1. Call Meeting to Order, Roll Call

2. Public Comment: The Committee reserves this portion of the agenda for members of the public to address the San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority Executive Committee on any items not on the agenda and within the jurisdiction of the Committee. Comments are limited to three minutes per speaker. The Committee will listen to all communication, but in compliance with the Brown Act, will not take any action on items that are not on the agenda.

3. Information Items

   A-1 Executive Director’s Report (Information)

4. Action Items

   B-1 RTA FY14-15 and FY15-16 Operating Budget, and FY14-15 through FY18-19 Capital Budget (Approve)
   B-2 RTA Reserve Funds Policy (Approve)
   B-3 Revised Runabout No-Show Policy (Approve)
5. **Consent Items**

- C-1 Executive Committee Meeting Minutes of February 19, 2014 (Approve)
- C-2 Executive Committee Meeting Minutes of March 12, 2014 (Approve)

6. **Agenda Review** – below are items that will be presented at the March 5, 2014 Board meeting:

**Information Items**

- A-1 Executive Director’s Report (Information)

**Action Items**

- B-1 RTA FY14-15 and FY15-16 Operating Budget, and FY14-15 through FY18-19 Capital Budget (Approve)
- B-2 RTA Reserve Policy (Approve)
- B-3 Revised Runabout No-Show Policy (Approve)
- B-4 Purchase of 40 Prado (Approve)

**Consent Items**

- C-1 Executive Committee Meeting Minutes of February 19, 2014 (Approve)
- C-2 Executive Committee Meeting Minutes of March 12, 2014 (Approve)
- C-3 AGP Contract for Fiscal Year 2014-2015 (Approve)
- C-4 Prop 1B Safety and Security: Transit System Safety, Security and Disaster Response Account Program and Authorized Agent Signature Authority (Approve)
- C-5 Vehicle Procurements: Runabouts, Support Vehicles, Over the Road Coaches (Approve)
- C-6 Maintenance Software Procurement (Approve)
- C-7 Bus Stop Improvements (Approve)
- C-8 RouteMatch Tablets and Backend Software (Approve)

**Closed Session Items**

- D-1 It is the intention of the Board to meet in closed session concerning the following items:
  
  - D-1-1 CONFERENCE WITH LABOR NEGOTIATOR (Govt. Code Section 54957.6)  
    Agency representative: Shelly Higginbotham  
    Unrepresented employee: Geoff Straw, Executive Director

7. **Closed Session Items**

CONFERENCE WITH LABOR NEGOTIATOR (Govt. Code Section 54957.6)  
Agency representative: Shelly Higginbotham  
Unrepresented employee: Geoff Straw, Executive Director

8. **Adjournment**

Next Executive Committee Meeting: **June 11, 2014**
SAN LUIS OBISPO REGIONAL TRANSIT AUTHORITY
April 16, 2014
STAFF REPORT

AGENDA ITEM:    A-1

TOPIC:     Executive Director’s Report

PRESENTED BY:    Geoff Straw

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:  Accept as Information

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION:

Operations:
RTA will conduct its next quarterly Employee of the Quarter barbecue lunch on 18th, and the winner will join us at the May 7th Board meeting. Please add that event to your calendars.

RTA has executed all consolidation agreements with the Cities of Atascadero and Paso Robles to implement the consolidation elements detailed in the two separate jurisdiction agreements. RTA has also finalized plans to hire and train the new Bus Operators who will focus on operation of the North County consolidated services. The training program will begin in late April and will be completed in time for the June 1 consolidation date. The Bus Operator candidates were chosen from the current First Transit crew that operates North County transit services, and these new employees will focus on Paso Express Routes A and B, as well as Paso Dial-A-Ride. RTA plans to conduct a Bus Operator bid/shift selection meeting on Sunday May 18 at 5:00 PM, during which the new North County Bus Operators will get a chance to meet their RTA-focused counterparts. Board members are invited to join us for pizza at this bi-annual event, which will give you a chance to meet all members of the RTA Bus Operator team.

RTA also wants to welcome aboard Michael Seden-Hansen, who RTA hired from the City of Paso Robles as part of the consolidation; his first day will be May 5th. His new title will be Special Projects Coordinator, and he will report directly to me.

RTA also plans to begin a new Bus Operator training class of five to seven candidates in June to fill open positions. Based on our standard six-week training period, it is expected that these new Bus Operators will be ready for revenue service in mid-July.

The Regional Transportation Advisory Committee will meet on April 17th. The agenda includes the FY14-15 budget, as well as the new Runabout No-Show Policy. These items are also included in the RTA Executive Committee agenda as Items B-1 and B-3, respectively.
Maintenance:
On April 2nd, RTA issued a Request for Proposals to furnish and install a computerized vehicle/facility maintenance tracking software system. This system will replace the antiquated spreadsheet-based system currently employed at RTA, which will permit better monitoring and analysis of maintenance costs. Proposals are due May 7, and it is anticipated the new system will be “live” in fall 2014.

RTA is planning to surplus two 1997 Gillig Phantom buses – units 148 and 149 – in the coming weeks. Each of these buses has far surpassed the designed economically useful life of a heavy-duty transit bus (12-years or 500,000 miles, whichever comes first). In fact, each of these two bus has traveled nearly 1 million miles over the past 17 years. RTA is planning a send-off party to coincide with the May 7 RTA Board meeting, and staff will inform the public of planned events as the date approaches.

RTA continues to meet preventive maintenance schedules according to manufacturer recommendations.

Service Planning & Marketing:
It is with a heavy heart that we say good-bye and thank you to RTA Planning and Marketing Manager Aimee Wyatt. Aimee has accepted a similar job with a larger transit agency in Southern California, and her last day with RTA will be April 18th. We invite RTA Board members to join us in celebrating her achievements here at RTA at our quarterly Employee of the Quarter barbecue on April 18th.

RTA and SLOCOG staff met with officials from the cities of Atascadero and Paso Robles, as well as from Cuesta College, on April 7th to discuss possible operating and financial elements related to a possible new late-evening service from the Cuesta College campus in Paso Robles. We will continue to develop alternatives, and we hope to bring a recommendation to the RTA Board at its May 7th meeting.

Finance and Administration:
Staff has developed the draft FY14-15 budget, which will be presented as Agenda Item B-1. Similar to last year, RTA will again be recommending a two-year operating budget (first year financially constrained; second year for planning purposes), while also incorporating a rolling five-year capital improvement program.

Based on Board member, jurisdiction staff member, and public comments received on the previous draft of the RTA Reserve Funds Policy, RTA staff has developed a revised policy that will be considered under Agenda Item B-2. Staff wishes to acknowledge the assistance provided by SLOCOG staff in focusing on capital and cash flow funds, while identifying SLOCOG LTF reserves as a possible solution for possible future operating fund challenges.
RTA Maintenance Facility Planning
Staff continues to work with our partner CAPSLO to acquire property at 40 Prado Road. This issue is discussed in Agenda Item B-4 at the May 7 Board meeting.

Labor Relations
SAN LUIS OBISPO REGIONAL TRANSIT AUTHORITY VISION STATEMENT, VISION ELEMENTS, MISSION STATEMENT AND STRATEGIC DIRECTION

VISION

The RTA of the future is an integral part of the “SLO lifestyle.” From the vineyards in North County, to the secluded beach towns on the North Coast, to multi-faceted communities in the South County, residents and visitors use public transportation rather than relying on their cars.

Vision Elements

- Continue successful partnerships with jurisdictions, county, other public agencies, businesses and schools.
- Provide excellent, reliable, sustainable seamless service that is effective in getting residents and visitors where they want to travel.
- Secure reliable funding.
- Implement an Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) program to improve service quality and provide efficiencies.
- Develop a well-executed image-building campaign with a single face for public transportation.

MISSION

The Mission of RTA is to provide safe, reliable and efficient transportation services that improve and enhance the quality of life for the citizens and visitors of San Luis Obispo County.

STRATEGIC DIRECTION

- Stabilize and grow funding.
- Continue to improve service quality: On-time performance, scheduling and routing, customer amenities on our vehicles and at our bus stops, operating procedures.
- Consolidate and streamline operations to improve efficiency and effectiveness of public transportation throughout the county.
- Include public transportation as part of the lifestyle evolution needed to confront climate change.
- Reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled.
- Embrace technological improvements that will positively impact efficiency and quality of service.
SAN LUIS OBISPO REGIONAL TRANSIT AUTHORITY VALUES

Commitment to Serve

Provide valuable services to the public and direct our energies in strengthening our relationships with our customers and the community while maintaining responsible ethical fiscal management.

Leadership

Be trustworthy, credible, confident, progressive and influential in all we do.

Teamwork

Work together with trust, support and mutual cooperation and respect. Provide an environment that fosters frank and open communication. Have Fun in our daily activities and keep issues in perspective. Have pride in our accomplishments while taking on our challenges with spirit and vigor.

Integrity

Promote honesty, loyalty, dignity, respect, decency, fairness, courtesy, responsibility, and character.

Human Development

Provide the appropriate resources and environment for employees to be successful, motivate individuals to take initiative and to be creative in all of our efforts.
AGENDA ITEM:         B-1

TOPIC:         FY14-15 and FY15-16 Operating Budget,
               and FY14-15 through FY18-19 Capital
               Budget

PRESENTED BY:   Geoff Straw

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:  Adopt FY14-15 Budget as presented

RTAC RECOMMENDATION:

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION:

We are pleased to present a balanced Fiscal Year 2014-15 and projected Fiscal Year
2015-16 operating budget. In addition, we are presenting a five-year capital program,
which includes the procurement of eight new 40-foot transit coaches, two CMAQ-funded
over-the-road coaches, and five Runabout/Dial-A-Ride vehicles over the next two years;
no Local Transit Fund (LTF) is required for local match for these new vehicles. The
FY14-15 operating budget is proposed at $8,307,730 and the FY14-15 capital budget is
proposed at $5,758,130. Staff has incorporated several significant assumptions based
upon the latest information provided by SLOCOG for the LTF and the State Transit
Assistance (STA) funding programs.

