REPORT TO SHASTA COUNTY RTPA

SUBJECT	MEETING DATE	ITEM NUMBER
Unmet Transit Needs - Consider Approval of 2001/02 Transportation Development Act (TDA) Allocation Instructions and Claims Budget.	06/21/01	4

RECOMMENDATION
It is recommended that the Agency:

1) Consider the attached recommendation of the Social Services Transportation Advisory (SSTAC) Committee dated April 1, 2001 as well as a subsequent letter from the Committee dated June 12, 2001 ;
2) Accept staff's responses to comments received from the February 27, 2001, unmet transit needs hearing;
3) Determine that the existing level of transit service as detailed in the 2001/2002 Transit Needs Assessment augmented by new trial services in the Cottonwood, Fall River Mills and Airport Road Areas (Exhibits D, E, and F) 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 2001/2002; and
4) Approve Resolution No. 01-05 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 2001/2002, and;
5) Approve 2001/02 Transportation Development Act (TDA) claims as submitted by eligible claimants. Claim amounts by jurisdiction are reflected on Exhibit B.
6) Authorize Staff to evaluate trial services as described in Staff report section entitled "Evaluation of Trial Services".
7) Adopt a weighted average 19% fare box standard for the RABA service area where services are jointly funded in the rural and urban areas.

SUMMARY
Adoption of the Staff recommendation will allow Agency staff to distribute TDA revenues to be received in 2001/02 and to complete the 2001/2002 Unmet Needs Process.

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

- February 27, 2001 - The Agency considered the 2001/02 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 29, 2001, the Social Services Transportation Advisory Committee met and made findings that there are Unmet Transit Needs that are reasonable to meet based on the adopted RTPA definition. The SSTAC recommendation is attached. The differences between RTPA Staff and the SSTAC recommendations are discussed further below.

- April 24, 2001, the Agency directs Staff to further review the five specific SSTAC recommendations in light of a one-time $150,000 subsidy from Shasta County Social Services.

- May 10, May 24, and May 31, public meetings were conducted in Cottonwood, Burney and at the Fairway Oaks Mobile Home Park. These meetings were intended to identify and assess the specific transit needs of these areas as they relate to the SSTAC recommendations. These meetings were well attended with individuals who indicated they would utilize transit services if they were available to them. The services proposed by Staff were discussed at these meetings. Modifications were made accordingly and the proposal presented to you today represents Staff's best recommendations of services that may eventually support themselves from actual fares.

- June 1, a meeting was held with Shasta County Social Services Administrators to discuss the proposed $150,000 transit subsidy for 2001-2002. Social Services indicated their desire to put these dollars to work in support of their Calworks clients. Transportation has been identified as one of the primary barriers to those in the Calworks program in the Intermountain and Cottonwood areas. Therefore, Social Services indicated that they fully supported the Staff proposal for these two areas. The Airport Road corridor service is supported by Social Services for a little different, but related reason. According to an informal survey done by the Employment Development Department, there are 100 employers providing nearly 2,000 jobs in this area. Social Services supports this service because it will allow job seekers and employees alike to access this area from the rest of the RABA service area. This is considered significant since many Calworks clients may seek or be employed in this area. Therefore, Social Services agreed to apply the $150,000 ratably to these three new services.

  Extended hours and Sunday service were 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 fare box requirement without a Social Services subsidy. 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 21 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 fare box ratio of 10.3%. If hours were extended complementary demand response would need to be in service as well. This factor would reduce the fare box recovery even further. It has, therefore, been determined the extension of the full RABA system for additional hours and Sunday service would not be reasonable to meet.

SSTAC is recommending that a limited fixed route Sunday service and extending the current fixed route until 8:30 in the evening. For the reasons stated above, RTPA Staff respectfully disagrees with this recommendation.

- ❑ June 11, the SSTAC met to discuss the revisions to the original RTPA Staff recommendation of April 24. The Committee generally agreed with the Staff recommendation. The group would like to see additional stops on Airport Road at Charlanne Drive and at Meadowview Road. These stops will serve the major employers in this area. Staff agrees with and supports this modification

In conclusion the RTPA staff recommends that the existing level of transit service as detailed in the 2001/2002 Transit Needs Assessment augmented by new services in Cottonwood, Fall River Mills and the Airport Road corridor, 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 2001/2002. TDA revenues available after the unmet transit needs are met are available to the jurisdictions for other purposes, i.e., streets and roads.

<u>Role of the Agency in Establishing New Services</u>
One of the obligations of the RTPA is to "Identify the unmet transit needs of the jurisdiction and those needs that are reasonable to meet" (99401.5 (c)). Further, it is the obligation of the RTPA that "If the transportation planning agency adopts a finding that there are unmet transit needs, including needs that are reasonable to meet, then the unmet transit needs shall be funded before any allocation is made for streets and roads within the jurisdiction" (99401.5(e))

Historically, the RTPA has not found any unmet needs reasonable to meet with the exception of the current RABA system and the Burney Express. Claims have been based upon RABA actual costs and revenues. For purposes of meeting the requirements of PUC code 99401.5 (e) it is necessary to estimate the costs of meeting these new services determined to be reasonable to meet.

