REPORT TO SHASTA COUNTY RTPA

SUBJECT		MEETING DATE	ITEM NUMBER
Approve Unmet Transit Needs – 2010/11 Transportation Development Act (TDA) Unmet Needs Findings, Allocation Instructions, and Claims Budget		04/27/10	4-3

RECOMMENDATION
It is recommended that the Board:

1. Receive the Social Services Transportation Advisory Council's (SSTAC) recommendation;
2. Accept staff responses to public comments received during the Unmet Transit Needs process;
3. Approve Resolution No. 10-07 which reflects the RTPA's Unmet Transit Needs findings and determines that there are no new transit services within each claimant jurisdiction that are "reasonable to meet";
4. Adopt the FY 2010/11 TDA budget and approve TDA claims by jurisdiction as shown in Attachment A; and
5. Authorize the Executive Director to distribute claims when sufficient funds are available.

SUMMARY
Adoption of the staff recommendation completes the FY 2010/11 Unmet Transit Needs process and authorizes distribution of TDA revenues in FY 2010/11.

DISCUSSION
Under a joint powers agreement, the Redding Area Bus Authority (RABA) provides transit service in the urban areas of the cities and some rural areas of the county. The cost associated with fixed-route and demand-response service is allocated to the jurisdictions based 80% on service hours and 20% on the population within RABA's service area. Revenues are primarily provided through the Local Transportation Fund (LTF), derived from one-quarter cent of the general sales tax. LTF is allocated to the jurisdictions based on total population.

"Off-the-top" allocations are deducted before funds are apportioned to the jurisdictions. RTPA administration is funded first, followed by the Consolidated Transportation Services Agency (CTSA) which is eligible for 5% of LTF, then RABA. After transit obligations are met, the jurisdictions may use their remaining apportionment for other eligible uses, including additional transit service or streets and roads (Attachment A).

RABA's administrative costs of $587,060 is included in RABA's operating budget and paid by the jurisdictions through the claims process. It is proposed that the RTPA use state planning funds to support RTPA administration. This will make available $272,000 in TDA funds that could be used to fund transit or other eligible uses.

The RTPA "reasonable to meet" definition is provided in Attachment D. It is recommended the Board find that the current level of transit service is "reasonable to meet."

Public and SSTAC Comments
Staff met with the SSTAC on January 20, 2010. The SSTAC voted to re-submit last year's recommendation, with the addition of the feasibility of adding a pilot or express service on the Airport Road Corridor (Attachment C). Historically, unmet needs comments usually are for extended hours and Sunday service. The SSTAC recommends "there are no unmet needs that are reasonable to meet at this time".

The public hearing was held on February 23, 2010. There were no public comments at the hearing. The RTPA received five comments during the public comment period. The RTPA's response to the comments is shown in Attachment B. The SSTAC will review unmet needs comments at a future meeting.

Budgeted Revenue and Expenses

Funding sources for public transportation include the LTF, the State Transit Assistance (STA) fund, and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5307 Urban Area and 5311 Rural Area assistance programs. RABA is responsible to annually apply for 5307 funds. A maximum of $750,000 may be requested for operating assistance. Recent legislation that swaps the sales tax on gas and diesel with an excise tax is estimated to provide nearly $1 million for public transit operations in FY 2010/11. The following is a summary of 2010/11 estimated revenue compared to transit funding obligations:

2010/11 TRANSIT OBLIGATION AND FUNDING SOURCES							
		Claimant					
Revenue Source		Anderson	Redding	Shasta Lake	County	CTSA	RTPA
LTF	6,000,000	352,906	2,979,888	336,646	2,330,560		
STA	940,000	36,876	311,376	35,177	243,526	300,000	13,044
FTA 5307	750,000	72,131	609,062	68,807			
FTA 5311	238,739				238,739		
Total Revenue	7,928,739	461,913	3,900,326	440,631	2,812,825	300,000	13,044
		Claimant					
Transit Expense		Anderson	Redding	Shasta Lake	County	CTSA	RTPA
RABA	4,222,585	178,478	3,585,604	205,941	252,562		
RABA Capital	12,000	507	10,190	585	718		
Burney Express	98,749				98,749		
County Lifeline	40,050				40,050		
Rural Admin	3,250				3,250		
RTPA Admin	13,045						13,044
CTSA	300,000					300,000	
County STA reserve	86,937				86,937		
Total Transit Expense	4,776,614	178,986	3,595,794	206,526	482,266	300,000	13,044
		Estimate of Funds Available for Other Uses					
Available for Other Uses	**3,152,124**	**282,928**	**304,532**	**234,104**	**2,330,560**	**0**	**0**

Burney Express, County Lifeline Service, and rural transit administration are funded solely by the County. The cities are not responsible for expenses incurred for these services. FTA 5311 and STA may only be used to fund public transit. County revenue received exceeds the transit obligation and will be reserved for future transit expenses.