We appreciate the Board’s support and leadership in these recently improved financial
times. Furthermore, we are proud that RTA was not forced to reduce service levels
during the economic downturn that began in 2008. The FY14-15 budget assumes the
same core levels of service miles and hours for fixed route, Dial-a-Ride and Trolley
service that are currently being operated, although a slight increase in Route 9 due to
consolidation and slightly later evening service. However, this budget assumes a higher
Runabout service level that is required to meet increasing demand. The highly
successful Route 14 service will continue to operate during peak commute times
between downtown San Luis Obispo and the main Cuesta College campus, our highest
trip generators in the regional system. The North Coast Connector service remains in
the schedule and we will be reviewing demand for this JARC-funded extra weekday
service later in the budget year as the JARC funding ends after FY14-15. Staff will also
continue to evaluate recommendations and monitor our Route Productivity Report to
develop service adjustments, which we will bring back to your Board for consideration.

It should be noted that a new column has been added to the revenue and expense
tables that depicts the consolidation of Paso Robles Express fixed route and dial-a-ride
services into RTA on June 1, 2014. This consolidation will only have a financial benefit for the cities of Atascadero and Paso Robles.

In summary, RTA staff has done a tremendous job of holding the line on expenses. The major increases in this year’s operating budget are costs for insurance, the wage adjustments programmed in the Collective Bargaining Agreement for covered employees, maintenance parts and supplies for the aging fleet, and our health plan. Although we have managed to make progress on upgrading our fleet in recent years, we continue to be conservative in our maintenance cost estimates as a result of the age of the remaining fleet. The delivery of eight new forty-foot low-floor buses in March 2015 will continue to help reduce a portion vehicle maintenance costs, but staff continues to be conservative given the overall fleet age.

The budget packet contains the following items:
- Adopted Budget Assumptions
- Definitions
- Fiscally-constrained FY14-15 operating and capital budgets
- Fiscally-unconstrained FY15-16 operating budget
- Fiscally-unconstrained FY15-16 through FY18-19 capital budgets

Lastly, we have broken each service route/type into weekday, Saturday and Sunday sections to better understand the financial commitment necessary to operate these distinct services should service reductions become necessary due to funding or other constraints.

**Revised Revenue Assumptions**

There is good news on two revenue fronts as our revenue outlook has improved overall from this current fiscal year, despite a projected decline in one funding source and elimination of another funding source typically used to fund RTA services. Below is a summary of those impacts.

RTA and South County Transit operate in the newly-designated Arroyo Grande – Grover Beach urbanized area. This means that RTA and SCT operations and capital projects are now eligible for Federal Transit Administration Section 5307 reimbursement funds. It should be noted that RTA services operated in that area are no longer eligible for Rural Transit Funding due to the urbanized area designation. On a related note, the AG-GB UZA is also apportioned approximately $100,000 annually in FTA Section 5339 capital reimbursement funds, which have been equitably programmed into the RTA budget.

LTF funds are derived from the statewide ¼ percent sales tax, while STA is derived from the sales tax on diesel fuel. Countywide LTF is projected by SLOCOG to be roughly 10% higher in FY14-15 in comparison to FY13-14. However, STA funding is estimated to be relatively flat for RTA, with an increase of roughly $17,500 in comparison to FY13-14.
We are predicating the revenue stream for the FY14-15 budget on the latest information that we have available on LTF and STA funding for the region. The LTF program should provide some stability in the revenue stream this year and optimistically in the coming years. Staff concurs and applauds the principles laid out in the SLOCOG staff report that any future funding formulas include incentive funding for Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and regional integration of the jurisdictional operations with the regional system as part of the regional funding formula. This budget assumes no increase in fare revenue for either FY14-15 or FY15-16, although staff is evaluating fare increase options for possible implementation in February 2015 to correspond with those fare program changes being considered by SCT.

Administration and Operations Expenses
The overall Administration Expense for RTA core services is up just over 5% compared to last fiscal year. This is reflective in workers compensation insurance as a result of RTA implementing policies and procedures related to safety programs. There is also a significant increase in our professional development line-item as RTA looks to provide additional training and cross training opportunities.

Under the Runabout section of this report, we discuss the change in ridership and the number of Runabout ADA applications that we receive as a result of the popularity of our service and other factors related to this increase. The amount of staff time that is dedicated to processing applications has changed dramatically over the years.

On the operating side, we have programmed greater Runabout service hours based on current demand trends. The service delivery line item for fixed route service is fairly consistent with that identified in the FY13-14 budget, as we are reallocating the majority of these hours and miles in this year’s budget so that the comparative increase is negligible. The only notable change is on Route 9, which includes an additional evening southbound run between Paso Robles and San Luis Obispo to meet local needs.

As included in the budget assumptions that your Board accepted in March 2014, based on the current projected funding, an annual Cost of Living Adjustment will be budgeted for non-union employees; the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) identifies annual increases based upon longevity for Bus Operators and Mechanics. It should be noted that RTA recently ratified a new CBA, which runs through January 31, 2018. Non-CBA employees within the salary range for their position will also be eligible for a step merit increase subject to performance assessments.

Finally, due to the unrest in North Africa and the Middle East, fuel prices have continued to swing wildly over the past three years. Similar to FY13-14, staff budgeted fuel at a relatively high per gallon cost, but we may need to adjust it if fuel prices rise significantly during the fiscal year. Due to our limited infrastructure, we are unable to purchase fuel in bulk to realize economies of scale.
Ridership Gains, Overcrowding Mitigation
This past year we saw steady ridership increases on all RTA services, and especially on our Runabout service. Runabout ridership was up 18%, while fixed route ridership was up over 5%, for the first eight months of FY13-14.

Pursuant to the language in the SLOCOG Regional Transportation Plan under Transit Policies, we have the ability to periodically adjust transit service parameters with the objective to maximize transit system efficiency, effectiveness and economic feasibility. Under this section there is a provision to review the need to add trips or tandems when the peak load factor consistently exceeds 90 percent of a seated bus load. In the case of all of our commute trips on Routes 9, 10 and 12, the load factors consistently range from 100 – 130% of the seated load. SLOCOG recently awarded RTA three-years’ of reimbursement Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) operating funds, as well as CMAQ capital funds to purchase two 57-passenger over-the-road coaches. Staff will work with our FTA partners to determine if the CMAQ operating funds can be used as soon as possible to implement additional express runs prior to when the new coaches arrive to address overcrowding issues on Route 9 and 10.

Runabout Ridership Gains and Runabout Client Census
Pursuant to the monthly ridership reports, Runabout ridership continues to grow at an alarming rate. The number of Runabout applications received has also increased significantly. Our Runabout fleet is currently at capacity on most weekdays. Runabout ridership year-to-date is up 18%, and monthly hours are up nearly 24% over the same period last year. Although our new scheduling software is providing increased efficiencies, we will need to increase Runabout service (vehicles and drivers) during FY14-15. It should be noted that federal regulations prohibit a pattern of ADA paratransit trip denials to certified ADA clients. The budget assumes a 20% increase in Runabout service levels, which – in conjunction with the COLA and CBA-based wage increases discussed above – has resulted in over $500,000 in higher costs in comparison to budgeted FY13-14 figures.

Capital Program
The focus of our financially constrained FY14-15 capital program will be funding the procurement of low-floor forty foot buses, over-the-road coaches, and Runabout vehicles. We have also programmed $52,000 for shop equipment for our maintenance department to improve efficiencies, $15,000 for facility improvements, miscellaneous computer equipment, and ITS improvements to our existing fleet and new fleet, including on-board camera security systems.

Also included is a projected five-year capital improvement program as part of the budget plan. While only the first year is financially constrained, the projects identified in the ensuing four years provide a snapshot of future capital needs and potential cost levels. It should be noted that staff has only identified replacement projects and easily identifiable on-going projects (i.e., computer needs and bus stop improvements) in the capital improvement program. With the exception of the two CMAQ-funded vehicles discussed above, no expansion vehicles are included. As the Board provides direction
to staff regarding possible expansion vehicles and/or facilities the capital improvement program will be updated.

Staff continues to aggressively pursue opportunities to pay down the existing loan for the 179 Cross Street building improvements project that began in 2006. Working closely with our partners at SLOCOG, staff has been able to secure State grants that have shortened the pay down period from 2021 to a recently-projected January 2017. That pay down month corresponds well with our current lease, which ends in February 2017; staff is currently in discussions with the property owner to extend our tenancy through 2020. Staff will continue to aggressively seek outside funding to plan and develop a long-term operations/maintenance facility.

**Conclusion and Staff Recommendation**

Fiscal Year 2014-15 will be another challenging year, although the challenges will be different than those faced in recent years – instead of being challenged with dire financial barriers this year, we will be challenged to implement a list of long-planned capital projects. We look forward to working with the Board, our stakeholders and our customers in providing the highest quality of transportation services to residents and visitors to our community. We believe that this budget reflects the path set by your Board in previous years and, although we would like to do more, we believe that this budget provides the optimum levels of service within the confines of existing resources.

