## REPORT TO SHASTA COUNTY RTPA

| SUBJECT | MEETING DATE | ITEM NUMBER |
|---|---|---|
| Consider Approval of 2002/03 Social Service Transportation Advisory Recommendation and, consider approval of unmet Transit Needs Findings, Transportation Development Act (TDA) Allocation Instructions, and TDA Claims for 2002-2003. | 04/23/02 | 4 |

RECOMMENDATION
It is recommended that the Agency:

1) Consider the attached recommendation of the Social Services Transportation Advisory (SSTAC) Committee;
2) Accept staff's responses to comments received from the February 26, 2002, unmet transit needs hearing;
3) Determine that the existing level of transit service as detailed in the 2002/2003 Transit Needs Assessment reflects the level of transit service that is reasonable to meet for each claimant jurisdiction out of its individual Local Transportation Fund (LTF) apportionment for 2002/2003; and
4) Approve Resolution No. 02-02 which reflects the Agency's formal unmet transit needs findings and Local Transportation Fund allocations, and adopt a Transportation Development Act (TDA) budget for fiscal year 2002/2003, and;
5) Approve 2002/03 Transportation Development Act (TDA) claims as submitted by eligible claimants. Claim amounts by jurisdiction are reflected on Exhibit B.
6) Adopt a 16.5% farebox standard for the RABA service area where services are jointly funded in the rural and urban areas for 2002/03.

SUMMARY
Adoption of the Staff recommendation will allow Agency staff to distribute TDA revenues to be received in 2002/03 and to complete the 2002/2003 Unmet Needs Process.

DISCUSSION
A brief chronology of the Unmet Needs and TDA claims process is as follows:

- February 26, 2002 - The Agency considered the 2002/03 Transit Needs Assessment and received public testimony regarding unmet transit needs. Staff subsequently met with the Social Services Transportation Advisory Committee (SSTAC) and presented the information generated from the hearing for formulation of the SSTAC recommendation. Staff prepared responses to comments and prepared draft findings regarding unmet needs that were reasonable to meet in each jurisdiction.

- March 28, 2002, the Social Services Transportation Advisory Committee (SSTAC) met and made findings that there are Unmet Transit Needs based on the adopted RTPA definition. The SSTAC recommendation is attached. The differences between RTPA Staff and the SSTAC are discussed further below.

  Extended hours and Sunday service was discussed. Although it is recognized that there would be benefits to be accrued from providing these services it was decided not to subsidize these services because of the low probability that these services would meet the farebox requirement. The analysis for the extension of hours and Sunday service are similar. Ridership trends during evening hours and weekend service show a significant reduction in ridership for those times. Ridership data for the fixed route for a twelve day period from March 21st through April 3, 2001 was reviewed in reaching this conclusion. For this twelve day period 890 riders used the fixed route from 6:30 to 7:30 P.M. generating $723.50 in revenue. The cost to provide this service was $7,020 yielding a farebox ratio of 10.3%. It has, therefore, been determined the extension of the full RABA system for additional hours and Sunday service would not be reasonable to meet. An analysis for deviated routes or a dial-a-ride service indicated that the fare to meet the 20% farebox would need be $3.50 for a one-way trip. This was determined to be too expensive and would not be supported.

SSTAC is also recommending that the one year time frame established for the Trail Express services be extended for three months or one year. RTPA staff has concluded that this request is not an unmet need and should be considered at the time when long term funding or the discontinuance of Express routes is considered, which would occur at the July or October meeting.

In conclusion the RTPA staff recommends that the existing level of transit service as detailed in the 2002/2003 Transit Needs Assessment reflects the level of transit service that is reasonable to meet for each claimant jurisdiction out of its individual Local Transportation Fund (LTF) apportionment for 2002/2003. TDA revenues available after the unmet transit needs are met are available to the jurisdictions for other purposes, i.e., streets and roads.

**Fare Box Standard**

In February 2002, the RTPA took action to reduce the RABA fare revenue ratio to operating costs to 16.5% for 2002/03, 17.5% for 2003/04, 18.5% for 2004/05 and 19% thereafter . The farebox standard is 19% and is based upon the percentage of service hours provided in the urban area and the percentage of service hours provided in the rural areas (Anderson area). The RABA fare revenue ratio to operating costs for 2001/02 was 18.88%.

Similar to previous years nearly all transit services will be provided by the Redding Area Bus Authority (RABA). The costs associated with fixed route and demand response services provided by RABA have been allocated to the three cities and the County based 80% on service hours provided by that jurisdiction and 20% based upon the population served in each jurisdiction. This formula is the same formula that has been used by the RTPA since 1993 to allocate jointly funded RABA services.

Exhibit "A" is a spreadsheet that apportions the available revenues to the local agencies based upon population and allocates transit costs to those jurisdictions. This schedule also deducts each claimant's transit obligation from its apportionment to arrive at amounts available for other uses.

"Off-the-top" allocations for CTSA services provided by Shasta Senior Nutrition Services ($278,839) and for Administrative costs ($202,696) have been deducted before funds are apportioned to the cities and the County. Funds to be used to match Overall Work Program (OWP) core functions have been deducted from funds available for apportionment. These funds will flow to the local agencies as they perform OWP functions.

