STAFF REPORT

MEETING DATE:	**6/26/12**
SUBJECT:	**Approve 2012/13 Unmet Transit Needs Findings, Allocation Instructions and Claims Budget**
AGENDA ITEM:	**9**
STAFF CONTACT:	**Anne Jensen**

SUMMARY:
The unmet transit needs process is conducted each year to collect requests for new or expanded transit service. Before recommending the allocation of Local Transportation Fund (LTF) funds for non-transit purposes, staff and the Social Services Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC) evaluate all service requests against the agency's adopted 'unmet transit need' and 'reasonable to meet' criteria (attachment D). No requests met the criteria this year. Adoption of staff's recommendation completes the 2012/13 unmet transit needs process and authorizes distribution of Transportation Development Act (TDA) revenue.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:
It is recommended that the board:
1. Consider the SSTAC recommendation;
2. Approve Resolution No. 12-11 reflecting the unmet transit needs findings that there are no new transit services within each jurisdiction that are reasonable to meet; and
3. Adopt the 2012/13 TDA budget and claims.

DISCUSSION:
Funding sources for public transportation include the TDA (comprised of the Local Transportation Fund (LTF), and State Transit Assistance (STA)) as well as Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5307 Urban and 5311 Rural programs. FTA and STA funds can only be used to fund public transit. LTF funds can be used for local streets and roads, but only after all unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet have been funded.

Consolidated Transportation Services Agency (CTSA) and the Shasta Regional Transportation Agency (SRTA) administration are funded first before funds can be apportioned to RABA, the cities of Anderson, Redding, and Shasta Lake and Shasta County (claimants). The CTSA is eligible for five percent of LTF revenue only.

Unmet Needs & Funding Allocation
The cost associated with operating RABA is apportioned to each claimant based on 80% service hours and 20% on each jurisdiction's population within RABA's service area. RABA's $5.47 million operating budget includes $524,727 for administration, paid by the claimants through the claims process. Burney Express, County Lifeline and rural transit administration are funded solely by the county (the cities are not responsible for expenses incurred for these services).

After transit requirements have been met, claimants may use their remaining apportionment for other eligible uses, including additional transit service or streets and roads.

The attached claims include adjustments from the FY 2010/11 true-up (Row 12). The claims do not include a farebox penalty due to non-compliance with the required farebox ratio. This will be deferred until the end-of-year true up when all costs and the requirements are reconciled.

Findings and Recommendations

An unmet transit needs public hearing was held on March 15, 2012. Requests were received for extended service hours, service to new areas and minor operational changes. Staff responses are provided in Attachment B. Staff recommends that there are no additional transit services that are reasonable to meet at this time.

On May 16, 2012, the SSTAC reviewed comments and prepared a recommendation (Attachment C). The SSTAC recommends that "there are no unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet at this time". In an effort to improve transit service and efficiency within the region, the SSTAC recommends that RABA's 2012 short-range transit plan address the following:

1. Extended service hours (or shorter headways)
2. A possible fare increase

The final scope of the 2012 short-range transit plan will be determined by the RABA board.

In addition, the SSTAC recommends that the county consider the following:

1. Examine funding options, such as grants, for transit service in Fall River Mills and McArthur.
2. Examine if and when another run of the Burney Express would benefit riders.

Claims Budget

The following is a summary of estimated revenue compared to transit funding obligations for 2012/13:

	Anderson	Redding	Shasta Lake	County	Regional Total
Revenue	$ 446,756	$ 4,155,309	$ 453,622	$ 2,921,724	$ 7,977,411
Transit Expense	$ (214,126)	$ (3,630,751)	$ (241,991)	$ (388,191)	$ (4,475,059)
County STA Reserve				$ (228,524)	$ (228,524)
Available for Other Uses	$ 232,630	$ 524,558	$ 211,631	$ 2,305,009	$ 3,273,828

Approval of the 2012/13 TDA Apportionments and Transit Obligations (Attachment A) will allow the SRTA to distribute funds to the claimants. Due to delays in receiving state revenue, staff proposes that funds for non-transit uses and STA funds be distributed as funds become available.