The Staff recommends that the Board adopt the Fiscal Year 2014-15 budget as presented.
SAN LUIS OBISPO REGIONAL TRANSIT AUTHORITY
PROPOSED OPERATING REVENUE BUDGET FOR 2014/2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUNDING SOURCES:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL RESERVES</td>
<td>1,095,528</td>
<td>2,050,020</td>
<td>152,321</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>1,479,337</td>
<td>1,478,492</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>1,752,581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTIMATED FUND BALANCE</td>
<td>1,095,528</td>
<td>2,050,020</td>
<td>152,321</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>1,479,337</td>
<td>1,478,492</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>1,752,581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESS REQUIRED RESERVES FOR FISCAL YEAR</td>
<td>1,332,659</td>
<td>1,479,337</td>
<td>152,321</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>1,292,581</td>
<td>1,101,746</td>
<td>178,685</td>
<td>1,378,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASH FLOW REQUIREMENTS PER TDA</td>
<td>1,332,659</td>
<td>1,479,337</td>
<td>152,321</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>1,292,581</td>
<td>1,101,746</td>
<td>178,685</td>
<td>1,378,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFFSET RESERVE FOR JARC (SECTION 5316) LOSS BEGINNING IN 15/16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>460,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1,332,659</td>
<td>1,479,337</td>
<td>152,321</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>1,752,581</td>
<td>1,101,746</td>
<td>178,685</td>
<td>1,378,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUND BALANCE AVAILABLE</td>
<td>(237,131)</td>
<td>570,683</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>(273,245)</td>
<td>376,746</td>
<td>(178,685)</td>
<td>374,498</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NON TDA SOURCES**

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FARES</td>
<td>1,375,807</td>
<td>1,100,000</td>
<td>25,450</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>1,175,000</td>
<td>26,600</td>
<td>107,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAT MANAGEMENT CONTRACT</td>
<td>77,500</td>
<td>77,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>78,760</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY MANAGEMENT CONTRACT</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>87,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>80,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH COUNTY MANAGEMENT CONTRACT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,620</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>39,720</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY OPERATIONS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTEREST</td>
<td>5,635</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE TRANSIT ASSISTANCE (STA)</td>
<td>173,592</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>98,295</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>105,219</td>
<td>83,073</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL TRANSIT FUND (Administration)</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL TRANSIT FUND (Operating Funds)</td>
<td>225,120</td>
<td>203,366</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>472,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEDERAL TRANSIT ADM (FTA) (Section 5307) - San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>340,000</td>
<td>340,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>612,880</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEDERAL TRANSIT ADM (FTA) (Section 5311) - Operating</td>
<td>519,830</td>
<td>519,830</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>800,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEDERAL TRANSIT ADM (FTA) (Section 5316) - JARC</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>800,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEDERAL TRANSIT ADM (FTA) (Section 5307-North County) - Operating</td>
<td>956,180</td>
<td>621,198</td>
<td>23,360</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>593,520</td>
<td>247,850</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEDERAL TRANSIT ADM (FTA) (Section 5307-Santa Maria) - Operating</td>
<td>233,831</td>
<td>233,831</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>235,860</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEDERAL TRANSIT ADM (FTA) (Section 5307) - South County Operating</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>39,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUESTA CONTRIBUTION ROUTE 12</td>
<td>61,336</td>
<td>54,001</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>53,855</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUESTA CONTRIBUTION NORTH COUNTY</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18,580</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHQ OPERATING FUNDS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDG ALLOCATION FOR SENIOR SHUTTLE</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIAL EVENTS REVENUE/OTHER</td>
<td>121,915</td>
<td>102,019</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>105,080</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB TOTAL</td>
<td>4,781,484</td>
<td>3,683,965</td>
<td>124,745</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,060,394</td>
<td>132,819</td>
<td>426,828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL FUND BALANCE &amp; NON TDA FUNDING</td>
<td>4,544,335</td>
<td>4,254,648</td>
<td>124,745</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,787,149</td>
<td>503,565</td>
<td>248,143</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### FUNDING SOURCES:

#### TDA REQUIRED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Arroyo Grande</td>
<td>177,456</td>
<td>200,136</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>220,044</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Atascadero</td>
<td>292,903</td>
<td>329,610</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>362,885</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Grover Beach</td>
<td>135,343</td>
<td>152,345</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>167,117</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Morro Bay</td>
<td>105,554</td>
<td>118,917</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>130,508</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Paso Robles</td>
<td>306,801</td>
<td>349,842</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>385,870</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>730,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Pismo Beach</td>
<td>78,770</td>
<td>88,835</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>97,619</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>110,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>598,269</td>
<td>676,192</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>744,023</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>845,203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>2,338,189</td>
<td>1,840,745</td>
<td>597,490</td>
<td>2,025,396</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,300,831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDA Requirements Before 5311 Exchange</td>
<td>4,033,285</td>
<td>3,756,623</td>
<td>597,490</td>
<td>4,133,461</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,695,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Rural Transit Fund/5311 Exchange</td>
<td>(519,830)</td>
<td>(519,830)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(612,880)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(626,735)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net TDA Requirements</td>
<td>3,513,455</td>
<td>3,236,793</td>
<td>597,490</td>
<td>3,520,581</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,068,839</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### TOTAL FUNDING SOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8,057,808</td>
<td>7,491,441</td>
<td>722,235</td>
<td>159,119</td>
<td>8,307,730</td>
<td>509,565</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### FUNDING USES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>1,184,497</td>
<td>1,381,074</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>19,772</td>
<td>1,492,720</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Expense</td>
<td>167,257</td>
<td>133,954</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>73,690</td>
<td>118,480</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Contracts</td>
<td>252,500</td>
<td>84,120</td>
<td>87,500</td>
<td>118,480</td>
<td>80,500</td>
<td>118,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Delivery</td>
<td>5,775,197</td>
<td>5,792,294</td>
<td>624,735</td>
<td>6,522,840</td>
<td>401,310</td>
<td>844,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>1,915</td>
<td>1,915</td>
<td>1,915</td>
<td>1,915</td>
<td>1,915</td>
<td>1,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Funding Uses</td>
<td>7,379,451</td>
<td>7,491,441</td>
<td>722,235</td>
<td>159,119</td>
<td>8,307,730</td>
<td>509,565</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### SAN LUIS OBISPO REGIONAL TRANSIT AUTHORITY

**PROPOSED CAPITAL REVENUE BUDGET FOR 2014/2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAPITAL PROJECTS RESERVE</strong></td>
<td>288,479</td>
<td>540,660</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>520,400</td>
<td>109,960</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>444,960</td>
<td>20,660</td>
<td>35,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ESTIMATED FUND BALANCE</strong></td>
<td>288,479</td>
<td>540,660</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>520,400</td>
<td>109,960</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>444,960</td>
<td>20,660</td>
<td>35,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LESS REQUIRED RESERVES FOR FISCAL YEAR</strong></td>
<td>288,479</td>
<td>318,373</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>363,150</td>
<td>20,660</td>
<td>89,300</td>
<td>35,010</td>
<td>74,176</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>288,479</td>
<td>318,373</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>363,150</td>
<td>20,660</td>
<td>89,300</td>
<td>35,010</td>
<td>74,176</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FUND BALANCE AVAILABLE</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>222,287</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>157,250</td>
<td>89,300</td>
<td>35,010</td>
<td>74,176</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NON TDA SOURCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Transit Assistance (STA)</td>
<td>355,400</td>
<td>544,071</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>636,640</td>
<td>561,640</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 1B Funding - Safety &amp; Security</td>
<td>10,400</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>558,030</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 1B Funding - Property Purchase</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>800,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 1B Funding - Bus Replacement</td>
<td>181,787</td>
<td>961,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>407,750</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Transit Fund (Capital)</td>
<td>52,458</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>601,364</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Transit Adm (FTA) (Section 5307) - San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>100,800</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>249,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Transit Adm (FTA) (Section 5309) - State of Good Repair</td>
<td>466,640</td>
<td>1,900,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,336,640</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Transit Adm (FTA) (Section 5339) - State of Good Repair</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>162,220</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Transit Adm (FTA) (Section 5311) - Stimulus</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Transit Adm (FTA) (Section 5311f)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>336,580</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Transit Adm (FTA) (Section 5316) - JARC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Transit Adm (FTA) (Section 5317) - New Freedom</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Transit Adm (FTA) (Section 5307-North County)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>424,970</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>99,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Transit Adm (FTA) (Section 5307-South County)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>347,030</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>51,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMAQ Capital Funds</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,040,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>1,167,485</td>
<td>7,298,456</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,600,880</td>
<td>2,329,004</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL FUND BALANCE &amp; NON TDA FUNDING</strong></td>
<td>1,167,485</td>
<td>7,520,743</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,758,130</td>
<td>89,300</td>
<td>2,403,180</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET TDA REQUIREMENTS</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35,010</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL FUNDING SOURCES</strong></td>
<td>1,167,485</td>
<td>7,520,743</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,758,130</td>
<td>89,300</td>
<td>35,010</td>
<td>2,403,180</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FUNDING USES:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>859,223</td>
<td>6,412,481</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,215,000</td>
<td>89,300</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,860,050</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan Paydown</td>
<td>380,262</td>
<td>1,086,262</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>543,130</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>543,130</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL FUNDING USES</strong></td>
<td>1,167,485</td>
<td>7,520,743</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,758,130</td>
<td>89,300</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,403,180</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Administration and Service Delivery Totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>57,726</td>
<td>58,259</td>
<td>60,118</td>
<td>66,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>1,534,626</td>
<td>1,547,180</td>
<td>1,594,232</td>
<td>1,678,830</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Administration:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labor operations cost</td>
<td>594,701</td>
<td>654,090</td>
<td>731,454</td>
<td>753,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor - Administration Workers Comp operations cost</td>
<td>25,892</td>
<td>29,835</td>
<td>35,690</td>
<td>42,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Space Rental operations cost</td>
<td>405,247</td>
<td>402,332</td>
<td>416,190</td>
<td>474,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Insurance operations cost</td>
<td>11,590</td>
<td>15,255</td>
<td>16,186</td>
<td>16,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Technical Services operations cost</td>
<td>98,754</td>
<td>59,108</td>
<td>90,725</td>
<td>102,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development operations cost</td>
<td>9,649</td>
<td>11,162</td>
<td>16,250</td>
<td>25,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expense operations cost</td>
<td>161,178</td>
<td>180,340</td>
<td>183,670</td>
<td>249,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing and Reproduction hourly</td>
<td>60,131</td>
<td>84,875</td>
<td>92,300</td>
<td>115,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County Management Contract operations cost</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(6,620)</td>
<td>(39,720)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Management Contract operations cost</td>
<td>(175,000)</td>
<td>(175,000)</td>
<td>(87,500)</td>
<td>(80,500)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAT Management Contract operations cost</td>
<td>(77,500)</td>
<td>(77,500)</td>
<td>(77,500)</td>
<td>(78,760)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Administration</strong></td>
<td>1,114,642</td>
<td>1,184,497</td>
<td>1,410,846</td>
<td>1,581,630</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Service Delivery:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labor - Operations hourly</td>
<td>2,245,490</td>
<td>2,537,706</td>
<td>2,869,163</td>
<td>3,734,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor - Operations Workers Comp hourly</td>
<td>145,292</td>
<td>167,417</td>
<td>206,962</td>
<td>289,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor - Maintenance hourly</td>
<td>570,872</td>
<td>669,076</td>
<td>760,398</td>
<td>889,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor - Maintenance Workers Comp hourly</td>
<td>45,659</td>
<td>52,612</td>
<td>63,811</td>
<td>84,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel miles</td>
<td>1,304,258</td>
<td>1,263,454</td>
<td>1,490,155</td>
<td>1,555,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance miles</td>
<td>299,406</td>
<td>264,641</td>
<td>352,037</td>
<td>435,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Transportation (includes Senior Vans, Lucky Bucks, etc) n/a</td>
<td>70,095</td>
<td>75,950</td>
<td>81,700</td>
<td>74,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avila Trolley n/a</td>
<td>55,661</td>
<td>46,444</td>
<td>66,100</td>
<td>55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Shuttle n/a</td>
<td>71,386</td>
<td>73,633</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance (parts, supplies, materials) miles</td>
<td>484,524</td>
<td>494,176</td>
<td>536,934</td>
<td>555,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Contract Costs miles</td>
<td>143,620</td>
<td>130,088</td>
<td>127,202</td>
<td>94,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operations</strong></td>
<td>5,436,263</td>
<td>5,775,197</td>
<td>6,554,461</td>
<td>7,768,860</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Contingency

- Contingency hourly | 20,395 | - | 101,915 | 132,585 |

### Interest Expense

- Interest Expense operations cost | 189,494 | 167,257 | 133,954 | 73,690 |

### Management Contracts

- Management Contracts | 252,500 | 252,500 | 171,620 | 198,980 |

### TOTAL FUNDING USES

- TOTAL FUNDING USES | 7,013,294 | 7,379,451 | 8,372,795 | 9,755,745 |
## Capital Expenditures

### Capital/Studies:
- **Computer System Maintenance/Upgrades**
  - FY 2012-13: 13,493
  - FY 2013-14: 13,310
  - FY 2014-15: 36,400
  - FY 2015-16: 20,900
  - FY 2016-17: 21,950
  - FY 2017-18: 23,050
  - FY 2018-19: 24,200
- **Facility Improvements**
  - FY 2012-13: 187,820
  - FY 2013-14: 15,000
  - FY 2014-15: 25,000
  - FY 2015-16: -
  - FY 2016-17: -
  - FY 2017-18: 17,250
- **Maintenance Software and Maintenance Equipment**
  - FY 2012-13: 60,000
  - FY 2013-14: -
  - FY 2014-15: 41,000
  - FY 2015-16: -
  - FY 2016-17: -
  - FY 2017-18: 36,470
- **Tire Lease Buyout**
  - FY 2012-13: 5,500
  - FY 2013-14: -
  - FY 2014-15: -
  - FY 2015-16: -
  - FY 2016-17: -
  - FY 2017-18: -
- **Marking and Tethering Program**
  - FY 2012-13: 18,700
  - FY 2013-14: 52,000
  - FY 2014-15: -
  - FY 2015-16: -
  - FY 2016-17: -
  - FY 2017-18: 22,730
- **Specialized Maintenance Tools**
  - FY 2012-13: 12,650
  - FY 2013-14: 52,000
  - FY 2014-15: 25,000
  - FY 2015-16: 26,250
  - FY 2016-17: 27,560
  - FY 2017-18: 28,940
- **Backup Generator/Radios**
  - FY 2012-13: 34,100
  - FY 2013-14: 1,800
  - FY 2014-15: 3,150
  - FY 2015-16: -
  - FY 2016-17: -
  - FY 2017-18: -
- **Vehicle ITS/Camera System**
  - FY 2012-13: 461,787
  - FY 2013-14: 558,030
  - FY 2014-15: 50,000
  - FY 2015-16: -
  - FY 2016-17: -
  - FY 2017-18: 339,140
- **Bus Stop Improvements**
  - FY 2012-13: -
  - FY 2013-14: 61,750
  - FY 2014-15: 73,750
  - FY 2015-16: 31,500
  - FY 2016-17: 33,080
  - FY 2017-18: 34,730
  - FY 2018-19: 36,470
- **Bus Rehabilitation**
  - FY 2012-13: 24,824
  - FY 2013-14: -
  - FY 2014-15: 3,336,000
  - FY 2015-16: 185,000
  - FY 2016-17: 388,500
  - FY 2017-18: 407,930
  - FY 2018-19: -
- **Bus Procurement Reserve/Large Capital Repairs**
  - FY 2012-13: -
  - FY 2013-14: 44,779
  - FY 2014-15: -
  - FY 2015-16: -
  - FY 2016-17: -
  - FY 2017-18: -
  - FY 2018-19: -
- **Support Vehicles**
  - FY 2012-13: -
  - FY 2013-14: 102,500
  - FY 2014-15: 62,500
  - FY 2015-16: -
  - FY 2016-17: -
  - FY 2017-18: -
  - FY 2018-19: -
- **40' Coaches/Over the Road Coaches**
  - FY 2012-13: 494,240
  - FY 2013-14: 3,336,000
  - FY 2014-15: 3,865,710
  - FY 2015-16: 1,300,000
  - FY 2016-17: -
  - FY 2017-18: 1,215,506
  - FY 2018-19: -
- **Trolley replacement vehicles**
  - FY 2012-13: 88,255
  - FY 2013-14: -
  - FY 2014-15: 89,300
  - FY 2015-16: -
  - FY 2016-17: 325,000
  - FY 2017-18: -
  - FY 2018-19: 347,290
- **One Dial A Ride Vehicle**
  - FY 2012-13: -
  - FY 2013-14: -
  - FY 2014-15: 89,300
  - FY 2015-16: -
  - FY 2016-17: 325,000
  - FY 2017-18: -
  - FY 2018-19: -
- **Runabout Vehicles**
  - FY 2012-13: 218,291
  - FY 2013-14: 360,000
  - FY 2014-15: 191,000
  - FY 2015-16: -
  - FY 2016-17: 347,290
  - FY 2017-18: -
  - FY 2018-19: 464,960

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Capital Outlay</strong></td>
<td>859,223</td>
<td>4,078,316</td>
<td>5,304,300</td>
<td>1,885,050</td>
<td>1,261,500</td>
<td>1,699,186</td>
<td>571,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Loan Paydown</strong></td>
<td>308,262</td>
<td>1,108,262</td>
<td>543,130</td>
<td>543,130</td>
<td>271,570</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Property Purchase</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,534,165</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL FUNDING USES</strong></td>
<td>1,167,485</td>
<td>7,520,743</td>
<td>5,847,430</td>
<td>2,428,180</td>
<td>1,533,070</td>
<td>1,699,186</td>
<td>571,820</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SAN LUIS OBISPO REGIONAL TRANSIT AUTHORITY

### Route 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>10,801</td>
<td>11,560</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>12,620</td>
<td>12,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>330,482</td>
<td>329,700</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>330,350</td>
<td>338,610</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Administration:**

- **Total Administration (Net of Contracts):** 250,621

**Service Delivery:**

- **Labor - Operations (hourly):** 453,275
- **Labor - Operations Workers Comp (hourly):** 32,662
- **Labor - Maintenance (hourly):** 122,578
- **Labor - Maintenance Workers Comp (hourly):** 10,270
- **Fuel (miles):** 290,989
- **Insurance (miles):** 68,102
- **Maintenance (parts, supplies, materials) (miles):** 99,942
- **Maintenance Contract Costs (miles):** 23,674

**Total Operations:** 1,101,491

**Capital/Studies:**

- **Total Capital Outlay:** 1,326,140
- **Contingency (hourly):** 18,475
- **Interest Expense (operations cost):** 24,748

**TOTAL FUNDING USES:** 2,721,474

**TOTAL NON-CAPITAL EXPENDITURES:** 1,395,335
### SAN LUIS OBISPO REGIONAL TRANSIT AUTHORITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weekday</td>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>Miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10,777</td>
<td>352,786</td>
<td>9,690</td>
<td>19,770</td>
<td>11,860</td>
<td>349,270</td>
<td>358,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Administration (Net of Contracts)</td>
<td>257,712</td>
<td>221,670</td>
<td>13,880</td>
<td>8,390</td>
<td>243,940</td>
<td>251,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Delivery:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor - Operations</td>
<td>hourly</td>
<td>452,242</td>
<td>438,310</td>
<td>27,590</td>
<td>16,740</td>
<td>482,640</td>
<td>483,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor - Operations Workers Comp</td>
<td>hourly</td>
<td>32,588</td>
<td>34,780</td>
<td>2,190</td>
<td>1,330</td>
<td>38,300</td>
<td>43,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor - Maintenance</td>
<td>hourly</td>
<td>122,298</td>
<td>113,920</td>
<td>7,170</td>
<td>4,350</td>
<td>125,440</td>
<td>123,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor - Maintenance Workers Comp</td>
<td>hourly</td>
<td>10,246</td>
<td>10,720</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>11,800</td>
<td>13,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel</td>
<td>miles</td>
<td>310,628</td>
<td>267,530</td>
<td>16,650</td>
<td>9,990</td>
<td>294,170</td>
<td>289,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>miles</td>
<td>72,698</td>
<td>76,140</td>
<td>4,740</td>
<td>2,840</td>
<td>83,720</td>
<td>88,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance (parts, supplies, materials)</td>
<td>miles</td>
<td>106,687</td>
<td>96,310</td>
<td>5,990</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>105,900</td>
<td>101,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Contract Costs</td>
<td>miles</td>
<td>25,272</td>
<td>15,800</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>17,370</td>
<td>16,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operations</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,132,658</td>
<td>1,053,510</td>
<td>65,980</td>
<td>39,850</td>
<td>1,159,340</td>
<td>1,199,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital/Studies:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Capital Outlay</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,323,117</td>
<td>1,150,546</td>
<td>72,429</td>
<td>43,932</td>
<td>1,266,907</td>
<td>148,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>hourly</td>
<td>18,433</td>
<td>14,900</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>16,410</td>
<td>15,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Expense</td>
<td>operations cost</td>
<td>24,691</td>
<td>10,980</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>12,090</td>
<td>10,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL FUNDING USES</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,756,611</td>
<td>2,451,606</td>
<td>153,919</td>
<td>93,162</td>
<td>2,698,687</td>
<td>1,584,368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL NON-CAPITAL EXPENDITURES</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,433,494</td>
<td>1,301,060</td>
<td>81,490</td>
<td>49,230</td>
<td>1,431,780</td>
<td>1,436,113</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SAN LUIS OBISPO REGIONAL TRANSIT AUTHORITY

