REPORT TO SHASTA COUNTY RTPA

SUBJECT		MEETING DATE	ITEM NUMBER
Consider 2000/2001 Transportation Development Act (TDA) True-Up of Claims		04/23/02	10

RECOMMENDATION
It is recommended that the Agency:

1) Approve Resolution 02-03 reflecting revised 2000/2001 Transportation Development Act (TDA) allocation instructions; and
2) Approve revised 2000/2001 TDA claims as reflected on Exhibit B (attached).

SUMMARY
RTPA Policy 6-3 and TDA regulations provide for a reconciliation of claimants' transit obligations to RABA's actual costs on an annual basis. Revised allocation instructions and claims have been prepared for Agency approval. Exhibit A reflects the revised calculation of transit obligations based upon RABA's actual audited costs. Exhibit B represents the revised schedule of claims.

After funding RABA's true TDA requirement (Actual Operating Expenses plus Capital costs), amounts available for other uses including Streets and Roads can be adjusted as follows:

City of Redding	$748,655
Anderson	77,416
City of Shasta Lake	61,146
County of Shasta	355,062
TOTAL INCREASE	$1,242,279

DISCUSSION
In April 2001, the Agency approved the TDA claims for 2000/2001. That approval was based on RABA's anticipated costs for the year. The actual costs of providing transit are now available based upon the 2000/2001 audited financial statements and RABA's annual report of transactions to the State Controller's office. This revision to the TDA claims is based on RABA's actual costs (operating and capital) of providing transit services. This true up also updates the population changes used in the apportionment and allocation process. This is consistent with past practices and is consistent with RTPA Policy 6-3.

The result of reconciling estimates to actual revenues received and expenses incurred is displayed below. Exhibit C describes each component that changed and translates that change from a global level to the effect on each individual local agency.

1) TDA resources were increased by $911,711. This represents an increase of revenue in LTF and STA funds of $900,000 over the amount used when claims were originally approved. This increase in revenue is due to stronger sales tax revenues than estimated and represents a buildup over several years. There was also a decrease in "off-the-top" administration costs

2) and an increase of $25,000 to the CTSA for the local match for the Rural Transit System Grant Program, resulting in a "net" increase of $11,711 to claimants.

3) RABA's actual TDA requirement (total operating and capital expenses less revenues) incurred was $2,809,147. This compares with a TDA requirement of $3,028,573 when the original claims were approved. This component resulted in a decrease in claimants' collective transit obligations of $219,426.

4) The original claims contemplated RABA utilizing $400,000 of FTA Section 5307 funding (operating only). RABA actually received $399,775 of FTA Section 5307 grant revenue for operating and $27,953 for capital costs. This translates to a decrease in the transit obligation assigned exclusively to Redding and Shasta Lake of $27,728. The reason that this applies exclusively to these agencies is that FTA Section 5307 is intended for urbanized areas. These revenue sources are credited exclusively to these two entities.

5) The original agency claims for expected FTA Section 5311 Grant funding was $85,727. Actual funding received increased to $ 92,904, resulting in an additional $7,177 available to Anderson and Shasta County. This revenue source is dedicated solely to those local agencies in the non-urbanized areas.

6) There was a significant decrease in Rural Transit Costs due to requirements from RABA to purchase two buses, which was not completed in the 2000-2001 year. This results in a decrease in Shasta County's transit obligation because these services are funded exclusively by Shasta County.

ALTERNATIVES

The Agency could modify any of the above proposed revisions recommended by Staff. This is not recommended because this reconciliation has been prepared in accordance with RTPA Policy 6-3 and TDA regulations.

OTHER AGENCY INVOLVEMENT

This reconciliation or "true-up" was developed in cooperation with RABA staff who concur with the staff recommendation.

The staff recommendation and supporting schedules were shared with the staffs of Redding, Shasta County and Shasta Lake, who have indicated their concurrence with the staff recommendation.

FINANCING

Approval of revised 2000/2001 claims will make claims consistent with actual costs and revenues of providing transit service.

Daniel J. Kovacich

Daniel J. Kovacich, Executive Officer

/jac

Attachments: Resolution No. 02-03
Exhibit A - Calculation of Revised TDA Apportionments and Transit Obligations for 2000/2001
Exhibit B - Schedule of Annual Claims/TDA Budget (as revised 4/23/02)
Exhibit C - Impact of 2000-2001 TDA True-Up on Local Agencies

RESOLUTION NO. 02-03
REVISED SHASTA COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AGENCY TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT ALLOCATIONS AND CLAIMS FOR FY 2000/2001

WHEREAS, Section 99230 of the California Public Utilities Code (PUC) requires that each transportation planning agency shall annually determine the amount of LTF funds to be allocated to each claimant, from an analysis and evaluation of the total amount anticipated to be available in the Local Transportation Fund (LTF) and the relative needs of each claimant for the purposes for which the fund is intended, and consistent with the provisions of the law; and

