority to expressly include security issues. The section also mandates a joint FTA and DHS rulemaking establishing the requirements and characteristics of any public transportation security grants, including funding priorities and eligible expenditures.

Data Implication: There are likely to be data implications arising from the joint rulemaking, especially for assessing the investment needs for security. Data vs. intelligence is always an issue when examining transportation system security.

Existing and Status:

New Data Needs:

Data Program Options:

Changing Roles of Partners:

Performance Expectations:

### **Section 3033 National Transit Database.**

Section 3033 provides \$3.5 m per year to maintain the National Transit Database.

Data Implication:

How was it funded previously? Is it enough?

Existing and Status:

New Data Needs:

Data Program Options:

Changing Roles of Partners:

Performance Expectations:

### **Section 3034 Apportionments of Formula Grants**

Legislative Provision: Section 3034 Apportionments of Formula Grants-- This section calls for a study of incentives which might be added to the urbanized area and other-than-urbanized area formula programs.

Data Implication: Report language cites the Administration incentive proposal and also suggests improvements in efficiency (cost per unit of service provided), effectiveness (service utilization per unit of service provided), and cost-effectiveness (cost per unit of service utilization).

Existing and Status:

New Data Needs:

Data Program Options:

Changing Roles of Partners:

Performance Expectations:

### **Section 3033 Apportionments Based on Fixed Guideway Mileage**

Legislative Provision: Section 3033 Apportionments Based on Fixed Guideway Mileage—This section continues to freeze fixed guideway mileage at 1997 levels, but adjusts fixed guideway mileage for a small urbanized area to treat that mileage as a large urbanized area for the purpose of apportionments.

Data Implication:

Existing and Status:

New Data Needs:

Data Program Options:

Changing Roles of Partners:

Performance Expectations:

### **3038 Growing States and High Density Formula Factors**

Legislative Provision: 3038 Growing States and High Density Formula Factors: The section defines apportionment formulas based on:

Forecast population for the 15 years after the most recent decennial census, as estimated by the Secretary of Commerce.

Urbanized area population in states with population density exceeding 370 persons per square mile.

Data Implication: While the data set for the high density states formula factor is defined as “the most recent available”, no such requirement is defined for the high density state formula factor.

Existing and Status:

New Data Needs:

Data Program Options:

Changing Roles of Partners:

Performance Expectations: