



1967-2011

History and Significant Transit Events of the Shasta County Regional Transportation Planning Agency



This report serves to document the origin, events and issues related to transit planning activities of the Shasta County Regional Transportation Planning Agency (SCRTPA). This report does not cover all activities performed by the SCRTPA.

PURPOSE

This report serves to provide background on the origin, events and issues related to transit planning activities of the Shasta County Regional Transportation Planning Agency (SCRTPA).

This report contains six sections discussing key agency issues. A table of chronological events is included on page 2.

1. Origin of the agency - includes major laws, designations and agreements
2. Transportation Development Act allocation process - describes the use of funds and the cost allocation method
3. RTPA/RABA roles – discusses the ability of the SCRTPA to provide transit services
4. Farebox issues – discusses mandatory farebox requirements and issues of non-compliance
5. Trial and express transit services – describes voluntary transit services
6. Summary

Information in this report is from historical documents, staff reports, board minutes and correspondence maintained in the SCRTPA archives. This report is a short version. A full version of this report is available in the SCRTPA library. The report is for informational purposes only and does not represent the opinions of the agency, board or staff of the present SCRTPA.

-2011 SCRTPA Staff

Year	Table of Chronological Events
1967	County of Shasta and Cities Area Planning Council Joint Powers Authority formed
1971	California's Transportation Development Act enacted
1971	Shasta County Local Transportation Commission established
1972	Local Transportation Commission designated as a Regional Transportation Planning Agency
1976	Joint Powers Agreement for operation of a Redding area bus system
1977	Local Agency Formation Commission approves Redding Area Bus Authority (RABA) service area
1981	Regional Transportation Planning Agency designated as a Metropolitan Planning Organization
1981	County withdraws from Area Planning Council
1990	RABA capital reserve policy established
1991	County and Anderson contract with RABA to operate Anderson-Cottonwood Transit System (ACT)
1993	20-Year Transit Development Plan adopted
1994	Local Transportation Fund cost sharing formula adopted (80/20) Rural dial-a-ride one-year trial service implemented
1995	RTPA prevails over Sierra Club lawsuit RTPAs ability to become a transit operator
1996	Shasta Senior Nutrition Programs designated as the Consolidated Transportation Services Agency Unmet Needs Definition revised to incorporate 80/20 methodology Rural dial-a-ride service terminated County contracts with RABA to operate Burney Express County coordinates Shingletown vanpool
1997	Cities of Anderson and Shasta Lake join RABA JPA Lakehead Lifeline Service starts
1998	Two-year temporary farebox reduction RTPA approves permanent farebox reduction to 19% Lakehead Lifeline Service terminated
2001	Airport Road, Cottonwood and McArthur trial express services implemented 2001 RABA Short-and Long-Range Master Transit Plan Study by LSC, Inc. adopted
2002	Three-year temporary farebox reduction Trial services terminated Shingletown vanpool terminated
2005	RABA/RTPA joint workshop discussion on governmental structure Anderson-only and Anderson Express route modifications implemented
2007	Anderson-only and Anderson Express terminated
2008	Seven-year tiered temporary farebox reduction
2011	RABA service area modification

SECTION 1- ORIGIN OF THE AGENCY

Regional governments are government entities that extend beyond city or town borders, but are different from city or county government. Regional government in Shasta County traces back to 1967 with the creation of a regional planning council. The following provides discussion on chronological events from 1967 to 2011.



1967

JOINT POWERS AGREEMENT (JPA) APPROVED FOR THE SHASTA COUNTY AND CITIES AREA PLANNING COUNCIL

The cities of Anderson and Redding and the County of Shasta formed a single agency with authority to coordinate expansion and development of the region as it became an urbanized area. The JPA was established pursuant to the provisions of California Government Code (CGC) §65600 to §65604. Each jurisdiction approved the rules for the organization, operation and function of the council¹.

1971

CALIFORNIA'S TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT (TDA) ENACTED

TDA was enacted by California's legislature to improve existing public transportation services and encourage regional transportation coordination. TDA provides funding to county transportation authorities for transit and non-transit related purposes that comply with regional transportation plans. Counties were required to establish a local transportation fund within each county treasury (CGC §29530).



TDA provides two funding sources for transportation: 1) the Local Transportation Fund (LTF), derived from one-quarter cent of the general sales tax collected statewide, and 2) State Transit Assistance Fund (STA), derived from excise taxes on gasoline and diesel fuel.