### Route 12, 14 and 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weekday</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>10,951</td>
<td>9,210</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>10,790</td>
<td>11,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>330,398</td>
<td>278,130</td>
<td>27,590</td>
<td>20,820</td>
<td>326,540</td>
<td>334,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Administration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Administration (Net of Contracts)</td>
<td>252,549</td>
<td>203,520</td>
<td>19,880</td>
<td>15,240</td>
<td>238,640</td>
<td>245,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service Delivery</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor - Operations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>459,574</td>
<td>416,600</td>
<td>40,260</td>
<td>31,210</td>
<td>488,070</td>
<td>488,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor - Operations Workers Comp</td>
<td>33,116</td>
<td>33,060</td>
<td>3,190</td>
<td>2,480</td>
<td>38,730</td>
<td>43,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor - Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>124,281</td>
<td>108,280</td>
<td>10,460</td>
<td>8,110</td>
<td>126,850</td>
<td>125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor - Maintenance Workers Comp</td>
<td>10,412</td>
<td>10,190</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>11,930</td>
<td>13,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>290,915</td>
<td>234,260</td>
<td>23,240</td>
<td>17,540</td>
<td>275,040</td>
<td>270,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>68,084</td>
<td>66,670</td>
<td>6,610</td>
<td>4,990</td>
<td>78,270</td>
<td>82,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance (parts, supplies, materials)</td>
<td>99,917</td>
<td>84,330</td>
<td>8,370</td>
<td>6,310</td>
<td>99,010</td>
<td>94,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Contract Costs</td>
<td>23,668</td>
<td>13,840</td>
<td>1,370</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td>16,250</td>
<td>15,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,109,908</td>
<td>987,230</td>
<td>94,480</td>
<td>72,440</td>
<td>1,134,150</td>
<td>1,134,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital/Studies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Capital Outlay</td>
<td>1,344,569</td>
<td>1,093,553</td>
<td>105,675</td>
<td>81,927</td>
<td>1,281,155</td>
<td>149,882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>18,731</td>
<td>14,160</td>
<td>1,370</td>
<td>1,060</td>
<td>16,590</td>
<td>15,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Expense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations cost</td>
<td>25,091</td>
<td>10,440</td>
<td>1,010</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>12,230</td>
<td>10,163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL FUNDING USES</strong></td>
<td>2,750,909</td>
<td>2,288,903</td>
<td>222,415</td>
<td>171,447</td>
<td>2,682,765</td>
<td>1,555,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL NON-CAPITAL EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td>1,406,340</td>
<td>1,195,350</td>
<td>116,740</td>
<td>89,520</td>
<td>1,401,610</td>
<td>1,405,983</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SAN LUIS OBISPO REGIONAL TRANSIT AUTHORITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Adopted Budget FY 2013-14</th>
<th>Total Proposed Budget FY 2014-15</th>
<th>Projected Budget FY 2015-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Runabout</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>25,937</td>
<td>30,940</td>
<td>35,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>509,405</td>
<td>588,030</td>
<td>676,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administration:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Administration (Net of Contracts)</td>
<td>507,375</td>
<td>579,140</td>
<td>670,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service Delivery:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor - Operations</td>
<td>1,088,454</td>
<td>1,399,520</td>
<td>1,571,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor - Operations Workers Comp</td>
<td>hourly</td>
<td>78,432</td>
<td>111,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor - Maintenance</td>
<td>hourly</td>
<td>294,347</td>
<td>363,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor - Maintenance Workers Comp</td>
<td>hourly</td>
<td>24,661</td>
<td>34,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel</td>
<td>448,531</td>
<td>495,270</td>
<td>546,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>104,972</td>
<td>140,960</td>
<td>166,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance (parts, supplies, materials)</td>
<td>miles</td>
<td>154,051</td>
<td>178,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Contract Costs</td>
<td>miles</td>
<td>36,492</td>
<td>29,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operations</strong></td>
<td>2,229,938</td>
<td>2,752,360</td>
<td>3,095,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital/Studies:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Capital Outlay</td>
<td>884,517</td>
<td>742,177</td>
<td>86,553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>44,364</td>
<td>47,590</td>
<td>50,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Expense</td>
<td>59,427</td>
<td>35,070</td>
<td>32,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL FUNDING USES</strong></td>
<td>3,725,620</td>
<td>4,156,337</td>
<td>3,935,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL NON-CAPITAL EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td>2,841,103</td>
<td>3,414,160</td>
<td>3,848,524</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SAN LUIS OBISPO REGIONAL TRANSIT AUTHORITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line 83, CMAQ Trips</th>
<th>Total Budget</th>
<th>Line 83 Proposed Budget</th>
<th>CMAQ Trips Proposed Budget</th>
<th>Total Proposed Budget</th>
<th>Projected Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>1,653</td>
<td>1,060</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>1,670</td>
<td>1,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>71,158</td>
<td>53,640</td>
<td>31,000</td>
<td>84,640</td>
<td>86,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Administration (Net of Contracts)</td>
<td>31,953</td>
<td>29,950</td>
<td>17,280</td>
<td>47,230</td>
<td>48,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Delivery:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor - Operations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hourly</td>
<td>69,377</td>
<td>47,950</td>
<td>27,590</td>
<td>75,540</td>
<td>75,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor - Operations Workers Comp</td>
<td>4,999</td>
<td>3,810</td>
<td>2,190</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor - Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hourly</td>
<td>18,761</td>
<td>12,460</td>
<td>7,170</td>
<td>19,630</td>
<td>19,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor - Maintenance Workers Comp</td>
<td>1,572</td>
<td>1,170</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>1,840</td>
<td>2,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>miles</td>
<td>62,655</td>
<td>45,180</td>
<td>26,110</td>
<td>71,290</td>
<td>70,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>miles</td>
<td>14,663</td>
<td>12,860</td>
<td>7,430</td>
<td>20,290</td>
<td>20,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance (parts, supplies, materials)</td>
<td>21,519</td>
<td>16,260</td>
<td>9,400</td>
<td>25,660</td>
<td>24,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Contract Costs</td>
<td>5,097</td>
<td>2,670</td>
<td>1,540</td>
<td>4,210</td>
<td>4,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operations</td>
<td>198,644</td>
<td>142,360</td>
<td>82,100</td>
<td>224,460</td>
<td>223,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital/Studies:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Capital Outlay</td>
<td></td>
<td>426,320</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>426,320</td>
<td>1,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hourly</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Expense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>operations cost</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL FUNDING USES</td>
<td>230,597</td>
<td>598,630</td>
<td>99,380</td>
<td>698,010</td>
<td>1,572,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL NON-CAPITAL EXPENDITURES</td>
<td>230,597</td>
<td>172,310</td>
<td>99,380</td>
<td>271,690</td>
<td>272,520</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B-1-17
## County Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2013-14</th>
<th>FY 2014-15</th>
<th>FY 2015-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Administration (Net of Contracts)</td>
<td>97,500</td>
<td>90,500</td>
<td>90,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Delivery:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor - Operations</td>
<td>hourly</td>
<td>255,072</td>
<td>159,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor - Operations Workers Comp</td>
<td>hourly</td>
<td>18,380</td>
<td>8,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor - Maintenance</td>
<td>hourly</td>
<td>68,978</td>
<td>42,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor - Maintenance Workers Comp</td>
<td>hourly</td>
<td>5,779</td>
<td>2,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel</td>
<td>miles</td>
<td>69,000</td>
<td>37,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>miles</td>
<td>19,100</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Transportation (includes Senior Vans)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>81,700</td>
<td>74,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avila Trolley</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>66,100</td>
<td>55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance (parts, supplies, materials)</td>
<td>miles</td>
<td>48,744</td>
<td>10,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Contract Costs</td>
<td>miles</td>
<td>11,546</td>
<td>2,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operations</td>
<td></td>
<td>644,400</td>
<td>401,310</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Capital/Studies:

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Capital Outlay</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>89,300</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>hourly</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Expense</td>
<td>operations cost</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL FUNDING USES**

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>741,900</td>
<td>598,865</td>
<td>531,870</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL NON-CAPITAL EXPENDITURES**

|                      | 741,900    | 509,565    | 531,870    |
## SAN LUIS OBISPO REGIONAL TRANSIT AUTHORITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Administration (Net of Contracts)</td>
<td>91,000</td>
<td>27,630</td>
<td>118,630</td>
<td>121,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Delivery:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor - Operations</td>
<td>hourly 412,020</td>
<td>146,460</td>
<td>558,480</td>
<td>588,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor - Operations Workers Comp</td>
<td>hourly 34,260</td>
<td>7,170</td>
<td>41,430</td>
<td>52,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor - Maintenance</td>
<td>hourly 48,850</td>
<td>14,270</td>
<td>63,120</td>
<td>65,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor - Maintenance Workers Comp</td>
<td>hourly 6,810</td>
<td>1,430</td>
<td>8,240</td>
<td>9,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel</td>
<td>miles 88,050</td>
<td>16,510</td>
<td>104,560</td>
<td>107,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>miles 20,610</td>
<td>3,860</td>
<td>24,470</td>
<td>26,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance (parts, supplies, materials)</td>
<td>miles 30,240</td>
<td>5,670</td>
<td>35,910</td>
<td>36,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Contract Costs</td>
<td>miles 7,160</td>
<td>1,340</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>8,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operations</strong></td>
<td>648,000</td>
<td>196,710</td>
<td>844,710</td>
<td>895,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital/Studies:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Capital Outlay</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>hourly 12,260</td>
<td>2,570</td>
<td>14,830</td>
<td>14,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Expense</td>
<td>operations cost -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL FUNDING USES</strong></td>
<td>751,260</td>
<td>226,910</td>
<td>978,170</td>
<td>1,057,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL NON-CAPITAL EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td>751,260</td>
<td>226,910</td>
<td>978,170</td>
<td>1,032,180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AGENDA ITEM: B-2

TOPIC: RTA Reserve Funds Policy

ACTION: Adopt Policy

PRESENTED BY: Geoff Straw, Executive Director

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Adopt New RTA Reserve Funds Policy

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION:

This staff report presents a recommended RTA Reserve Funds Policy and its various components. This policy will provide direction to staff when developing annual budgets and, more importantly, to guide decisions when either funding shortfalls or windfalls result in relatively large deviations from projections.