ALTERNATIVES:

The 2012/13 TDA budget was developed in compliance with SRTA Administrative Policy 6-3. Revenues are based on official estimates or historic trends. RABA expenditures are based on

RABA's 2012/13 draft budget. The board could choose to modify any of these estimates; however, in most cases policy or budget amendments would also be needed.

OTHER AGENCY INVOLVEMENT:

RABA and the CTSA have been consulted throughout the TDA claims process. The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) concurs with the staff recommendation.

FINANCING:

Final action consistent with the attached resolution will result in the distribution of funds as outlined in Attachment A.

Daniel S. Little, AICP, Executive Director

Attachments: Resolution No. 12-11

A. Apportionments and transit obligations for 2012/13
B. Staff responses to comments
C. SSTAC Recommendation
D. Resolution No. 00-21: Definition of Unmet Transit Needs and Reasonable to Meet, adopted December 2000.

RESOLUTION

RESOLUTION NUMBER:	**12-11**
SUBJECT:	**2012/13 Unmet Transit Needs Findings, Allocations and Claims Budget**

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 funds as represent that area's apportionment; and

WHEREAS, the provisions of PUC Section 99401.5 further require that the Shasta Regional Transportation Agency (SRTA) annually review and make findings concerning "unmet transit needs" in each claimant jurisdiction, and prior to making any LTF allocations to claimants for streets and roads purposes, fund such unmet transit needs in each claimant jurisdiction as have been found "reasonable to meet"; and

WHEREAS, to ensure eligibility for State Transit Assistance funds, the Redding Area Bus Authority (RABA) shall submit calculations supporting its compliance with PUC Section 99314.6 ; and

WHEREAS, the 2012/13 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 2012/13 Transit Needs Assessment (TNA), 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 potential alternative public transportation and specialized transportation services and service improvements.
3. A presentation by the SRTA staff on March 15, 2012, concerning current unmet needs findings and existing service ridership and feasibility.

4. A public hearing held on March 15, 2012, 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 2012/13 for each affected jurisdiction, and consideration of their respective costs and revenues and other factors, as detailed in the 2012/13 TNA, 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 SRTA 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, 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 the 2012/13 include:

1. The 2012/13 TNA and supplemental data and analysis provided.
2. SSTAC consultation.
3. Public and claimant agency comments.
4. Staff reports and presentation to the SRTA board.
5. The 2010 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).
6. Redding Area Bus Authority (RABA) Short-Range Transit Plan, dated October 2007.
7. All correspondence, testimony and documents otherwise comprising the record of proceedings.

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 2012/13 TDA allocations to the claimants, in the form of a 2012/13 TDA budget, have been prepared; and

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

WHEREAS, as a result of this annual planning and review process, the SRTA has identified that there are no new "unmet transit needs" that are "reasonable to meet" for the claimant jurisdictions in Shasta County for 2012/13.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Shasta Regional Transportation 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 2012/13 TNA is reasonable to meet; and
3. Determines that 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. Approves the 2010/11 TDA true-up by incorporation into the 2012/13 claims; and
5. Determines that the farebox ratio for RABA's service area where services are jointly funded in the rural and urban areas for 2012/13 is 17.9%, unless subsequently amended by the board as a result of short-range transit plan; and
6. Defers assessment of the 2012/13 farebox penalty, which is based on FY 2010/11, until the end-of-year TDA true-up when all 2010/11 costs and farebox requirements are reconciled; and
7. Approves allocations for each claimant jurisdiction that are consistent with and reflected in the 2012/13 TDA budget on Attachment A; and
8. 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 2012/13, and that these claims and the use of resulting funds shall be consistent with transit requirements before any LTF allocations go to other uses; and
9. Authorize the executive director to distribute LTF funds for non-transit uses as revenue is available, and use LTF funds to backfill transit-only funds as needed until these revenues are available.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 26th day of June, 2012, by the Shasta Regional Transportation Agency.