1971/72

SHASTA COUNTY LOCAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION (LTC) AND SHASTA COUNTY RTPA ESTABLISHED

TDA required the establishment of LTCs to administer public transportation funds earmarked by this new legislation (CGC §29535). In February 1971, the County of Shasta established the county's LTC. Membership consisted of three members appointed by the Shasta County Board of Supervisors, and three members appointed by the mayors of the cities within the county. The County of Shasta public works director served as the chief engineer and chief executive for the commission. The commission adopted rules for the performance of the commission's duties.

¹ Resolutions – County 67-112, Redding 3946 and Anderson 67-32

On July 20, 1972 the LTC was designated by the Secretary of Business and Transportation as an RTPA (CGC §29535). The RTPAs primary duties included:

- Development and implementation of a regional transportation plan
- Administration of revenues received under the TDA
- Review and approval of federal grants
- Review and approval of federal aid programs
- Development of traffic models

1976

JOINT POWER AGREEMENT (JPA) FOR OPERATION OF A REDDING AREA BUS SYSTEM



The County of Shasta and the City of Redding entered into a JPA to operate a system of bus transportation to serve the Redding area and adjacent areas. This agreement created a separate public entity known as the Redding Area Bus Authority (RABA). The JPA outlined the powers and duties for the formation and operation of RABA.

1977

FORMATION OF RABA SERVICE AREA

Changes in local government and service boundaries must be coordinated through Shasta County's Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO). Approved by voters, creation of the RABA service area added a \$0.25 maximum tax rate to the local sales tax². In December 1977, LAFCO certified completion of the service area formation and the JPA was filed with the Secretary of State in March 1978.

1981

RTPA DESIGNATED AS A METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

Areas of over 50,000 in population are considered urbanized for the purposes of federal assistance. The results of the 1980 census established Shasta County as an urbanized area, and therefore eligible for federal planning funds. On behalf of the Governor, the State of California Business, Transportation and Housing Agency designated the RTPA as the Shasta County Metropolitan Planning Organization. The Area Planning Council was dissolved.

1996

SHASTA SENIOR NUTRITION PROGRAMS DESIGNATED AS CONSOLIDATED TRANSPORTATION SERVICES AGENCY (CTSA)

CTSA's were established in 1979 by the Social Service Transportation Improvement Act (CGC §15950) to improve social service transportation services by promoting consolidation of services. In 1996, Shasta Senior Nutrition Programs, Inc. (SSNP) replaced RABA as the CTSA (SCRTPA 20-96). In December 2010, the SCRTPA executed a memorandum of understanding outlining the roles and responsibilities of the CTSA and SCRTPA³.

² County of Shasta Resolution 77-77, 77-105

³ SCRTPA Resolution 20-96

1997

CITIES OF ANDERSON AND SHASTA LAKE JOIN RABA JPA

Prior to 1997, the County of Shasta and City of Anderson approved an agreement to contract with RABA to provide transit service to the Anderson and Cottonwood areas. In 1997, the cities of Anderson and Shasta Lake formally joined the County of Shasta and the City of Redding in governing the delivery of local public transportation services. A new JPA formed adding these cities. The newly created RABA board appointed one member to the SCRTPA board.

SECTION 2 – TDA ALLOCATION PROCESS

The California Department of Transportation – Division of Mass Transportation governs TDA statutes. The SCRTPA is responsible for adopting rules and regulations delineating the procedures for the submission of claims for TDA funds, and the criteria under which claims are analyzed and evaluated. These rules provide for an orderly and periodic distribution of nearly \$7 million (2011) in state transportation funds annually for public transportation.

Transit operators claim TDA funds under three articles:

- Article 4 supports public transportation systems Public Utilities Code (PUC) §99260 (a), and is generally utilized in urban areas. RABA claims funds under this Article;
- Article 4.5 supports community transit services (PUC §99233.7). The CTSA is eligible for 5% of LTF funds under this article; and
- Article 8 can be claimed for voluntary transit service, or for local streets and roads. The cities of Anderson, Redding and Shasta Lake and the County of Shasta (jurisdictions) may claim these funds only after all transit needs that are “reasonable to meet” are funded.



The SCRTPA allocates TDA funds to the jurisdictions based on population (PUC §99231). The jurisdictions may agree on any method of dividing the costs of transit service between them (cost allocation method).

COST ALLOCATION METHOD

In 1993, the SCRTPA board approved the 20-Year Transit Development Plan for Shasta County (Nelson/Nygaard). The primary purpose of this plan was to determine the

appropriate levels of funding allocations to transit services and the optimal design of those services. A plan update was required in 1994 when the City of Shasta Lake formed.

