# REPORT TO SHASTA COUNTY RTPA

| SUBJECT | | MEETING DATE | ITEM NUMBER |
|---|---|---|---|
| Approve Unmet Transit Needs – 2008/09 Transportation Development Act (TDA) Unmet Needs Findings, Allocation Instructions, and Claims Budget | | 06/24/08 | 6 |

RECOMMENDATION
It is recommended that the Board:

1. Receive the Social Services Transportation Advisory Council's (SSTAC) presentation and recommendation;
2. Accept staff responses to public comments received during the Unmet Transit Needs process;
3. Approve Resolution No. 08-12 which reflects the RTPA's Unmet Transit Needs findings and determines that transit service for each claimant jurisdiction will be "reasonable to meet" upon implementation of service modifications recommended in the Redding Area Bus Authority's (RABA) Short-Range Transit Plan (SRTP) update; and
4. Adopt the 2008/09 TDA budget and approve TDA claims by jurisdiction pursuant to Attachment A.

SUMMARY
Adoption of the staff recommendation allows RTPA staff to complete the 2008/09 Unmet Transit Needs process and distribute TDA revenues for 2008/09, including funding for RABA to implement service changes identified in the SRTP.

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 in each jurisdiction that is within the service area. Attachment A apportions all the available revenues to the local agencies based upon 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.

Before funds are apportioned to the cities and County, "off-the-top" allocations have been deducted. These allocations include:

- RTPA Administrative Costs - $ 344,063
- Consolidated Transportation Services Agency (CTSA) - $ 337,098
- Overall Work Program Core Functions (local agency match) - $16,516

RABA's administrative costs are included within RABA's operating budget and paid by the claimants through the claims process. RABA will begin implementation of the SRTP in 2008/09 and expects to meet a 19% farebox recovery over a 7-year period. The recommended system modifications do not change the RABA service area boundaries, although certain routes and headways will be modified. It is recommended the Board find that the level of transit service to be implemented through the SRTP represents the maximum level of transit service that is "reasonable to meet." The RTPA "reasonable to meet" definition is attached.

Public and SSTAC Comments
At the February 26, 2008, Unmet Needs hearing, the Board received public testimony regarding transit needs. During this year's Unmet Transit Needs process, the RTPA received six public comments (Attachment B) and staff responses are attached (Attachment C). Individual response letters were also provided.

Staff met with the SSTAC on May 21, 2008, and presented information from the Unmet Transit Needs hearing for formulation of the SSTAC recommendation (Attachment D). The SSTAC recommends that:

1. The Board support and encourage implementation of recommendations in the SRTP;
2. The Board approve a temporary farebox ratio recovery reduction consistent with the SRTP; and
3. The SSTAC, Consolidated Transportation Services Agency, RABA, and the RTPA should continue the implementation of priorities addressed in the Shasta County Coordinated Human Transportation Plan.

Budgeted Revenue and Expenses

Funding sources for public transportation include the Local Transportation Fund (LTF), State Transit Assistance (STA) fund, and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5307 urban and 5311 rural assistance programs.

LTF funds are derived from a quarter-cent sales tax and have declined over the last two years with a slowing economy. $7 million in LTF revenues are budgeted in 2008/09 to match this year's estimation of actuals.

STA funds are based on gasoline sales tax and Proposition 1B revenue. STA revenues are more difficult to estimate since they are based on annual appropriations by the Legislature and a portion of the funds have been diverted to general fund programs. $1.613 million in STA funds are estimated based on the latest State budget proposals.

RABA is responsible to annually apply for 5307 funds. RABA's budget for 2008/09 contains $1,339,248 in 5307 funds for expansion of the maintenance facility and rolling stock replacement. A $334,811 TDA match is required. The County is not eligible for 5307 funds. The County will receive $247,357 in FTA 5311 to assist in the operation of transit services that are provided in the unincorporated area of the county.

A summary of TDA apportionments and transit funding for 2008/09 is presented in the table below.

| Jurisidiction and Funding Sources | LTF Revenue | STA Revenue | FTA 5311 Revenue | Transit Funding | Available For Other Uses |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Redding | 3,337,947 | 590,822 | | (3,825,171) | 103,598 |
| Anderson | 392,814 | 69,512 | | (238,225) | 224,101 |
| Shasta Lake | 381,518 | 67,536 | | (190,541) | 258,513 |
| County | 2,613,158 | 462,376 | 247,357 | (709,733) | 2,613,158 |
| RTPA | 274,563 | 86,016 | | (360,579) | 0 |
| CTSA | 0 | 337,098 | | (337,098) | 0 |
| Total | 7,000,000 | 1,613,360 | 247,357 | (5,661,347) | 3,199,370 |

With approval of this budget, the RTPA will disperse funds throughout the 2008/09 fiscal year as revenues are received. 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 funds to the claimants, or debit claimants in the event of overpayments.

