CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

PUBLIC COMMENTS: This portion of the agenda is reserved for any members of the public to directly address the San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority (RTA) Board on any items not on the agenda and within the jurisdiction of the Board. Comments are limited to three minutes per speaker. The Board 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.

A. INFORMATION AGENDA

A-1 Executive Director’s Report (Receive)
A-2 Strategic Business Plan Performance Measures Report (Receive)

B. ACTION AGENDA

B-1 Reimbursement for South County Area Transit Use of RTA Vehicles (Approve)
B-2 Unlimited Access on RTA Fixed Route Services for RTAC Members (Approve)
C. **CONSENT AGENDA:** (Roll Call Vote) the following items are considered routine and non-controversial by staff and will be approved by one motion if no member of the RTA or public wishes an item be removed. If discussion is desired by anyone, the item will be removed from the consent agenda and will be considered separately. Questions of clarification may be made by RTA Board members, without the removal of the item from the Consent Agenda. Staff recommendations for each item are noted following the item.

C-1 Procurement of ITS Technologies (Approve)
C-2 RTA Board Meeting Minutes of May 1, 2013 (Approve)
C-3 RTA Executive Committee Minutes of April 17, 2013 (Approve)
C-4 Title VI Plan for August 1, 2013 – July 13, 2016

D. **CLOSED SESSION ITEMS** (JOINT SESSION WITH SLOCOG BOARD)

D-1-1 It is the intention of the Board to meet in closed session concerning the following items:

**CONFERENCE WITH REAL PROPERTY NEGOTIATOR (Gov. Code Sec. 54956.8):**

Agency Negotiators: Geoff Straw (RTA), Ronald De Carli (SLOCOG), Peter Rodgers (SLOCOG)

Under Negotiation/Discussion: Price and Terms of Payment

Properties:

179 Cross Street, San Luis Obispo, CA (APN: 053-257-032) Negotiating Party: LTC of SLO, Ltd.

40 Prado Road, San Luis Obispo, CA (APN: 053-022-014) Negotiating Party: Rescal SLO193 LLC

1114 Higuera Street, San Luis Obispo, CA (APN: 002-436-009) Negotiating Party: Blum Michael L Tre Etal


1041 Mill Street, San Luis Obispo, CA (APN: 002-323-023) Negotiating Party: SLO Council of Governments

E. **BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS**

ADJOURNMENT

Next RTA meeting: September 4, 2013
SAN LUIS OBISPO REGIONAL TRANSIT AUTHORITY
July 10, 2013
STAFF REPORT

AGENDA ITEM: A-1

TOPIC: Executive Director’s Report

PRESENTED BY: Geoff Straw

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Information

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION:

Operations:
RTA took delivery of its first new Gillig low-floor bus on May 17th. This “pilot bus” is the first of seven for RTA and three for South County Transit (SCT), and it has been tested extensively to ensure it meets the performance standards that staff included as part of the procurement documents. Following a rigorous vehicle inspection process and a focused training program for all RTA and SCT Bus Operators, bus number 1301 entered revenue service on June 6, 2013. We eagerly await delivery of the remaining nine buses in early August.

RTA began a new Bus Operator training class of seven candidates on May 28, 2013. Based on our standard six-week training period, it is expected these new Bus Operators will be ready for revenue service during the first week of July. We conducted a “shake-up” on May 11th, which is a twice-yearly event where the Bus Operators choose their driving shifts according to seniority. The shake-ups correspond with planned service changes (i.e., elimination of Route 14 during the summer and the corresponding implementation of the summer Cambria Trolley), and the next shake-up is scheduled for August. The final issue related to safety/training is that RTA provided CHP-required 8-hour Verification of Transit Training classes for Commercial Drivers Licensed employees in April, May and June.

The CHP conducted its TDA-mandated annual terminal inspection of RTA and SCT buses and facilities, as well as driver records, from June 3rd through June 5th. No deficiencies were noted during the on-site review, and we received the final report at the end of June. Congratulations to our staff for working so hard to ensure another successful inspection.

Maintenance:
Unfortunately, the engine in RTA bus number 155 failed in May. Although this bus has traveled almost 900,000 miles since we bought it in 1999 (FTA standards for replacement eligibility are 12 years or 500,000 miles, whichever comes first), staff is currently swapping the engine from bus number 157 – which was destroyed in a non-
preventable crash in April 2012 – to get it back on the road. This is the first time this type of work is being completed in-house, and it should be ready for service by the end of July. However, the temporary loss of that bus put a lot of pressure on the maintenance and operations staff over the past few weeks, given that RTA has a very slim spare ratio with the previous loss of RTA bus number 148 and SCT’s need for one or more buses on a continual basis. Fortunately, the arrival of the new Gillig low-floor bus, as well as the dedicated efforts of our operations and maintenance staff, has ensured that RTA continues to provide 100% service delivery during this challenging period.

**Service Planning & Marketing:**
RTA staff continues to participate with stakeholders and the consultants engaged in the following planning efforts:

- **North County Transit Plan** – The Cities of Atascadero and Paso Robles have endorsed the Term Sheet, and we are currently updating the cost models with more recent information. We plan to develop an operating agreement (similar to the RTA/County agreement) in the coming weeks and to bring it to the RTA Board in September (or possibly November).

- **North Coast Surveys Study** – This study is surveying passengers on Morro Bay transit and RTA Routes 12, 14 and 15. The spring on-board surveys were conducted the week of April 22nd, and the consultant team is planning the Morro Bay Trolley summer surveys in early July.

RTA is working with SLOCOG to help plan the July 11th SLOCOG Social Services Transportation Summit at the Madonna Inn. The intent of the summit is to help area specialized transportation providers coordinate with the agencies that serve persons that typically use Runabout, Ride-On and other demand response services. A key goal from RTA’s perspective is to help area agency staff members understand the relatively high per-passenger cost of providing Runabout services and to assist in finding the lowest-cost yet responsive services that can meet their clients’ transportation needs.

RTA recently hired Outreach Assistant interns that have been visiting businesses throughout the county to share information about RTA and SCT services. These interns also helped Rideshare with Bike Month Promotion, and worked at some of the transportation-related outreach events in the region to promote summer transit services. Some of these interns will also be conducting focused passenger surveys, including on the Summer Avila Trolley in July to start benchmarking service performance and customer satisfaction, as well as trip origin/destination and trip purpose. Staff is actively promoting the Youth Ride Free Program with radio trade ads on El Dorado and ESPN stations. Press Releases have been widely picked up throughout the county, in the Tribune, the Cambrian and Paso Press, as well as good coverage in the Tolosa Press papers. Finally, staff continues to sell advertising space on RTA and SCT buses.
RTA worked with Cambria area officials to finalize plans for summer Cambria Trolley services, which began on May 25th and will operate through Labor Day. New and improved Cambria Trolley marketing materials were developed and distributed, and staff continues to work with area officials and area media outlets to promote the service.

RTA Intern (and Cal Poly graduate student) Alex Fuchs completed a Professional Project (akin to a Master’s Thesis) on RTA services that included a general public survey. The goal of the survey was to ask non-riders to try to identify new services that would have the greatest potential of increasing ridership among commuters, particularly focusing on North County commuters from Paso Robles, Templeton and Santa Margarita where extra service could be added as part of the North County Consolidation Plan.

A total of 614 surveys were received. Survey participants included:
- 77 Cal Poly employees
- 14 Rideshare email newsletter recipients
- The balance of over 500 San Luis Obispo City and County employees – sent from an email from the HR department of each.

RTA wishes to thank our partners for their help in administering the email surveys to employees and the high rate of participation that we received, especially from County employees. Results showed that a high percentage of downtown workers that live in the North County would be more likely to ride new express service with faster travel times to travel to and from downtown SLO. This could be achieved with: fewer bus stops; possibly an express bus between Paso Robles and downtown SLO; and with a Paso Robles, Templeton and Atascadero Transit Center trip that would go straight downtown, and then make connections for Cal Poly riders.

Staff is still awaiting word from Caltrans whether or not our FTA Section 5304 planning grant application to conduct a joint Short Range Transit Plan study effort with SLO Transit will be funded. As noted earlier, this joint effort would permit us to better coordinate our service and capital plans, while also studying some of the impediments of travel between our two agencies’ routes.

Staff is currently conducting a comprehensive assessment of each RTA and SCT fixed route bus stop. We have modified a survey instrument developed by CalTIP (our liability insurance provider), using input from County and RTA staff, to quantify on-site and adjacent amenities and to prioritize opportunities for improvements within the public right of way. We expect to complete the surveys and begin circulating a draft report by the end of July; we will provide a summary at the September 4th RTA Board meeting.

The STA-funded Summer Beach service was officially launched on June 7, and the early ridership results are as depicted in the table below for the first ten days of service.
As shown, we are not yet meeting the goals established for the service, although it is still in its infancy. We will continue to monitor the service closely and to work with local officials in the North County and in the Morro Bay / Cayucos area to determine ways to attract more riders.

Staff continues to work with area press to promote this new/experimental service, which will operate through August 24th.

**Finance and Administration:**

Preliminary year-to-date April 2013 financials are included in the attached report. As depicted, overall non-capital expenses totaled 76.9% of the annual budget, yet we completed 83.3% of the year. Staff continues to closely monitor vehicle maintenance and fuel expenses, which together comprise almost one-third of the annual Service Delivery budget ($1,921,239 of $6,053,335). Vehicle maintenance and fuel costs booked through April currently represent 81.1% of the budgeted amount. As noted in previous discussions, SCT’s use of RTA buses has not been correctly accounted in the current year RTA or SCT budget; a recommended method to resolve this issue will be discussed as Item B-2. If your Board accepts staff’s recommendation to transfer $67,466.20 in maintenance-related costs to SCT, the year to date percentage changes from 81.1% to 77.6%. Staff also continues to closely monitor costs related to the operation of Runabout service. Runabout has accumulated $2,095,958 in year-to-date operating expenses through April 2013, equating to 89.1% of the annual Runabout operating budget ($2,351,598, as depicted on page B-1-26 of the FY12-13 budget).

Fixed route ridership continues to remain strong with 622,097 passenger boardings through April 2013 in comparison to 575,282 in the previous year, representing a year-over-year increase of 8.1%. Runabout ridership also continues to increase. Year-to-date FY12-13 Runabout ridership totaled 30,020, compared to 28,291 during the same period in FY11-12. That equates to a year to date 6.1% increase – which represents a declining increase as depicted in the graph below. We will continue to closely monitor

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>% Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Ridership</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>3,450</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Hours/Day</td>
<td>7.74</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Daily Ridership</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Productivity</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Fare Revenues</td>
<td>$94.47</td>
<td>$2,588.00</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Cash Fare/Passenger</td>
<td>$0.33</td>
<td>$0.75</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Days/Season</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Days Operated So Far</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farebox Recovery Ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent non-youth</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>70.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
these ridership trends to determine if changes to our service plan should be considered in future months. See the graphs on the next page for details.

The overall RTA farebox recovery ratio (FRR) of 19.1% continues to exceed the minimum 15.8% “blended” FRR required by SLOCOG under TDA law. The graphs below depict ridership trends by month for Route 9, Route 10, other RTA fixed routes, and Runabout over the past three fiscal years. Similar to the discussion at the May 2013 Board meeting, with the exception of only a few instances, FY12-13 monthly ridership on Routes 9 and 10, as well as on Runabout, is higher year-over-year. However, monthly FY12-13 ridership on the other fixed routes (Routes, 12, 14 and 15) generally mirrors the ridership of FY11-12, but exceeds ridership experienced in FY10-11.

Productivity (number of passenger boardings divided by the number of service hours) remains very strong and typically above the goal of 21 passenger-boardings/hour, as depicted in the graph below.

At your January 12 Board meeting, staff reported on the operations-based performance standards identified in the RTA Strategic Business Plan. Staff will present results on the remaining metrics (see Item A-2), and a summary of those results will be included in future Executive Director reports.

At your May 1 meeting, the RTA Board adopted the Stipend Policy for Board members from the member cities. However, the motion did not include unlimited fixed route access for RTAC members as suggested by staff – despite deliberations that appeared to include support for that notion. As such, staff is bringing that specific issue up for clarification as Item B-2.

On July 2, the US Department of Treasury delayed implementation of the employer mandate from 2014 to 2015. Staff is recommending that RTA continue with our budget
plan to implement medical benefits in FY13-14 for the ten Bus Operators that would otherwise have become eligible by working greater than 30 hours per week. This is included as Item B-3 in the agenda.

RTA and SCT staff members are working cooperatively to finalize the scope of work for an Intelligent Transportation System program procurement, which is included as Item C-4 in the Agenda packet. As presented in the staff report, this ITS system will use a GPS-based automatic vehicle location program to provide dispatchers/supervisors with real-time information, and will provide vehicle arrival times to passengers. The system will also automatically announce the next bus stop for riders on the bus, which is especially helpful for persons with visual impairments. The system will also automatically record passenger boardings and alightings by location to assist with passenger amenity planning and system capacity needs by route / bus stop. Finally, on-bus surveillance systems are included in the recommended program.

The next RTA Employee of the Quarter barbecue is scheduled for July 19 from 11:30AM until 1:00PM. We will also acknowledge the 4-Year Anniversary of RTA’s assuming in-house operations and vehicle maintenance, which officially began on August 1, 2009. We hope that all RTA Board members can join us – the Bus Operators really enjoy the chance to meet the RTA decision-makers in an informal setting.