Approval of this budget will allow the RTPA to distribute funds during FY 2010/11. It is proposed that funds for other uses be distributed when funds are available. Redding's transit obligation represents 93% of their estimated revenues. Funds available for other uses will be maintained in a transit reserve. In approximately two years, once audited revenues and expenses are known, this budget is "trued-up" to correct any over or under payment to the claimants.

ALTERNATIVES

The FY 2010/11 TDA budget was developed in compliance with RTPA Policy 6-3. Revenues are based on official estimates or, in the case of LTF, historic trends. RABA expenditures are based on RABA's 2010/11 draft budget. The Board could choose to modify any of these estimates; however, in most cases policy or budget amendments would be needed.

OTHER AGENCY INVOLVEMENT

The local agencies have reviewed the attached exhibits and concur with the staff recommendation. RABA and Shasta Senior Nutrition Programs (the CTSA) have been consulted throughout the TDA claim process. The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) concurs with the staff recommendation.

FINANCING

Final action consistent with the attached resolution will result in claims as outlined in Attachment A.

Daniel S. Little, AICP, Executive Director

DSL/SLC/jac

Attachments: Attachment A – Apportionments and transit obligations for 2010/11
Attachment B – Staff responses to comments received during the 2010/11 unmet needs process
Attachment C – SSTAC recommendation
Attachment D – Resolution 00-21, adopted December 12, 2000, definition of Unmet Transit Needs and Reasonable to Meet
Attachment E - Resolution No. 10-07

ATTACHMENT A - SHASTA COUNTY RTPA - 2010-11 TDA APPORTIONMENT & TRANSIT OBLIGATIONS

TDA Claim Allocation. Annual claims are prepared based on estimated revenues and expenses for the future year. These estimates are revised, or "trued-up" once audited revenues and expenses are available. Excess funds may be distributed to claimants for other eligible uses

							POPULATION BY JURISDICTION							
							City of Anderson		City of Redding		City of Shasta Lake		County of Shasta	
Population Factors from E-1 Dept of Finance Jan 2010	2009	2010 Pop.					2009	2010	2009	2010	2009	2010	2009	2010
Countywide Population	183,023						10,765		90,898		10,269		71,091	
Percent of Population by Jurisdiction	100.00%						5.88%		49.66%		5.61%		38.84%	
			OFF-THE-TOP ALLOCATIONS				REVENUE BY JURISDICTION							
SECTION 1: REVENUE			RTPA (PUC 99233.1)		CTSA		City of Anderson		City of Redding		City of Shasta Lake		County of Shasta	
Funding Source	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual
Transportation Development Act Funds	6,000,000													
Local Transportation Fund (PUC 99231)	6,000,000						352,906		2,979,888		336,646		2,330,560	
Local Transportation Fund -Overall Work Program Match	0													
State Transit Assistance - Agency	626,956						36,876		311,376		35,177		243,526	
State Transit Assistance - CTSA	300,000				300,000									
State Transit Assistance - OWP	13,044		13,044											
Federal Transit Admin. 5311 (County Only)	238,739												238,739	
Federal Transit Admin. 5307 (Cities Only)	750,000						72,131		609,062		68,807			
TOTAL ESTIMATED TDA & FTA FUNDS	**7,928,739**		**13,044**		**300,000**		**461,913**		**3,900,326**		**440,631**		**2,812,825**	
SECTION 2: TRANSIT FUNDING REQUIRED							TRANSIT REQUIREMENTS BY JURISDICTION							
Calculation of 80/20 transit obligation	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	City of Anderson		City of Redding		City of Shasta Lake		County of Shasta	
Population in RABA Service Area	117,478						10,765		90,898		10,269		5,546	
Percent of Population by Jurisdiction	100.00%						9.16%		77.37%		8.74%		4.72%	
Service Hours By Jurisdiction	135.00						4.04		117.18		5.28		8.50	
Percent of Service Hours in Jurisdiction	100.00%						2.99%		86.80%		3.91%		6.30%	
Revised Weighted Average Share Per Jurisdiction	100.00%						4.23%		84.91%		4.88%		5.98%	
Redding Area Bus Authority	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual
RABA TDA (PUC Article 4 99260(a)) Operating	4,222,585						178,478		3,585,604		205,941		252,562	
RABA TDA FTA 5307 Capital Match	12,000						507		10,190		585		718	
Other Transit Obligations														
Burney Express	98,749												98,749	
County Lifeline	40,050												40,050	
Rural Transit Administration	3,250												3,250	
Consolidated Transportation Services Agency (CTSA)	300,000				300,000									
RTPA Admin (Per 10/11 OWP)	13,044		13,044											
TOTAL ESTIMATED TRANSIT REQUIREMENTS	**4,689,678**		**13,044**		**300,000**		**178,986**		**3,595,794**		**206,526**		**395,329**	
							AVAILABLE FOR OTHER USES BY JURISDICTION							
			RTPA		CTSA		City of Anderson		City of Redding		City of Shasta Lake		County of Shasta	
SECTION 3: AVAILABLE FOR OTHER ELIGIBLE USES	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual
Total Estimated Revenue	7,928,739		13,044		300,000		461,913		3,900,326		440,631		2,812,825	
Less Transit Requirements (PUC 99400c)	(4,689,678)		(13,044)		(300,000)		(178,986)		(3,595,794)		(206,526)		(395,329)	
Less Shasta County STA revenue for public transit	(86,937)												(86,937)	
TOTAL AVAILABLE FOR OTHER USES	**3,152,124**						**282,928**		**304,532**		**234,104**		**2,330,560**	
TOTAL AMOUNT OF TDA FUNDS CLAIMED BY AGENCY								Anderson		Redding		S Lake		County

