REPORT TO SHASTA COUNTY RTPA

SUBJECT		MEETING DATE	ITEM NUMBER
Approve Unmet Transit Needs – 2009/10 Transportation Development Act (TDA) Unmet Needs Findings, Allocation Instructions, and Claims Budget		04/28/09	4-5

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. 09-06 which reflects the RTPA's Unmet Transit Needs findings and determines that transit service for each claimant jurisdiction is "reasonable to meet" ;
4. Adopt the 2009/10 TDA budget and approve TDA claims by jurisdiction pursuant to Attachment A; and
5. Authorize the Executive Director to modify the 2009/10 TDA claims when the Redding Area Bus Authority's (RABA) budget is approved.

SUMMARY
Adoption of the staff recommendation allows RTPA staff to complete the 2009/10 Unmet Transit Needs process and distribute TDA revenues for 2009/10.

DISCUSSION
Under a joint powers agreement, RABA provides transit service in the urban areas of the cities and some rural fringe areas in the county. The cost associated with fixed-route and demand-response service is allocated to the three cities and the county based 80% on service hours and 20% on the population that is within the service area. Attachment A apportions available revenues to the cities and county based upon total population pursuant to TDA law, and allocates transit costs to those jurisdictions. After transit obligations are met, the jurisdictions may use their remaining apportionment for other eligible uses, including additional transit service or streets and roads.

RABA's administrative costs ($460,277) are included in RABA's operating budget and paid by the claimants through the claims process. Before funds are apportioned to the cities and county, "off-the-top" allocations are deducted for the following:

- RTPA Administration - $ 230,257
- Consolidated Transportation Services Agency (CTSA) - $327,129
- Local agency match to federal funds in the Overall Work Program - $27,160

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

Public and SSTAC Comments
At the February 24, 2009, Unmet Transit Needs hearing, the Board received public testimony. One comment was received requesting later hours and Sunday service. Staff's response is provided in Attachment B.

Staff met with the SSTAC on April 15, 2009, and presented information from the Unmet Transit Needs hearing for an SSTAC recommendation (Attachment C). The SSTAC recommends that:

1. The RTPA explore the feasibility of a centralized dispatch center.
2. Although there are transit needs, there are "no unmet needs that are reasonable to meet" at this time.

Budgeted Revenue and Expenses
Funding sources for public transportation include the Local Transportation Fund (LTF), the State Transit Assistance (STA) fund, and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5307 urban and 5311 rural assistance programs. LTF funds are based on a one-quarter cent sales tax revenue and have been decreasing. RABA is responsible to annually apply for 5307 funds. A maximum of $750,000 may be requested for operating assistance.

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) will provide approximately $2 million dollars for urban and rural transit projects. ARRA funds require no match, freeing up state funds for operating and other eligible uses.

A summary of TDA and FTA funds in the cities and county compared to transit funding obligations are presented in the table below:

	Transit Obligation and Funding Sources				
Claimant	TDA Revenue	County Only FTA 5311*	RABA 5307*	Transit Obligation	Available For Other Uses
Redding	$ 3,102,350	$ -	$ 3,264,694	$ (6,347,206)	$ 19,838
Anderson	$ 362,863	$ -	$ 381,664	$ (574,293)	$ 170,234
Shasta Lake	$ 352,004	$ -	$ 370,841	$ (524,636)	$ 198,209
County	$ 2,425,397	$ 668,207		$ (803,529)	$ 2,290,075
Total	$ 6,242,614	$ 668,207	$ 4,017,199	$ (8,249,664)	$ 2,678,356

** Includes ARRA funds*

With approval of this budget, the RTPA will disperse funds throughout the 2009/10 fiscal year as revenues are received. It is recommended that the Board authorize the Executive Director to modify claims once RABA's adopted budget is received. This could provide for a more accurate distribution of TDA apportionments during the fiscal year. In approximately two years, once the audited revenues and expenses are known, this budget is "trued-up." As a result, the RTPA will either credit excess revenues to the claimants or debit claimants in the event of overpayments.

ALTERNATIVES
The 2009/10 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 2009/10 draft budget. The Board could choose to modify any of these estimates; however, policy or budget amendments would first be needed in most cases.

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. This item was reviewed at the April 14, 2009, Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting and TAC recommends approval.

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: Resolution No. 09-06
Attachment A – Apportionments and transit obligations for 2009/10
Attachment B – Staff responses to comments received during the 2009/10 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

RESOLUTION 09-06
UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS DETERMINATION
FOR CLAIMANT JURISDICTIONS IN SHASTA COUNTY FOR
FY 2009/10

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 2009/10 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 2009/10 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 24, 2009, concerning recent unmet needs findings and existing service ridership and feasibility.