After presenting a reserve fund “white paper” at the January 8th RTA Board meeting and considering input from the public and from Board members, including the March 5th Board meeting, staff forwarded the document to each jurisdiction’s Finance Manager. Based on all input received, staff is recommending that two distinct reserved funds be established and maintained:

1. Cash Flow Reserve Fund, and
2. Capital Projects Reserve Fund

It should be noted that the policy does not include a separate Operating Reserve Fund, as was discussed in previous draft documents. Instead, should RTA encounter an operating fund shortfall in the future, RTA would appeal to SLOCOG to access its regional LTF reserve account, which is set annually by the SLOCOG Board. SLOCOG’s LTF reserve account is intended to assist any jurisdiction in the County with a transportation-related emergency funding shortfall.

As explained in the attached recommended policy document, each reserve fund balance should be reviewed annually during the budget development process to reflect the most recent financial information available. The allocations budgeted for each of these reserve funds would be included in the annual budget and the proposed use of any reserves would be accompanied, when feasible, with a plan for replenishment within a reasonable period of time.

Staff Recommendation
Adopt the RTA Reserve Funds Policy.
This policy provides direction to staff on two reserve funds that should be addressed when developing annual budgets. More importantly this policy will guide RTA on decisions when either funding shortfalls or windfalls result in relatively large deviations from budget projections.
An important consideration of this policy is how the two different reserve funds presented below should be used. The Cash Flow Reserve Fund is self-explanatory; it is intended to be used to fund those projects and programs authorized in the annual budget. However, this policy assumes staff will follow existing procurement and other administrative policies/procedures when using the Capital Projects Reserve Fund. For example, RTA staff must obtain Board approval prior to contracting to purchase a replacement bus – and part of that approval process includes staff’s recommendation on how the replacement bus would be funded. In this example, staff would identify FTA participation of 80% and use of the Capital Projects Reserve Fund to cover the remaining 20%.

This policy also assumes that an emergency operating funding shortfall may require petition to access SLOCOG’s LTF Reserve account. The SLOCOG LTF Reserve account is developed annually by staff and is adopted by the SLOCOG Board. It is intended to assist SLOCOG jurisdictions when faced with a transportation-related emergency that requires additional financial assistance.

Another important consideration is the intended limits on flexibility of moving funds from one reserve to another. It is understood that the RTA Executive Director can authorize the use of up to $10,000 from either of the two reserve funds for another RTA intended purpose, as long as that use is expressly reported by the Executive Director at the next regularly-scheduled RTA Board meeting. Any single use of a reserve fund requiring greater than $10,000 will require prior authorization in writing (electronic messages permitted) from the RTA Board President, as well as a report to the RTA Board at its next regularly scheduled meeting. Any projected use of a reserve fund that represents greater than 25% of the fund balance will require staff to develop a written action plan to replenish the fund and/or to reduce service levels to bring expenses back in-line with projected revenues.

Cash Flow Reserve Fund

RTA will maintain a Cash Flow Reserve representing 25% of annual budgeted net operating costs. Budgeted net operating costs are defined as budgeted total operating costs less budgeted fare revenues. The Cash Flow Reserve Fund is necessary because of two facts:

1. Transportation Development Act funds are disbursed quarterly, and those funds are provided by SLOCOG to RTA at the end of each quarter, and
2. FTA funds are provided on a reimbursement basis only.
The primary funding source for the Cash Flow Reserve Fund is the statewide Transportation Development Act (TDA) program, which is comprised of two components:

1. The Local Transportation Fund, which is derived from a ¼ percent of the general sales tax collected statewide. LTF is collected by the California State Board of Equalization, and distributed to each county based on sales receipts. Each county then distributes LTF to jurisdictions according to population.

2. The State Transit Assistance fund, which is derived from the statewide sales tax on diesel fuel. The STA funds are appropriated by the Legislature to the State Controller’s Office. That Office then allocates the tax revenue, by formula, to planning agencies and other selected agencies. State statute requires that 50% of STA funds be allocated according to population and 50% be allocated according to operator revenues from the prior fiscal year.

In practice, RTA has funded a “Cash Flow Requirements Per TDA” amount equal to 25 of the net operating cost for the past several years. The unused amount from the prior fiscal year is carried over to the next fiscal year. RTA staff will present the proportional use of TDA for each jurisdiction in the annual budget document.

Capital Projects Reserve Fund

RTA will establish and maintain a Capital Projects Reserve Fund that is based on 20% of the five-year annual average capital projects cost. This 20% amount represents the typical local match required for Federal Transit Administration funded capital projects. If there is a significant future change in Federal funding, the Capital Projects Reserve Fund policy would need to be reconsidered.

RTA staff will provide a five-year Capital Improvement Program as part of the annual budget-making process. This CIP will identify those smaller projects that assume 100% local funding, as well as those larger projects that assume 80% FTA participation.

In order to minimize the financial impact of establishing this new formal Capital Projects Reserve Fund, staff will present a three-year plan to attain the required amount as part of the FY14-15 budget. Once the Capital Projects Reserve Fund is fully established, staff will adjust it annually as part of the budget-making process.
SAN LUIS OBISPO REGIONAL TRANSIT AUTHORITY
April 16, 2014
STAFF REPORT

AGENDA ITEM: B-3

TOPIC: Revised RTA Runabout No-Show Policy

ACTION: Approve

PRESENTED BY: Geoff Straw
Executive Director

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approve Revised RTA Runabout No-Show Policy

RTAC RECOMMENDATION: Approve

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION:

This staff report provides discussion on a necessary revision to the RTA Runabout No-Show Policy, which was originally adopted in March 2012 and subsequently revised in January 2013. As a result of a Triennial Review finding by the Federal Transit Administration, RTA must amend its current Runabout No-Show Policy to ensure that a pattern or practice of missed-trips by passengers has impacted our operations prior to suspending a rider’s service.

Attached is a revised RTA Runabout No-Show Policy document that considers the proportion of trips that a rider misses when determining if a suspension should apply. Staff from FTA has reviewed the draft revised policy and determined that it meets the requirements of our Triennial Review finding and is in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. In the meantime, RTA has ceased enforcing the sanctions identified in the existing Runabout No-Show Policy (see the attached document with the “Suspended Policy” watermark); we have instead committed to sending notification letters to frequent no-show riders explaining how their missed trips impact our operations and result in an ineffective use of public funds.

Staff introduced this draft policy at the March 5th Board meeting and considered comments from the public and Board members in the recommended revised policy document. Staff also reached out to disability advocacy groups in the County to solicit further input; no problems with the revised document were submitted to staff.

Staff Recommendation
Approve the amended policy as presented, with implementation beginning no earlier than July 1, 2014.
RUNABOUT NO-SHOW POLICY

In an effort to improve the availability of Runabout appointment time slots, to ensure that public dollars are carefully spent on Runabout services, and to make RTA Runabout service more efficient for passengers, RTA has adopted a policy that is designed to deter a pattern of late cancellations and no-shows.

Any Runabout passenger that does not show for a ride, or who cancels less than 2 hours prior to a scheduled trip will receive a no-show penalty. A pattern or practice of no-shows and late cancels can result in suspension of service.

This policy directs RTA staff to consider the percentage of no-shows and late cancellations within a rolling 31-day period to establish if a pattern of no-shows and/or late cancellations is present. If a pattern is present, a warning letter or suspension notification letter will be issued to the customer. The proportion of no-show violations, as well as the related suspension periods, is listed below.

**Riders are allowed the following no-shows and late cancellations, in a rolling 31-day period, before being subject to suspension:**

- 1 to 14 trips per month – maximum of 2 no-show penalties per 31-day period
- 15 to 39 trips per month – maximum of 4 no-show penalties per 31-day period
- 40 to 59 trips per month – maximum of 6 no-show penalties per 31-day period
- 60+ trips per month – maximum of 8 no-show penalties per 31-day period

**If a rider exceeds these limits, they are subject to the following schedule for suspension of service:**

- 1\(^{st}\) violation – letter of warning
- 2\(^{nd}\) violation – 7 day suspension
- 3\(^{rd}\) violation – 14 day suspension
- 4\(^{th}\) violation – 21 day suspension
• 5th violation – 28 day suspension

**Right to Appeal**
Persons receiving a suspension notification letter will have the right to appeal prior to implementation of the suspension. To file an appeal, a customer or his/her representative must submit to RTA a written explanation of why the customer should not be suspended along with any supporting facts and statements. The appeal must be received within 30 days of the date on the suspension notification letter from RTA. Appeals should be sent to:

Regional Transit Authority Runabout
179 Cross Street, Suite A
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401
Attention: RTA Operations Manager

RTA will conduct an appeal hearing within two weeks of receiving the request, and customers will be permitted to continue to ride the Runabout bus until the final determination is made by the RTA Operations Manager (typically within ten working days of the appeal hearing). The appeal hearing will be conducted by RTA operations, customer service, and administrative staff members. The intent of the hearing is to validate instances of no-shows and late cancellations, and to determine if a temporary suspension is warranted due to a pattern of no-shows and late cancellations.