Agency:______________________________ **Authorizing Signature:**______________________________ **Date:**__________________

FEDERAL TRANSIT FUNDS: FTA 5307 funds are available to RABA for capital and operating expenses. Funds may be banked for up to 3-years. RABA may carryover funds if expenditures are delayed in a fiscal year. FTA revenue is not a factor in TDA calculations although a 20% TDA match is required. Only the cities are eligible for 5307 funds. ARRA and Prop1B are 100% of cost and are calculated based on population within the jurisdicitions.

	Budget	Actual	City of Anderson		City of Redding		City of Shasta Lake			
	2009	2010	2009	2010	2009	2010	2009	2010		
Urban Area Population	111,932		10,765		90,898		10,269			
Percent of Population by Jurisdiction	100.00%		9.62%		81.21%		9.17%		County	
Note: Due to change in claims format, FTA is disbursed in the True-Up based on the actual revenue RABA receives.										
	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual
Prop 1B Safety & Security	153,000		8,999		75,987		8,584		59,429	
Prop 1B	1,184,000		69,640		588,031		66,432		459,897	
Estimated ARRA Capital (100%)	1,613,050		155,134		1,309,929		147,986			
FTA 5307 Operating by Jurisdiction	750,000		72,131		609,062		68,807			
Total state and federal grants by jurisdiction	**3,700,050**		**305,904**		**2,583,009**		**291,810**		**519,326**	

Formula for LTF revenue distribution	**RTPA admin is off the top. Admin is deducted from the LTF total prior to calculating jurisdictions percent.**
STA Distribution	**STA funds must first fund public transportation. STA can only be used to fund RABA, CTSA, and RTPA admin. If any funds remain, the total STA revenue less CTSA and Admin would be distributed to claimants for public transit use ONLY.**
CTSA	**The CTSA receives 5% of LTF revenue received after RTPA admin costs. The formula is total LTF revenue, less RTPA admin costs times 5%**
FTA Operating	**FTA Operating is available to the cities only. FTA is not distributed through allocations, and is included in the true-up.**
RABA Capital Match	**Local match for federal and TDA funded capital purchases such as; rolling stock, computers, passenger loading improvements, and misc. equipment.**
County STA Reserve	**Excess STA funds are reserved in RTPA fund balance on behalf of the county for future transit purposes.**

ATTACHMENT B—STAFF COMMENTS

2010/2011 UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

Introduction: Annually, the RTPA takes public testimony on unmet transit needs in n 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 that do not meet either of these funding criteria may be funded at the discretion of a city or 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	
A. Extended Service Area	
E-1: Service to Cottonwood.	In 2001/02 a trial service was implemented in this area. Due to lack of ridership and farebox ratio recovery of 3%, the service was terminated. The demographics of this area have not changed. The area is low in density, and a trial service is not recommended at this time.
E-4: Extend Burney Express route to McArthur-Burney State Park.	This rural area is served by the Burney Express, a commuter service with limited stops. The additional 20 minutes to add service to the park would compromise the existing service, which is on a time schedule oriented to work commuters.
P-1: Service to Redding Municipal Airport.	The RTPA recommends this service is not reasonable to meet at this time since Redding's transit costs are at or very near Redding's available revenue. The SSTAC recommends that the RTPA and RABA explore the feasibility of an express or pilot service on the Airport Road Corridor. This area is expanding with the addition of Stillwater Business Park, and the future home of the Veterans Retirement Home.
2. Route Service and Operations Applicable to RABA's Jurisdiction	
E-2: Extend Route #4 to Airose and Churn Creek.	This service was modified as part of the Short-Range Transit Plan. This comment has been forwarded to RABA.
E-3: Changes to Route 11	Wants route 11 the way it was before. This comment has been forwarded to RABA.