4. A public hearing held on February 24, 2009, 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 2009/10 for each affected jurisdiction, and consideration of their respective costs and revenues and other factors, as detailed in the 2009/10 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 2009/10 include: (1) The 2009/10 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) 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 2009/10 TDA allocations to the claimants, in the form of a 2009/10 TDA budget, have been prepared; 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, 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 2009/10.

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 2009/10 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 2009/10 is 16.2%; and

6. Approves allocations for each claimant jurisdiction that are consistent with and reflected in the 2009/10 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 2009/10, 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. Authorizes the Executive Director to modify the 2009/10 TDA claims once RABA's adopted budget is available.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 28th of April, 2009, by the Shasta County Regional Transportation Planning Agency.

____

Dick Dickerson, Chair
Shasta County Regional
Transportation Planning Agency

Attachment A

SUMMARY OF 2009/10 TDA APPORTIONMENT AND TRANSIT OBLIGATION

Estimated Revenue and Expenditures		Apportionment by Jurisdiction					
	TOTAL	City of Anderson	City of Redding	City of Shasta Lake	County of Shasta	CTSA	RTPA
Total Estimated Operating Revenue	$ 7,810,501	$ 434,119	$ 3,711,859	$ 421,239	$ 2,685,898	$ 327,129	$ 230,257
Total Estimated Transit Capital Revenue	$ 3,674,906	$ 310,409	$ 2,655,185	$ 301,606	$ 407,706		
Less Estimated RTPA and OWP Administration	$ (257,417)	$ (2,049)	$ (16,008)	$ (1,422)	$ (7,681)		$ (230,257)
Less Estimated Transit Operations	$ (4,874,728)	$ (261,836)	$ (3,676,013)	$ (221,608)	$ (388,142)	$ (327,129)	
Less Estimated Transit Capital Purchases	$ (3,674,906)	$ (310,409)	$ (2,655,185)	$ (301,606)	$ (407,706)		
Available for Other Eligible Uses (Total Estimated Revenue less Estimated Funding Requirements)	$ 2,678,356	$ 170,234	$ 19,838	$ 198,209	$ 2,290,075	$0	$0

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O
1	*ATTACHMENT A* - SHASTA COUNTY RTPA - 2009-10 TDA APPORTIONMENT & TRANSIT OBLIGATIONS														
2	*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*														
3	*distributed to claimants for other eligible uses.*														
4	ATTACHMENT A - SHASTA COUNTY RTPA - 2009-10 TDA APPORTIONMENT & TRANSIT OBLIGATIONS			REVENUE BY JURISDICTION											
5				City of Anderson		City of Redding		City of Shasta Lake		County of Shasta		RTPA (PUC 99233.1) "Off the Top"		CTSA (PUC 99275) 5% of LTF after RTPA	
6	2008 COUNTYWIDE POPULATION BY JURISDICTION	182,236		10,579		90,491		10,279		70,887					
7	PERCENT OF POPULATION BY JURISDICTION	100.00%		5.81%		49.66%		5.64%		38.90%		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
8		Budget	Actual Revenue	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual
9	Transportation Development Act Funds for distribution	6,800,000													
10	Local Transportation Fund (PUC 99231)	6,215,454		360,814		3,086,342		350,582		2,417,716					
11	LTF Required for RTPA and OWP (09/10 OWP Budget)	257,417		2,049		16,008		1,422		7,681		230,257			
12	LTF For CTSA (5% of LTF after RTPA)	327,129												327,129	
13	FTA 5307 Operating (Cities only)	750,000		71,256		609,509		69,235							
14	FTA 5311 Operating (County only)	260,501								260,501					
15	TOTAL ESTIMATED TDA FUNDS	7,810,501		434,119		3,711,859		421,239		2,685,898		230,257		327,129	
16															
17	SECTION 2: ESTIMATED TRANSPORTATION FUNDING REQUIRED			TRANSIT REQUIREMENTS BY JURISDICTION											
18	(Weighted Average Share based on 80% service hour/20% population in RABA Service Area)			City of Anderson		City of Redding		City of Shasta Lake		County of Shasta		RTPA		CTSA	
19	Calculation of 80/20 transit obligation														
20	Population in RABA Service Area	116,893		10,579		90,491		10,279		5,544					
21	Percent of Population by Jurisdiction	100.00%		9.05%		77.41%		8.79%		4.74%					
22	Service Hours By Jurisdiction	140.50		6.00		120.50		4.25		9.75					
23	Percent of Service Hours in Jurisdiction	100.00%		4.27%		85.77%		3.02%		6.94%					
24	Weighted Average Share	100.00%		5.23%		84.09%		4.18%		6.50%		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
25	Funding Requirements														
26	Redding Area Bus Authority	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual
27	Transportation Development Act Funds Required														
28	RABA (PUC Article 4 99260(a)) TDA Operating	3,646,484		190,580		3,066,503		152,373		237,027					
29	FTA 5307 Operating (Cities only)	750,000		71,256		609,509		69,235							
30	Other Transit Obligations														
31	CO - Burney Express	106,115								106,115					
32	CO - County Lifeline	40,000								40,000					
33	CO - Rural Transit Administration	5,000								5,000					
34	CTSA (5% LTF)	327,129												327,129	
35	RTPA Admin and OWP	257,417		2,049		16,008		1,422		7,681		230,257			
36	TOTAL ESTIMATED TRANSPORTATION REQUIREMENTS	5,132,144		263,885		3,692,021		223,030		395,823		230,257		327,129	
37															
38				AVAILABLE FOR OTHER USES BY JURISDICTION											
39	SECTION 3: AVAILABLE FOR OTHER ELIGIBLE USES			City of Anderson		City of Redding		City of Shasta Lake		County of Shasta		RTPA		CTSA	
40		Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual
41	Total Estimated Revenue	7,810,501		434,119		3,711,859		421,239		2,685,898		230,257		327,129	
42	Less Transit Requirements (PUC 99400c)	(5,132,144)		(263,885)		(3,692,021)		(223,030)		(395,823)		(230,257)		(327,129)	
43	NET AVAILABLE FOR OTHER USES (PUC 99400a)	2,678,357		170,234		19,839		198,209		2,290,075		0		0	