The RABA budget for 2002/03 contains $697,600 in FTA Section 5307 funds. Consistent with RTPA Policy 6-3, receipt of these funds will reduce TDA obligations on a dollar for dollar basis. These FTA grant funds reduce the transit obligations for Shasta Lake and Redding by $69,817 and $627,783, respectively. In the event these grant revenues are not received by RABA, their respective transit obligation will increase by the same relative percentages.

A summary of apportionments and transit obligations for 2002/03 are presented as follows:

| Claimant | Total Revenue - All Sources | Total Cost Allocated for Transit Services | Available for Other Uses |
|---|---|---|---|
| City of Redding | $3,300,083 | $2,669,912 | $630,171 |
| City of Anderson | $344,598 | $169,050 | $175,548 |
| City of Shasta Lake | $367,009 | $196,689 | $170,320 |
| Shasta Senior Nutrition Program (CTSA contractor) | $278,839 | $278,839 | Not Applicable |
| Shasta County | $2,162,505 | $407,372 | $1,755,133 |

ALTERNATIVES

The Agency could choose to allocate transit costs differently than proposed and adjust the farebox standard differently than recommended. The farebox standard can be set anywhere from 15% to 20%. Adjusting transit cost allocations is not recommended because all local agencies have reviewed the attached exhibits and concur with the Staff recommendation. The amount to be provided to RABA has been reviewed with them and they concur that RTPA Policy 6-3 has been correctly implemented.

OTHER AGENCY INVOLVEMENT

All claimants, including the Redding Area Bus Authority, Shasta Senior Nutrition Program, Shasta County, and the cities of Anderson, Redding, and Shasta Lake, have been consulted throughout the TDA claims process, both through their participation on the Technical Advisory Committee, responses to comments, and through informal consultations.

FINANCING
Final action consistent with the attached resolution will have the impacts to the Local Transportation Funds for transit service operations as outlined in Exhibit B. The TDA Budget funds RABA's transit needs in accordance with the RTPA's adopted Policy No. 6-3, entitled "Policy to Determine Transportation Development Act (TDA) Revenue to Be Made Available to Eligible Transit Operators" that was adopted by the Agency on October 27, 1998.

Daniel J. Kovacich

Daniel J. Kovacich, Executive Officer

/jac

Attachments:

1) Resolution No. 02-02
2) Exhibit A - Apportionments and Transit Allocations for 2002/03 *N/A 4/9/02*
3) Exhibit B - Schedule of Annual Claims/ TDA Budget *N/A 4/9/02*
4) 2001 Population Estimate - Revised
5) Staff Responses to Comments Received during 2002/03 Unmet Needs Process
6) April 3rd RABA letter
7) SSTAC April 3rd recommendation

**RESOLUTION 02-02**

**SHASTA COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AGENCY CONCERNING UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS DETERMINED REASONABLE TO MEET FOR CLAIMANT JURISDICTIONS IN SHASTA COUNTY FOR FY 2002/03**

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 further 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 2002/03 transit needs review process in Shasta County has included all of the following actions:

(1) Consultations with and recommendations from the Social Services Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC), and other interested organizations and individuals;

(2) Identification of the transit needs for claimant jurisdictions in Shasta County as detailed in the 2002/03 Transit Needs Assessment, which includes the following:

(a) An assessment of the size and location of identifiable groups which are likely to be transit dependent or transit disadvantaged, including, but not limited to the elderly, the handicapped and persons of limited means;

(b) An analysis of the adequacy of existing public transportation services and specialized transportation services, including privately and publicly provided services in meeting the demand identified pursuant to the assessment referred to in sub-paragraph (a) above;

(c) An analysis of the potential alternative public transportation and specialized transportation services and service improvements;

(3) A presentation by the RTPA staff on February 26, 2002, concerning recent study findings concerning unmet needs, and existing service ridership and feasibility;

(4) A public hearing held on February 26, 2002, for the purpose of soliciting claimant agency and citizen comments on unmet transit needs that may exist within each claimant's jurisdiction that might be reasonable to meet using LTF funds; and

(5) An analysis of, and response to, comments prepared for the April 23, 2002, RTPA meeting. Separate responses were prepared by the RTPA, and Redding Area Bus Authority (RABA) for consideration; and

WHEREAS, as a result of this annual planning and review process, the RTPA has identified no new unmet transit needs for the claimant jurisdictions in Shasta County for 2002/03, which are reasonable to meet; and

WHEREAS, an analysis of identified transit needs for fiscal year 2002/03 for each affected jurisdiction, and consideration of their respective costs and revenues and other factors, has resulted in the determination that the existing level of transit service, as detailed in the 2002/03 Transit Needs Assessment, represents those transit needs that are reasonable to meet; and

WHEREAS, the findings required by PUC Section 99401.5, and related RTPA rules and policies, for each claimant jurisdiction are reflected in a single resolution for administrative convenience and as a reflection of the coordinated transit service that the individual claimants have separately elected to provide through a Joint Powers Agreement (JPA), despite their individual status as eligible TDA claimants; and