Farebox Penalty

RABA's farebox for 2006/07 was 18.13%. This places RABA in a second year farebox "penalty" phase. The penalty is the difference between the actual farebox recovery and the 19% farebox standard. The $37,471 shortfall will be funded by the cities and County in this year's claims. Although referred to as a penalty, no TDA funds are actually lost to the region.

## ALTERNATIVES

The 2008/09 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 the approved 2008/09 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 June 10, 2008, 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. RABA's SRTP can be fully funded while excess TDA revenues will be available for other eligible uses in each jurisdiction.

Daniel S. Little, AICP, Executive Director

DSL/SLC/jac

Attachments:
- Resolution No. 08-12
- A - Apportionments and Transit Obligations for 2008/09
- B - Comments Received During 2008/09 Unmet Needs Process
- C - Staff Responses to Comments Received During the 2008/09 Unmet Needs Process
- D -SSTAC Recommendation
- Resolution 00-21, Adopted December 12, 2000, Definition of Unmet Transit Needs and Reasonable to Meet

**RESOLUTION 08-12**
**UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS DETERMINATION**
**FOR CLAIMANT JURISDICTIONS IN SHASTA COUNTY FOR**
**FY 2008-09**

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 2008/09 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 2008/09 Transit Needs Assessment, which includes the following:

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

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

    c. An analysis of the potential alternative public transportation and specialized transportation services and service improvements.

3. A presentation by the RTPA staff on February 26, 2008, concerning recent unmet needs findings and existing service ridership and feasibility.

4. A public hearing held on February 26, 2008, 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 2008/09 for each affected jurisdiction, and consideration of their respective costs and revenues and other factors, as detailed in the 2008/09 Transit Needs Assessment, has resulted in the determination that the existing level of transit service, upon modifications, 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 2008/09 include: (1) The 2008/09 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 2008/09 TDA allocations to the claimants, in the form of a 2008/09 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 2008/09.

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 2008/09 Transit Needs Assessment, upon the RABA Short-Range Transit Plan modifications, and fully set forth herein by reference, 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 service implementations recommended in RABA's Short-Range Transit Plan update is the most reasonable and practical path to achieve the 19% farebox ratio recovery; and

5. Determines that the farebox ratio for the RABA service area where services are jointly funded in the rural and urban areas for 2008/09 is 15.5%; and

6. Approves allocations for each claimant jurisdiction that are consistent with and reflected in the 2008/09 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 2008/09, 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.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 24th day of June, 2008, by the Shasta County Regional Transportation Planning Agency.

______________________________

Norma Comnick, Chair
Shasta County Regional
Transportation Planning Agency

## *ATTACHMENT A* - SHASTA COUNTY RTPA - 2008-09 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 Factors (from 2007 E-1 Dept of Finance) for revenue allocation | 2007 E-1 Population | | POPULATION BY JURISDICTION | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | City of Anderson | | City of Redding | | City of Shasta Lake | | County of Shasta | | RTPA/CTSA | |
| Countywide Population Factor | 181,401 | 100.00% | 10,594 | 5.84% | 90,045 | 49.64% | 10,293 | 5.67% | 70,469 | 38.85% | n/a | n/a |
| Urban Population (for 5307) | 110,932 | 100.00% | 10,594 | 9.55% | 90,045 | 81.17% | 10,293 | 9.28% | 0 | 0 | | |
| Population in RABA Service Area | 116,408 | 100.00% | 10,594 | 9.10% | 90,045 | 77.35% | 10,293 | 8.84% | 5,476 | 4.70% | | |