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K
44											
45	**Section 4: FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION AND OTHER GRANT REVENUE**										
46	**FTA 5307 funds are available to RABA for capital expenses. Funds may be banked for up to 3-years. RABA may carryover funds if expenditures are delayed in a fiscal year. FTA capital revenue is not a factor in TDA calculations although a 20% TDA match is required.**										
47	**Other Revenue Funds**		**Urban Pop.**	**City of Anderson**		**City of Redding**		**City of Shasta Lake**		**County of Shasta**	
48	**Other revenues are for revenue recognition only in the TDA claims process. These funds flow directly through the claimant agency.**		111,349	10,579	9.50%	90,491	81.27%	10,279	9.23%	70,887	100%
49		**Budget**	**Actual**	**Budget**	**Actual**	**Budget**	**Actual**	**Budget**	**Actual**	**Budget**	**Actual**
50	FTA 5307 RABA Capital (PUC Article 4 99260(a)) - (Cities only)	1,597,200		151,746		1,298,011		147,443		0	
51	**Note: FY09/10 5307 capital will be matched with Prop1B. No TDA match is required.*										
52	ARRA FTA 5307 (Cities only)	1,670,000		158,663		1,357,174		154,163			
53	ARRA FTA 5311 (County only)	407,706								407,706	
54	Prop1B Revenue (unknown at this time)										
55	**TOTAL NON-TDA FUNDS REQUESTED**	3,674,906		310,409		2,655,185		301,606		407,706	
56											

57 It is understood that the TDA apportionment is an estimate based on estimated revenue and transit requirements. This allocation may be revised to match actual revenue and expenses once the RTPA and RABA's audited financial statements are available at the end of the fiscal year claimed. Payment of the claim is subject to approval by Shasta County RTPA, based on the availability of funds for distribution and the provision that claimed monies will be used only for those purposes for which the claim is approved, and in accordance with the terms of the allocation instructions. Further, in signing this claim, the authorized

58 representative of the claimant certifies that, to the best of his/her knowledge, the financial information contained herein is

Agency: ______________________________

59 ______________________________

Signature of Authorized Representative Date:

ATTACHMENT B—STAFF COMMENTS

2009/2010 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 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. Extend hours of operation, Sunday Service	
IP-1: Person is in a wheelchair and relies on RABA's demand-response to get around. Although demand-response is a great service, it could benefit with longer hours and Sunday service. If there is any way possible to extend RABA's hours during the week to 10:30 p.m., and run on Sundays until 3:00 p.m., it would give many people the opportunity to live a more abundant life.	Although extended hours of service and Sunday service is a recognized benefit, these services can not be considered until the existing transit system can sustain the mandatory farebox ratio requirement. The California budget crisis will have a considerable impact on funds available for transportation services. Currently, insufficient funds are available to expand transit services, particularly in Redding.

Attachment C

SHASTA COUNTY SOCIAL SERVICES
TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COUNCIL
(SSTAC)

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

DATE: **April 15, 2009**

SUBJECT: **2009-2010 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. The cost to provide a demand-response trip is significantly higher than a fixed-route service. Sunday and extended hour service should not be considered until the existing transit system can sustain the mandatory farebox ratio requirement. The demand and cost for demand-response service continues to increase.

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 2009/10 is that there are **"no unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet."**

Respectfully submitted,

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

Attachment D

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:

Unmet Transit Needs. 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.

<u>Reasonable to Meet</u>. 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