For this purpose Staff has estimated the transit costs depicted on Exhibits D, E and F. Exhibits D, E and F represent the generic needs expressed by individuals at meetings held in May. For this purpose $45 per service hour has been used. This rate is an estimate of RABA's costs.

As the local agencies begin to implement these services, they may realize that additional stops or modifications to Staff proposals are warranted or desired. There is a high probability that the actual costs of these services when implemented will vary from the Staff proposal. It is recommended that the costs of these services can be adjusted to actual costs incurred as part of the annual "true-up" process.

Staff has no reason to believe that these services will not be provided by RABA, but that decision is one to be made by the respective local agencies. It seems apparent to Staff that the local agencies will use RABA since all three services will need to interface and be coordinated with RABA provided services. Further, RABA was formed by the same local agencies to provide transit services, so it seems reasonable that they would be used for any new services.

For purposes of assigning costs to local agencies, the Fall River Mills extension of the Burney Express is allocated 100% to Shasta County. The Airport Road Corridor Express is allocated 100% to Redding. Both of these services are wholly contained within those jurisdictions. The Cottonwood Express was allocated 2/3 to the County and 1/3 to Anderson based upon the number of bus stops proposed. If the local agencies wish to share costs on another basis, it is recommended that be done at the time of true-up.

The estimated net costs to the local agencies after considering the Social Services subsidy and marketing expenses is as follows:

Redding	$43,795
Anderson	11,013
Shasta County	36,612
Total Net Costs	$91,420

These costs represent only operating costs of these services. If additional busses are needed these may increase. It is recommended that no new rolling stock be purchased until after the trial period has ended and the future sustainability of these services has been determined. Spares or leased vehicles should be used to provide these services during the trial phase.

Evaluation of Trial Services

Social Services has advised Staff to consider their subsidy as "one time only". Therefore, it is necessary and desirable to establish clear evaluation criteria to evaluate these new trial services. This should be of benefit to the users of the system, the transit advocates who have lobbied very hard for these services and to Staff. For this purpose the following fare box standards are recommended:

Cottonwood Express	10%
Fall River Mills extension of the Burney Express	10%
Airport Road Corridor Express	20%

These trial services should be put in service for a twelve month period. This will remove seasonal fluctuations and give realistic feedback as to the probability of these services meeting the fare box requirement absent a Social Services subsidy.

For purposes of computing fare box ratios for these services, the transit provider will need to be required to keep track of ridership by stop. This data will be used by RTPA staff to compute a pro forma or "what-if" fare box ratio if there was no Social Services subsidy. Further, it is recommended that this information be provided by the provider to the RTPA by the 15th of the month following each calendar quarter. This will allow all stakeholders to monitor the activity of these new services. It is further proposed that this data be considered a condition of getting paid for services rendered.

For purposes of assigning costs to these services Staff recommends that the cost per service hour represent the fully allocated service hour cost of the transit provider (presumably RABA) plus the direct cost of marketing costs incurred to promote these services. This means that the costs will include these services' ratable amount of overhead. This is consistent with past practices of this Agency.

For purposes of assigning fare revenue to these new services, it is recommended that the revenue assigned will represent average fare per rider of the RABA system (not counting Demand Response) times the actual number of riders that use these new services.

TDA statutes are vague in addressing what a fare should be for a service. To provide guidance to local agencies implementing these new services, it seems appropriate that the RTPA provide some guidance or recommendations in this area. Based upon input received at the May meetings and consistent with current RABA operations, Staff recommends the following fare requirements:

Cottonwood Express	$1.00 (Senior citizens half price
Fall River Mills extension of the Burney Express	$1.00 (one way from Burney to/from Fall River Mills; $4.00 from FRM to Redding)
Airport Road Corridor Express	$1.00 (Senior citizens half price)

It is recommended that riders on the Cottonwood and Airport Road Corridor expresses be allowed one free transfer to other RABA routes. These two routes should also be allowed to be accessed with monthly passes sold by RABA The regular fares, the discounted senior citizen rate and the free transfer are features of fixed route services in the RABA system. Considering that these two services will feed other RABA routes, this requirement seems reasonable. Any other policies that apply to regular RABA routes not specifically outlined should be applied to these new services.

These new services should be marketed to ensure their best chance of success. Obviously, if the general public is not aware of these new services they will not be used. For this purpose it is suggested that $10,000 be set aside for marketing these services to be applied equally to all three services. This is similar to the marketing effort expended when services were expanded in 1994.

Finally, if these services do indeed indicate that they can support the required fare box standards without a subsidy, it is recommended that the Airport Road Corridor and the Cottonwood Expresses be funded in future years under the "80/20" formula currently used to fund joint services in the RABA service area. This may require the local agencies to amend the RABA boundaries to incorporate these areas. If the Fall River Mills extension of the Burney Express is successful, it would be funded wholly by the County.