RTA Facility Planning
Staff has working with a local real estate appraiser to develop a commercial appraisal of our operations/maintenance facility at 179 Cross Street. This will be discussed under Item D-1 during a joint RTA/SLOCOG Board meeting in Closed Session.
### SAN LUIS OBISPO REGIONAL TRANSIT AUTHORITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adopted Budget FY 2012-13</th>
<th>March Actual</th>
<th>April Actual</th>
<th>April Variance</th>
<th>Year to Date Total Budget FY 2012-13</th>
<th>Percent of Total Budget FY 2012-13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>61,187</td>
<td>4,977</td>
<td>5,099</td>
<td>(12,155)</td>
<td>78.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>1,054,777</td>
<td>132,890</td>
<td>129,565</td>
<td>134,793 (5,228)</td>
<td>1,274,906 (62.00%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administration:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor operations cost</td>
<td>736,692</td>
<td>51,287</td>
<td>61,391</td>
<td>50,908 (10,483)</td>
<td>529,866 (71.93%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor - Administration Workers Comp operations cost</td>
<td>33,081</td>
<td>2,423</td>
<td>2,757</td>
<td>2,423 (334)</td>
<td>24,989 (75.54%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Space Rental operations cost</td>
<td>401,278</td>
<td>30,074</td>
<td>33,440</td>
<td>30,074 (3,366)</td>
<td>342,419 (85.33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Insurance operations cost</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>15,255 (117.35%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Technical Services operations cost</td>
<td>127,520</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11,477</td>
<td>1,491 (9,986)</td>
<td>28,717 (22.52%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development operations cost</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>(425)</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>2,032 (1,032)</td>
<td>7,745 (77.45%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expense operations cost</td>
<td>190,685</td>
<td>17,517</td>
<td>15,890</td>
<td>16,601 (711)</td>
<td>143,149 (75.07%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing and Reproduction hourly</td>
<td>5,272</td>
<td>6,667</td>
<td>5,780</td>
<td></td>
<td>62,373 (77.74%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Management Contract operations cost</td>
<td>(175,000)</td>
<td>(14,583)</td>
<td>(14,583)</td>
<td>(14,583)</td>
<td>145,833 (81.33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAT Management Contract operations cost</td>
<td>(77,500)</td>
<td>(6,458)</td>
<td>(6,458)</td>
<td>(6,458)</td>
<td>(64,583) (83.33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Administration</strong></td>
<td>1,339,756</td>
<td>85,105</td>
<td>111,580</td>
<td>88,266 (23,314)</td>
<td>944,095 (70.47%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service Delivery:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor - Operations</td>
<td>2,606,717</td>
<td>196,429</td>
<td>217,236</td>
<td>194,440 (22,787)</td>
<td>2,026,171 (77.73%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor - Operations Workers Comp</td>
<td>185,537</td>
<td>13,599</td>
<td>15,481</td>
<td>13,599 (1,872)</td>
<td>140,239 (75.59%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor - Maintenance</td>
<td>654,862</td>
<td>50,559</td>
<td>54,572</td>
<td>52,099 (2,473)</td>
<td>537,304 (82.05%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor - Maintenance Workers Comp</td>
<td>58,336</td>
<td>4,273</td>
<td>4,861</td>
<td>4,273 (589)</td>
<td>44,067 (75.54%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel</td>
<td>1,143,884</td>
<td>113,555</td>
<td>119,574</td>
<td>111,778 (7,796)</td>
<td>1,097,054 (76.46%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>276,335</td>
<td>22,772</td>
<td>23,028</td>
<td>22,750 (278)</td>
<td>227,641 (82.38%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Transportation (includes Senior Vans, Lucky Bucks, etc)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>6,304</td>
<td>6,660</td>
<td>6,090 (570)</td>
<td>63,840 (79.88%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avila Trolley</td>
<td>66,100</td>
<td>1,140</td>
<td>5,508</td>
<td>4,062 (1,446)</td>
<td>25,358 (38.36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Shuttle</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>5,081</td>
<td>6,667</td>
<td>5,081 (1,586)</td>
<td>61,505 (76.88%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance (parts, supplies, materials)</td>
<td>486,355</td>
<td>59,855</td>
<td>40,530</td>
<td>48,844 (8,314)</td>
<td>461,392 (94.87%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Contract Costs</td>
<td>124,283</td>
<td>5,992</td>
<td>10,357</td>
<td>7,627 (2,730)</td>
<td>105,666 (85.02%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operations</strong></td>
<td>6,052,335</td>
<td>479,250</td>
<td>504,485</td>
<td>479,023 (33,212)</td>
<td>4,792,237 (79.13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital/Studies:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer System Maintenance/Upgrades hourly</td>
<td>6,678</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Capital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automatic Ticket Machine</td>
<td>69,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transmission Jack</td>
<td>7,480</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheel Alignment Tool</td>
<td>1,430</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opacity Tester</td>
<td>6,820</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coolant Flush Machine</td>
<td>4,290</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camera System</td>
<td>61,787</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Rehabilitation</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24,824 (24.82%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Procurement Reserve</td>
<td>29,894</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven 40' Coaches</td>
<td>3,326,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Dial A Ride Vehicle</td>
<td>95,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five Low Floor Runabout Vans</td>
<td>224,510</td>
<td>6,667</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7,510 (2,710)</td>
<td>140,049 (62.38%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Capital Outlay</strong></td>
<td>3,932,889</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>10,013</td>
<td>(10,013)</td>
<td>252,128 (6.44%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8,333</td>
<td>8,333 (8,333)</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Expense operations cost</td>
<td>168,585</td>
<td>14,099</td>
<td>14,049</td>
<td>13,644 (405)</td>
<td>141,522 (83.95%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan Paydown</td>
<td>308,262</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>154,131 (50.00%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Contracts</td>
<td>252,500</td>
<td>21,042</td>
<td>21,042</td>
<td>21,042 (210,417)</td>
<td>103,333 (83.33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL FUNDING USES</strong></td>
<td>12,155,327</td>
<td>690,295</td>
<td>639,488</td>
<td>603,598 (50,804)</td>
<td>6,492,524 (52.42%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL NON-CAPITAL EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td>7,912,176</td>
<td>397,795</td>
<td>398,986</td>
<td>398,986 (14,583)</td>
<td>6,088,277 (76.90%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SAN LUIS OBISPO REGIONAL TRANSIT AUTHORITY
#### YEAR TO DATE THRU APRIL 30, 2013 - WEEKDAYS ONLY
#### CURRENT FISCAL YEAR - 2012/2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUES:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FARES</strong></td>
<td>262,252</td>
<td>286,921</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>217,760</td>
<td>23,236</td>
<td>26,429</td>
<td>82,540</td>
<td>899,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ROUTE REVENUES</strong></td>
<td>262,252</td>
<td>286,921</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>217,760</td>
<td>23,236</td>
<td>26,429</td>
<td>82,540</td>
<td>899,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENDITURES:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADMINISTRATION</strong></td>
<td>177,357</td>
<td>178,605</td>
<td>1,434</td>
<td>117,267</td>
<td>1,434</td>
<td>42,227</td>
<td>19,429</td>
<td>546,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MARKETING</strong></td>
<td>18,464</td>
<td>18,594</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>12,208</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>4,395</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54,904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPERATIONS/CONTINGENCY</strong></td>
<td>524,603</td>
<td>535,718</td>
<td>4,203</td>
<td>341,369</td>
<td>341,369</td>
<td>128,233</td>
<td>64,607</td>
<td>1,630,239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FUEL</strong></td>
<td>230,888</td>
<td>248,982</td>
<td>1,710</td>
<td>140,508</td>
<td>140,508</td>
<td>62,446</td>
<td>41,104</td>
<td>741,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INSURANCE</strong></td>
<td>41,646</td>
<td>44,909</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>25,346</td>
<td>25,346</td>
<td>11,267</td>
<td>7,417</td>
<td>133,682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td>992,959</td>
<td>1,026,808</td>
<td>7,797</td>
<td>636,698</td>
<td>636,698</td>
<td>248,568</td>
<td>132,557</td>
<td>3,106,861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FAREBOX RATIO</strong></td>
<td>26.41%</td>
<td>27.94%</td>
<td>8.03%</td>
<td>34.20%</td>
<td>34.20%</td>
<td>10.63%</td>
<td>62.27%</td>
<td>28.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RIDERSHIP</strong></td>
<td>181,646</td>
<td>190,126</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>157,653</td>
<td>157,653</td>
<td>61,475</td>
<td>248,568</td>
<td>132,557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SERVICE MILES</strong></td>
<td>239,347.70</td>
<td>258,109.30</td>
<td>1,999.20</td>
<td>145,647.50</td>
<td>145,647.50</td>
<td>64,720.30</td>
<td>42,642.00</td>
<td>768,324.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SERVICE HOURS</strong></td>
<td>7,820.00</td>
<td>7,875.37</td>
<td>66.98</td>
<td>5,169.73</td>
<td>5,169.73</td>
<td>2,762</td>
<td>1,1267</td>
<td>7,417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RIDERS PER MILE</strong></td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RIDERS PER HOUR</strong></td>
<td>23.23</td>
<td>24.14</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>30.50</td>
<td>30.50</td>
<td>44.27</td>
<td>8.85</td>
<td>8.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COST PER PASSENGER</strong></td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>32.76</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>15.09</td>
<td>18.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBSIDY PER PASSENGER</strong></td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>30.13</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>13.49</td>
<td>6.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SAN LUIS OBISPO REGIONAL TRANSIT AUTHORITY
### YEAR TO DATE THRU APRIL 30, 2013
#### CURRENT FISCAL YEAR - 2012/2013