____

Leonard Moty, Chair
Shasta Regional Transportation Agency

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P
1	*DRAFT* *ATTACHMENT A* - SHASTA COUNTY RTPA - 2012/13 TDA BUDGET & TRANSIT REQUIREMENTS															
2	Annual TDA claims are prepared based on estimated revenue 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.															
3	Section 1: Estimated State and Federal Revenue (Apportioned based on percent of countywide population)	PUC Section	Countywide Population	12/13 True-Up	Section 1: Estimated Revenue by Jurisdiction								Apportioned "off-the-top"			
4					Anderson		Redding		Shasta Lake		County		RTPA		CTSA	
5	Countywide Population as of 1/1/11		177,924		10,005		90,250		10,125		67,544					
6	Percent of Population by Jurisdiction		100.00%		5.62%		50.72%		5.70%		37.96%					
7	**Transportation Development Act (TDA) Revenue**	6,200,000	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual
8	Local Transportation Fund (LTF) Estimate	99231	5,827,738		327,519		2,955,829		332,181		2,212,209					
9	Local Transportation Fund (LTF) for SRTA Administration	99231	65,539										65,539			
10	State Transit Assistance (STA) Estimate	6731	996,950		56,029		505,653		56,826		378,442					
11	Local Transportation Fund (LTF) to fund CTSA	99231	306,723												306,723	
12	2010/11 True-Up	99231	171,965		(4,741)		80,627		(1,235)		92,800				4,514	
13	**Total Estimated State Revenue**		7,368,915		378,806		3,542,109		387,772		2,683,452		65,539		311,237	
14			Urban Pop.	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual
15	**Federal Transit Administration Formula Funds**		110,380		10,005		90,250		10,125							
16			100.00%		9.06%		81.76%		9.18%							
17	FTA 5307 Operating Apportionment (Cities only)		750,000		67,950		613,200		68,850							
18	FTA 5311 Operating Apportionment (County only)		238,273								238,273					
19	**Total Estimated Federal Revenue**		988,273		67,950		613,200		68,850		238,273		0		0	
20																
21	TOTAL ESTIMATED STATE AND FEDERAL REVENUE		8,357,188		446,756		4,155,309		456,622		2,921,724		65,539		311,237	
22																
23-24	Section 2: Estimated Transit Funding Requirements		Population in RABA Service Area	12/13 True-Up	Section 2: Estimated Transit Funding Requirements by Jurisdiction											
25	**80/20 Weighted Average Formula**				Anderson		Redding		Shasta Lake		County		RTPA		CTSA	
26	Population in RABA Service Area		115,634		10,005		90,250		10,125		5,251					
27	Percent of RABA Service Area Population by Jurisdiction		100.00%		8.65%		78.05%		8.76%		4.54%					
28	RABA Service Hours by Jurisdiction		135.00		4.04		117.18		5.28		8.50					
29	Percent of Service Hours/Population in each Jurisdiction		100.00%		2.99%		86.80%		3.91%		6.30%					
30	Equals Weighted Average Share		100.00%		4.12%		85.05%		4.88%		5.95%					
31	**Transit Funding Requirements**															
32	**Redding Area Bus Authority**		Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual
33	TDA Funds Required															
34	RABA (PUC Article 4) TDA Required for Operating	99260a	3,011,245		124,063		2,561,064		146,949		179,169					
35	RABA Administration	99260a	524,727		21,619		446,280		25,607		31,221					
36	TDA Capital Match (from RABA budget)	99260a	12,000		494		10,206		586		714					
37	FTA 5307 Operating (Cities only)		750,000		67,950		613,200		68,850							
38	Total Required by RABA		**4,297,972**		**214,126**		**3,630,751**		**241,991**		**211,104**					
39	**Other Transit Obligations**															
40	**County Transit**															
41	Burney Express Budget	99400c	129,086								129,086					
42	Lifeline Transit Service	99400c	45,000								45,000					
43	Rural Transit Administration Budget	99400d	3,000								3,000					
44	**CTSA (5% LTF) Plus True-Up**	99275	311,237												311,237	
45	**RTPA Admin**	99400d	65,539										65,539			
46	TOTAL ESTIMATED TRANSIT FUNDING REQUIREMENT		4,851,835		214,126		3,630,751		241,991		388,191		65,539		311,237	
47																
48	Section 3: Estimate of Funds Available for Other Uses			12/13 True-Up	Section 3: Revenue Less Transit Requirements = Available for Other Uses by Jurisdiction											
49					Anderson		Redding		Shasta Lake		County		RTPA		CTSA	
50			Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual
51	Total Estimated Revenue		8,357,188		446,756		4,155,309		456,622		2,921,724		65,539		311,237	
52	Less Estimated Transit Requirements	99400c	(4,851,835)		(214,126)		(3,630,751)		(241,991)		(388,191)		(65,539)		(311,237)	
53	County STA Reserved for Future Transit Requirements		(228,524)								(228,524)					
54	EQUALS NET AVAILABLE FOR OTHER USES	99400a	3,276,829		232,630		524,558		214,631		2,305,009		0		0	
55																
56	Section 4: Capital Purchase Requirements															
57	FTA 5307 funds are available to RABA for capital expenses. Funds may be banked for up to 3 years. RABA may carry over 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.															
58	**Other Revenue Funds**			Urban Pop.	City of Anderson		City of Redding		City of Shasta Lake		County of Shasta					
59	Other revenues are for revenue recognition only in the TDA claims process. These funds flow directly through the claimant agency.			110,380	10,005	9.06%	90,250	81.76%	10,125	9.18%	100%					
60			Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual				
61	FTA 5307 RABA Capital (PUC Article 4 99260(a)) - (Cities only)		750,000		67,950		613,200		68,850		0					
62	Prop1B Revenue		-		0		0		0		0					
63	TOTAL NON-TDA FUNDS REQUESTED		750,000		67,950		613,200		68,850		0					
64																