Fare box Standard

In October 1998, the RTPA took action to reduce the RABA fare revenue ratio to operating costs to 15% for 1997/98, 17.5% for 1998/99, and 19% for 1999/00. The fare box standard recommended for 2000/01 and thereafter 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 2000/01 was 19.1%.

Similar to previous years nearly all transit services (new trial services notwithstanding) 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 ($235,000) and for Administrative costs ($200,955) 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 2001/02 contains $1,604,273 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 $175,742 and $1,428,531, 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 2001/02 are presented as follows:

Claimant	Total Revenue - All Sources	Total Cost Allocated for Transit Services	Available for Other Uses
City of Redding	$3,765,627	$3,476,795	$288,833
City of Anderson	309,469	229,221	80,248
City of Shasta Lake	452,465	262,040	190,424
Shasta Senior Nutrition Program (CTSA contractor)	235,000	235,000	Not Applicable
Shasta County	2,073,554	546,211	1,527,343

<u>ALTERNATIVES</u>
The Agency could choose to allocate transit costs differently than proposed and adjust the fare box standard differently than recommended. The fare box

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.

Adjusting the fare box standard is not recommended because the currently adopted standard of 19% reflects the mix of service hours provided in the rural and urban areas.

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. This budgeting process includes $400,000 of FTA Section 5307 funds and $92,904 of FTA Section 5311 funds.

Daniel J. Kovacich, Executive Officer

/jmg

Attachments:

1) Resolution No. 01-05
2) Exhibit A - Apportionments and Transit Allocations for 2001/02
3) Exhibit B - Schedule of Annual Claims/ TDA Budget
4) Exhibit C - SSTAC April 3rd recommendation (including conceptual Cottonwood Express Service)
5) Exhibits D through F - Schedule of Unmet Needs Deemed Reasonable to Meet
6) Staff Responses to Comments Received during 2001/02 Unmet Needs Process
7) Letter from SSTAC date June 12, 2001.

RESOLUTION 01-05

SHASTA COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AGENCY CONCERNING UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS DETERMINED REASONABLE TO MEET FOR CLAIMANT JURISDICTIONS IN SHASTA COUNTY FOR FY 2001/02

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 2001/02 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 2001/02 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 27, 2001, concerning recent study findings concerning unmet needs, and existing service ridership and feasibility;

(4) A public hearing held on February 27, 2001, 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 24, 2001, 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 2000/01, which are reasonable to meet; and

WHEREAS, an analysis of identified transit needs for fiscal year 2001/02 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 2001/02 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 2000/01 include: (1) The 2000/01 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 2001/02 TDA allocations to the claimants , in the form of a 2001/02 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 2001/02 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 2001/02 Transit Needs Assessment fully set forth herein by reference as well new trial services, 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 cost allocation for new trial services reflects the most equitable distribution of those costs to claimant agencies; and

(5) Approves allocations for each claimant jurisdiction that are consistent with and reflected in the 2001/02 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 2001/02, 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 24th day of April 2001, by the Shasta County Regional Transportation Planning Agency.

____

Norma Comnick, Chair
Shasta County Regional
Transportation Planning Agency

	Exhibit A				
Shasta County Regional Transportation Planning Agency					
Calculation of TDA Apportionments and Transit Obligations for 2001-2002					
Population Factors (for Apportionment Only)					
	Population Based on 1999 figures 1/1/00	Percentage			
Redding	79,600	47.66%			
Anderson	8,800	5.27%			
Shasta Lake	9,425	5.64%			
Unincorporated County Area	69,200	41.43%			
Total Population in RTPA Area	167,025	100.00%			
Service Hour Factors					
Allocate Service Hours to Claimant Jurisdictions					
Service Hours from RABA					
Represents Daily Hours Allocated to each Jurisdiction					
	REDDING	ANDERSON	SHASTA LAKE	SHASTA COUNTY	DAILY TOTAL
Hours by Jurisdiction	120.05	0	8.45	9.00	137.50
Hours on Route 9	9.00	6.50	0	4.00	19.50
	129.05	6.50	8.45	13.00	157.00
	82.20%	4.14%	5.38%	8.28%	100.00%
Claimant Populations Within Urban Fixed Route Area based on 1999 State Department of Finance E-1 report		Population in Service Area	Population Split 20%	Service Hour Split 80%	Weighted Average Share
Redding		76,612	76.41%	82.20%	81.04%
Anderson		8,800	8.78%	4.14%	5.07%
Shasta Lake		9,425	9.40%	5.38%	6.19%
Unincorporated County Area		5,426	5.41%	8.28%	7.71%
Total Population in RTPA Area		100,263	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Actual LTF received	5,080,694	(Per Forecast of Current Year)			
Actual STA received PUC 99313	262,130	(Per 2000/2001 State Controller's Office Allocation Estimate)			
Subtotal	5,342,824				
" Off - The - Top " Allocations					
Actual Administration PUC 99233.1 LTF	(200,955)	(Per OWP)			
Actual CTSA PUC 99275 LTF	(235,000)	(Per Memo from Virgina Webster)			
Actual RTPA Core Planning Functions Match	(2,930)	(Per OWP)			
Total "Off-the-Top"	(438,885)				
Amount Available for Distribution	4,903,939				