<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>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUES:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FARES</strong></td>
<td>16,459</td>
<td>9,550</td>
<td>19,466</td>
<td>10,906</td>
<td>19,466</td>
<td>10,906</td>
<td>12,329</td>
<td>8,809</td>
<td>2,489</td>
<td>83,776</td>
<td>983,541</td>
<td>85,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ROUTE REVENUES</strong></td>
<td>16,459</td>
<td>9,550</td>
<td>19,466</td>
<td>10,906</td>
<td>19,466</td>
<td>10,906</td>
<td>12,329</td>
<td>8,809</td>
<td>2,489</td>
<td>83,776</td>
<td>983,541</td>
<td>85,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENDITURES:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADMINISTRATION</strong></td>
<td>12,295</td>
<td>8,112</td>
<td>11,493</td>
<td>7,061</td>
<td>8,392</td>
<td>8,062</td>
<td>8,412</td>
<td>5,158</td>
<td>68,985</td>
<td>615,763</td>
<td>476,376</td>
<td>1,092,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MARKETING</strong></td>
<td>1,281</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>1,198</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>7,120</td>
<td>62,024</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>62,024</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPERATIONS/CONTINGENCY</strong></td>
<td>36,232</td>
<td>24,029</td>
<td>34,341</td>
<td>21,095</td>
<td>23,343</td>
<td>25,528</td>
<td>15,644</td>
<td>204,426</td>
<td>1,309,043</td>
<td>3,143,708</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FUEL</strong></td>
<td>15,883</td>
<td>10,730</td>
<td>15,912</td>
<td>9,020</td>
<td>9,461</td>
<td>12,533</td>
<td>7,640</td>
<td>90,851</td>
<td>832,109</td>
<td>238,786</td>
<td>1,070,895</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INSURANCE</strong></td>
<td>2,860</td>
<td>1,937</td>
<td>2,865</td>
<td>2,482</td>
<td>1,708</td>
<td>2,257</td>
<td>1,379</td>
<td>17,230</td>
<td>71,753</td>
<td>222,665</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td>68,552</td>
<td>45,634</td>
<td>65,809</td>
<td>40,376</td>
<td>49,606</td>
<td>30,347</td>
<td>204,426</td>
<td>3,495,473</td>
<td>3,095,958</td>
<td>5,591,431</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FAREBOX RATIO</strong></td>
<td>24.01%</td>
<td>20.93%</td>
<td>29.58%</td>
<td>27.01%</td>
<td>27.46%</td>
<td>20.30%</td>
<td>7.60%</td>
<td>21.56%</td>
<td>28.14%</td>
<td>4.06%</td>
<td>19.11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RIDEHSIP</strong></td>
<td>9,969</td>
<td>5,746</td>
<td>10,796</td>
<td>5,790</td>
<td>5,338</td>
<td>2,107</td>
<td>1,447</td>
<td>48,319</td>
<td>622,097</td>
<td>31,020</td>
<td>653,117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SERVICE MILES</strong></td>
<td>16,309.90</td>
<td>11,048.40</td>
<td>16,340.00</td>
<td>10,032.00</td>
<td>9,933.00</td>
<td>9,741.60</td>
<td>7,867.20</td>
<td>94,141.50</td>
<td>862,465.70</td>
<td>412,440.00</td>
<td>1,274,905.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SERVICE HOURS</strong></td>
<td>540.51</td>
<td>356.40</td>
<td>505.25</td>
<td>310.20</td>
<td>368.94</td>
<td>354.20</td>
<td>226.60</td>
<td>3,031.90</td>
<td>27,144.08</td>
<td>21,008.94</td>
<td>48,153.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RIDERS PER MILE</strong></td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COST PER PASSENGER</strong></td>
<td>6.88</td>
<td>7.94</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>6.97</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>8.13</td>
<td>20.97</td>
<td>8.04</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>67.57</td>
<td>8.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBSIDY PER PASSENGER</strong></td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>21.75</td>
<td>6.31</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>64.82</td>
<td>6.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AGENDA ITEM:    A-2

TOPIC:      RTA Operations Performance Report

PRESENTED BY:  Tania Arnold, CFO and Director of Administration

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:  Information

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION:

At the January 2013 RTA Board meeting, staff provided a presentation on the five Service Quality and Efficiency performance standards as detailed under the 2012-2014 RTA Strategic Business Plan adopted in October 2011. Four of the Service Quality and Efficiency performance standards are objective and easily measurable/reportable on a quarterly basis, while the remaining standard is subjective and will be reported annually. Staff is now presenting the remaining five sections of the Strategic Business Plan, as follows:

1. Revenue and Resources (three objective and one subjective standards)
2. Safety (five objective standards)
3. Human Resources (two objective and two subjective standards)
4. Fleet and Facility (four objective and one subjective standards)
5. Leadership (all subjective standards)

The narrative below will primarily address the objective standards, with a cursory discussion on the subjective elements.

Significant findings from this review are as follows:

1. Most performance standards have been met or exceeded.

2. Our risk management results are mixed. The number of preventable vehicle-related collisions varies, with year to date FY12-13 results exceeding the adopted standard. Overall Worker’s Compensation claims exceed the standard, although lost-time injuries are well below the adopted standard.

3. Due to competing budget and staffing priorities, RTA did not complete a passenger and/or general public survey in the past two years. As such, we were unable to accurately discern if we met standards relating to quality of service perceptions.
Regional Transit Authority Standards of Excellence: Service Quality and Efficiency

Summary: We will deliver dependable, customer focused and efficient transit services to the communities that we serve. Further, we will look for opportunities to deploy innovative new service within the resources available.

Standard 1: Fixed Route passengers per revenue vehicle service hour will be 21 or greater.
   Measurement: Objective.

RTA achieved an overall FY11-12 productivity of 21, and we have neared or surpassed the standard of 21 passenger boardings per hour during each month of FY12-13.

Standard 2: Service delivery rate shall be 99% or greater.
   Measurement: Objective.

As long as a scheduled fixed route bus trip is delivered ahead of the next scheduled bus trip, then service is considered “delivered” (but that late trip will still be reported under the on-time performance measure discussed below). A typical weekday includes a total of 134 bus trips, while each Saturdays includes 50 trips and each Sunday includes 32. The service delivery goal is 99% or greater. In total, RTA missed one scheduled trip during November and one in December, or a service delivery achievement of 99.97% of 3,040 scheduled trips. It should be noted that only two trips were missed since July 1st – representing two trips out of 31,572 scheduled trips, or 0.006 percent of total trips missed.

Standard 3: System wide On-time Performance shall be 90% or greater.
   Measurement: Objective.
Fixed route service is considered on-time if at no point the bus is six or more minutes late. The goal is 90% or greater\(^1\). As presented below, RTA has far surpassed the goal during each month of FY12-13.

**Standard 4:** Runabout On-time Performance shall be 90% or greater.

*Measurement:* Objective.

Runabout service is considered on-time if the bus arrives within 30 minutes of the appointed pick-up time. The goal is 90% or greater, and Runabout surpassed this goal in each month of FY12-13. Staff will continue to monitor Runabout’s on-time performance to ensure this trend continues.

**Standard 5:** RTA will make consistent efforts to explore new service and service delivery options as well as work with regional efficiencies in the delivery of transportation to the jurisdictions

*Measurement:* Subjective.

RTA will make consistent efforts to explore new service and service delivery options, as well as work to achieve regional efficiencies, in the delivery of public transportation to the JPA jurisdictions. RTA’s achievements in this area will be reported annually, following the end of the fiscal year.

---

\(^1\) Bus Operators call in late-running trips to the Dispatcher via our two-way radios. RTA’s new buses will use a GPS-based Automated Vehicle Location (AVL) system to more accurately report this statistic, and it is probable that our reported on-time performance will decline as the AVL system is fully-implemented across the entire fleet.
Regional Transit Authority Standards of Excellence: Revenue and Resources

We will live within our means. While providing excellent service to our customers and communities, we will do so within the financial resources available to us. The financial health of the organization will not be compromised and we will work to deliver good value for the taxpayers’ investment in RTA.

**Standard 1:** The annual operating budget will be based upon projected revenue and the total operating cost will not exceed the budget adopted by the Board.

*Measurement:* Objective.

Revenue for the operating budget is collected from various sources, primarily from Federal Transit Assistance, Local Transit Fund, State Transit Assistance, Rural Transit Funds (RTF) and fares. For RTF, we can do a swap of 5311 and give back some transit funds to the local jurisdictions. SLOCOG administers RTF to eligible cities and RTA. Further, RTA applies to Caltrans for FTA 5311 f, which helping connect inner cities.

Tania compares the budget versus actual expenses on a monthly basis which is reported to the Board every other month so we can all make better decisions.

**Standard 2:** Fixed Route Farebox Recovery Ratio shall be greater than 20%.

*Measurement:* Objective.

