

REPORT TO SHASTA COUNTY RTPA

SUBJECT	MEETING DATE	ITEM NUMBER
Consider 2003/04 Transit Needs Assessment and Conduct 2003/04 Unmet Transit Needs Hearing	02/25/03	8

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Agency:

- 1) Consider the 2003/04 Transit Needs Assessment that generally discusses transit needs within Shasta County;
- 2) Hold a public hearing and take testimony on unmet transit needs in Shasta County;
- 3) Direct staff to present the information generated from today's hearing to the Social Services Transportation Advisory Committee (SSTAC) and claimant agencies for formulation of their recommendation; and
- 4) Direct staff to prepare recommendations, written responses to comments, and draft findings in anticipation of final Agency action at the April 22, 2003 RTPA meeting.

SUMMARY

Annually, the RTPA is required to address the issue of unmet transit needs. This is a prerequisite to making annual Transportation Development Act (TDA) allocations in each jurisdiction. Generally, the unmet transit needs process involves a three-part review as follows:

- 1) A general assessment of transit needs within Shasta County jurisdictions in accordance with §99401.5(B) of the TDA and as provided in the 2003/04 Transit Needs Assessment;
- 2) A public hearing to consider specific unmet transit needs; and
- 3) Participation by the SSTAC, including a recommendation to the RTPA regarding unmet needs that are reasonable to meet. The SSTAC meeting is scheduled for March 19, 2003.

DISCUSSION

2003/04 Transit Needs Assessment

The attached 2003/04 Transit Needs Assessment meets the requirements for part one of the unmet needs process outlined above. The report concludes that the system's ridership is growing and met the required farebox ratio approved by the RTPA. The 2001/02 RABA farebox ratio calculation is 19.8%. The 2003/04 Transit Needs Assessment is intended to provide background information when reviewing more specific transit needs identified at the public hearing and when considering the SSTAC recommendation. Final action by the Board on the 2003/04 transit needs and proposed TDA allocations to claimant agencies is scheduled for Tuesday, April 22, 2003.

The 2003/04 Transit Needs Assessment concludes that, generally, public and private transit operators serve the primary areas of high transit demand as well as many other specialized transit needs throughout the county. TDA-funded transportation services are currently operating consistent with established performance standards, including those found in the "unmet needs" and "reasonable to meet" definition.

Where funding is available, new or expanded services can be required under the Transportation Development Act where an "unmet transit need" is found "reasonable to meet" by the RTPA. Where services do not meet the TDA criteria, the service may still be provided with TDA funds under one of the following conditions:

1. The service is approved by the RTPA as a Consolidated Transportation Service Agency (CTSA) service which meets the criteria for services; or
2. The service is funded at the discretion of the individual cities or the county.

Again, it should be noted that this general assessment is intended to provide background information when reviewing more specific transit needs during today's public hearing and when considering the SSTAC recommendation.

TDA Fund Claims

One of the duties of the RTPA is to distribute TDA funds, including those deposited in the Local Transportation Fund (LTF). These funds are derived from $\frac{1}{4}$ of 1 percent of the 7-1/4-cent retail sales tax raised within the County and are returned by the State to the RTPA for apportionment to eligible claimants on the basis of population.

Attachment A, page 32 shows last year's TDA budget adopted for FY 2002/03, the proposed disbursements off the top, and the remainder of the individual claimant apportionments available to the local jurisdictions based on population.

TDA Funding Priorities

The first priority for claiming funds from a claimant's apportionments is for public transit under Article 4. The amount that is available for each claimant is limited to the amount representing that claimant's population-based apportionment. (See PUC '99230-99231.2; Title 21 California Code of Regulations Sections 6649 and 6655.) In Shasta County, an 80% service hours/20% population-based cost sharing formula was agreed to and adopted as the most equitable assessment for transit costs among claimants.

After the allocations for Article 4 (Transit) are made, disbursements may be made under Article 8, which can be used for miscellaneous claims such as pedestrian or bicycle facilities, or for streets and roads claims of the cities and county. Attachment A, page 34 is a summary of LTF allocations, purposes and priorities from the Caltrans TDA Manual.