WHEREAS, the information developed pursuant to PUC Section 99401.5, subdivisions (a) through (c), inclusive, which provide the basis for the findings herein for FY 2002/03 include: (1) The 2002/03 Transit Needs Assessment and supplemental data and analysis provided; (2) the Transit Development Plan (TDP) as updated with 1995 Transit Needs Study Technical Memorandums No. 1 and No. 2; (3) SSTAC consultations; (4) public and claimant agency comments; (5) staff reports and presentations to the RTPA Board; (6) the Regional Transportation Plan; and (7) all correspondence, testimony and documents otherwise comprising the record of proceedings; and

WHEREAS, the PUC Section 99401.5 findings made herein, including determinations that existing transit services include all transit needs that are reasonable to meet, will require that the existing level of transit service shall continue to be funded for each claimant as specified before any allocation is made by the responsible claimant for streets and roads within its jurisdiction; and

WHEREAS, proposed 2002/03 TDA allocations to the claimants , in the form of a 2002/03 TDA budget, have been prepared which include funding for the existing level of service determined reasonable to meet; and

WHEREAS, to ensure eligibility for STA funds, RABA shall submit calculations supporting its compliance with California Code of Regulations Section 99314.6; and

WHEREAS, the PUC Section 99401.5 findings made herein are consistent with the goals, objectives and policies of the Regional Transportation Plan; and

WHEREAS, from the 2002/03 unmet transit needs evaluation process, the RTPA has determined a level of transit service for each claimant that is considered reasonable to meet under the criteria of Resolution 00-21 and the rules and regulations governing the implementation of the Transportation Development Act; and

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

(1) Makes the above stated findings and determinations, including, but not limited to a finding that existing transit services fully and adequately address all unmet transit needs in each claimant jurisdiction in Shasta County, which are reasonable to meet; and

(2) Determines that the existing level of transit service, as detailed in the 2002/03 Transit Needs Assessment fully set forth herein by reference represents the highest level of transit service that can be reasonably funded; and

(3) 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

(4) Determines that the farebox ratio for the RABA service area where services are jointly funded in the rural and urban areas for 2002/03 is 16.5%; and

(5) Approves allocations for each claimant jurisdiction that are consistent with and reflected in the 2002/03 TDA Budget attached as Exhibit B; and

(6) Directs that claimants for TDA funds be instructed by RTPA staff that they shall submit claims for transit funds in the amounts not exceeding those shown on Exhibit B for fiscal year 2002/03, and that these claims and the use of resulting funds shall be consistent with the TDP, as amended, before any LTF allocations shall be used for street and road purposes.

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

Norma Comnick, Chair
Shasta County Regional
Transportation Planning Agency

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SHASTA COUNTY RTPA | | | | | | |
| CALCULATION OF TDA APPORTIONMENTS AND TRANSIT OBLIGATIONS FOR 2002-2003 | | | | | | |
| **EXHIBIT A - PAGE 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 | 0.00 | 8.45 | 9.00 | 137.50 |
| | Hours on Route 9 | 9.00 | 6.50 | 0.00 | 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 | opulation Split | ervice Hour Sp | Weighted |
| based on 2001 State Department of Finance E-1 report | | | Service Area | 20.00% | 80.00% | 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 expected to be received | 5,576,772 | | | | |
| | STA expected to be received PUC99313 | 274,278 | | | | |
| | | ---------------------- | | | | |
| | Subtotal | 5,851,050 | | | | |
| | " Off - The - Top " Allocations | | | | | |
| | Administration PUC 99233.1 LTF | (202,696) | PER OWP | | | |
| | CTSA PUC 99275 LTF | (278,839) | 5% of LTF expected | | | |
| | RTPA Core Planning Functions Match | (2,242) | PER OWP | | | |
| | | ------------------------- | | | | |
| | Total "Off-the-Top" | (483,777) | | | | |
| | | ------------------------- | | | | |
| | Amount Available for Distribution | 5,367,273 | | | | |