Exhibit A page 1

Shasta County Regional Transportation Planning Agency

Calculation of TDA Apportionments and Transit Obligations for 2001-2002

Total Amount Expense and Capital per RABA: 4,236,170 =Results of Service hour forecast + $1,520,340 Capital needs
(2,715,829.68) + (1,520,340)

RABA % Funded Based Upon Service Hours	80.00%
RABA % Funded Based Upon Population	20.00%

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

	Amount to be Distributed	FTA Section 5307	Core Planning Match	5311 Grant FTA Section	Total Resources Available	To Fund RABA	To Fund Trial Services	To Fund Burney Express Rural Transit	To Fund Rural Admin & Vanpool	TDA Apportion Available for Other Uses
Amount to be Apportioned to Claimants	4,903,939									
Redding	2,337,096	1,428,531			3,765,627	(3,432,999)	(43,795)			288,833
Redding Core Match	843		(843)							
Anderson	258,372			51,097	309,469	(214,667)	(14,554)			80,248
Anderson Core Match	755		(755)							
Shasta Lake	276,723	175,742			452,465	(262,040)				190,424
Shasta Lake Core Match	310		(310)							
Unincorporated County Area	2,031,747			41,807	2,073,554	(326,463)	(33,071)	(129,425)	(57,252)	1,527,343
Shasta County Core Match	533		(533)							
Administration	200,955				200,955					200,955
CTSA	235,000				235,000					235,000
RABA -	489		(489)			4,236,170				4,236,170
County Admin/Vanpool Subsidy	0				0			129,425	57,252	186,677
Trial Services					0		91,420	0		0
TOTAL TO DISTRIBUTE	5,342,823	1,604,273	(2,930)	92,904	7,037,070	0	0	0	0	6,945,650
Source Notes		Per RABA	Per OWP	Last Year's #				(42.95*1500) + 65,000 Bus	(1,021 * 12) + 40,000	

EXHIBIT B					
SHASTA COUNTY RTPA					
SCHEDULE OF ANNUAL CLAIMS /TDA BUDGET					
FISCAL YEAR 2001 -2002					
		Funding Sources			
CLAIMANT/PURPOSE		LTF	STA	FTA	
Off-The-Top Apportionments					
Administrative	PUC 99233.1	203,885			
(includes Core Function Match)					
CTSA Funding for Elderly Population	PUC 99275	223,000			
CTSA Funding for Administration by CTSA	PUC 99275	12,000			
Total Off The Top Apportionments		438,885			
Redding Area Bus Authority					
TDA funds required per RABA budget	4,236,170				
PUC 99400(c)					
Sources of Transit Funding:					
LTF - Redding	1,879,543	1,879,543			
STA - Redding	124,925		124,925		
FTA Section 5307	1,428,531			1,428,531	
LTF - Shasta Lake	71,507	71,507			
STA - Shasta Lake	14,792		14,792		
FTA Section 5307	175,742			175,742	
LTF - Anderson	149,760	149,760			
STA - Anderson	13,811		13,811		
FTA Section 5311	51,097			51,097	
LTF - Shasta County	217,860	217,860			
STA - Shasta County	108,603		108,603		
FTA Sec 5311					
Total Funds Provided RABA for Transist	4,236,170	2,318,670	262,130	1,655,370	
Services Provided Under Contract to Shasta County					
Burney Express		87,618		41,807	
Trial Services		33,071			
City of Redding					
LTF Streets and Roads		288,833			
Trial Services		43,795			
City Of Anderson					
LTF Streets and Roads		80,248			
Trial Services		14,554			
City Of Shasta Lake					
LTF Streets and Roads		190,424			
Shasta County					
LTF - Streets and Roads (PUC 99400(a))		1,527,343			
LTF - Purchased Transportation - Vanpool Subsidy (PUC 99400(c))		27,252			
LTF - Purchased Transportation - Lifeline Services (PUC 99400(c))		30,000			
Total TDA Funds to be Distributed		5,080,693	262,130	1,697,177	7,040,000

REDDING AREA BUS AUTHORITY

SHASTA COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AGENCY

Calculation of TDA Apportionment for FYE 2002

(Per SCRTPA Policy 6 - 3)

