REPORT TO SHASTA COUNTY RTPA

SUBJECT	MEETING DATE	ITEM NUMBER
Consider 2001/02 Transit Needs Assessment and Conduct 2001/02 Unmet Needs Hearing	02/22/00	7

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Agency:

1) Consider the 2001/02 Transit Needs Assessment which 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 24, 2001 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) funds 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 2001/02 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 which are reasonable to meet. The SSTAC meeting is scheduled for March 29.

DISCUSSION

2001/02 Transit Needs Assessment

The attached 2001/02 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 exceeds the minimum adjusted 19% farebox ratio approved for 1999/00 by the RTPA. The 2001/02 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 2001/02 transit needs and proposed TDA allocations to claimant agencies is scheduled for Tuesday, April, 24, 2001.

The 2001/02 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 ¼ cent the of the 7 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 shows last year's TDA budget adopted for FY 2000/01, 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 distribution of 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. Exhibit B 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 which do no 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 jurisdiction's urban area and 90% in its nonurban 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 13 and the written comment period will extend to March 2, 2001. Comments received to date are summarized in Attachment C.

Recommendation
In proceeding, the Board should conduct a public hearing to take testimony from the public and interested agencies, then close the public hearing. Staff would then prepare responses to all comments. At the April 24 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 2001/02 claims.

<u>OTHER AGENCY INVOLVEMENT</u>
The 2001/02 Transit Needs Assessment has been reviewed by the Redding Area Bus Authority, the 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.

Daniel J. Kovacich, Executive Officer

/jmg

Attachments: Adopted 2000/01 TDA Budget
TDA Summary of LTF Allocation Purposes & Priorities
Public Comments Received to Date
Letter from Mike Evans, Chair, SSTAC
2001/02 Transit Needs Assessment

Shasta County Regional Transportation Planning Agency					
Calcualtion of TDA Apportionments and Transit Obligations for 2000-2001					
	SHASTA COUNTY RTPA				
	SCHEDULE OF ANNUAL CLAIMS /TDA BUDGET				
	FISCAL YEAR 2000-2001				
			Funding Sources		
	CLAIMANT/PURPOSE		LTF	STA	FTA
Off-The-Top Apportionments					
	Administrative	PUC 99233.1	176,850		
	(includes Core Function Match)				
	CTSA Funding for Elderly Population	PUC 99275	178,000		
	CTSA Funding for Administration by CTSA	PUC 99275	12,000		
	Carryover CTSA Funding for Senior Training Program	PUC 99275	0		
	Total Off The Top Apportionments		366,850		
			===============		
Redding Area Bus Authority					
	TDA funds required per RABA budget	3,028,573			
	PUC 99400(c)				
	Sources of Transit Funding:				
	LTF - Redding	1,970,128	1,970,128		
	STA - Redding	124,707		124,707	
	FTA Section 5307	357,520			357,520
	LTF - Shasta Lake	127,855	127,855		
	STA - Shasta Lake	14,816		14,816	
	FTA Section 5307	42,480			42,480
	LTF - Anderson	91,272	91,272		
	STA - Anderson	13,746		13,746	
	FTA Section 5311	46,087			46,087
	LTF - Shasta County	131,101	131,101		
	STA - Shasta County	108,861		108,861	
	FTA Sec 5311				
Total Funds Provided RABA for Transist		3,028,573	2,320,356	262,130	446,087
		============	============	============	============
Services Provided Under Contract to Shasta County					
	Burney Express		84,785		39,640
City of Redding			51,025		
	LTF - Shasta County				
City Of Anderson			131,516		
	LTF Streets and Roads				
City Of Shasta Lake			112,269		
	LTF Streets and Roads				
Shasta County					
	LTF - Streets and Roads (PUC 99400(a))		1,502,049		
	LTF - Purchased Transportation - Vanpool Subsidy (PUC 99400(c))		16,400		
	LTF - Purchased Transportation - Lifeline Services (PUC 99400(c))		30,000		
Total TDA Funds to be Distributed			4,615,250	262,130	485,727
			============	============	============

TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT
SUMMARY OF LTF ALLOCATION PURPOSES AND PRIORITIES

PRIORITY	PURPOSE, PUC SECTION	ELIGIBLE CLAIMANTS	AMOUNT AVAILABLE
1	TDA administration, 99233.1	County Auditor and the TPA	As necessary
2	Planning and programming, 99233.2	MTC, TRPA, Orange CTC, Riverside CTC, San Bernardino CTC, Placer County TPA, Nevada County TPA, Santa Cruz County RTC, El Dorado County TPA, Monterey County TPA	Up to 3% of revenues
		Ventura CTC	Up to 2% of revenues
		LACMTA	Up to 1% of revenues
		Southern California Association of Governments	Up to ¾ of 1% and not more than $1 million of revenues
3	Pedestrian and bicycle facilities, 99233.3, 99234	Counties and cities	Countywide, up to 2% of remaining money
4	Rail passenger service operations and capital improvements, 99233.4 and 99234.9	Counties, cities, CTC's or operators	Up to area apportionment
5	Long-term planning, 99233.5(a)	San Diego Association of Governments	Up to 2% of remaining money in areas of the 2 transit development boards
	San Diego MTDB administrative and planning functions, construction and acquisition programs, 99233.5(b)	San Diego Metropolitan Transit Development Board	Up to 10% of remaining money for area of MTDB
6	Community Transit Services, Article 4.5, 99233.7	Cities, counties, operators and CTSA's	Countywide, up to 5% of remaining money
7	<u>Article 4-Public Transportation,</u> 99233.8 Support of public transportation systems, 99260(a), 99262	Operators	Up to area of apportionment
	Aid to research and development projects, 99260(b)	Operators	Up to area of apportionment
	Grade separation projects, 99260(c)	Operators	Up to area of Apportionment
	Peak hour service contract, 99260.2(a)	Operators	Up to area of apportionment
	Rail passenger ticket purchases, 99260.2(b)	Transit Districts	Up to area of apportionment
	Payments to railroad corporation, 99260.5	Transit Districts, cities, counties	Up to area of apportionment
	Rail passenger service, 99260.6, 99234.9	Cities and counties, CTC, Operator	Up to area of apportionment
	Claims for separate service to elderly and handicapped, 99260.7	Cities and counties in joint power entities	Up to area of apportionment
8	<u>Article 8-Other Allocation,</u> 99233.9 Local streets and roads-pedestrian and bicycle projects, 99400(a), 99402, 99407	Cities and counties where not restricted	Up to area of apportionment
	Commuter ferry services	Cities within the county of San Diego	Up to area of apportionment
	Rail Passenger service operations and capital improvements, 99400(b)	Cities and counties	Up to area of apportionment

Attachment C

SUMMARY OF 2001/02 UNMET NEEDS COMMENTS			
COMMENT	NAME, ADDRESS	PHONE, EMAIL, MAIL?	COMMENT
L-1 & L-4	Ms. Alpha Shaw 4621 Loch Place Shasta Lake, CA 96019	Mail (RABA response letters dated 9/12/00 and 01/08/01)	• Transit Service to Palo Cedro
L-2	Barbara Lapp Co-President League of Women's Voters 310 Travertine Court Redding, CA 96003	Mail (RTP workshop from August 21, 2000)	• Transit Needed in Outlying Areas
PC-1	Mary Onwhiler 365-1777	Phone Call 10/18/00	• Need transit in Wooded Acres and Airport area
E-1	Nata Greenleaf <greypine@hotmail.com	Email Dated Jan 10, 01	• New transit service between Eureka and Redding
L-3	David Rich 1790 School Street Anderson, CA 96007	Mail (RABA response letter dated 1/4/01	• Request longer service hours
L-5	Community Employment Center - SMART 1201 Placer Street Redding CA 96001	Letter dated January 17, 2001	• Request Sunday Service • Monthly cost of pass from Anderson and City of Shasta Lake pay double because of transfer • Need transit service on Airport Road Corridor • Need express service from Cottonwood/Anderson area to downtown Redding or Mt Shasta Mall • Need transit between Burney and Fall River Mills • Request extend RABA hours until at least 8:00 p.m.
PC-2	Ron Johnson 222-4968 email ron1969785@cs.com	Phone Call on January 29, 2001	• Request Sunday Service • Request Longer Service Hours

Attachment D

TO: Dan Kovacich, Executive Officer, RTPA
Kurt Starman, Executive Officer, RABA

CC: Bill Ramsdell, RTPA
Ray Duryee, RABA

FROM: Mike Evans, Chair
Social Services Transportation Advisory Council

At our meeting of Thursday, January 11, 2001, the Social Services Transportation Advisory Council discussed several 'unmet need' situations that have surfaced in the past year and have also been the subject of input in previous years Unmet Needs hearings.

In order to assist the Council in formulating proposals and recommendations for the review of the RTPA Board, both at the scheduled Unmet Needs Hearing set for Feb. 27th and for later action at their April meeting, we are asking the RTPA and RABA staff to prepare some background cost of service data.

The criteria for dealing with unmet needs includes finding the needs 'reasonable to meet' in order for an implementation strategy to be developed. A major part of this process requires some well grounded estimates of the costs of providing services for those unmet needs. Also, in the event that there is shortfall in terms of estimates of farebox recovery, it would be useful to have the amount of the estimated shortfall known to see if there is partner funding available from other sources and/or modifications to the service strategy that may at least partially serve the unmet need.

The consensus of the Council was to submit the following service enhancements to the staff for cost estimates and estimates of farebox recovery potential:

1. Cottonwood/Anderson Express Van Shuttle:
   The service envisioned would be an express service from the Gas Point Road area (probably the Sentry Market shopping center), to the Factory Outlet Stores on I-5 and Deschutes Road, to the Gateway Shopping Center in Anderson on Balls Ferry Road, thence directly up Interstate 5 to the Mt. Shasta Mall and Downtown transfer stations.