tda 2002-2003 claims rev 4-9-02.xls

**SHASTA COUNTY RTPA**

**CALCULATION OF TDA APPORTIONMENTS AND TRANSIT OBLIGATIONS FOR 2002-2003**

**EXHIBIT A - PAGE 2 OF 2**

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Amount to be provided to RABA - Urban Fixed Route and DR | | 3,257,279 | From policy 6-3 2003 | | | | | | | | |
| RABA % Funded Based Upon Service Hours | 80% | | | | | | | | | | |
| RABA % Funded Based Upon Population | 20% | | | | | | | | | | |
| Calculation of transit obligation based on 80% Service Hours/20% Population | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Amount to be Distributed | FTA Section 5,307 | Core Planning Match | 5311 Grant FTA Section | Total Resources Available | To Fund RABA | To Fund Trial Services July 1 - Nov 30 | To Fund Burney Express Rural Transit | To Fund Rural Admin & Vanpool | TDA Apportion Available for Other Uses | Total Claimed |
| Amount to be Apportioned to Claimants | 5,367,273 | | | | | | calculate actual cost | | | | |
| Redding | 2,672,300 | 627,783 | | | 3,300,083 | (2,649,409) | (20,503) | | | 630,171 | |
| Redding Core Match | 766 | | 766 | | | | | | | | |
| Anderson | 296,382 | | | 48,216 | 344,598 | (164,170) | (4,880) | | | 175,548 | |
| Anderson Core Match | 984 | | 984 | | | | | | | | |
| Shasta Lake | 297,192 | 69,817 | | | 367,009 | (196,689) | | | | 170,320 | |
| Shasta Lake Core Match | 136 | | 136 | | | | | | | | |
| Unincorporated County Area | 2,101,399 | | | 61,106 | 2,162,505 | (247,012) | (19,465) | (68,643) | (72,252) | 1,755,133 | |
| Shasta County Core Match | - | | | | | | | | | | |
| Administration | 202,696 | | | | 202,696 | | | | | | 202,696 |
| CTSA | 278,839 | | | | 278,839 | | | | | | 278,839 |
| RABA | 356 | | 356 | | - | 3,257,279 | 44,848 | | | | 3,302,127 |
| Trial Services | - | | | | - | | | 68,643 | 72,252 | | 140,895 |
| | - | | | | - | | | - | | | - |
| TOTAL TO DISTRIBUTE | 5,851,050 | 697,600 | 2,242 | 109,322 | 6,655,730 | - | - | - | - | 2,731,173 | 3,924,556 |
| **Source Notes** | | PER RABA BUDGET | Per OWP | Last Year's # 2001/2002 | | | Includes Fall River Cottonwood | Per Budget | Per Budget | Proof | 0 |
| Proof | 0 | | | | | | | | | | |

| SHASTA COUNTY RTPA | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SCHEDULE OF ANNUAL CLAIMS /TDA BUDGET | | | | |
| FISCAL YEAR 2002/2003 CLAIMS | | | | |
| **EXHIBIT B** | | | | |
| | | Funding Sources | | |
| CLAIMANT/PURPOSE | | LTF | STA | FTA |
| Off-The-Top Apportionments | | | | |
| Administrative | PUC 99233.1 | 204,582 | | |
| (includes Core Function Match) | | | | |
| CTSA Funding for Elderly Population | PUC 99275 | 266,839 | | |
| CTSA Funding for Administration by CTSA | PUC 99275 | 12,000 | | |
| Carryover CTSA Funding for Senior Training Pr | PUC 99275 | - | | |
| | | -------------------- | | |
| Total Off The Top Apportionments | | 483,421 | | |
| | | ============ | | |
| Redding Area Bus Authority | | | | |
| TDA funds required per RABA budget | 3,257,279 | | | |
| PUC 99400(c) | | | | |
| Sources of Transit Funding: | | | | |
| LTF - Redding | 1,885,066 | 1,885,066 | | |
| STA - Redding | 136,560 | | 136,560 | |
| FTA Section 5307 | 627,783 | | | 627,783 |
| LTF - Shasta Lake | 111,684 | 111,684 | | |
| STA - Shasta Lake | 15,187 | | 15,187 | |
| FTA Section 5307 | 69,817 | | | 69,817 |
| LTF - Anderson | 100,808 | 100,808 | | |
| STA - Anderson | 15,146 | | 15,146 | |
| FTA Section 5311 | 48,216 | | | 48,216 |
| LTF - Shasta County | 139,626 | 139,626 | | |
| STA - Shasta County | 107,386 | | 107,386 | |
| FTA Sec 5311 | | | | |
| | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- |
| Total Funds Provided RABA for Transist | 3,257,279 | 2,237,185 | 274,278 | 745,816 |
| | ========== | ========== | ========== | ========== |
| Services Provided Under Contract to Shasta County | | | | |
| Burney Express | | 7,537 | | 61,106 |
| Trial Services | | 19,465 | | |
| City of Redding | | | | |
| LTF - Streets and Roads | | 630,171 | | |
| Trial Services | | 20,503 | | |
| City Of Anderson | | | | |
| LTF Streets and Roads | | 175,548 | | |
| Trial Services | | 4,880 | | |
| City Of Shasta Lake | | | | |
| LTF Streets and Roads | | 170,320 | | |
| Shasta County | | | | |
| LTF - Streets and Roads (PUC 99400(a)) | | 1,755,133 | | |
| LTF - Purchased Transportation - Vanpool Subsidy (PUC 99400(c)) | | 42,252 | | |
| LTF - Purchased Transportation - Lifeline Services (PUC 99400(c)) | | 30,000 | | |
| | | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- |
| Total Revenues by Funding Source | | 5,092,995 | 274,278 | 806,922 |
| | | ========== | ========== | ========== |
| PROOF | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **TOTAL REVENUES TO BE DISTRIBUTED=** | | **6,174,195** | | |

tda 2002-2003 claims rev 4-9-02.xls

# COUNTY OF SHASTA

## DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

*DATE* April 10, 2002 RAF 010005

*TO* Dan Kovacich, Executive Director - SCRTPA

*FROM* Sue Crowe, Accountant Auditor - SCRTPA

*SUBJECT* 2001 Population Estimate - Revised

The RTPA population estimate for the cities, unincorporated area and the RABA service area within Shasta County is based on the 2000 California Department of Finance E-1 population estimate. An estimate of the population served by rural transit is also included for calculating the FTA Section 5311 funding allocation based on 2000 census data. Where an area does not directly correspond to the area reported in the E-1 report, the rate of change from a comparable area listed in the E-1 is used to adjust the 1990 U.S. Census estimate. The 2000 U.S. Census will be analyzed as a work goal in the 2002-2003 OWP.