| SECTION 1: ESTIMATED REVENUE | | | REVENUE BY JURISDICTION | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 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 | |
| Funding Source | Budget | Actual | Budget | Actual | Budget | Actual | Budget | Actual | Budget | Actual | Budget | Actual | Budget | Actual |
| *Transportation Development Act Funds* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Local Transportation Fund (PUC 99231) | 7,000,000 | | 393,737 | | 3,346,614 | | 382,550 | | 2,619,052 | | 258,047 | | | |
| Overall Work Program TDA Match | 0 | | (923) | | (8,667) | | (1,032) | | (5,894) | | 16,516 | | | |
| State Transit Assistance (PUC 99313.3) | 1,613,360 | | 69,512 | | 590,822 | | 67,537 | | 462,376 | | 86,016 | | 337,098 | |
| Federal Transit Admin. 5311 | 247,357 | | | | | | | | 247,357 | | | | | |
| TOTAL ESTIMATED TDA FUNDS | 8,860,717 | | 462,325 | | 3,928,769 | | 449,054 | | 3,322,891 | | 360,579 | | 337,098 | |

| SECTION 2: ESTIMATED TRANSPORTATION FUNDING REQUIRED | | | TRANSIT REQUIREMENTS BY JURISDICTION | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | City of Anderson | | City of Redding | | City of Shasta Lake | | County of Shasta | | RTPA | | CTSA | |
| Weighted Average Share based on 80% service hour/20% population in RABA Service Area | Hours 140.50 | Percent 100% | 6.00 | 5.24% | 120.50 | 84.08% | 4.25 | 4.19% | 9.75 | 6.49% | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Redding Area Bus Authority | Budget | Actual | Budget | Actual | Budget | Actual | Budget | Actual | Budget | Actual | Budget | Actual | Budget | Actual |
| *Transportation Development Act Funds Required* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| RABA (PUC Article 4 99260(a)) Operating* | 4,177,015 | | 218,730 | | 3,512,146 | | 174,949 | | 271,190 | | | | | |
| *Includes deduction of 06/07 penalty | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Add back 2006-07 Penalty | 37,471 | | 1,962 | | 31,507 | | 1,569 | | 2,433 | | | | | |
| RABA TDA FTA 5307 Capital Match | 334,811 | | 17,532 | | 281,518 | | 14,023 | | 21,737 | | | | | |
| Other Transit Obligations | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Burney Express | 104,000 | | | | | | | | 104,000 | | | | | |
| County Lifeline | 40,000 | | | | | | | | 40,000 | | | | | |
| Rural Transit Administration | 3,250 | | | | | | | | 3,250 | | | | | |
| Rural Transit STA Carryover | 267,123 | | | | | | | | 267,123 | | | | | |
| CTSA | 337,098 | | | | | | | | | | | | 337,098 | |
| RTPA Admin and Core Planning | 360,579 | | | | | | | | | | 360,579 | | | |
| TOTAL ESTIMATED TRANSPORTATION REQUIREMENTS | 5,661,347 | | 238,225 | | 3,825,171 | | 190,541 | | 709,733 | | 360,579 | | 337,098 | |

| SECTION 3: AVAILABLE FOR OTHER ELIGIBLE USES | | | AVAILABLE FOR OTHER USES BY JURISDICTION | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | City of Anderson | | City of Redding | | City of Shasta Lake | | County of Shasta | | RTPA | | CTSA | |
| | Budget | Actual | Budget | Actual | Budget | Actual | Budget | Actual | Budget | Actual | Budget | Actual | Budget | Actual |
| Total Estimated Revenue | 8,860,717 | | 462,325 | | 3,928,769 | | 449,054 | | 3,322,891 | | 360,579 | | 337,098 | |
| Less Transit Requirements (PUC 99400c) | (5,661,347) | | (238,225) | | (3,825,171) | | (190,541) | | (709,733) | | (360,579) | | (337,098) | |
| NET AVAILABLE FOR OTHER USES (PUC 99400a) | 3,199,370 | | 224,101 | | 103,598 | | 258,513 | | 2,613,158 | | 0 | | 0 | |

TOTAL AMOUNT OF TDA FUNDS CLAIMED BY AGENCY

Agency:____________________ Authorizing Signature:____________________ Date:__________

| Section 4: FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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, as demonstrated in Section 2. | | | | | | | | | FTA 5311 Rural | |
| | | | City of Anderson | | City of Redding | | City of Shasta Lake | | County of Shasta | |
| *Federal Transit Administration Funds* | Budget | Actual | Budget | Actual | Budget | Actual | Budget | Actual | Budget | Actual |
| RABA (PUC Article 4 99260(a)) FTA Capital | 1,339,248 | | 127,898 | | 1,087,086 | | 124,264 | | 0 | |
| TOTAL FTA FUNDS REQUESTED | 1,339,248 | | 127,898 | | 1,087,086 | | 124,264 | | - | |