To approve a claim for streets, roads or other purposes under Article 8, the RTPA must make a finding for each claimant jurisdiction that **1)** there are no unmet transit needs, or **2)** there are no unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet. The cities and the County have full discretion over how Article 8 funds are used and may choose to fund additional transit services that do not meet the RTPA standards as discussed below.

Definition of "Unmet Transit Needs" and "Reasonable to Meet"

The definitions of "unmet transit needs" and "reasonable to meet" (Transit Needs Assessment, page 3) are established by RTPA Resolution 00-21.

Accordingly, a jurisdiction's "unmet need" must be for both of the following: **1)** for a defined population group; and **2)** necessary for maintenance of life, health, or physical and mental well-being, which excludes primary and secondary school transportation needs.

In order for a transit need to be found "reasonable to meet," it must be demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Agency that: **1)** the service subsidy required to meet the need will not exceed 80% of operating cost in the claiming jurisdictions urban area and 90% in its non-urban area (the subsidy maximums may be determined on an individual route or service area basis); **2)** the service proposed to be funded will not be in direct competition with existing private service; and **3)** where transit service is to be jointly funded by two or more of the local claimants, that the resulting inter-agency cost sharing is equitable. Also, proposed expenditures must be in conformity with the Regional Transportation Plan.

Public Hearing

This public hearing was advertised beginning January 10, 2003 and the written comment period will extend to February 25, 2003. Comments received to date are summarized in Attachment B.

Recommendation

In proceeding, the Board should conduct a public hearing to take testimony from the public and interested agencies. Staff would then prepare responses to all comments. At the April 22, 2003 meeting, the RTPA will review responses to comments and determine for each claimant jurisdiction what unmet needs are reasonable to meet and adopt formal findings as the basis for the 2003/04 claims.

OTHER AGENCY INVOLVEMENT

The 2003/04 Transit Needs Assessment has been reviewed by the Redding Area Bus Authority, CTSA, Caltrans, the Cities of Anderson, Shasta Lake and Redding, and Shasta County, and the Social Services Transportation Advisory Committee.

FINANCING

The Agency review and final approval of findings in April will provide the basis for Agency evaluation of the annual claims of the various jurisdictions for TDA funding.

FOR *Dan Little*
Daniel J. Kovacich, Executive Officer

SLC/jac

Attachments:

- A. 2003/04 Transit Needs Assessment
- B. Public Comments Received to Date

January 27, 2003

RTPA
1855 Placer Street
Redding, CA 96001

Subject: Performance of Route 9A/12 and 9B/12 - Anderson

Dear RTPA Staff:

I am a passenger who rides the 7:13 a.m. bus from Anderson to work in Redding Monday through Friday. Also, home from work on the 4:30 bus.

I would like to address a problem that I see for this route. The needed performance does not seem to be met on any kind of a regular basis. I feel this is because the ridership has increased considerable over the last few years since this route was designed and has picked up for people just staying in Anderson. The only way bus 9 can leave the terminal at 6:30 a.m., drive the prescribed route to Anderson picking up riders, leave the Factory Outlets at 7:13, drive the prescribed route back to Redding picking up riders, and arrive at the terminal at 8:00 a.m. is:

If there are no wheelchair passengers, bicycles being loaded and unloaded, parents with strollers and babies, people with walkers or shopping carts to be loaded, and then only if there are only a very few passengers. And --- if you did that, you would defeat the whole purpose of having transportation available for all of us who need and/or want it.

Years ago, I joined the gazillion other cars (with only one person in each car - and each of our cars polluting the air) and drove to work in the 8 O'clock traffic. I arrived at work all white-knuckled because of all the drivers that ran the stop signs and red lights, pulled right out in front of me, etc... After work it would be the same way driving home in the 5 O'clock traffic.