The 2001 Population Estimate for the RABA Service Area has been revised per the April 9, 2002 Technical Advisory Committee meeting where RABA stated that the entire population of the City of Redding is within the RABA service area.

**2001 POPULATION ESTIMATE**

| Jurisdiction | Population | Percent of Total | Percent Change from 2000 RTPA Estimate |
|---|---|---|---|
| **2001 E-1 Estimate** | | | |
| *These figures are used for TDA apportionment and represent the total population of Shasta County* | | | |
| Anderson | 9,150 | 5.53% | 1.04% |
| Redding | 82,500 | 49.80% | 1.0364% |
| Shasta Lake | 9,175 | 5.55% | -0.026% |
| Unincorporated County | 64,875 | 39.12% | -0.064% |
| Total County Population | 165,700 | 100.00% | -0.0079% |
| **RABA Service Area** | | | |
| ***These figures represent the claimant populations within the Urban Fixed Route Area of Shasta County used for 80/20 Service hour and population split*** | | | |
| | | % Change per 4/9 TAC Meeting | |
| Anderson | 9,150 | 8.6% | -.29% |
| Redding | 82,500 | 77.9% | +.59% |
| Shasta Lake | 9,175 | 8.7% | -.2% |
| Unincorporated County | 5,079 | 4.8% | -.1% |
| Total RABA | 105,904 | 100.00% | |
| **Rural Population (FTA 5311)** | | | |
| *These figures represent the County non-urbanized population of Shasta County* | | | |
| Anderson | 9,150 | 44.11% | |
| Unincorporated RABA Area | 5,079 | 31.85% | |
| Intermountain Express | 4,917 | 24.04% | |
| TOTAL FTA 5311 | 19,146 | 100.00% | |

SLC/mlc

# 2002/03 UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

**Introduction:** Annually the RTPA takes public testimony on unmet transit needs in Shasta County. Comments received are grouped below according to subject matter. Some comments, such as those for new general-public transit services, require an RTPA response as to whether the service can meet "unmet transit needs" and "reasonable to meet" criteria developed by the RTPA. Other comments, such as those for new senior services, require a CTSA response on whether that service is consistent with "community transit service" criteria. Services which do not meet either of these funding criteria may be funded at the discretion of a city or the county, depending on where the transit need occurs, and a jurisdiction response may be provided.

| Comments: Grouped by Subject | RTPA Response |
| --- | --- |
| 1. FIXED ROUTE/DEMAND RESPONSE SERVICE AREA<br>**a. Expand Service**<br>i. Extend routes from Redding to Palo Cedro /Millville , French Gulch, Old Shasta and Lakehead (L-2&4,PC-1,PH-1)<br>ii. New route or route extension to serve Airport Road Corridor including Fairway Oaks area (L-1) | These services are subject to "unmet transit need" and "reasonable to meet" criteria. Expansion of Fixed Route/Demand Response services are "unmet transit needs"<br><br>i. A new transit service would need to generate at least 15 passenger trips per each new service hour. Pages 7 through 9 of the 2002/03 Transit Needs Assessment identify high and low transit demand area within the County. Palo Cedro/Millville, French Gulch , Happy Valley and Lakehead are among the lowest travel demand areas in the County. The extension of fixed route services to outlying areas is not reasonable to meet.<br><br>ii. The Airport Road Area is in census tract 115 where the travel demand is similar to that of the Bella Vista area and is not sufficient to recover a 20% farebox requirement. A dial-a-ride service may be reasonable to meet, but it's not clear if that level of transit service would meet the needs of the residents. Currently the Airport Road Express service is in the fourth month of operation in this area. This service connects to route 9 on the fixed route system and other fixed routes that connect with the Dana Drive Transfer site. It should be emphasized that the Express Route service does not include Demand Response service but does connect areas in the RABA service area that can provide that service.<br><br>Currently, the RABA system is servicing the highest transit demand areas. Service to new areas would increase costs and further reduce the farebox ratio. Such expansions are, therefore, not "reasonable to meet". |

| Comments: Grouped by Subject | RTPA Response |
|---|---|
| **b. Extend Hours of Operation**<br>i. Sunday Service (PH-1,2,3,4 & L-2,3)<br>ii. Longer Hours (PH-1,2,3,4 & L-2) | These services are subject to "unmet transit need" and "reasonable to meet" criteria. Expansion of Fixed Route/Demand Response services are "unmet transit needs" which are not "reasonable to meet."<br><br>These requests are similar to comments received last year. This indicates that this is an unmet need. However, the RTPA analysis of transit needs on pages 7 through 9 of the 2002/03 Transit Needs Assessment shows that the high transit demand areas within the County are currently being served by transit.<br><br>There are two general options available to provide service within the RABA service area on Sundays. The first would be to run the whole system on Sunday. The second would be to create another type of service such as a deviated route or dial-a-ride type of service. These services could operate for the same number of hours or less tha. RABA operates on Saturday.<br><br>The 2000/01 RABA farebox ratio was 18.8%, which is below the adjusted farebox ratio as approved by the RTPA. This falls short of the 20% requirement to for new service be determined "reasonable to meet." RABA estimates that ridership for the current Saturday service averaged 55% of weekday ridership. Based on this non-weekday performance and the low average farebox ratio, it is highly unlikely that running the complete system on Sunday would do significantly better than Saturday or the average weekday service.<br><br>Ridership projections for a deviated route or dial-a-ride service is comparable to RABA's current demand response service. In order to make the 20% farebox ratio, a vehicle costing $46.76 per hour to operate would have to have a fare of $3.50 to $4.00. Demand response currently averages 2.5 passengers per hour which is above the national average for demand response service. The fare to meet farebox recovery ratio would be too high and the service may not be supported with the high fares.<br><br>Currently, the RABA system is servicing the highest transit demand areas during the highest transit demand times. Although TDA funds maybe available to claimants for expanded services, expansion of Fixed Route/Demand Response services -- half hour headways, extended hours or days of service -- would increase the system costs and further reducing the farebox ratio. Such expansions are, therefore, not "reasonable to meet" at this time. |