WHEREAS, PUC Section 99231 and the California Code of Regulations, Section 6655 require that the transportation planning agency shall allocate to a claimant for a given area only such moneys as represent that area's apportionment; and

WHEREAS, the provisions of PUC Section 99401.5 require that the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) annually review and make findings concerning "unmet transit needs" in each claimant jurisdiction and, prior to making any LTF allocations to claimants for street and road purposes, fund such unmet transit needs in each claimant jurisdiction as have been found "reasonable to meet"; and

WHEREAS, the RTPA made the required transit needs findings process for each claimant agency in Shasta County for 2000/2001 at its April 24, 2001 meeting, as reflected in Resolution No. 8-01; and

WHEREAS, the resulting proposed LTF allocations to the claimant jurisdictions will fund all identified transit needs that can be reasonably funded, and only thereafter will LTF monies be made available for eligible streets and road purposes; and

WHEREAS, these revisions to the 2000/2001 TDA allocations to the claimants maintain the existing level of transit service previously determined by the RTPA to be reasonable to meet; However, specified true-ups are proposed to more accurately reflect actual transit expenses incurred since the original claims were adopted. Actual expenses were agreed to audited financial statements and compared to the original filing. RABA's total costs incurred were $2,809,147 resulting in a decrease in the requirements for 2000/2001 of $219,426. Funding sources for RABA FTA Section 5307 increased $27,728, and FTA Section 5311 funding increased $7,177. Rural Transit costs were decreased due to RABA purchase requirement for two buses that was not completed in the 2000/2001 year. TDA resources were also increased by $911,711 due to increased revenue from LTF and STA funds during the 2000/2001 period.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that Shasta County Regional Transportation Planning Agency:

(1) Determines that the 80% service hours/20% population-based cost sharing formula represents the cost sharing alternative which reflects the most equitable distribution of RABA service area costs to the claimant agencies in light of the transit system benefits each will realize from the RABA provided services; and

(2) Approves the true-up to the 2000/2001 claims as summarized in Schedule A and better reflect actual transit costs incurred to date.

(3) Approves allocations for each claimant jurisdiction that are consistent with and reflected in the 2000/2001 TDA Budget attached as Schedule B; and

(4) Approves the claims for TDA funds as submitted by claimants for transit funds in the amounts not exceeding those shown on Schedule B for fiscal year 2000/2001

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 23rd day of April 2002, by the Shasta County Regional Transportation Planning Agency.

____

Norma Comnick, Chairman
Shasta County Regional
Transportation Planning Agency

SHASTA COUNTY RTPA						
CALCULATION OF TDA APPORTIONMENT AND TRANSIT OBLIGATIONS						
2000-2001 TRUE UP						
EXHIBIT A 1 of 2						
Population Factors (for Apportionment Only)						
Based on 2002 E-1 Population Report		Population				
		Based on 2001				
		1/1/2001	Percentage			
	Redding	82,500	49.79%			
	Anderson	9,150	5.52%			
	Shasta Lake	9,175	5.54%			
	Unincorporated County Area	64,875	39.15%			

	Total Population in RTPA Area	165,700	100.00%			
		===============				
	Service Hour Factors					
	Allocate Service Hours to Claimant Jurisdictions					
	Service Hours from RABA					
	Represents Daily Hours Allocated to each Jurisdiction					
		REDDING	ANDERSON	SHASTA LAKE	SHASTA COUNTY	DAILY TOTAL
	Hours by Jurisdiction	120.05	0	8.45	9.00	137.50
	Hours on Route 9	9.00	6.50	0	4.00	19.50
		129.05	6.50	8.45	13.00	157.00
		82.20%	4.14%	5.38%	8.28%	100.00%
Claimant Populations Within Urban Fixed Route Area			Population in	Population Split	Service Hour Split	Weighted
based on 2001 State Department of Finance E-1 report			Service Area	20%	80%	Average
						Share
	Redding		82,500	77.90%	82.20%	81.34%
	Anderson		9,150	8.64%	4.14%	5.04%
	Shasta Lake		9,175	8.66%	5.38%	6.04%
	Unincorporated County Area		5,079	4.80%	8.28%	7.58%
	Total Population in RTPA Area		105,904	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
	LTF Received 2000/2001 Per WTB	5,415,250	Increased by $800K available in LTF Fund.			
	STA received PUC 99313	362,130	Increased by $100K available in STA Fund.			