Penalties will begin accruing July 1, 2014. All no-shows accumulated prior to July 1 will be nullified, and Runabout customers will begin with a clean slate.
NO-SHOW POLICY

In an effort to improve the availability of appointment time slots and make Runabout service more efficient for passengers, RTA has a policy that is designed to limit the number of late cancellations and no-shows.

Any Runabout passenger who is a no-show or cancels their trip after 5 p.m. the day before their schedule pick-up will be given penalty points. If a passenger accumulates a specific number of points over a period of time, their service will be temporarily suspended. The number of points given for late cancellations and no-shows and suspension periods are listed below.

Penalty Assessment

- Any person cancelling a ride after 5 p.m. the day prior to a scheduled pick-up will be assessed one (1) point.
- Any person cancelling a ride within three (3) hours to 30 minutes prior to the beginning of a pick-up window will be assessed two (2) points.
- Any person cancelling a trip within 30 minutes prior to the beginning of the pick-up window or not showing up at all within five minutes after our arrival will be assessed three (3) points.

Accumulated points for late cancellations and “no-shows” shall result in the following suspensions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accumulated Points</th>
<th>Within a Period of</th>
<th>Suspension Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>30 days</td>
<td>15 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>60 days</td>
<td>15 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>120 days</td>
<td>30 days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Right to Appeal**

Persons receiving suspensions will have the right to appeal. To file an appeal, a customer or his/her representative must send a written explanation of why the customer should not be suspended along with any supporting facts and statements. The appeal must be received within 30 days of the suspension notification. Appeals should be sent to:

Regional Transit Authority  
179 Cross Street, Ste. A  
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401  
Attention: RTA Customer Service Specialist

Individuals will be permitted to ride the bus during the appeal process, which lasts about 30 days. Rulings shall be deemed final.

Penalties will begin accruing March 1, 2013. All tardy and no-shows prior to March 1 will be nullified and members will begin with a clean slate.
San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority
Executive Committee Meeting
Minutes 2/19/2014
C-1

Members Present:  
Shelly Higginbotham, President  
Debbie Arnold, Vice President  
Frank Mecham, Past President

Members Absent: 

Staff Present:  
Geoff Straw, Executive Director  
Tania Arnold, CFO & Director of Administration  
Anna Mafort-Lacy, Administrative Assistant  
Tim McNulty, County Counsel  
Doug Moody, Intern

Also Present:  
Ron DeCarli, SLOCOG  
Eliane Wilson, SLOCOG  
Aida Nicklin, SLOCOG  
Eric Greening, Atascadero

1. **Call to Order and Roll Call:**
President Shelly Higginbotham called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. Silent Roll Call was taken and a quorum was present.

2. **Public Comments:**
Mr. Eric Greening, Atascadero, requested that RTA make a better offer to the bus operators. I know you may not be able to do everything in the first year, but perhaps you can increase the wages in incremental steps. The drivers are far below parity with drivers in other places with similar cost of living. Secondly, we need a Route 10 stop in Shell Beach. In order to get to Coastal Commission meeting at the Cliffs Hotel that began at 8:30 a.m., I had to leave Atascadero at 5:48 a.m. I got to see the Cliffs Hotel from the bus at about 6:50 a.m., as we
headed to the Outlets. The South County Transit bus dropped me at 7:48, about an hour after first seeing the hotel. There is a real need for a Shell Beach stop coming from the North.

3. **Information Items**
   A. Information Items:

   **A-1 Executive Director’s Report**

   *Mr. Straw* began his report by announcing Mechanic *Mr. Fred Carlberg* is the latest Employee of the Quarter. He was the overwhelming winner.

   We just completed a training class of four, who graduated on Friday and began revenue service on Monday.

   The Cities of Atascadero and Paso Robles ratified their consolidation agreements last month. Staff met with most of the First Transit employees in those cities to begin the recruitment process. We will be hiring two operations supervisors, up to nine bus operators and one Special Projects Coordinator. All of these will be solely funded by North County.

   *President Higginbotham* asked if these are new positions. Will you be hiring from within the system? *Mr. Straw* answered that these will be internal hires with first dibs going to current drivers in Paso Robles and Atascadero. The Special Projects Coordinator will be *Mr. Michael Seden-Hansen*. One of the operations supervisors will likely be the current supervisor in Paso Robles, *Ms. Terry Gillespie*, who has many great skills. We will have one more supervisor/dispatcher who will be funded by the North County budget and will be available to all current RTA staff first.

   *Mr. Straw* announced *Mr. Seden-Hansen* as the new chair and welcomed *Mr. Greening* as the new Vice Chair and for the Regional Transit Advisory Committee (RTAC).

   RTA took possession of three Ford Focus staff cars and two pickup trucks for maintenance. These vehicles will replace trucks and cars previously surplused by the County that RTA purchased used and are long past their usable life.

   The SLOCOG Board adopted its Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) grant award at the February 5 meeting. The goal is to implement new express service with these funds in August 2015. If the State will allow us, we may try to expedite these services using existing vehicles, assuming overcrowding issues continue. Once CMAQ is fully executed by the state, we can order the vehicles, probably this summer.

   RTA and Cambria area officials continue to work together to provide trolley service for six annual community events. On December 6, we boarded 278 passengers as part of the
Hospitality Night service and 52 passengers on January 25th for the Cambria Art and Wine Festival.

FTA Administrator Peter Rogoff was recently nominated as the Acting Undersecretary for Policy of the US Department of Transportation. He is very transit-focused.

The FTA Triennial Review was recently completed at the RTA facilities. A total of 18 areas of compliance were tested and RTA was found to be fully compliant in 17 areas. However, the Runabout No-Show Policy was found to not contain appropriate clauses that clearly define a pattern or practice of passenger no-shows and late cancellations. It was found to be too stringent. One of our agenda items is to review and revise this policy. Staff plans to adopt a revised policy no later than August 22.

Google Transit has been a useful Internet-based trip planning feature on the RTA website. Mr. Straw briefly described how this feature works and that it’s prominently placed on our home page. Recently Google implemented a new component that shows the daily span of service.

Staff will once again present at the May Board meeting a two-year operating budget and five-year rolling capital plan. For the first six months of the fiscal year, overall non-capital expenditures were at 44.9% of budget. Farebox Recovery Ratio (FRR) is down slightly from last year at 20.44%. Fixed Route ridership is up 6.5% from last year.

Runabout ridership is up 21.1% over this time last year. It had as many operating hours as fixed routes, which is a financially unsustainable trend. Costs will continue to rise with this service as the population ages and more people become aware of the service. Productivity (passenger boardings per hour of service) is 4.3% lower than in the prior year.

Ms. Eliane Wilson noted the Runabout approval process is very lenient. Mr. Straw agreed and said one suggestion is to implement a process that is much more stringent. He noted this is very costly and only the largest transit agencies have an in-house eligibility process.

President Higginbotham suggested adding an education component for doctors to better understand the service. Mr. Straw said staff will consider this and other ways to cap costs on this service.

RTA will have closed session at the March 5 Board meeting for both facility planning and labor negotiations.

Mr. Straw concluded the Executive Directors report.
Mr. Greening clarified the RTAC meetings will now be held on Thursday afternoons. Ms. Tania Arnold affirmed they are scheduled to begin at 2 p.m. on scheduled Thursdays.

A-2. RTA Bus Stop Improvement Prioritization Report

Mr. Straw introduced Mr. Doug Moody, an intern who was instrumental in assessing all RTA bus stops around the County. The report seeks to prioritize RTA fixed-route bus stop improvements so that, to the extent possible, every stop served by an RTA fixed-route is ADA accessible, safe, convenience and comfortable. He pointed to page 9 of the draft report that had some key findings. He noted over 75% of the fixed route boardings and alightings occurred at 20% of the bus stops. This helps us prioritize improvements.

Staff recommends the Committee accept this report and direct staff to submit it to local jurisdictions served by RTA fixed routes.

Mr. Straw concluded his report.

President Higginbotham opened public comment.

Mr. Greening said he looked forward to reviewing the report and discussed issues surrounding bright ambient lighting in the bus. It can be very difficult to see when de-boarding at dark bus stops.

A-3. Draft Revised Runabout No-Show Policy

Mr. Straw briefly reviewed the current No-Show policy, which is currently suspended. This was adopted in March 2012 and implemented in March 2013. Since then, staff sent out 32 suspension notifications. Of those, 28 suspensions were lifted after the appeal hearing.

The FTA said the policy does not include necessary language indicating a pattern of no-shows and late cancellations. We want to look at the percentage in addition to the number of miss-outs. Staff developed a new draft policy that mirrors what other transit agencies are doing to address this issue. He reviewed the revisions and violations. Staff submitted this new policy to FTA for input.

Mr. Straw concluded his report.

4. Action Items

B-1. RTA FY14-15 and FY15-16 Budget Assumptions

Mr. Straw announced the budget assumptions for the fiscal years 2014-15 and 2015-16. Staff is again developing a two-year operating budget and five-year rolling capital budget. He asked Ms. Tania Arnold to present the budget assumptions.
Ms. Arnold reviewed the objectives, including maintaining services levels, increasing reserves and continuing to work on efficiencies. Staff is looking at ways to flush out the reserve policy for everyone, including North County. We are evaluating options for the five-year capital improvement policy. We are looking at what the needs are and how to fund them. For example, we are rolling out many new fixed route buses, which require a considerable local match. Staff continues to address overcrowding issues and looks forward to implementing additional service with the CMAQ grant. North County consolidation is expected to begin June 1, 2014. This and the Collective Bargaining agreement are itemized in the budget assumptions.