Because of this, I started riding the bus and found that I enjoyed it a great deal. I just got on the bus, sat there and relaxed and left the driving to the RABA driver. I did crafts, read, or visited with other passengers. I arrived at work all calm and relaxed. I have continued to ride the bus all these years (except for a couple of years that I had to ride Demand Response) and still enjoy it very much.

Recently, I discovered that the only way to make sure I arrive at work by 8 a.m. is to take the 6:13 bus from Anderson and arrive in Redding somewhere around 7 a.m. Instead of having to do that on a daily basis, my supervisor lets me write down my time when I arrive at work each day and then make the time up once a week.

The 9 bus is supposed to leave the terminal at 4:30 p.m., so I have to be at the bus stop on Gold Street by that time in case the bus is on time, but most of the time I am picked up much later because the bus seems to get later and later as the day goes on. Also, the 4:30 p.m. route is usually quite full (a few times it has been standing room only).

I'm not sure what the answer is, but I know the Anderson route needs some kind of change to be able to meet the schedule. Some thoughts I have had are:

1. Have a transfer station at Westwood Village and have one bus drive only from the Factory Outlets to the Westwood Village Transfer Station and back to Anderson all day; the other bus drive from the Westwood Village Transfer Station to the terminal and Route 12 all day. Would this make any difference?
2. Save time by stopping on Highway 273 for the Whitehouse Drive and Verde Vale/Vaughn's Market stops instead of doing the off-the-highway loop on the way to Anderson. Would this save enough time to matter?
3. Condense pick up stops in Anderson. Example: on Silver Street there are three stops; one at Silver & Briggs, one at Silver & ??? with a bench, and one at Silver and North. Maybe they could be condensed into just the one with the bench, which is in the middle and have a covered stop there because the stops aren't very far apart. We always stop at one, and usually at two or all three of them. Or, would tis save enough time to even matter?

If you can do anything to change the Anderson route so it can meet the schedule, I would truly appreciate it.

Sincerely,



Linda Risk

2-2-03

Shasta County RTPA
Attn: Dan Kovacich
1855 Placer St.
Redding, Ca. 96001

Dear Sir:

In considering changes to the bus schedule, you might want to consider service between the downtown transit center and the Mt. Shasta Mall area.

Rts 6, 7, + 11 all leave the downtown transit center on the half hour and arrive about the same time at the Shasta Mall area.

It would be nice if one of those routes left the downtown transit center on the hour, and returned on the hour. That way we would be able to catch a bus between those two points, every half hour. There is fairly heavy passenger use between those two points.

Sincerely yours,
Duane M. Bent

RECEIVED

FEB 04 2003

DEPT. OF PUBLIC WORKS

TO: Mr. Dan Kovacich
Shasta County Regional
Transportation Planning Agency
1855 Placer St., Redding 96001

FM: Diana J. Hoffman

DATE: February 1, '03

Re: RABA Demand Response Expense

Copy my file

Dear Mr Kovacich:

I just recently started taking the RABA Demand Response to my many doctors appointments. I am on Disability, and the total price of \$3.00 round trip is eating a huge chunk of my monthly disability check.

Your name was given to me to contact, and ask if there might be a waiver, or at least paying a less price per trips. I am, unfortunately, in the midst of getting tests done, in order to possibly being diagnosed with Multiple Sclerosis.

I am only 45 years old. I also do not have any family here to help me; they are all in Wisconsin.

I do not have any children, so I am not allowed food stamps, so any monies I am spending on RABA is cutting into my food allowance. Currently I am living out of my depleting canned foods.

I am also spending out-of-pocket expenses for health needs not covered through my insurance. I am keeping those receipts.

I think MarkChrist from the City of Redding gave me (sorry - Mark Christ) your name, and also that you were going to have a some sort of meeting on Feb. 25, which I'll be unable to attend.

Please let me know if you can help me. Eventually I won't need to go to so many doctors like I am right now. I am keeping all me used up punch cards for possible reimbursement.

Looking forward to hearing from you,
Sincerely, Diana Hoffman

Diana Hoffman

RECEIVED

FEB 04 2003

DEPT. OF PUBLIC WORKS

(No endosures)