| ATTACHMENT B - SUMMARY OF 2008/09 UNMET NEEDS COMMENTS | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **COMMENT #** | **NAME, ADDRESS** | **PHONE, EMAIL, MAIL** | **COMMENT** |
| E-1 | Sally Scott | Sally_scott@dot.ca.gov | • Commuter services for Shingletown |
| E-2/P-1 | Kimberly Nicholas | Kngofish@yahoo.com | • More service to Anderson. Current service is not enough. |
| IP-1 | Daisy Riley | 13634 Hill Blvd.<br>Shasta Lake | • On-time stops and shorter headways |
| IP-2 | Rick Cornelius | 2586 Henderson Rd<br>Redding | • Earlier bus service |
| IP-3 | Afton Fitzgerald for Hill County Clinic | Round Mountain | • Request for Burney Express to stop at Clinic |
| IP-4 | Marta McKenzie | Shasta County Health and Human Services Agency | • Requested stop at County Public Health and Mental Health facilities' on Breslauer |

# ATTACHMENT C—STAFF COMMENTS

**2008/2009 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** | |
| **IP-2: Earlier bus service** | Although extended service hours and Sunday service is a recognized benefit, there is a low probability that these services would meet farebox requirements. The existing service is experiencing a decline in ridership and is currently operating below the established RTPA "reasonable to meet" standards. |
| **B. Expand Service** | |
| **E-1: Service to Shingletown** | This area is in the low density population area and does not meet the "reasonable to meet" criteria. Previously, the County voluntarily provided a vanpool service which failed due to lack of riders and a qualified driver. |
| **IP-3: Request for stop at Hill County Clinic in Round Mountain** | Burney Express is a commuter express route with limited stops. RABA and the Clinic set up a stop at the Clinic on a call-in basis. The Clinic is adjacent to SR 299E and there is no location for the bus to stop. At this time, the Clinic is making parking lot improvements that will allow RABA's 16-passenger vehicle to maneuver the parking area. |
| **E-2, P-1, IP-1: More service to Anderson** | In 2005/06 RABA implemented a 6-month trial service of an Anderson-Only route with an hourly express route to Redding. This service did not change the service hours or miles; therefore an analysis by the RTPA of the "reasonable to meet" criteria was not required.<br><br>System-wide the RABA service has been unable to attain the RTPA recommended farebox recovery of 19% for several years. The City of Anderson, as a member of the Joint Powers Agreement, requested that the Anderson service return to the jurisdictions' service hours prior to the trial service. This resulted in a 2-hour headway from Anderson to Redding. |
| **E-4: Stop at County Public and Mental Health facilities on Breslauer Way** | RABA will be incorporating a stop at this location on the Anderson/ Redding route. A bus stop location that will accommodate the fixed-route bus is under review by Shasta County Facilities Management. |

Attachment D

# SHASTA COUNTY SOCIAL SERVICE TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COUNCIL (SSTAC)

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

**DATE:** **May 29, 2008**

**SUBJECT:** **2008-2009 Unmet Transit Needs Recommendation**

The Shasta County Social Service Transportation Advisory Council (Council) meets bi-monthly to review transit needs in Shasta County.

As part of the annual unmet transit needs process, the Council is responsible for preparing and presenting an unmet needs recommendation to the RTPA Board.

The Council has reviewed the Redding Area Bus Authority's (RABA) Short Range Transit Plan and supports the implementation of the strategies addressed in the plan. Modifications of transit services, as outlined in the plan, assume that RABA will meet the RTPA required farebox ratio recovery of 19% in 2014/15. The Council recommends that the RTPA Board approve a tiered farebox ratio requirement consistent with RABA's 7-year financial plan.

The Council also supports continued implementation of priorities in the Shasta County Coordinated Human Transportation Plan adopted in June 2007.

While there are recognized transit needs in the region, the Council reports that these needs are not feasible at this time. Developing a plan for these needs will require a broad range of strategies and planning by residents, organizations, agencies, and other parties interested in public transportation and the needs of the transit dependent.

The Council's recommendation for 2008/09 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
Cindy Dodds – Tri-Counties Community Network
Ray Duryee – Redding Area Bus Authority

Janice Galloway – Shasta County Department of Health and Human Services
Sharon Howard – Shasta County Department of Health and Human Services
Kay Hudelson – Golden Umbrella
Del Lockwood – Shasta County Opportunity Center
Debbie McClung – Shasta Senior Nutrition Programs, Inc.
Lisa White – Consolidated Transportation Services Agency

# 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.

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