65–66 **Claimant Certification:** It is understood that this TDA budget is based on estimated revenue and transit requirements. This budget may be revised to match actual revenue and expenses once the RTPA and RABA's audited financial statements are available. Monies claimed may only be used for the purpose for which the claim is approved, and in accordance with the terms of the allocation instructions. The claimant certifies that, to the best of his/her knowledge, the financial information contained herein is reasonable and accurate.

Agency:

67 Signature of Authorized Representative Date:

Attachment B

2012/13 Unmet Transit Needs Comments and Responses

Introduction: Annually, the SRTA 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 SRTA response as to whether the service can meet "unmet transit needs" and "reasonable to meet" criteria developed by the SRTA. 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	SRTA Response
1. Service to New Areas ***A. Service to McArthur*** **IP-1:** Person says that people have no means of public transportation from McArthur to Burney or Redding for needed services and requests addition of service to McArthur. ***Comments submitted via email by We Care A Lot.***	**IP-1:** Service was attempted in the past (2001-2002) by extending the Burney Express to serve Fall River Mills and McArthur. During the trial year, farebox ratio was 3.7%, indicating extremely low ridership. The SRTA does not recommend extending service at this time.
B. Service to Fall River **IP-1:** Person says that people have no means of public transportation from Fall River to Burney or Redding for needed services. Requests addition of service to Fall River. ***Comments submitted via email by We Care A Lot.***	**IP-1:** Service was attempted in the past (2001-2002) by extending the Burney Express to serve Fall River Mills and McArthur. During the trial year, farebox ratio was 3.7%, indicating extremely low ridership. The SRTA does not recommend extending service at this time.
2. Unmet Needs ***A. Extended Hours*** **IP-1:** Person says that buses stop operating at 7 pm, leaving those who work the 2-10 pm shift at the Opportunity Center without service home. ***Comments submitted via email by We Care A Lot.*** **IP-2:** Person requests to add Saturday hours of operation ***Comments submitted via email by We Care A Lot.***	**IP-1:** Comment forwarded to RABA for consideration; RABA will consider extending hours in the upcoming Short Range Transit Plan. The SRTA does not recommend expansion of service (such as extended hours) while farebox ratio is not being met. **IP-2:** Comment forwarded to RABA for consideration; RABA will consider additional weekend hours in the upcoming Short Range Transit Plan. The SRTA does not recommend expansion of service (such as extended weekend hours) while farebox ratio is not being met.