   The primary need to be met is for commuters getting to and from employment and social service centers in both Anderson and Redding.

   We would envision the service to be established to serve the morning and late afternoon/evening commute period, beginning at about 7 am and concluding at about 6 pm. There would be no middle of the day service at the outset.

   Ridership: there is a significant amount of new recent development in the Cottonwood town area including low and moderate income housing and rentals. We believe the primary destinations would be the Factory Outlet Stores complex, the central shopping and service area of Anderson on Balls Ferry Road, and the large retail shopping centers near the Hilltop and Dana Drive areas. Office workers and social service clients would also have access from the Downtown Intermodal center to county offices and medical offices nearby. Both would provide transfer points for persons to other destinations.

The current RABA route ends at the Factory Outlet Stores with no connection to Cottonwood. Persons riding the current RABA route face a one hour or longer commute to the central Redding area and a schedule often inadequate for them to be on time for most employment.

2. Sunday service:
   Currently there is no public transit service available on Sundays. This creates a severe hardship on those who need to commute on Sunday for purposes of employment, shopping, worship and entertainment. The issue is strongly considered an economic one as it limits both workers and retailers to engage in normal and convenient commerce.

   Two possibilities are recommended for cost estimate study:

   a. A Dial-a-ride system which could operate from perhaps 8 am to 4 pm, providing public transit service during the most popular part of the day. Some dispatching problems would require solution in order to transport people on an acceptable schedule. The Dial-a-ride system may not have to serve the entire normal RABA service area, perhaps only the central core area of Redding.

   b. An abbreviated Saturday schedule fixed route system which might only serve the most frequently used RABA routes.

   Which system might yield the most 'reasonable to meet' data would depend on the existing data RABA has regarding ridership, especially for their Saturday routes.

3. Single Fare Zone:
   Currently, there is a zone fare surchange for persons using the system from either Anderson or Shasta Lake City. The cost of a monthly pass is also virtually doubled.

   A preliminary review indicates very few monthly passes are sold for transit from Anderson or Shasta Lake City. We would estimate that the farebox revenue lost from reducing fares to a single uniform fare without zone surcharges would be very minor.

   Since both areas contain a high ratio of lower and moderate income housing, there is a significant population which has transit needs especially to central Redding employment, medical and social service activities.

   Enhancement of ridership as a result of more affordable costs to the rider on these more distant routes is projected to have a positive economic effects of more persons finding stable employment and for expansion of general retail and office service trade.

4. Route #4 two-way service:
   This current route is a one-way loop on Churn Creek Road and Bechelli Lane. The area contains a large amount of apartment and low and moderate income housing. Many residents are employed in the Hilltop/Dana Dr. retail area. Most are faced with a substantially longer journey on either the incoming or outgoing portion of the route due to its circular nature.

   Two solutions to the current situation are possible:

   a. Divide the route into two separate routes, both with out and back service.
   b. Configure the route with buses running in opposite directions.

5. Airport Corridor:
   There is currently no service in this area. The area has been rapidly developing to new commercial and industrial uses with two new large employers recently established. The City of Redding has given it Enterprise Zone status and is also sponsoring development of ready to build upon land development for industrial users. The area also has a large population located at the south end of Airport Road (mobile home parks and subdivisions) which has no public transit service available to it.

   Using the Cottonwood/Anderson Express Van Shuttle as a model, we need to estimate the cost of providing a commute time service from Dersch Road north along Airport Road and with continuing express service to the Mt. Shasta Mall and central Downtown transfer points.

6. Burney - Fall River Express Loop:
   No service presently exists to link these two intermountain communities. SSNP van service for seniors cannot accommodate children.

   An estimate of the cost of providing a morning and late afternoon/early evening commuter van service between the two communities is needed. Probably four runs per day would be an adequate beginning. SSNP provides some current dispatching services and might be available to assist in dispatching a dial-a-ride service system also.

7. Extended evening hours transit:
   No bus service exists much past 6:30 pm and cannot serve later shift workers at the major retail and industrial locations. A small increase in service hours to at least 8 pm (route departures) would greatly enhance the number of riders who could use public transport to get to employment. Once longer hours of service are established, employers could adjust workers hours slightly to accommodate the hours of service more easily.

   It is estimated that the cost would be reasonably proportional to the current hourly cost of providing service on the fixed route system. However, the incremental costs may be somewhat less and the opportunity for better fare box recovery exists due to the larger number of potential riders.

The Social Services Transportation Advisory Council has set its next meeting for Monday, January 29th. We would like to have the chance to review the cost estimate figures and assumptions regarding farebox returns at that meeting and then be able to forward that refined information to the RTPA and RABA boards for their additional information prior to or at the Unmet Needs hearing on Feb. 27th.

Following that hearing and staff analysis of other issues raised during the hearing or by public comments received by mail, we feel we can prepare an adequate and factual set of recommendations to the RTPA and RABA boards regarding the strategies to serve the unmet needs that are deemed 'reasonable to meet.'

Thanks for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Mike Evans