RTA consistently meets or exceeds this goal and ridership remains high. As the economy continues to improve and gas prices stabilize the goal is to maintain this goal. Should the ridership gains continue, the goal may need to be increased.

**Standard 3:** No significant financial audit findings.

*Measurement:* Objective.

RTA is audited every year and consistently has clean reports or minor adjustments, which are quickly fixed. Improved transparency and continuing to implement procedures that exceed the auditors’ expectations.

**Standard 4:** Ensure that all capital procurements provide good value to our customers and our employees.

*Measurement:* Subjective.

We have not yet fully completed this task. Community evaluation surveys aren’t done to date, but should be completed in late 2013. The annual capital program by staff and the Board are done through annual budget process and regular updates if things change as compared to budget projections.
Regional Transit Authority Standards of Excellence: Safety

We recognize the tremendous importance of safety in the operation of RTA service to our customers and communities. Therefore the safety of our customers and employees will be an organizational priority and we will be proactive in promoting system safety.

**Standard 1:** Rate of preventable accidents will not exceed 2.0 per 100,000 miles.
  
  *Measurement:* Objective.

  **Fiscal Year 2012 Result:** 1 per 134,773 service miles

  **Fiscal Year 2013 Result:** 1 per 94,789 service miles (through 4/30/2013)

RTA achieved its goal by significant margins in 2012 and is on pace to meet its goal for 2013. Fixed object accidents have gone up significantly as an overall percentage of preventable accidents compared to previous years. The training department will address this trend in future training sessions. As is customary in the transit business, the majority of accidents are caused by drivers who have been employed less than one year.

**Standard 2:** Address all safety hazards indentified by the Health and Safety Survey conducted in June 2011 and indentified by the Safety Resource Committee.
  
  *Measurement:* Objective.

All operations and maintenance items have been addressed and action either taken or in progress.

**Standard 3:** Workers compensation claims will not exceed 12 annually.
  
  *Measurement:* Objective.

  **Fiscal Year 2011 Result:** 10

  **Fiscal Year 2012 Result:** 16 (includes 7 medical only)

  **Fiscal Year 2013 Result:** 11 (through 4/30/2013; includes 7 medical only)

2012 was not a good year for workers compensation claims. As of the April 30th of the current fiscal year we may meet our goal. Most importantly to note is workers compensation claim management has become a significant area of focus from both the administrative and safety sides of the issue.

**Standard 4:** Customer and Community perception of system safety will be at least 90%.
  
  *Measurement:* Objective.

Marketing has planned to develop and administer the survey in fall 2013.

**Standard 5:** Total risk management costs shall not exceed 8.5% of total operating costs.
  
  *Measurement:* Objective.
Fiscal Year 2011 Result: 5.1% of total operating costs

Fiscal Year 2012 Result: 7.5% of total operating costs

Fiscal Year 2013 Result: 7.4% of total operating costs as of April 2013

Well under the goal for fiscal years 2011, 2012 and 2013. This includes property, workers compensation, liability, and auto physical damage insurance costs.

Regional Transit Authority Standards of Excellence: Human Resources

Our employees are the foundation of the organization. We will support our employees in achieving excellence through training and development, teamwork, and continuous efforts at effective communication while treating each with integrity and dignity.

Standard 1: Recruit, promote and retain highly qualified employees to achieve our service standards.

Measurement: Subjective.

Based on the positive direction of our organization it should be noted that we have hired and retained in the past two years Operations Manager and a Human Resource Specialist. Promoted in the past two year six Bus Operators to Operation Supervisors, and have retained four as Operation Supervisors and two returned to be Bus Operators. The turnover rates for RTA are as follows:

2010 – 24%

2011 – 33%

2012 – 20%

Standard 2: Provide continuous development of organizational skills through ongoing training and development programs that result in personal and professional growth.

Measurement: Objective.

- Departments have submitted training needs with budget process.
- Maintenance: 40 Hours per technician annually.
- Operations Supervisors: 24 Hours annually.
- Bus Operators: 8 Hours Annually (does not include bi-annual safety meetings).
- Finance and Administration: 16 Hours per employee annually.

RTA is very fortunate to have an approved training budget over the last two year even through the bad economic time. It should be said that these ongoing training is essential to what staff at RTA does on a daily basis to help both the organization and staff grow.
• Maintenance 40 Hours per technician annually – here are the six technicians training hours over the 2012/2013 fiscal year:
  1. 18 hrs.
  2. 36 hrs.
  3. 22 hrs.
  4. 18 hrs.
  5. 18 hrs.
  6. 22 hrs.
However, with the purchase of new buses in FY2013 maintenance staff will get more than 40 hours of training to learn more on the new technological components of these new buses.
• Operations Supervisors 24 Hours annually – some Supervisors have completed this 24 hours training in the past year. Due to the lean dispatch staff we currently have it was hard to schedule the entire 24 hours of training but, we will work harder in the future to get this accomplished. Most of the dispatch staff did up 6 hours CalTip training this year.
• Bus Operators has a mandatory 8 hours of VTT annually – Completed. However, retraining is taking place every three months and six month of bus operators graduating and put into service.
• Finance and Administration 16 Hours per employee annually – these hours are used by each employee in various ways based on their responsibilities.

**Standard 3:** Enable our employees to achieve excellence in serving our customers by building teamwork and understanding effective communication within the organization.
  **Measurement:** Subjective.

All employees went through a training call Verbal Judo which taught us how to communicate more effectively with each other and our customers. Some Maintenance staff went to training on how to deal with generation diversity in the work place. RTA staff also has by-weekly staff meeting where we discuss general items that may affect other departments.

**Standard 4:** Employees will be evaluated annually in a fair and equitable way to judge performance and be provided a developmental plan for the next fiscal year.
  **Measurement:** Objective.

RTA currently does formal annual evaluation for Administration and Management Staff. However, the maintenance staff and bus operators are evaluated based on the requirements of the collective bargaining agreement. They are also evaluated as part of the RTA Safety Awards program on their anniversary date.
Regional Transit Authority Standard of Excellence: Fleet and Facility

We will operate and maintain a modern and clean fleet and facilities that will be pleasing to our customers and a source of pride for our employees and our communities.

**Standard 1:** Replace, rehabilitate, or retire 100% of all revenue vehicles within 1-3 years of their useful life (as defined by FTA).

*Measurement:* Objective.

With the new vehicles on order scheduled to arrive at the beginning of the 2013-2014 fiscal year as well as the funding that has been secured for procurement at the beginning of the 2014-2015 fiscal year, all revenue vehicles will be retired within 1-3 years of their useful life. The capital program is scheduled to be updated in 2015 (previously adopted in by the Board in July 2011).

As of January 31, 2013, the average RTA fixed route fleet age is over 10.9 years with an average of over 610,000 miles; and the Runabout/Dial A Ride average fleet age is 3 years with an average of over 110,000 miles.

**Standard 2:** Road calls will not exceed 7 per 100,000 miles of revenue service hours.

*Measurement:* Objective.

This standard has been surpassed each month during the last two fiscal years based on how staff has defined road calls. Staff is working in aligning and reporting to match the definition as listed in the National Transit Database reporting manual as:

“All failures that affect the completion of a scheduled revenue trip or the start of the next scheduled revenue trip, including failures during deadheading and layover.

Major Mechanical System Failures

These are failures of a mechanical element of the revenue vehicle that prevents the vehicle from completing a scheduled revenue trip or from starting the next scheduled revenue trip because actual movement is limited or because of safety concerns. Examples of major bus failures include breakdowns of brakes, doors, engine cooling system, steering and front axle, rear axle and suspension and torque converters.

A number of factors affect the number of major mechanical system failures incurred by a transit agency including local operating conditions, types of vehicles operated, and effectiveness of the maintenance program. However, it is expected that the same types of major mechanical failures will be reported by different agencies. The differences among agencies may be in the numbers reported, not the types of major mechanical failures.
Other Mechanical System Failures

These are failures of some other mechanical element of the revenue vehicle that, because of local agency policy, prevents the revenue vehicle from completing a scheduled revenue trip or from starting the next scheduled revenue trip even though the vehicle is physically able to continue in revenue service. Examples of other bus failures include breakdowns of fareboxes, wheelchair lifts, heating, ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC) systems and other problems not included as a major mechanical systems failure.