| Comments: Grouped by Subject | RTPA Response |
|---|---|
| **2. SPECIALIZED SERVICES**<br>**a. Special Purpose Transit Needs**<br>i. Extension of Trial Transit Services trial period from one year to two years or not use the first three months of operation for evaluating the trial routes. (PH-1& 5, L-1&2)<br>ii. Consider taxi cab subsidy program for late evening transportation needs.(PH-3)<br>iii. Services for disabled should be expanded (PH-2& 3) | These services are subject to "unmet transit need" and "reasonable to meet" criteria. Expansion of Fixed Route/Demand Response services are "unmet transit needs" which are not "reasonable to meet" at this time.<br><br>i. During last years Unmet Needs Process the RTPA took action to fund trial express transit services for Cottonwood, Airport Road and Intermountain area. Their action included a provision that after one year the services not meeting the required farebox would be discontinued and directed staff to monitor and report findings. The current request to extend the trial period either three months or one year will be considered at a future RTPA meeting. Because the trial services have only been operating since Nov. 5, 2001 staff feels it is too early to consider requests for extending the trial period for all routes. If routes are making the farebox requirement they will be considered for long term funding after one year. This request is not consider a Unmet Transit Need and will be considered at a later date.<br><br>ii. Cab subsidy programs funded with TDA funds have several issues that make this request not reasonable to meet.<br>A. The service would need to serve the general public unless a pre-screening program was in place such as is used for Demand Response.<br>B. If designed for mobility impaired only, the existing cab fleets do not have lift equipped vans to deal with wheelchairs.<br>C RTPA staff has determined that several social service organizations have contracts with cab companies to provide after hours transportation needs. Should TDA funds be used to subsidize social service organizations transportation budgets?<br>D. If public entities determine that this program is worthy of funding other funding sources could be used for this program.<br><br>iii. Currently the RABA system provides services for the disabled at a level that exceeds the minimum ADA standards. |
| | |
| | |
| iv. Would like bi-weekly transit service from Lakehead (PC-4,L-4,PC-1) | See response for i. |

| Comments: Grouped by Subject | RTPA Response |
|---|---|
| 3. **OPERATIONAL IMPROVEMENTS**<br>a. Demand Response<br>i. Improve dispatching and communications (L- 1& 3)<br>ii. Bus benches and shelters (L-1) | Demand Response service, as part of the Fixed Route system, is subject to "unmet transit need" and "reasonable to meet" criteria. The level of Demand Response service currently provided exceeds the minimum requirements under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). Since these comments address level-of-service needs, these are RABA operational issues. In addressing level-of-service needs, however, RABA needs to consider effects on the Fixed Route farebox ratios (see response to Section 1). (See RABA response.) |
| 4. **POLICY ISSUES**<br>a. RABA needs more promotion | (See RABA response.) |
| b. Reduce farebox ratio to 16.5% or less to encourage new transit starts and consider distributing TDA funds in a way that more transit can be funded (PH-1, L-2) | The issue of reducing the farebox ratio for the RABA service area was considered by the RTPA. Instead of a permanent reduction of the farebox ratio, the RTPA Board adopted a fare box recovery plan . The decision was to strive to meet a 19% farebox ratio. Currently this issue is being considered by the RABA board. |
| | |