3. Operational	
A. Fare Increase **IP-1:** Person recommends fare increase for RABA. ***Presented at public hearing 3/15/12.***	**IP-1:** Comment forwarded to RABA for consideration; RABA will address fare increases in the upcoming Short Range Transit Plan.
B. Headways **IP-1:** Person requests lowering the amount of time that it takes to get to and from the Shasta County Opportunity Center. Possibly addition of a stop near the Opportunity Center at both the outgoing and incoming routes. ***Comment submitted via email by We Care A Lot.***	**IP-1:** Comment forwarded to RABA for consideration; RABA will consider extending service hours (adding more runs to decrease headways) in the upcoming Short Range Transit Plan. The SRTA does not consider adding runs to shorten headways an unmet need.
IP-2: Person requests increased frequency of buses for pick up.	**IP-2:** Comment forwarded to RABA for consideration; RABA will include in the upcoming Short Range Transit Plan.
IP-3: Person requests "safety officials" at the Masonic transfer station. ***Comment submitted via email by We Care A Lot.***	**IP-3:** Comment forwarded to RABA for consideration; RABA does not plan to add safety officials, but recently approved a grant to make safety improvement at the site, including lights, fencing, and a security camera.
IP-4: Person requests that RABA stops for routes 1 and 8 go "back the way they were". ***Comment presented at public hearing 3/15/12.***	**IP-4:** Comments forwarded to RABA for consideration; reinstating former routes 1 and 8 will be considered in the Short Range Transit Plan.
4. Burney Express Service	
A. Route Change **IP-1:** Person requests a stop near Dubois (near Round Mountain). ***Comment presented at public hearing 3/15/12.***	**IP-1:** Comment submitted to Shasta County. Currently riders can request stops if they require; the SRTA does not consider a new stop an unmet transit need.
B. Extended Hours **IP-1:** Person says that times Burney Express runs to the Hill Country Clinic in Round Mountain makes it difficult to utilize. Possible modification of hours to allow people to get to Hill County Clinic easier. ***Comments submitted via email by We Care A Lot.***	**IP-2:** Comment submitted to Shasta County; current Burney Express routes are timed to coordinate with other transit services. Changing times would create lengthy waits for riders transferring. The SRTA does not consider the current run times to produce an unmet need, but recommends examining the cost of adding an additional run.

Shasta County
Social Services Transportation Advisory Council
(SSTAC)

To: Shasta County Regional Transportation Planning Agency (SCRTPA)

Date: 5/16/2012

Subject: <u>2012-13 Unmet Transit Needs Recommendation</u>

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 an unmet needs recommendation to the SCRTPA Board.

The 2012-13 SSTAC identifies the following items to consider that could improve efficiency of the transit system within the region:

Service to New Areas

The SSTAC recommends that the county examine funding options (such as grants) for transit service in Fall River Mills and McArthur, and the addition of such service if funds become available. With funds available this fiscal year, a service area expansion is currently unreasonable to meet.

Extended Service Hours

The SSTAC recognizes that there are unmet transit needs, such as weekend service and extended hours of service, that exist in the region. Currently RABA does not meet required efficiency standards, making service expansion this fiscal year unreasonable to meet. However, the SSTAC recommends that RABA examine feasibility of extending service hours in the upcoming Short Range Transit Plan.

RABA Operational Changes

Several comments were submitted relating to possible operational changes to RABA's system, specifically a fare increase, shorter headways, safety improvements at the Masonic Transfer station and reinstating the old routes 1 and 8. RABA plans to consider recommending all suggested changes when updating their Short-Range Transit Plan, to be completed in spring 2013.

One request that has already been met is for safety officials at the Masonic transfer station. RABA has recently approved a grant to make safety improvements at this site. These changes include lights, fencing, and a security camera.

Burney Express Route Change & Extended Hours

The Burney Express' current hours are timed to coordinate with other transit services, providing transfer capabilities to riders. Changing the times that the Burney Express runs would create lengthy waits for riders transferring. However, riders can currently request stops if they require.

Though changing current Burney Express route times is not recommended at this time, the SSTAC recommends that the county consider conducting studies to see if and at what times an additional run of the Burney Express would benefit riders.

The items discussed above are considerations to improve service within the region, and do not meet the qualifications for unmet transit needs considered reasonable to meet at this time. The SSTAC's recommendation for 2012-13 is that there are **"no unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet".**

Respectfully submitted,

Del Lockwood

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

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:

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

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

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

3. Unmet transit needs specifically include:

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

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

4. Unmet transit needs specifically exclude:

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

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

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

(d) Primary and secondary school transportation.

<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