Since other mechanical system failures are based on local policies, there will be variation in the types and therefore, the numbers reported by different transit agencies. For example, some agencies in the southern part of the country may continue to operate a bus with a heating system breakdown while agencies in the northern part of the country would replace the bus immediately."

**Standard 3:** Maintain a clean, attractive fleet. Maintain our facilities so that they are safe and appealing to customers and employees.

*Measurement:* Subjective.

To be included in the annual Community Evaluation conducted by Marketing, this is scheduled for late in 2013.

**Standard 4:** Achieve an 80% favorable rating of bus stop appearance by customers and the communities that we serve.

*Measurement:* Objective.

To be included in the annual Community Evaluation conducted by Marketing, this is scheduled for late in 2013.
Standard 5: Achieve all federal, state-mandated maintenance practices, as well as vendor recommended maintenance schedules for our fleet and facilities.

   Measurement: Objective.

There has been no negative FTA or TDA findings in the previous audits, with triennial audit schedule during the 2013 and 2014 calendar years. Preventable maintenance has been completed on a timely basis with no CHP findings in during 2011 and 2012. The next CHP audit is for July/August 2013.

Regional Transit Authority Standards of Excellence: Leadership

We will strive to be one of the nation’s leading small transit operators. We will work to maintain collaborative relationships within the industry, our community, with our stakeholders and develop future leaders from within our organization.

Standard 1: Maintain cooperative relationships with federal, state and local funding agencies.
   Measurement: Subjective.

To be reviewed as part of the RTA Executive Directors annual performance evaluation.

Standard 2: Develop partnerships with stakeholders, community leaders and decision makers keeping them well informed of the integral role of RTA and contributions to the communities that we serve.
   Measurement: Subjective.

To be reviewed as part of the RTA Executive Directors annual performance evaluation.

Standard 3: Promote effective internal communications and promote the values of the organization.
   Measurement: Subjective.

To be reviewed as part of the RTA Executive Directors annual performance evaluation.

Standard 4: Provide effective leadership for public transportation within the County.
   Measurement: Subjective.

To be reviewed as part of the RTA Executive Directors annual performance evaluation.
SAN LUIS OBISPO REGIONAL TRANSIT AUTHORITY
July 10, 2013
STAFF REPORT

AGENDA ITEM:    B-1

TOPIC:     Reimbursement for South County Transit Use of RTA Vehicles

ACTION:     Review and Approve

PRESENTED BY: Geoff Straw, Executive Director

RTAC RECOMMENDATION: Supported at April 17, 2013 Meeting

BACKGROUND:
This Staff Report is slightly revised from the one that was included in the May 1 RTA Board agenda packet to include more information about the methodology used to develop the per-mile costs. It should be noted that South County Transit approved the reimbursement to RTA for use of RTA’s buses at its June 26 Board meeting.

As noted during previous Executive Director’s reports, at various times during FY12-13 South County Transit has borrowed RTA buses to meet its service needs, and this practice is continuing in FY13-14. This vehicle loan arrangement is due to vehicle shortages related to the failure of South County Transit’s remanufactured gasoline-electric hybrid bus (#208), as well as when additional buses are needed for training and when South County Transit’s four remaining buses are in the shop for repairs/maintenance. Bus #208 has been inoperable since June 2012.

The decision to pursue gasoline-electric hybrid technology was made in response to deficiencies in the South County Transit fleet in the early 2000s, to improve the air quality in our region, and to come into compliance with California Air Resources Board (CARB) emissions reduction requirements promulgated under the Urban Bus Transit Fleet Rule. With regard to the latter, in 2000 all publicly-funded transit agencies were required to choose either a “Diesel Fuel Path” or an “Alternative Fuel Path” to demonstrate reductions in smog-forming vehicle emissions. Both paths ultimately led to the same Oxides of Nitrogen (NOx) and Particulate Matter (PM) emission levels for diesel and alternative fuel engines by 2011, although the annual average fleet emission reductions were different over the monitoring period. Most significantly, the Diesel Fuel Path required greater reductions in the early part of the program. All three of the transit agencies operating heavy-duty transit buses in San Luis Obispo County chose the Diesel Fuel Path. We were not alone in making that decision, as more than half of the transit agencies in the state (40 out of 79) chose the Diesel Fuel Path.

Attached is a timeline of events that ultimately led to South County Transit’s decision to purchase the gasoline-electric hybrid bus that was delivered in March 2007. Bus #208
used a unique series hybrid gasoline-and-battery/ultracapitor drivetrain package manufactured by ISE Corporation that was installed by Complete Coach Works into a used 1994 Gillig Phantom chassis (purchased for $10,000). As indicated in the attached timeline, area officials first began discussing alternative fuel and hybrid technologies in October 2001. The discussion became more urgent after it was clear that then-current diesel technologies could not attain the NOx and PM reductions required under the CARB rules; in fact, no new diesel-powered buses were available in California after 2004 until the 2007 model-year engines were available. During that time period, CARB fined South County Transit in 2004 for not using the Ultra-Low Sulfur Diesel fuel required to meet the emissions reductions for its fleet of one 1983 and four 2003 Gillig Phantom buses. Area officials were also made aware that continuing to operate the 1983 bus would result in not meeting the annual NOx and PM reductions required under the Urban Bus Fleet Rule, so funding was identified in December 2005 to obtain a model year 1996 or newer bus. However, the entire transit industry was scrambling to find usable diesel-powered buses because no new diesel-powered buses were available in the market due to the lack of CARB-compliant engines. As such, both RTA and South County Transit pursued hybrid technologies instead. Following delivery of bus #208, RTA then moved forward to purchase three remanufactured gasoline-electric hybrid buses from Complete Coach Works.

However, it quickly became apparent after the delivery of RTA’s first hybrid bus (#169) in mid-2008 that there were significant reliability issues with this technology, and RTA ceased its contract for the remaining two buses while the warranty issues were worked out for buses #169 and #208. It should be noted that while the hybrid drivetrain caused the majority of the reliability problems, other non-drivetrain systems failed and contributed to the challenge of keeping the two buses on the road (likely due to using old chassis for the foundation of the buses). The promise of increased fuel economy was also unfulfilled, as the hybrid buses achieved significantly lower miles per gallon than conventional clean-diesel technologies. In 2010, the company that manufactured the hybrid drivetrain package (ISE) filed for bankruptcy and technical support for that technology ceased. RTA and area third-party vendors struggled greatly to maintain the two vehicles in working order, but both vehicles were ultimately parked due to on-going safety and reliability issues.

During normal operations, South County Transit currently operates three buses all day on Routes 21, 22, 23 and 24. In addition, one bus is operated on Route 25 in the peak morning and afternoon periods during the academic year to augment the regular all-day routes. With only four remaining 2003 Gillig Phantom buses available to meet its needs once bus #208 was “mothballed” in June 2012, RTA offered use of its spare buses when needed with the expectation that South County Transit would reimburse the direct operating costs. It should be noted that South County Transit incurred no operating costs for bus #208 during its periods of inactivity, since its operating costs are only incurred when the bus operates on the road.

In order to determine the extent of South County Transit’s use of RTA buses, staff reviewed the driver-prepared Daily Vehicle Inspection reports for the period July 1, 2012
to April 30, 2013. During that time 39,686 miles were operated on RTA vehicles for South County Transit needs.