STEP 1	$ 44.09	Cost per Service Hour (Per SCO Report 99/00)
STEP 2	0	Known Increase/Decrease to CPSH
STEP 3	3.00%	Apply (%) Change in CPI (Dec 99 - Dec 00)
	$ 1.32	Amount Calculated
	$ 45.42	Adjusted CPSH
STEP 4	3.00%	Apply 3% Contingency
	$ 1.36	Amount Calculated
	$ 46.78	Adjusted CPSH
STEP 5	70,000	Expected Service Hours
	$ 3,274,530	Gross TDA Allocation (Hrs * ADJ CPSH)
STEP 6	(558,700.00)	Less Expected Revenues per RABA budget
	2,715,829.68	TDA Allocation net of RABA Revenues
STEP 7	$ 1,520,340	Add Capital Purchase Estimate
	$ 4,236,170	TDA/5307 Requirement
	$ (400,000)	Less Other Operating Sources paid direct to RABA
		- Section 5307 FTA Operating Assistance
	($1,204,273.00)	Less Other Capital Sources paid direct to RABA
		- Section 5307 FTA Capital Assistance
	2,631,896.68	RABA's Net Funding Requirement

TO: Regional Transportation Planning Agency

FROM: Social Services Technical Advisory Committee

DATE: April 3, 2001

RE: Unmet Needs Process and Recommendations of "Reasonable to Meet" Transit Improvements:

The SSTAC met on Thursday, March 29, 2001 to review the various unmet needs that surfaced as a result of the Unmet Needs Hearing and public comment process for 2001-2002. The committee engaged in a wide-ranging discussion with staff from both RTPA and RABA concerning costs, ridership, potential fare-box returns and degree of need for the proposed service enhancements. The following are the unanimous recommendations of the committee as service enhancements that we believe would be "reasonable to meet" under current RTPA guidelines.

1. Express Van shuttle service originating in Cottonwood with a stop in Anderson and proceeding directly to the central Redding area. The service would be morning, noon and evening in each direction.
2. Express Van shuttle service along the Airport Road corridor originating near Kent's Market and proceeding north to the Airport Road major employers and thence directly to the Mt. Shasta Mall transit interchange.

   (Note: it is possible that a combination of items 1 & 2 might also be feasible, depending on the results of staff study.)

3. Limited Sunday Service on up to 6 of the currently most heavily used routes in the central urban area. Hours would be more limited than current Saturday service and would not include all routes.
4. Inception of a Burney to Fall River/McArthur Express Van shuttle service providing morning, noon and evening service in each direction.
5. Extension of Monday through Saturday hours of operation until 8:30 in the evening, at least for the daylight savings time period from April through October.

Rationale:

Cottonwood is currently without any public transit service. The current ride length from Anderson to central Redding is an hour or more, and arrives too late to serve most employment commuting needs. Based on a $2.00 one-way fare, an Express Van service competes favorably with the cost of gasoline in a private car for the same distance journey. The Shasta County Dept. of Social Services has identified in excess of 80 welfare to work participants who have no access to a private vehicle living in the Cottonwood and Anderson areas. DSS has made some budget allocations from TANF sources to assist in funding this service if necessary. In addition, recent low-income housing has been built in the Anderson and Cottonwood areas which has added significantly to the need for public transit for employment and other purposes for these residents.

The Airport Road corridor is a similar situation with no existing public transit service. A significant feature of the area is the clustering of most residential housing in the southern portion from Dersch Road to Meadowview Road, including a large number of active senior citizens. There has also been recent and continuing growth of larger employers in this area whose employees often are transit dependent. The Express Van shuttle service would provide service to both the southern extremity population needing to go to the central area as well as employees living in the central area commuting to work in the newly developed industrial zones. In addition, the staff analysis of the resident population density of this census tract area fails to take into account the relatively large area set aside for the airport and commercial/industrial uses (which have no 'residents' but generate both employment and shopping demand). The Express Van service addresses this situation by reducing overall ride time and making direct service contact with the most populous portion of this region.

In both of the above cases, no costly demand-response service is required since the Express Van shuttle service is not classified as 'fixed route.'

Limited Sunday service has been requested and desired by a large number of people for both employment commuting needs and for general shopping and recreational/spiritual activities. A significant transit dependent population exists within the areas served by the most active routes and would provide adequate ridership for this service to meet the fare-box return ratio required. Staff's suggestion of a dial-a-ride service instead of limited fixed route service would result in similar operating costs with a dramatically reduced capacity for service to all who need it. The SSTAC committee believes that by designing service for both a limited number of hours and routes, the costs of providing this service can be contained well within limits to insure an adequate fare-box return.

The Intermountain area has only an express shuttle service from/to Redding and Burney. This service already exceeds its fare box return ratio requirement. Based on the number of transit dependent persons identified within the Burney and Fall River valley areas, it is strongly believed that an Express Van shuttle service would be equally if not more greatly supported and also be able to satisfy and probably exceed fare box requirements. The IMAGE group in the Intermountain area has indicated in several ways the strong need for this service and has agreed that service providers would alter hours of operation to insure that it 'works' for their clientele.