The SCRTPA adopted an 80% service hour and 20% population-based cost-sharing method as the most equitable distribution of transit costs among claimants. The SCRTPA implemented this methodology on October 1, 1994 (Nelson/Nygaard 1994:7.10-7.20). The “unmet transit needs” and “reasonable to meet” definition was revised to incorporate this method.

TDA allocations estimated. Once audited financial statements are available for the previous year, budget to actual revenues and expenses from both the SCRTPA and RABA are reconciled, or “trued-up.” Jurisdictions may claim remaining funds for other transit services or local streets and roads.

Prior to making any allocation not directly related to public transportation, the SCRTPA must perform an annual assessment of transit needs within each jurisdiction (PUC §99401.5). The SCRTPA must adopt criteria that determines if a new and/or existing transit service is feasible (PUC §99401), or as referred to in TDA - “reasonable to meet.” The current definition of “unmet

transit needs” and “reasonable to meet” was adopted by resolution in December 2000⁴.

SIERRA CLUB LAWSUIT

In 1995, the SCRTPA’s cost allocation method was tested in a court of law. The Sierra Club filed two lawsuits against the SCRTPA, claiming that over a two-year period the SCRTPA improperly diverted TDA funds from public transit uses to city and county streets and roads projects. The SCRTPA prevailed in the lawsuit (Case No. 118648 and 124032).

RABA CAPITAL RESERVE POLICY

RABA maintains a minimum \$500,000 capital reserve in the County of Shasta Treasury⁵. These funds are for the scenario of a potential catastrophic accident where two full-size RABA buses simultaneously require immediate replacement (RABA Short-and Long-Range Master Transit Plan Study - LSC, Inc. 2001).



TDA statutes allow holding funds for up to three years. If funds have not been expended at the end of the three-year period the funds can become available for allocation for a different project, or to another claimant agency, at the discretion of the RTPA (PUC §6648). Since RABA is the only transit provider in Shasta County eligible for State Transit Assistance funds, there is no

need to reallocate funds. RABA may request release of funds for unexpected capital needs at any time. The SCRTPA must approve a separate allocation instruction prior to releasing funds (California Code of Regulations (CCR) §6648).

Interest earned on funds: PUC 99301 states that, “Interest earned on funds allocated shall be expended only for those purposes for which the funds are allocated.” Interest earned from both LTF and STA funds is added to the RABA reserve⁶.

⁴ SCRTPA Resolution 00-21

⁵ SCRTPA Resolution 19-90

⁶ SCRTPA staff report dated 12/16/97

SECTION 3 - RTPA/RABA ROLES

The SCRTPA is a legally separate public agency with its own governing board. The governing board is a seven-person board consisting of elected officials from the county, each city and RABA. A multi-jurisdictional technical advisory committee advises the board.

In 1972 bylaws were approved which designate the county's public works director, or his/her designee, as the SCRTPA executive director. Public works staff also acts as staff to the SCRTPA. SCRTPA staff guide the distribution of over \$12 million in funds annually (FY 2011) to the three cities and the county.

The SCRTPA's responsibilities include adoption of rules and regulations governing the allocation of LTF monies and setting forth procedures and criteria for evaluating operators' TDA claims. The question on if the SCRTPA can directly provide transit services presently provided by RABA has come about several times.

The SCRTPA is responsible for making allocations of LTF funds to claimants under the provisions of the TDA (PUC §99203). In TDA terms, a claimant is a transit operator, city, county or consolidated transportation services agency. The SCRTPA is neither and can't be considered a claimant.

An operator is any transit district, municipal operator or transit development board. RABA is referred to as a municipal operator who is wholly owned or controlled by the city or county (PUC §99209). The SCRTPA is a statutorily created public entity, which is neither owned nor controlled by an individual city or county, therefore it can't be a municipal operator.

There is no indication of any legislative intent that transportation planning agencies can serve in a dual role as a transit operator⁷.

In September 2005, a joint workshop was held between the RABA and SCRTPA boards. The purpose of the workshop was to discuss the direction and current/future public transit opportunities within RABA's service area. The governmental structures of RABA and the SCRTPA were examined; how each body carries out its respective functions and duties; and whether the bodies could be combined into one governing body⁸.