To determine a cost per mile, various cost factors were evaluated, including fuel, parts, maintenance staff time, and insurance. As was noted at the May 1 Board meeting, RTA is not looking to recover any depreciation costs or physical damage liability costs because that would be “double-dipping.” Based on staff’s evaluation, the cost per mile of operating RTA buses is $1.70, which would result in a charge of $67,466.20 through April 2013 based on the accumulated miles discussed above. In comparison, the FY12-13 South County Transit annual operating budget assumes $423,384 in direct miles-based vehicle maintenance costs ($48,895 for insurance + $164,385 for parts/labor + $210,104 for fuel). The budget also assumes 231,548 miles of in-revenue service, which equates to $1.82 per mile – approximately 7.1% greater than the $1.70 per mile proposed herein. As presented to the South County Transit Board on June 26, when this $67,466.20 amount is added to the already booked year-to-date total operating costs of $715,435, the resulting total of $782,901 is still below budgeted amount (76.1% vs. 83.3% through April 30, 2013).

It should be noted that RTA vehicles continue to be used at South County Transit and likely will be utilized until their three new 2013 Gillig low-floor buses are delivered in August 2013. While the notion of using a leased or other bus in the absence of RTA spare vehicles could have been considered, the per-mile cost of maintaining/fueling alternate buses would still be the responsibility of South County Transit. To wit, RTA has paid an annual lease cost of almost $8,000 to the Livermore Amador Valley Transit Authority for bus #317 and RTA is responsible for all miles-based costs.

**Staff Recommendation**

Following adoption of a similar action by the South County Transit Board at its June 26 meeting, staff is recommending that the RTA Board approve the transfer of $67,466.20 in maintenance costs from RTA to SCAT for the use of RTA buses from July 1, 2012, through April 30, 2013. In addition, approve the per mile rate for using RTA vehicles of $1.70 through the end of September 2013.
Timeline for Hybrid Bus Planning at SCAT & RTA

1. October 1, 2001: As part of the Coordinated Transit Maintenance/Dispatch Facility study, page 3 of the Transit Resource Center project planning correspondence includes RTA staff statement that due to CARB requirements SLORTA and SCAT “are considering the option of hybrid vehicles and how those would fit into the RTP and fixed route systems” in order to meet CARB 2007 emission reduction requirements.

2. January 12, 2004: SCAT Board accepts a negotiated $1,000 fine from CARB for violations of emission reduction requirements under the Urban Bus Fleet Rule.

3. December 21, 2005: SCAT Board authorized through Resolution 05-02 submittal of a Rural Transit Fund (RTF) grant application for $75,000 to purchase a used 1996 or newer bus to replace a gross-polluting 1983 bus.

4. March 15, 2006: The Administrator’s Report discusses the purchase of a hybrid bus and the various funding mechanisms, including:
   a. RTF – $75,000 was requested, although $60,000 was awarded.
   b. PTA – $310,000 was requested.

5. March 15, 2006: The SCAT FY06-07 Budget Assumptions report includes a discussion of the need to fund a new bus to replace SCAT’s 1983 bus. Further, Resolution 06-01 authorized submittal of a $90,000 APCD MOVER grant request for a hybrid bus.

6. May 3, 2006: RTA Resolution 06-02 authorizes the submittal of a $1,350,000 Public Transit Account (PTA) grant request to purchase three 40-foot hybrid buses for RTA and one 35-foot hybrid bus for SCAT. Of this amount, $300,000 is appropriated for SCAT’s replacement bus.

7. September 26, 2006: The SCAT Administrator’s Report to the Board discusses the award of $50,000 in Conoco Grant Funds through the APCD to purchase a hybrid gasoline/electric bus; that report also lays out the updated funding mechanisms, including:
   a. PTA – $300,000
   b. RTF – $60,000
   c. Conoco Grant Funds – $50,000
   d. STA – $35,000
   e. SCAT Reserve Funds – $20,000

8. December 13, 2006: The SCAT Administrator’s Report to the Board provides an update on the funding scenario presented above, with the caveat that SCAT Reserve Funds will not be required.


AGENDA ITEM:    B-2

TOPIC: Unlimited Access on RTA Fixed Route
Services for RTAC Members

PRESENTED BY: Geoff Straw

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Support Provision of 31-Day RTA Passes
beginning in FY13-14

RTAC RECOMMENDATION: Support

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION:
At the March 6, 2012 meeting, the RTA Board adopted the RTA Stipend Policy that
essentially mirrors the SLOCOG Board stipend policy. However, staff also
recommended that RTAC members in good standing¹ be provided unlimited access on
RTA fixed-route services. While Board member comments seemed to provide general
support for that notion during discussion of the proposed policy, a review of the minutes
indicates that the motion to adopt the stipend policy only pertained to Board members.
For that reason, staff is seeking the Board’s authorization to provide unlimited access to
RTAC members on RTA fixed route services.

Staff Recommendation
Provide 31-Day RTA passes to RTAC members for unlimited access on RTA fixed route
services upon request.

¹ As indicated in the RTAC By-Laws, RTA staff will notify the appointing agency within 30 days in the
event of three consecutive absences by its representative. If an RTAC member misses three consecutive
RTAC meetings, their unlimited access privileges would be revoked.
AGENDA ITEM: B-3

TOPIC: Delayed Implementation of the ACA Employer Mandate until 2015

PRESENTED BY: Geoff Straw

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Do Not Delay Implementation of RTA’s Planned September 1, 2013 Medical Benefits Program

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION:
The Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (ACA) was signed into law by President Barack Obama on March 23, 2010. The ACA is aimed at increasing the affordability and rate of health insurance coverage for Americans, and reducing the overall costs of health care (for individuals and the government). It provides a number of mechanisms – including mandates, subsidies, and tax credits – to employers and individuals to increase the coverage rate and health insurance affordability. Under the original ACA plan, large companies would have had to pay the Internal Revenue Service $2,000 for each full-time employee who did not get health coverage, beginning January 1, 2014, when the ACA was scheduled to come into full effect.

RTA staff has been working on this issue judiciously over the past three years to finalize our Health Benefits Program, and to ensure that our agency is not penalized financially or otherwise. As part of these preparations, we have begun a meet and confer process with Teamsters Local 986 so that we could be ready for open enrollment that begins on August 1, 2013. The Collective Bargaining Agreement includes Bus Operators and Maintenance personnel. As part of this negotiation process, we discussed the impacts of the ACA over the past several months and then submitted a letter to the union on June 17. The letter explains that RTA is designating a new employee classification (“Part-Time/Health-Benefited”) and that the medical benefits would be implemented on September 1, 2013. Union leadership has agreed with the new designation and implementation schedule, and has submitted the letter to their regional legal counsel for final review and execution.

On July 2, 2014, the U.S. Department of Treasury announced that it will delay a key provision of the ACA by a year, essentially not requiring employers to provide health insurance for their workers (“Employer Mandate”) until 2015. RTA is considered a large employer under the ACA, and the Board adopted the FY13-14 budget assuming that an additional ten part-time employees (all Bus Operator positions) would be provided access to medical benefits; vision and dental benefits are not required under the ACA. It should be noted that our partner agency, South County Transit, does not meet the
definition of large employer, so that agency did not budget for additional medical benefits in FY13-14.

In total, RTA budgeted $47,110 in FY13-14 for ACA medical benefits for ten Bus Operators not currently covered by our existing Health Benefits Program, or approximately 0.56% of the overall non-capital operating budget. While in gross terms, that represents an approximately an 9.5% increase over the $496,500 budgeted for all employees already covered under our current Health Benefits Program (inclusive of vision and dental coverage), it should be noted that the budgeted FY13-14 rates assume an overall lower per-employee cost for medical benefits with the larger pool that includes the ten new employees. So it is likely that, if the Board chooses to delay implementation of medical benefits for those ten employees, the savings will be lower than the $47,110 identified above. Staff is working with our insurance broker to determine what the net cost reduction would be, but it might be several weeks until that can be finalized. It should also be noted that approximately 10% of any cost savings would also need to be shared with the SLOCAT budget, because our agreement is based on budgeted operating costs.

It should be noted that if RTA employees that do not currently have health insurance choose to opt into the Insurance Exchange in 2014 and the Employer Mandate implementation moves forward in 2015, it may be difficult to “pull” those employees out of the Exchange and back into our Health Benefits Program – which could result in RTA paying penalties in 2015, and as a result would face higher per person rates because our pool would be reduced.