Extended service hours would greatly benefit those who are employed in the major retail, telemarketing and food industry occupations, generally at starting level wages who tend to receive the less popular shifts. During the daylight savings time period, there is also considered to be significant demand for general transit. At the hearing process there was also concern raised for those who have late appointments at clinics and mandatory programs after 5 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Evans, Chair SSTAC

Eastside Express - *New Bus Route Conceptual Overview*

This proposed new route would greatly enhance many other existing routes and for the first time connect Downtown Redding, Dana Drive area, Anderson and Cottonwood and serve three major employment areas: Airport Rd., HWY 44/Old Oregon Trail and HWY 44/Shasta View. It would also provide service to the Redding Municipal Airport.

The multiple jurisdictions that this route encompasses may be seen as a political hurdle or, the Eastside Express can be seen as adding a much needed service for employers, employees and the public efficiently linking needs in each jurisdiction while leveraging existing routes.

South county riders can get to work on Airport by 8:00 a.m. or Dana Drive by 8:15. Canby Transfer Facility riders from Downtown and other origination areas can connect to the Eastside Express and get to work on Airport Rd. by 8:30 a.m..

The Eastside Express bus, originating in Cottonwood, would leave at 6:50 a.m. to catch transfers at Shasta Factory Outlets at 7:13 a.m.. Cottonwood riders can then connect to Route 9 to downtown Redding (arrives before 8:00) through downtown Anderson, or stay on the Eastside Express for Airport Rd. or Dana Drive areas.

The Eastside Express passes through Anderson following the existing bus route to North/Stingy without stopping and continues along Airport Rd. to Dana Drive.

Eastside Express Stops:
Cottonwood
Shasta Factory Outlets
Meadowview/Airport Rd.
Redding Municipal Airport
Rancho Market/Airport Rd.
Midway stop on Airport Rd.
Charlanne Drive/Airport Rd.
Lumberjack (Old Oregon/Innsbruck)
Route 5 near Goodwater/Hartnell
Shasta View/44
Canby Transfer Facility (Dana Drive)

After Lumberjack, bus connects for transfers with Route 5 (to Enterprise/Downtown) at its eastern tip before 8:05 then to Shasta View/HWY 44 then to Canby by 8:15 for connection/transfers to and from Downtown, North Point, etc.

Schedule:
Two northbound morning trips from Cottonwood leaving at 6:50 a.m. and 8:50 a.m.. Morning southbound trips from Canby back along Airport Rd. leave at 8:15 a.m. and 10:15 arriving back in Cottonwood at 10:50. (4 service hours)
Two evening trips start from Canby at 5:20 to give workers time to get there and riders from downtown get there by 5:15. Arrives around 6:00 p.m. in Cottonwood and back to Canby by 7:15 p.m. to arrive back to Cottonwood by 8:00 p.m. (3 service hours -- plus transit time for bus to get from Cottonwood back to Canby to start the evening routes)

The Eastside Express route as described above is designed primarily for working people. Shoppers and people with appointments are unlikely to want to board a 6:50 a.m. bus from Cottonwood though they would have 2 hours of shopping at Dana Drive before catching the bus at 10:15 to return. They could board the later morning route then wait until 5:20 to return towards Cottonwood. Other riders more towards the middle of the line can use it a bit more flexibly. It may be more realistic to have an additional later morning and early afternoon route to better serve the general public. This would add another 4 service hours.

Cost estimated @$40 per hour as a high figure.
Monday through Friday service - morning and evening only - $83,200.
Saturdays - possibly different schedule - $16,640.
Additional midmorning & afternoon route M-F = $41,700 Saturday = $8,320

Exhibit D

Shasta County Regional Transportation Planning Agency					
Schedule of Unmet Needs Deemed "Reasonable to Meet"					
Fiscal Year 2001-2002					
General Area of Origin:	Cottonwood area				
Desired Destinations:	Factory Outlets in Anderson				
	Downtown Transit Facility				
Type of Service	Express				
Stops:	West side of Interstate 5 (suggest Holiday Market)				
	East side of Interstate 5				
	Factory Outlets in Anderson				
	Downtown Transit Facility				
Agencies costs (operating)	County (67%) - $56,280				
	Anderson (33%) - $27,720				
Frequency					
Days per Week	6				
Times per Day	3 Round Trips				
Service hours estimated	1,872				
Fare recommended	$1	(To include one free transfer)			

Exhibit E

Shasta County Regional Transportation Planning Agency	
Schedule of Unmet Needs Deemed "Reasonable to Meet"	
Fiscal Year 2001-2002	
General Area of Origin:	Fall River Mills
Desired Destinations:	Mayer's Memorial Hospital - FRM
	Holiday Market - Burney
Type of Service	Express
Stops:	Mayer's Memorial Hospital - FRM
	Highway 299 at Fall River
	Holiday Market - Burney
Agencies costs (operating)	County (100%) - $35,100
Frequency	
Days per Week	5
Times per Day	3 Round Trips
Service hours estimated	780
Fare recommended	$1
Note: Fare from Fall River Mills to Redding should be $4.00.	