| SUMMARY OF 2002/03 UNMET NEEDS COMMENTS | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| COMMENT # | NAME, ADDRESS | PHONE, EMAIL, MAIL | COMMENT |
| PH-1 | Mike Evans<br>SSTAC<br>c/o 2227 Flagstone<br>Anderson, CA 96007 | Public Hearing<br>Feb. 26, 2002 | • Extension of RABA's Cottonwood, Airport Road, Intermountain trial express routes from 1 to 2 years<br>• Supports farebox ratio to 16.5%<br>• Monthly passes kept at current price or lower<br>• Request Sunday bus service & extended evening hours<br>• Bus benches & stops/shelters some not handicapped accessible, some not visible<br>• RABA needs more promotion<br>• Request bus service to Happy Valley, Palo Cedro, Bella Vista |
| PH-2 | Shelly Anderson<br>On behalf of disabled community | Public Hearing<br>Feb. 26, 2002 | • Request Sunday bus service & extended evening hours |
| PH-3 | Isabelle Cordova<br>Far Northern Reg'l Ctr<br>PO Box 492418<br>Redding, CA 96049 | Public Hearing<br>Feb. 26, 2002 | • Request Sunday bus service & extended evening hours<br>• Possibly could work with taxi cab's & subsidize |
| PH-4 | Sandra Van Larsen<br>Ind Living Svcs of N Ca<br>1411 Yuba Street<br>Redding, CA 96001 | Public Hearing<br>Feb. 26, 2002 | • Request Sunday bus service & extended evening hours<br>• Request bus service to Lakehead |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| PH-5 | Melinda Brown<br>People Of Progress<br>1242 Center Street<br>Redding, CA 96001 | Public Hearing<br>Feb. 26, 2002 | • Supports farebox ratio to 16.5%<br>• Extension of RABA's Cottonwood, Airport Road, Intermountain trial express routes from 1 to 2 years<br>• RABA needs more promotion |
| L-1 | Mary Onwiler<br>6945 Amber Lane<br>Redding, CA 96002<br>(530) 365-1777<br>monwiler@hotmail.com | Public Hearing<br>Feb. 26, 2002 | • Letter requesting the Airport express trial route be hourly<br>• Signs marking all stop locations on Airport Road<br>• Advertisement within the RABA bus system |
| L-2 | Mike Evans<br>SSTAC<br>c/o 2227 Flagstone<br>Anderson, CA 96007 | Letter dated February 12, 2002 | • Extension of RABA's Cottonwood, Airport Road, Intermountain trial express routes from 1 to 2 years<br>• Supports farebox ratio to 16.5%<br>• Monthly passes kept at current price or lower<br>• Request Sunday bus service & extended evening hours<br>• Bus benches & stops/shelters some not handicapped accessible, some not visible<br>• RABA needs more promotion<br>• Schedule enhancements & improvements<br>• Request bus service to Happy Valley, Palo Cedro, Bella Vista |
| L-3 | Robert M. Montrees<br>2873 Arcade Way, Sp 234<br>Redding, CA 96002 | Letter dated January 9, 2002 | RABA Service Improvements & Sunday Service |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| L-4 | Ms. Lois Hansen<br>20490 Lakeview Drive<br>Lakehead, CA 96051-9508<br>(530) 238-2489 | Letter dated September 7, 2001 | Bus service to Lakehead |
| PC-1 | Lois Hansen<br>20490 Lakeview<br>Lakehead, CA 96051<br>(530) 238-2489 | Phone Call on August 22, 2001 | Bus service to Lakehead |

PH=Public Hearing
L=Letter
PC=Phone Call

RABA

April 3, 2002
R-010-750-000

Bill Ramsdell
Shasta County Regional Transportation
Planning Agency
1855 Placer Street
Redding, CA 96001

Dear Bill:

SUBJECT: Responses to 2002-03 Unmet Transit Needs

It appears that the only comments that were listed in the 2002-03 Unmet Transit Needs that require responses relate to operational improvements and policy issues. The Redding Area Bus Authority's (RABA) responses are as follows:

3. **Operational Improvements**

The unmet needs comments that RABA is responding to in "L-1 & -3" are confusing. Pursuant to your grouping, this section refers specifically to Demand Response service, which is a door-to-door service for the mobility impaired and does not require passenger loading improvements. The "L-3" comment from Robert M. Montrees is primarily for extended hours and Sunday service (see enclosed letter). Mrs. Onwiler's comments seem to reference the new express service, which does not include Demand Response. However, I am providing a brief response to the bus benches and shelters as an "informational" item for your use.

The Redding Area Bus Authority (RABA) accepted a Short- and Long-Range Master Transit Plan Study in August 2001. Among other items, the study included a schedule of capital costs, including bus stop amenities based primarily on funds available. Over the next 25 years, capitals costs range from $25,000 to $51,000 a year. Annually, RABA budgets for bus stop improvements (curb, gutter, sidewalk, bus turnouts, and benches) within its fixed route service area. Additionally, RABA has a contract with a firm to provide shelters throughout its service area. The contract allows the firm to place shelters with advertising kiosks, at no cost to RABA, with RABA receiving a percentage of the revenue. Additionally, major developments have been conditioned to provide public transit amenities as a part of their permit to develop.

**REDDING AREA BUS AUTHORITY**
777 CYPRESS AVENUE,REDDING, CALIFORNIA 96001-3396 • (530) 225-4171 • FAX (530) 245-7024

RABA's past efforts have been to focus on placing shelters and benches where there is a demonstrated need–ridership and infrastructure to support the placement of benches and shelters. Currently, there are 22 shelters and 78 benches in the RABA service area. This effort is slowing down as benches and shelters have been placed in those areas that meet the sidewalk width requirements. RABA is now shifting its focus to those places where it is harder to locate the amenities. Harder to locate simply means that easements will have to be acquired to allow the placement of amenities (sidewalk widths do not accommodate placement) and/or costly infrastructure improvements are required. These infrastructure improvements will be costly and will dictate the number of benches placed on an annual basis. We would also note that the benches and shelters are primarily in commercial areas due to resistance of residential property owners to have amenities along their property.