	Subtotal	5,777,380				
	" Off - The - Top " Allocations					
	Administration PUC 99233.1 LTF	(136,360)	(Per WTB)			
	CTSA PUC 99275 LTF	(215,000)	Original request plus match for RTSGP Grant			
	RTPA Core Planning Functions Match	(3,779)	PER OWP RDG,SL			

	Total "Off-the-Top"	(355,139)				

	Amount Available for Distribution	5,422,241				
		==============				

SHASTA COUNTY RTPA

CALCULATION OF TDA APPORTIONMENT AND TRANSIT OBLIGATIONS

2000-2001 TRUE UP

EXHIBIT A 2 of 2

Amount Required by RABA - Urban Fixed Route & DR	2,809,147										
RABA % Funded Based Upon Service Hours	80.00%										
RABA % Funded Based Upon Population	20.00%										

Calculation of transit obligation based on 80% Service Hours/20% Population

	Amount to be Distributed	FTA Section 5307	Core Planning Match	5311 Grant FTA Section	Total Resources Available	To Fund RABA	To Fund Burney Express Rural Transit	To Fund Rural Admin & Vanpool	TDA Apportion Available for Other Uses	Actual TDA Claimed	Difference
Amount to be Apportioned to Claimants	5,422,241										
Redding	2,699,667	384,920			3,084,587	(2,284,907)			799,680	51,025	748,655
Redding Core Match	3,506		(3,506)								
Anderson	299,418			51,097	350,515	(141,583)			208,932	131,516	77,416
Anderson Core Match	0										
Shasta Lake	300,236	42,808			343,044	(169,628)			173,415	112,269	61,146
Shasta Lake Core Match	273		(273)								
Unincorporated County Area	2,122,920			41,807	2,164,727	(213,028)	(83,576)	(11,012)	1,857,111	1,502,049	355,062
Shasta County Core Match	0										
Administration	136,360				136,360				136,360	136,360	0
CTSA	215,000				215,000				215,000	215,000	0
RABA	0				0	2,809,147			2,809,147	2,809,147	0
County Admin/Vanpool Subsidy	0				0		83,576	11,012	94,588	94,588	0
	0				0		0		0		0
TOTAL TO DISTRIBUTE	5,777,380	427,728	(3,779)	92,904	6,294,233	0	0	0	6,294,233	5,051,954	1,242,279

SHASTA COUNTY RTPA

SCHEDULE OF ANNUAL CLAIMS /TDA BUDGET

FISCAL YEAR 2000-2001 TRUE UP OF CLAIMS

EXHIBIT B

CLAIMANT/PURPOSE		Funding Sources LTF	STA	FTA
Off-The-Top Apportionments				
Administrative	PUC 99233.1	140,139		
(includes Core Function Match)				
CTSA Funding for Elderly Population	PUC 99275	178,000		
CTSA Funding for Administration by CTSA	PUC 99275	12,000		
CTSA match for RTSGP	PUC 99275	25,000		
Total Off The Top Apportionments		355,139		
Redding Area Bus Authority				
TDA funds required per RABA budget	2,809,147			
PUC 99400(c)				
Sources of Transit Funding:				
LTF - Redding	1,719,687	1,719,687		
STA - Redding	180,300		180,300	
FTA Section 5307	384,920			384,920
LTF - Shasta Lake	106,769	106,769		
STA - Shasta Lake	20,052		20,052	
FTA Section 5307	42,808			42,808
LTF - Anderson	70,489	70,489		
STA - Anderson	19,997		19,997	
FTA Section 5311	51,097			51,097
LTF - Shasta County	71,247	71,247		
STA - Shasta County	141,781		141,781	
Total Funds Provided RABA for Transist	2,809,147	1,968,192	362,130	478,825
Services Provided Under Contract to Shasta County				
Burney Express (FTA 5311)		41,769		41,807
City of Redding		799,680		
LTF - Streets & Roads				
City Of Anderson		208,932		
LTF Streets and Roads				
City Of Shasta Lake		173,415		
LTF Streets and Roads				
Shasta County				
LTF - Streets and Roads (PUC 99400(a))		1,857,111		
LTF - Purchased Transportation - Vanpool Subsidy (PUC 99400(c))		11,012		
LTF - Purchased Transportation - Lifeline Services (PUC 99400(c))		30,000		
Total TDA Funds to be Distributed		5,445,250	362,130	520,632

SHASTA COUNTY RTPA							
IMPACT OF 2000-2001 TDA TRUE UP ON LOCAL AGENCIES							
EXHIBIT C							
		Increase (Decrease) in Amount Available for Other Uses					
RESOURCES	TOTAL	Redding	Anderson	Shasta Lake	County	RABA	TOTAL
Increase in Resources	911,711	553,808	62,883	45,296	249,724		911,711
LTF - 800K							
STA - 100K							
"Off-the-top" - 11,711							
Change in Amount Necessary to Fund RABA on "80/20" allocation	219,426	167,447	9,523	15,523	26,934	(219,426)	0
Change in 5307 Grant Revenue	27,728	27,400		328			27,728
Change in 5311 Grant Revenue	7,177		5,010		2,167		7,177
Reduction in Rural Transit Costs					76,237		
(Bus purchase not made until 01-02)							
Net Increase (Decrease) in Streets and Roads		748,655	77,416	61,146	355,062	(219,426)	1,022,853
Net Increase (Decrease) in S & R from Schedule A		748,655	77,416	61,146	355,062		1,242,279
Difference		0	0	0	0		