Staff is working very closely with SLOCOG on State Transit Assistance (STA) and FTA funding. We are taking a more conservative approach to STA as those funds have been fluctuating greatly. We will be using STA for capital as much as possible and not relying on it for operating. Local Transit Fund (LTF) projections are closely monitored and we are considering how much we can use for the operating budget. Ms. Arnold said staff was successful in getting about $800,000 in Job Access Reverse Commute (JARC) funding for FY14-15 for Route 10 and North Coast. However, this will be the last year and it will create a significant gap in the FY15-16 budget.

She next reviewed expenses. Runabout service hours are expected to increase due to demand. Part of our internal objectives for the next fiscal year is to do some serious analysis related to patterns and data. Mr. Straw noted we must have the capacity to accommodate the demand for this service. We try to control expenses where possible, such as overtime.

Ms. Arnold said staff continues to look at the Strategic Business Plan, Short Range Transit Plan and efficiencies and various goals and objectives we wish to address.

Fuel is budgeted at $4.15 per gallon, slightly lower than in recent years. The new vehicles have a diesel exhaust fluid (DEF) additive that is used to lower emissions, but it adds to the effective cost per gallon. This is included in the fuel line item.

Staff is proposing one additional full-time Bus Operator for Runabout. All other core RTA service positions remain unchanged. The positions and other expenses related to the North County Consolidation will be listed as a separate and distinct column.

Vice President Debbie Arnold noted insurance costs remain uncertain and pointed to the estimated 10% liability premium increase, 20% increase to worker’s compensation and 8% for healthcare costs. This adds up to a chunk of money. Mr. Straw said Workers Compensation overall for this fiscal year totals about $300,000 out of a $6.5M operating budget, which is a relatively small piece. Ms. Arnold added there were some losses but we went to mediation for one large-loss employee injury last week and expect to get some
money back to offset these losses. The California Transit Insurance Pool (CalTIP) has been very successful in keeping liability insurance costs down. We will have a much better idea of how much annual premiums may increase in April.

Ms. Arnold reviewed the proposed budget calendar with the committee and concluded the report.

Mr. Greening addressed the final bullet point on page B-1-4: “Staff assumes Bus Operator and Mechanic annual wage increases similar to those in the last year of the recently-expired CBA for the next two fiscal years”. The CBA is currently at an impasse as the offer was voted down. This is not a real budget assumption until an offer is approved. Perhaps to overcome wage increases, the reserves will build slower. I would encourage you not to assume you will get approval on offers similar to the one just voted down.

Mr. Straw responded that this is a snapshot in time. Today, this is all we can assume. Staff is meeting with the Union next Monday. As we bring these documents forward according to the schedule, we will update these numbers accordingly. We have to assume something in order to move forward.

Past President Frank Mecham moved to approve Staff Recommendation to approve budget assumptions and budget calendar, Item B-1 and Vice President Arnold seconded. The motion passed on a voice vote.

B-2 RTA Reserve Policy
Mr. Straw briefly reviewed the three reserve funds: Cash Flow Reserve, Capital Projects Reserve and Operating Reserve. He recommended increasing the Executive Director’s authorized spending limit from $5,000 to $10,000 as discussed on page 1, third paragraph of the policy. Staff uses the latter number for competitive bidding on the procurement policy.

RTA will continue to maintain a cash flow reserve amount of 25% of the net operating costs. This is really used for TDA purposes.

Capital Projects Reserves will be based upon 20% of the five-year annual average capital projects cost and represents the typical local-match required for Federal funding.

For the Operating Reserve fund, staff recommends 5% of the “Service Delivery” line-item of the budget. This includes expenses such as fuel, bus operator wages and benefits, maintenance, etc. This fund is expected to be fully funded in three years.

Mr. Straw concluded his report.
Vice President Arnold moved to approve Staff Recommendation to approve the Reserve Policy, Item B-2 and Past President Mecham seconded. The motion passed on a voice vote.

B-3 North County Transit Consolidation Service Changes

Mr. Straw said this has been a long and interesting process and represents follow-up recommendations made by the North County Transit Study of 2012. Concerns about the impact to Cal Poly warrant more discussion. We had a public meeting yesterday on campus and had 15-20 people attend. Cal Poly was great about notifying faculty, staff and students. We also received some feedback before the meeting.

He reviewed the options related to Cal Poly listed on page B-3-3. Staff recommends option 1, based upon the ridership numbers we see. This would eliminate Cal Poly Route 9 local service. In June 2013, Route 9 southbound service was eliminated from Cal Poly after noon. No public comments were observed at last night’s meeting about this proposed change. There is some duplication of service with San Luis Obispo Transit.

President Higginbotham asked if RTA staff has discussions with SLO Transit about ridership and redundancy concerns. Mr. Straw affirmed ongoing communication and said SLO Transit staff members also attended yesterday’s meeting. People most affected are residents of Santa Margarita and South Atascadero, as express service doesn’t cover these areas. These people will have to travel to downtown Atascadero to catch the southbound bus back to South Atascadero and Santa Margarita. People understand this. What we heard most was the need for more express runs.

Mr. Greening expressed concerns about the Peach Tree stop being eliminated. People working at the motels and other businesses around there would have to go downtown in order to get in any outbound Route 9. Mr. Straw confirmed this. Mr. Greening requested the last trip go up Grand Avenue to service this stop. He also suggested RTA use the Amtrak stop on campus for the last two trips of the day. Mr. Straw agreed.

President Higginbotham verified staff recommendation is Option 1 with these two changes.

Mr. Straw briefly talked about future expansion of Route 9, which will be done using the CMAQ grant. We currently have overcrowding on some runs and can look at trying to add extra service using operating funds before the new buses arrive. He also discussed changing the child fare policy to be 44 inches and shorter, rather than age-based. This will be easier for the drivers to figure out.

We are adding a new zone for Templeton so that travel between Atascadero and Templeton will remain the same as it is now on the El Camino Shuttle. RTA will modify the cash fare
between Paso Robles and San Luis Obispo from $2.50 to $3.00 to bring it in line with Route 10. Paso Express will eliminate its 31-day and daily passes.

RTA held three sets of public meetings: Two in Paso Robles; two in Atascadero and one at Cal Poly. The consolidation will begin June 1 but RTA will continue to operate Cal Poly service through finals, June 15.

Mr. Greening said the bus died at Santa Barbara road on the way to the Atascadero City Hall Public meeting. There may have been people on that bus who intended to give input.

Past President Frank Mecham moved to approve Staff Recommendation to approve North County Transit consolidation service changes previously discussed, Item B-3 and Vice President Arnold seconded. The motion passed on a voice vote.

5. Consent Agenda Items

C-1 Executive Committee Meeting Minutes of December 11, 2013

C-2 RTA Customer Perception Survey

Mr. Straw briefly reviewed the report with the Committee. These will be added to the Strategic Business Plan later this year.

Vice President Arnold moved to approve Consent Agenda Items and Past President Mecham seconded. The motion passed on a voice vote.

6. Agenda Review:

Mr. Straw reviewed the Board agenda for the Board meeting of March 5, 2014.

7. Closed Session Items:

None

8. Open Session:

None

9. Adjournment: President Higginbotham adjourned the meeting at 11:30 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted, Acknowledged by,

__________________________  __________________________
Anna Mafort-Lacy            Shelly Higginbotham
Administrative Assistant    RTA President
San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority
Executive Committee Meeting
Minutes 3/12/2014
C-2

Members Present:   Shelly Higginbotham, President
                  Debbie Arnold, Vice President
                  Frank Mecham, Past President

Members Absent:   None

Staff Present:    Geoff Straw, Executive Director
                  Tim McNulty, County Counsel

Also Present:     Ron DeCarli, SLOCOG
                  Pete Rodgers, SLOCOG
                  Aida Nicklin, SLOCOG
                  Eric Greening, Atascadero

1. **Call to Order and Roll Call:**
President Shelly Higginbotham called the meeting to order at 10:25 a.m., immediately following adjournment of the SLOCOG Executive Committee meeting. Silent Roll Call was taken and a quorum was present.

2. **Public Comments:**
   None

3. **Information Items**
   None
4. **Action Item**

**B-1  RTA FY13-14 Budget Amendment – Capital Project**

**Mr. Straw** provided information on the proposed increase in LTF funds for the purchase of 40 Prado into the FY13-14 capital budget plan. Since RTA has already secured $1 million in State of California Proposition 1B funds to purchase property for RTA’s long-term administration/operations/maintenance facility needs, the proposed increase of $535,000 in LTF funds would be accounted for as part of a budget amendment at the joint SLOCOG/RTA Board meeting on April 2, 2014.

**Mr. Straw** also informed the Committee that RTA would need to complete additional site evaluation work to ensure no environmental clean-up would be necessary, since the current U-Haul rental agency on the site was previously a Mobil gas station. Staff has been able to verify that the Mobil fuel tanks, dispensers and piping was appropriately removed, and “no further action” certification was provided by City of San Luis Obispo staff in the 1990s. However, staff cannot find documentation that the waste oil tank was properly removed. Staff is proposing 3rd party consultant soil sample borings and testing to ensure the waste oil tank was properly removed and contamination (if any) is clearly identified in the property sale documents. **President Higginbotham** suggested that RTA should secure a commitment from CAPSLO to share in the cost of the soils testing. **Mr. Straw** stated that RTA would seek that commitment from CAPSLO.

**Mr. Eric Greening**, Atascadero, stated that LTF funds should be used for operations and not for capital projects – particularly if service cuts would need to be implemented in order to complete the proposed capital project. **Mr. Greening** would not want to create the understanding that RTA could not “go back to the well” if operating costs unexpectedly increase.

**Past President Frank Mecham** moved to approve Staff Recommendation to approve budget amendment and **Vice President Arnold** seconded. The motion passed on a voice vote.

5. **Consent Agenda Items**

   None

6. **Agenda Review:**

   **Mr. Straw** reviewed the Board agenda for the special joint RTA/SLOCOG Board meeting on April 2, 2014.

7. **Closed Session Items:**

   None
8. **Open Session:**
   None

9. **Adjournment:** President Higginbotham adjourned the meeting at 10:35 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted, Acknowledged by,

__________________________   __________________________
Geoff Straw     Shelly Higginbotham
RTA Executive Director    RTA President