Exhibit F

Shasta County Regional Transportation Planning Agency					
Schedule of Unmet Needs Deemed "Reasonable to Meet"					
Fiscal Year 2001-2002					
General Area of Origin:	Airport Road Corridor				
Desired Destinations:	Fairway Oaks Mobile Home Park				
	Canby Transfer Station				
	Downtown Transit Facility				
Type of Service	Express				
Stops:	Fairway Oaks Mobile Home Park				
	Rancho Road at Airport Road				
	Canby Transfer Station				
	Downtown Transit Facility				
Agencies costs (operating)	Redding (100%) - $112,320				
Frequency					
Days per Week	6				
Times per Day	4Round Trips				
Service hours estimated	2,160				
Fare recommended	$1	(To include one free transfer)			

2001/02 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 **a. Expand Service** i. Extend Anderson Route to Cottonwood (PH-9,PH-12,PH-20) ii. Consider loop route service for Anderson and Cottonwood with express service connection to Redding (L-5,L-7,L-13,PH-2,PH-15) iii. Extend routes from Bella Vista to Redding, Palo Cedro/Millville to Redding, French Gulch, Old Shasta and Lakehead to Redding and outlying area (L-1&4,L-2,L-13,E-3,PC-5,PH-21,PH-22PH-25) iv. New route or route extension to serve Airport Road Corridor including Fairway Oaks area (L-5,L-6, L-7,L-10,L-13,L-16, PH-1,PH-2,PH-3,PH-6,PH-15,PH-27,PC-1) v. Need service to and from Burney/Fall River/McArthur Redding (L-5, L-7,L-12,PH-2,) vi. Extend routes to Ravenwood Estates area (PH-24)	These services are subject to "unmet transit need" and "reasonable to meet" criteria. Expansion of Fixed Route/Demand Response services are "unmet transit needs" i.&ii Comments from Cottonwood include requests for Fixed route w/ Demand Response and Express route service to Redding during commute times. A Cottonwood Express service may be reasonable to meet based on census data in the Transit Needs Assessment that indicates the potential for 15 one way transit trips per day. The possibly that a commuter Vanpool type service may work for commute trips should also be considered. Additional public input may be needed to determine the level of service needed.(see Cottonwood Express analysis) iii. A new transit service would need to generate at least 15 passenger trips per each new service hour. Pages 7 through 9 of the 2001/02 Transit Needs Assessment identify high and low transit demand areas within the County. Cottonwood, Palo Cedro/Millville, French Gulch and Happy Valley are among the lowest travel demand areas in the County. The extension of fixed route services to outlying areas is not reasonable to meet. iv. 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. (See RABA response) 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". v. The existing Burney Express service is operating at a19% farebox ratio, the request to add service hours to extend the route to Fall River would add 69 hours a month . Census data for the Fall River Mills area does not support the needed trips per day to extend the route. No one from Fall River Mills spoke or wrote a letter during the unmet needs comment period. vi. (See RABA response)

Comments: Grouped by Subject	RTPA Response
b. Extend Hours of Operation i. Sunday Service (L-5, , L-5, L-9, PC-3,E-6,PC-6, L-13, L-14, PH-2, PH-6, PH-7, PH-9, PH-13, PH-26, PH-27,E-8) ii. Longer Hours (, L-3, L-5, PC-2, L-7, L-9,PC-13,PC-4,E-6 L-13, PH-2, PH-7, PH-9, PH-10, PH13, PH-14, PH-15,PH-16,PH-17,PH-24PH-26PH-27) iii. Shorter Routes/Headways (L-8,E-4,E-8,L-13, PH-8, PH-9,PH-24,PH-26)	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." 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 2001/02 Transit Needs Assessment shows that the high transit demand areas within the County are currently served by transit. 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 than RABA operates on Saturday. The 1999/00 RABA farebox ratio was 19.1%, which is 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. 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 $45 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. Even if the estimated cost per hour for the new service is a high figure, the costs to meet farebox recovery ratio would be too high and the service may not be supported. Currently, the RABA system is servicing the highest transit demand areas during the highest transit demand times. The farebox ratio for these periods of time is 19.01%. Although TDA funds are available to claimants for expanded services, expansion of Fixed Route/Demand Response services -- half hour headways, extended hours or days of service -- would increase costs 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 **a. Special Purpose Transit Needs** i. Service for CalWORKS clients in the Intermountain area (L-12,) ii. Extend hours of routes for individuals taking night classes at Shasta College (PC-6,PH-17) iii. Would like Tehama Co. transit to connect with RABA for work trips between Red Bluff and Redding (E-7) iv. Services for disabled should be expanded (PH-5) v. Provide seasonal service to Whiskeytown Lake area for recreational purposes (L-23)	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. i. The information that is used in the Transit Needs Assessment to determine transit demand takes into account the CalWORKS population. While the CalWORKS program gathers these individuals in to an identifiable group, they still represent a scattered population. All of the areas where program participants have unmet transit needs are identified as areas that have low transit demand primarily because of low residential densities, See the response to (1a & b) above. In the case of the Burney area, a dial-a-ride service was tried in 1995, and failed. Only 323 trips were generated in March 1995. To meet a 10% farebox currently there would have to be 410 rides per month with a 2.00 fare. Census data does not support the increase needed to gain the 410 rides needed to meet farebox. ii. See response for extended hours analysis. iii. Currently there is no service to Cottonwood. The closest the system gets is the Factory Outlets. If a Cottonwood Express service is established, Cottonwood may be served . iv. Currently the RABA system provides services for the disabled at a level that exceeds the minimum ADA standards. v. It is staff's opinion that recreational trips are not necessary trips in accordance with the Unmet Needs definition and is, therefore, not an unmet need.
vi. Transit service between Eureka and Reno on St. Hwy.44 corridor (E-1,E-2)	Out of County services are not an unmet need under the RTPA definition and cannot be funded with TDA funds. Currently, Greyhound Bus is proposing a service for that route that will use federal funds.
b. Specific Individual Transit Needs i. Need from Big Bend Rd. to connect with Burney Express Route (E-5)	A bus stop at the intersection of Big Bend Rd. and 299 could occur if riders were present.
ii. Would like daily transit service from Lakehead (PC-5)	See response for 1a iii.