RABA counsel prepared a legal analysis relative to the functions of RABA and the SCRTPA as to whether the agencies can consolidate or better coordinate functions. Since the SCRTPA does not legally qualify as a claimant or operator of TDA funds, it is not possible for the functions of the SCRTPA and RABA to consolidate. The functions of the local planning agency must remain distinct from the role and functions of the transit system operator⁹.

⁷ Memo of law 1995, 1997

⁸ SCRTPA minutes dated 9/19/05

⁹ Memo of law 2005-16

SECTION 4 – FAREBOX ISSUES

Transit operators who provide both demand-response and fixed-route service must maintain a combined ratio of fare revenues to operating cost (farebox ratio) of 20% in urban areas and 10% in rural areas (PUC §99268.5c). An RTPA may permanently set the farebox ratio to 15% if specific findings are made to justify the reason (CCR §6633.2d).

In 1997, the City of Anderson joined RABA’s JPA. Based upon the percentage of service hours in Redding’s urban area, and the percentage of service hours in Anderson’s rural areas, the SCRTPA board approved a permanent farebox ratio of 19%.

NON-COMPLIANCE WITH FAREBOX REQUIREMENTS

A transit operators failure to meet the farebox ratio can result in a reduction of funds to a transit operator (CCR §6633.9) and (PUC §99268.9). The first year that an operator fails to meet farebox is the start of a three-year penalty cycle. The penalty is the difference between the actual farebox received and the farebox ratio recovery required by the RTPA. Should a transit operator continue to fail to meet farebox, the RTPA must evaluate the service to determine if the system is no longer “reasonable to meet.” This determination could require restructuring of system-wide service hours, service days and routes. Though referred to as a penalty in TDA regulations, no TDA funds are lost to the region. The jurisdictions funds for other uses decrease to make RABA whole. These funds may return to the jurisdictions in the following year during the SCRTPA’s annual “true-up” of TDA funds, providing funds are available.

An example of the penalty process is as follows:

THREE-YEAR FAREBOX PENALTY CYCLE

Established Farebox Ratio – 19%	(Year 1)	(Year 2)	(Year 3)	(Year 4)
	One-Time Grace Year	Non-Compliance Year	Determination Year	Penalty Year for Non-Compliance
a) Operating Cost	\$100,000	\$125,000	\$150,000	\$175,000
b) Required Fare Revenues (a x 19% = fare revenue)	19,000	23,750	28,500	33,250
c) Actual fare revenues	15,000	18,000	23,000	28,000
d) Shortfall (b – c = shortfall)	4,000	5,750	0	0
e) Allocation Estimate	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$200,000 <u>-5,750</u> \$194,250
f) Penalty Assessed	No reduction	No reduction	Penalty amount determined from the shortfall in Year 2 (d)	Year 2 shortfall (d) is deducted from the Year 4 allocation (e)

BOARD APPROVED TEMPORARY FAREBOX REDUCTIONS

The RTPA board can approve a temporary farebox ratio reduction if the operator can demonstrate how it will achieve the required ratio of fare revenues during any penalty year.

In October 1998 the SCRTPA board approved a temporary farebox ratio reduction for fiscal year (FY) 1997/98 (15%), 1998/99 (17.5%) and thereafter 19%¹⁰.

In 2002, RABA was operating below the required 19% farebox ratio due to increased costs in the minimum wage and a new union labor agreement. RABA anticipated that the ratio would continue to decrease to 16.5% over time and requested a permanent reduction to 16.5%. Rejecting this request, the board approved a temporary farebox ratio reduction for FY 2001/02 (16.5%), 2002/03 (17.5%), 2003/04 (18.5%) and 19% thereafter¹¹.

In 2008, RABA was again operating in a second-year farebox ratio penalty. Over the past several years, RABA made service adjustments, expenditure adjustments and fare increases in an attempt to meet the 19% farebox requirement. The SCRTPA approved a temporary farebox ratio reduction consistent with RABA's 7-year financial plan, with tiered farebox ratios¹².

2014/15	19.0%
2013/14	18.6%
2012/13	17.9%
2011/12	17.3%
2010/11	16.7%
2009/10	16.2%
2008/09	15.5%

¹⁰ SCRTPA Resolution 14-98

¹¹ SCRTPA Resolution 02-01

¹² SCRTPA Resolution 08-07

SECTION 5 – TRIAL AND EXPRESS TRANSIT SERVICES

Public transit service is in those areas of Shasta County with the highest density per census tract. As a result of the unmet needs process, funds can be allocated to implement new or trial service, providing funding is available. Local jurisdictions may voluntarily decide fund the service from the jurisdictions portion of TDA or other revenue sources. The following trial and/or express services attempted over the past twenty years:

ANDERSON-COTTONWOOD TRANSIT (ACT) (1991-1997)

The County of Shasta and the City of Anderson approved an agreement to contract with RABA to provide transit service to the Anderson and Cottonwood areas. ACT merged into the 1997 RABA JPA and service to Cottonwood eliminated.