SHASTA COUNTY
SOCIAL SERVICES TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COUNCIL
(SSTAC)

TO: **Shasta County Regional Transportation Planning Agency (SCRTPA)**

DATE: **01/20/2010**

SUBJECT: **2010-2011 Unmet Transit Needs Recommendation**

The Shasta County Social Services Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC) meets bi-monthly to review transit needs in Shasta County. As part of the annual unmet transit needs process, the SSTAC is responsible for preparing and presenting an unmet needs recommendation to the SCRTPA Board.

The SSTAC recognizes that there are unmet transit needs such as, Sunday service and extended hours of service. Sunday and extended hour service should not be considered until the existing transit system can sustain the mandatory farebox ratio requirement. The SSTAC does recommend that the SCRTPA explore the feasibility of an express or pilot bus service on the Airport Road Corridor.

A goal of the Shasta County Coordinated Human Transportation Plan is to research the feasibility of developing a centralized dispatch center. The consolidation of transportation services could improve the efficiency of the transit system within the region, maximize available resources, and improve access to transportation for the general public as well as special needs customers. To accomplish this goal will require planning and participation of multiple agencies. The SSTAC suggests that the SCRTPA, working in collaboration with the SSTAC and specialized transportation providers, explore funding options available to plan for a centralized dispatch center for Shasta County.

The SSTAC's recommendation for 2010/11 is that there are **"no unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet."**

Respectfully submitted,

Virginia Webster

Virginia Webster, Chair – Shasta Senior Nutrition Programs
Mike Evans, Vice-Chair – ACCA, Faithworks
Chuck Aukland – Redding Area Bus Authority
Cindy Dodds – Tri-Counties Community Network
Janice Galloway – Shasta County Health and Human Services Agency – Mental Health
Sharon Howard – Shasta County Health and Human Services Agency – Social Services
Kay Hudelson – Golden Umbrella
Del Lockwood – Shasta County Opportunity Center
Debbie McClung – Shasta Senior Nutrition Programs
Lisa White – Consolidated Transportation Services Agency
Mike Harding – We Care A Lot
Dave Plowman – HELP, Inc.

RESOLUTION NO. 00-21

DEFINITION OF UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS AND REASONABLE TO MEET

WHEREAS, the Transportation Development Act (TDA) requires each transportation planning agency to find, prior to any allocation of Local Transportation Fund (LTF) monies for streets and roads, (1) that there are no unmet transit needs, or (2) that there are no unmet transit needs which can reasonably be met, or (3) if there are unmet transit needs, including some such needs that are reasonable to meet, that those needs determined reasonable to meet have been funded (California Public Utilities Code (PUC) Section 99401.5); and

WHEREAS, the TDA further permits the agency to define the terms "unmet transit needs" and "reasonable to meet" as it determines appropriate, consistent with PUC Section 99401.5(c); and

WHEREAS, Shasta County Regional Transportation Planning Agency staff, having consulted with claimant jurisdiction representatives and the Citizens Transportation Advisory Committee and have concluded that minor technical changes consistent with the TDA and prior RTPA practice are appropriate, and have therefore recommended the following revised definitions:

<u>Unmet Transit Needs</u>. An "unmet transit need" under the Transportation Development Act shall be found to exist only under the following conditions:

1. A population group in the proposed transit service area has been defined and located which has no reliable, affordable, or accessible transportation for necessary trips. The size and location of the group must be such that a service to meet their needs is feasible within the definition of "reasonable to meet" as set forth below.

2. Necessary trips are defined as those trips which are required for the maintenance of life, education, access to social service programs, health, and physical and mental well-being, including trips which serve employment purposes.

3. Unmet transit needs specifically include:

   (a) Transit or specialized transportation needs identified in the transit system's Americans with Disabilities Act Paratransit Plan or short-range Transit Plan which are not yet implemented or funded.

   (b) Transit or specialized transportation needs identified by the Social Services Transportation Advisory Council and confirmed by the RTPA through testimony or reports which are not yet implemented or funded.