Comments: Grouped by Subject	RTPA Response
3. OPERATIONAL IMPROVEMENTS a. Demand Response i. Improve dispatching and communications (PC-3,PH-27, PH-9) ii. Use environmentally friendly vans (PH-27 iii. Exceed ADA minimum requirements (PH-27)	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). Comments addressing level-of-service issues should be directed to RABA.
4. POLICY ISSUES a. Request for transit information to be provided with bilingual needs (PH-4,L-17)	(See RABA response.)
b. Reduce farebox ratio to 15% or less to encourage new transit starts and consider distributing TDA funds in a way that more transit can be funded (PH-23) c. Consider single fare zone (L-7,L13,PH-2) d. Exiting transit system is not being used at full capacity (L-11) e. Senior transportation services are under funded (PH-11)	The issue of reducing the farebox ratio for the RABA service area was considered by the RABA board. Instead of requesting a permanent reduction of the farebox ratio, the RABA Board adopted a fare box recovery plan that was approved by the RTPA. The decision was to strive to meet a 19% farebox ratio. So far the RABA system is meeting the milestones of the recovery plan.
	No response required.

SOCIAL SERVICES TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

TO: Regional Transportation Planning Agency
1855 Placer Street
Redding, Ca 96001

FROM: Mike Evans, Chair
Social Services Technical Advisory Committee

June 12, 2001

RE: Revised staff recommendations regarding unmet transit needs

The Social Services Technical Advisory Committee met on Monday, June 11th with RTPA and RABA staff to review and discuss their most recent staff report containing their recommendations regarding unmet transit needs and the 'reasonable to meet' requirements.

The committee is pleased that the more intensive review of unmet needs for the Cottonwood/Anderson, Airport Road Corridor and Burney-Fall River Mills proposed express routes received favorable public input that has led staff to conclude that these new services should be funded and will meet farebox return ratio requirements. We are also pleased to note that the Shasta County Department of Social Services will be co-sponsoring these improved transportation services to assist their clients in the welfare-to-work process to gain better access to employment, training and supportive services.

We therefore wholeheartedly support the staff recommendations with a few minor suggestions for route stop adjustments that they will be incorporating into the final draft.

We will also work diligently with our respective client populations to encourage the use of public transit and, particularly, these new services which could be vital to their success. We look forward to cooperatively assisting with publicity and information activities to make the new services as widely known as possible.

Meanwhile, the staff report remains unchanged with regard to both extended hours of service and beginning limited Sunday service. It is our hope that further brainstorming and a search for reasonable data will continue on these two issues throughout the year and that more concrete solutions for these needs can be found for next year's unmet needs process. We are still awaiting the release of the RABA consultant's report which is a complete update and review of the local public transit now operated by RABA. We hope that this will provide a foundation and basis for further study of possible methods and financing options that would make both extended hours and Sunday service feasible under current fare box recovery ratios.

This year's process had far more focus and greater participation by a wide range of social service providers, their client populations, and the general public. The special hearings conducted by RTPA and RABA staff in the proposed service areas were successful in surfacing specific responses and general public support for the proposals.

We also have become aware through our limited research that several area employers are strongly supportive of public transit improvements. We believe that further data gathering and possible other public meetings with a transit focus might generate better quantifiable results for planning improved services.

It is our hope that efforts can continue well into the future of transportation planning for our entire county area. We would also hope for a continued awareness of available other funding that may come through transportation, welfare to work and workforce improvement grants and funding and would ask that the RTPA board encourage staff to pursue such funding opportunities when they arise.

Thank you for the opportunity to participate in this year's unmet needs process. We believe that the results show positive forward movement for the betterment of our entire community.

Sincerely,

Mike Evans, Chair, SSTAC