COUNTY-FUNDED SERVICES (IN ORDER OF OCCURANCE)

Rural Dial-A-Ride Services (1994-1996)

Based on the 1993 Shasta County Transit Development Plan recommendations; the County entered into an agreement with RABA to operate various dial-a-ride rural transit services. This included one-year trial services in Burney, Bella Vista, Palo Cedro and Happy Valley, and an express service to Burney and Shingletown. Most services were unable to achieve the 10% minimum farebox required by state law. Services terminated in 1996, with the exception of Burney Express¹³.

Burney Express (1996-present)

The County of Shasta continues to contract with RABA to provide express service to the outlying community of Burney. This service is for commuters and has limited stops. Burney Express operates with two round-trips each day. The service continues to exceed the 10% minimum farebox requirement.



Shingletown Vanpool (1996-2002)

Upon termination of the Shingletown Express, the county coordinated a vanpool from 1996 to 2002.

The Shingletown Vanpool provided approximately ten passenger trips daily. The program was “self-operated” by its riders; meaning it used a volunteer driver/coordinator and a leased van. The county guaranteed a fixed monthly using TDA funds and riders paid the remaining balance. Vanpool services are subject to performance requirements established by the county including; use of a volunteer driver, a required four-passenger minimum and maximum subsidy payments. The vanpool terminated in 2002 due to lack of riders and a volunteer driver.

Lakehead Lifeline Service (1997-1998)

As a result of the 1997 unmet needs process a Lakehead Lifeline Service was voluntarily funded by the county and operated by Shasta Senior Nutrition Programs, Inc. One rider rode on one occasion during the year. This service terminated after one year¹⁴.

¹³ SCRTPA staff report 4/2/96

¹⁴ County of Shasta 6/23/98

Airport Road, Cottonwood and Intermountain Trial Services (2001-2002)

Resulting from the 2001 unmet needs process, the county contracted with RABA to implement trial express services to Airport Road and Cottonwood, and extended Burney Express to Fall River Mills/McArthur. The CalWorks program, TDA and farebox revenue funded these services.

The farebox ratios for the Burney Express extension yielded 3.7%, Airport Road Corridor- 1.5% and Cottonwood – 3%. Services terminated at the end of the one-year trial period.

ANDERSON-ONLY AND ANDERSON EXPRESS (2005-2007)

At the request of the City of Anderson, RABA made route modifications to Route 9 to operate only in Anderson with an express bus to Redding every other hour. This modification went into effect on October 1, 2005. This service resulted in an increased cost to the City of Anderson of \$20,000 per month. Since the service area boundary did not change, nor overall system route hours, the service change did not require SCRTPA action¹⁵.

In April 2007, the City of Anderson requested that the Anderson-only service be eliminated and requested reinstatement of service levels prior to the October 2005 route modification. The RABA board approved this request at the August 20, 2007 meeting.

RABA SERVICE AREA MODIFICATION (2011-)

The RABA board approved a new commuter route along Airport Road. Funding for the majority of this route is through an agreement with IASCO Flight Training Center to purchase a minimum number of bus passes for a three-year period. One-mile of the new route is within the County's jurisdiction and outside of the current service area boundary, which required the County's approval¹⁶.

¹⁵ RABA Board minutes 5/16/05, 5/21/07 and 7/2/07

¹⁶ County staff report 8/23/11

SECTION 6 – SUMMARY

In summary, the SCRTPA is a public entity whose governing board consists of multi-jurisdictional members with a system of checks and balances to control conflict of interest issues. Core functions of the SCRTPA include; development of long-range transportation policies; local agency funding support and coordination; oversight of public transit funding; and approval of short-range capital improvement programs for all modes of transportation. The SCRTPA operations and programs are funded entirely by federal funding and grants.

This concludes the documentation of historic and significant events of the SCRTPA.

For more information regarding the material in this document, please contact the SCRTPA:

Address: Shasta County Regional Transportation Planning Agency
1855 Placer Street
Redding, CA 96003

Phone: (530) 225-5654

Email: scrtpa@co.shasta.ca.us

Website: www.scrtpa.org