4. **Policy Issues**

a. RABA promotes public transportation utilizing a multitude of media–newspaper, radio, television, door-to-door handouts, schools, regional fairs, specialty fairs (health, etc.), social service agencies, local jurisdictions, and the Economic Development coordinator of the City of Redding. This City position works directly with new businesses looking at the greater Redding area for relocation and promotes the local public transportation system. RABA has always worked with the community at large and participated in events, where feasible. With the current express services that are being provided on a trial basis, RABA has used the media to promote RABA and also enlisted many other agencies and jurisdictions in promoting the new services. The belief being that it takes a "community to promote transit."

As a brief synopsis of our current expenditures for advertising, RABA budgets $85,400 a year for advertising. With these funds, we run approximately 300 radio spots a month (includes paid and bonus spots), ads in two newspaper each month, and approximately 313 television spots (includes paid and bonus spots) per month. Included within this media mix, we advertise with local schools and/or other programs, as funds are available.

Of course, more promotion can always be added. If it is envisioned that a person would be designated to this activity, it would increase RABA's budget for staff time, which would directly impact the local jurisdictions. While this is a worthwhile endeavor, it must also be weighed from the standpoint of higher operating costs which would impact the farebox recovery ratio. RABA is currently at 18.8 percent and increases in operating costs will impact this ratio.

Should you have questions you comments, please do not hesitate to call me at 245-7114 or Sue Hanson at 245-7116.

Sincerely,

Ray Duryee

Ray E. Duryee
Transportation Manager

Enclosure
c: Transportation Planner

# SOCIAL SERVICES TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COUNCIL

To: Regional Transportation Planning Agency

From: Mike Evans, Chair, SSTAC

Date: April 8, 2002

RE: Unmet Needs and Reasonable to Meet Recommendations:

The Social Services Transportation Advisory Council met on March 28, 2002 to review the unmet needs process and staff report regarding their recommendations concerning those unmet needs that are "reasonable to meet."

**1. Trial Express Services:**

At the present time, the usage of these programs seems to be growing although a dip was noted for February ridership and the programs do not yet meet the minimum farebox ratios that would be required for continuation. The SSTAC recommends:

- That a two-year trial period be considered, consistent with the recommendations of RABA's own transportation consultant and thereby giving the trial effort a chance to succeed.
- Increased efforts upon all who are affected to raise ridership on all these routes. A mailing will be made with all welfare checks to CalWorks clients to encourage the use of these new services. In addition, increased efforts will be made by all the social service agencies to encourage clients from these areas to use the trial services.

**3. Sunday Service:**

This is a very frequently requested enhancement to the public transit system by many different clients and the public at large. The staff report does not believe that Sunday service would be economically feasible based on existing Saturday service statistics. Unfortunately, no adequate data exists to prove either position, pro or con. However, there does seem to be a lot of vocal demand for this service, especially for those who need it for employment and personal activities. A moderate position which we could recommend is to begin Sunday service on a trial basis, using actual results to measure its feasibility and effect on the overall farebox ratio. Including Sunday service would have the added beneficial effect of providing a 7 day a week continuity in service that potential riders could rely on.

**4. Extended hours of operation:**

This, along with #2. above, is the most frequently requested enhancement to the public transit system. Requests come from those who work especially in retail and service industries where shifts end after 6:30 (usually 7 or 8 pm). The staff analysis is based on the existing ridership for the last hour or so of service on the current schedule. We believe there may be significant additional riders who would use the service if hours were extended and who currently do not use the service at all since they currently have no way to return in the later hours. In addition, there are many more students attending Shasta College for evening classes who might be able to utilize public transportation if it were available with later hours. Again, we would suggest a trial period to determine the feasibility of this service and its overall effect on farebox ratios.

**General remarks:**

SSTAC supports the RABA Board's request to permanently reduce the farebox recovery ratio to 16.5%. Since TDA revenues are legislatively intended for public transit uses as a first priority, every effort should be made to support the efforts to provide a working and well-developed overall public transit system. While certain route enhancements, service corridors, or additions to the system may not prove to be individually able to contribute to the overall farebox return, the system should be measured upon its ability to provide an overall service capability with some more 'profitable' routes helping to subsidize other routes which serve a significant ridership population but do not quite meet the higher farebox requirements. Reducing the overall farebox ratio for the entire system would enable RABA to have greater flexibility in meeting perceived needs and making adjustments that would benefit the overall system as a whole. As an example, it is presently clear that the Airport Road corridor express route does not meet the farebox recovery ratio on its own, but that it still serves a significant number of riders and enables those riders to utilize the balance of the fixed route system.

In addition, it is apparent that the staff time available for RABA and/or RTPA staff to engage in promotional activities on behalf of the system is extremely limited. There are many opportunities to promote and publicize the system that could be taken advantage of if there were staff available to pursue these goals. The SSTAC suggests that some investment be made in providing additional funding for staffing to engage directly in promotional activities in an effort to raise overall ridership and as a result, farebox revenues.

Finally, the pace of improvements to existing bus stops is very slow. We recommend a community-based effort led by RABA staff to encourage improvements of bus stops by civic and community group efforts, donations, and possible sponsorships.

We would like to thank the RABA staff, RTPA staff and RTPA Board for the opportunity to participate in the unmet needs and reasonable to meet process. Working together, it is indeed possible to help make our public transportation system work for everyone.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Evans, Chair, SSTAC