4. Unmet transit needs specifically exclude:

(a) Minor operational improvements or changes, involving issues such as bus stops, schedules and minor route changes.

(b) Improvements funded or scheduled for implementation in the following fiscal year.

(c) Trips for any purpose outside of Shasta County, in accordance with PUC Section 99220(b).

(d) Primary and secondary school transportation.

Reasonable to Meet. An identified unmet transit need shall be found "reasonable to meet" only under the following conditions:

1. It has been demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Agency that transit service adequate to meet the unmet need can be operated with a subsidy not to exceed 80% of operating cost in urbanized areas and 90% in nonurbanized areas. It must also have been demonstrated that the unsubsidized portion of operating costs can be recovered by fare revenues as defined in the State Controller's Uniform System of Accounts and Records. The "Cost Allocation Method" as shown in Exhibit (A) is the method to be used for determining fare box ratio.

   (a) Transit service subsidy maximums may be determined on an individual route or service area, or an individual proposed route or service area, basis.

2. The proposed expenditure of Transportation Development Act funds required to support the transit service does not exceed the authorized allocation of the claimant, consistent with Public Utilities Code Sections 99230-99231.2 and TDA Regulations Sections 6649 and 6655.

   The fact that an identified need cannot fully be met based on available resources, however, shall not be the sole reason for finding that a transit need is not Reasonable to Meet.

3. The proposed expenditure shall not be used to support or establish a service in direct competition with an existing private service, nor to provide 24-hour service.

4. Where transit service is to be jointly funded by two or more of the local claimant jurisdictions, it shall be demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Commission that the resulting inter-agency cost sharing is equitable. In determining if the required funding equity has been achieved the Commission may consider, but is not limited to

considering whether or not the proposed cost sharing formula is acceptable to the affected claimants.

5. Transit services designed or intended to address an unmet transit need shall in all cases make coordinated efforts with transit services currently provided, either publicly or privately.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the definitions set forth above shall govern the RTPA's determinations of unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet pursuant to applicable TDA statutes and regulations, and the resulting allocation of TDA funds by this Commission;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Resolution 10-97 of the Shasta County Regional Transportation Planning Agency dated December 16, 1997, is hereby rescinded and superseded.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 12th day of December, 2000, by the Shasta County Regional Transportation Planning Agency.

David L. McGeorge, Chairman
Shasta County Regional
Transportation Planning Agency

RESOLUTION 10-07
UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS DETERMINATION
FOR CLAIMANT JURISDICTIONS IN SHASTA COUNTY FOR
FY 2010/11

WHEREAS, Section 99230 of the California Public Utilities Code (PUC) requires that each transportation planning agency shall annually determine the amount of Local Transportation Fund (LTF) funds to be allocated to each claimant, from an analysis and evaluation of the total amount anticipated to be available in the 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 California Code of Regulations Section 6655 require that the transportation planning agency shall allocate to a claimant for a given area only such monies 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 2010/11 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 2010/11 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 23, 2010, concerning recent unmet needs findings and existing service ridership and feasibility.

4. A public hearing held on February 23, 2010, 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. Public comments were analyzed and responded to.

WHEREAS, an analysis of identified transit needs for fiscal year 2010/11 for each affected jurisdiction, and consideration of their respective costs and revenues and other factors, as detailed in the 2010/11 Transit Needs Assessment, has resulted in the determination that the existing level of transit service 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 Transportation Development Act (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 2010/11 include: (1) The 2010/11 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; (7) Redding Area Bus Authority (RABA) Short-Range Transit Plan, October 2007, and (8) 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, upon modifications, 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 2010/11 TDA allocations to the claimants, in the form of a 2010/11 TDA budget, have been prepared; and

WHEREAS, to ensure eligibility for STA funds, RABA shall submit calculations supporting its compliance with PUC 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, as a result of this annual planning and review process, the RTPA has identified that there are "no new unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet" for the claimant jurisdictions in Shasta County for 2010/11.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the 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 2010/11 Transit Needs Assessment is reasonable to meet; 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 2010/11 is 16.7%; and

6. Approves allocations for each claimant jurisdiction that are consistent with and reflected in the 2010/11 TDA Budget on Attachment A; and

7. Directs that claimants for TDA funds shall submit claims for transit funds in the amounts not exceeding those shown on Attachment A for fiscal year 2010/11, 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 other uses; and

8. Authorize the Executive Director to modify the 2010/11 TDA claims once RABA's adopted budget is available.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 27th day of April, 2010, by the Shasta County Regional Transportation Planning Agency.

____

Dick Dickerson, Chair
Shasta County Regional Transportation Planning Agency