Based on steps taken to date (budget authority, negotiations with our broker and with Teamsters Local 986, policies/procedures development, etc.), staff is recommending that we continue to move forward with implementing the Part-Time/Health-Benefited classification on September 1, 2013. Staff believes there is an expectation from the Bus Operator group that employees that work a minimum of 30 hours weekly will receive medical benefits – including those seven Bus Operators that completed their training on July 3rd, who were hired with the supposition that they would be eligible for RTA-provided medical benefits. In short, staff believes this benefit will assist with Bus Operator recruitment and retention.

**Staff Recommendation**
Do not delay implementation of medical-only health benefits for employees that work a minimum of 30 hours weekly until 2015.
AGENDA ITEM: C-1

TOPIC: Procure Intelligent Transportation System Technologies

PRESENTED BY: Geoff Straw

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Authorize Executive Director to Jointly Procure ITS Technologies that meet both RTA’s and South County Transit’s needs

RTAC RECOMMENDATION:

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION:

At its July 2011 meeting, the RTA Board discussed plans to continue to implement Intelligent Transportation System technologies. At that time, staff updated the Board on the successful implementation of the electronic validating GFI fareboxes on fixed route vehicles, as well as the successful implementation of a GPS-based Runabout scheduling and dispatching system (RouteMatch). Other planned ITS technologies discussed two years ago included an updated fixed route communication system and an on-bus security camera system. RTA has been successful in obtaining grant funds to fully implement planned technologies.

Based on that identified capital need, staff began seeking state and federal funds to implement a joint RTA and South County ITS system. Together, RTA and South County has been successful in securing a total of $784,121 in the following grants:

1. CA Proposition 1B Safety &Security: $619,813 ($261,787 is secured, awaiting bond sale for $358,026).
2. CA Proposition 1B SCAT funds remaining from current bus procurement $ 28,908 for SCAT’s three replacement buses to be delivered in 2013.
3. FTA Section 5309 funds remaining from current bus procurement $135,400 for RTA’s replacement buses to be delivered in 2013.

Staff is seeking Board authorization that would permit the Executive Director to procure the already fully-funded fixed route technologies, as described below:

1. Procure a GPS-based Automatic Vehicle Location system for the RTA and SCT fixed route services. This system will use wireless communications to transmit
each vehicle’s location, speed and estimate arrival times at bus stops in real-time. In addition, the following system attributes will be sought from prospective bidders:

a. Automated Voice Annunciation, both inside the vehicle for passengers and on the exterior so that passengers will know which bus is approaching. This system will also display the next bus stop on an LED message board inside the bus.

b. Automatic Passenger Counters, which will geo-code each boarding and alighting by time of day and direction of travel. This system will assist with vehicle capacity and passenger amenity planning.

c. Emergency Alert system that will allow the Bus Operator to covertly alert RTA Dispatchers of an emergency situation occurring on the vehicle.

d. Vehicle Monitoring and Diagnostic Systems that relay and track engine, transmission and other vehicle component performance and monitoring back to the Dispatch Center.

2. On-bus Security Camera System, which will record video using up to ten cameras and audio using up to three channels. The on-bus Digital Video Recorder (DVR) system can retain up to two weeks of voice/audio recordings before the system begins to record over the first-in data.

As mentioned above, this system has long been in planning, and RTA has been successful in obtaining grants to fund its implementation. Funding sources include FTA State of Good Repair funds earmarked for bus replacement, Proposition 1B Safety and Security Funds, and Proposition 1B transit funds from South County Transit.

**Staff Recommendation**
Authorize the RTA Executive Director to procure ITS technologies to meet both RTA’s and South County Transit’s needs.
CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL: President Frank Mecham called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m. A roll call was taken and a quorum was present.

Public Comments: Mr. Geoff Straw welcomed several members of Paso Robles Studios on the Park. The organization collaborated with the Regional Transit Authority to display youth art on the fixed route fleet. The originals were in display at the meeting. He introduced Mr. Henry Ramos.

Mr. Ramos, Paso Robles, greeted the Board and acknowledged those with whom he’s previously met. He thanked Mr. Straw for the opportunity to speak and briefly talked about the ARC (Artist’s Re-imagining Color) program, which promotes youth—particularly teens—getting
involved in art and giving back to their community. Four members came to the meeting. He introduced **Ms. Beth Reninger**, Atascadero. She spoke about her experiences that led her to the program and how much she’s grown since getting involved—they personally and professionally. She introduced follow ARC member artists, **Mr. Kyler Olson, Mr. Jacob Scotti** and **Mr. Patrick Keating**. She said they were the oldest members of the group and were transitioning into mentors for younger artists in middle and high schools.

**Ms. Reninger**: Working with RTA has been great. I don’t have a car and take the bus as do many of my friends. It’s great to get on the bus and see my art. The first day I saw the banner on the side of the bus, it was amazing. My art is on the bus. I really hope we can keep this going.

**President Mecham** said the Board greatly appreciates what the group has done.

**Vice President Shelly Higginbotham** said she enjoyed attending the opening ceremony in March. She said it’s a great program and hoped it will continue. She congratulated the group for a job well done.

**Board Member Fred Strong** thanked them for coming to the Board meeting. He said what amazed him about the team was the broad range of ages. He said they all have bright futures in art.

**Mr. Straw** said many riders have provided positive feedback. It’s a great experience for our riders to have something displayed that is so positive and uplifting.

**Mr. Eric Greening**, Atascadero, thanked the artists; Studios on the Park, RTA and everyone who helped put together the program. He noted the Studios is located just a few blocks north of the Paso Robles Transit Center and an easy walk for those who ride Route 9. He talked about various art, wine and food events around the county.

### A. INFORMATION AGENDA:

**A-1**  
**Mr. Geoff Straw** provided an update on the Runabout No-Show policy that began March 1 and those riders who accumulated enough late cancellations and no-show points to receive a suspension letter. RTA issued 28 letters to 16 riders in the first 30 days. He reviewed the policy and noted people can appeal their suspension.

**Ms. Debbie Arnold** inquired about the cost to operate this service and suggested that staff remind the public about the expense. **Mr. Straw** said on average it costs $66 per passenger trip to operate Runabout.

The new Bus Operator training class concluded on April 5. Mike and Clark are out on the road.
Mr. Straw introduced Employee of the Quarter Mr. Roy Esmon and Operations Manager Mr. Phil Moores.

Mr. Moores said Mr. Esmon is one of the reasons RTA is able to deliver service on time. He is always smiling and friendly, and he has never received a complaint. He has never been late for work. He is an exemplary Runabout driver.

Mr. Esmon said serving Runabout customers is fulfilling because they need you. It fills the heart when you can help them.

President Mecham said the Board greatly appreciates him and all RTA bus operators. You have a very important role and high level of responsibility. You take it seriously. Thank you very much.

Mr. Straw announced he will once again be conducting mobile office hours as a way to keep the conduit open with the riders. Bus 148 blew an engine and will not be repaired until the new buses arrive. The first new bus will go on the production line Friday.

The North County Summer Beach Shuttle is all set to begin June 7. It will travel from Paso Robles to Atascadero and then over Highway 41 into North Morro Bay and Cayucos. It will also serve the Charles Paddock Zoo. He talked about ongoing marketing outreach efforts.

Pension reform and the Affordable Care Act has impacted some transit agencies because unions have protested some grant funds requested from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). RTA drivers do not receive Public Employee Retirement System (PERS) benefits so we do not expect protests from our union partners, but grants to some agencies are being delayed.

The Automatic Vehicle Locator (AVL) system initially slated to be funded with Prop 1B funds was not fully funded. We pulled this component out of the new buses. Our intent is to have a smart phone friendly Global Positioning System (GPS) that allows passengers to see where buses are in real-time.

Board Member Fred Strong discussed funding subject to Department of Labor (DOL) review. He said there is a bill pending in Sacramento that would exempt certain transit positions from reform.

Mr. Straw reviewed year-to-date financials beginning on page A-1-5. Fuel is budgeted at $4.25 per gallon. Runabout expenses are slightly higher than budgeted. The overall farebox recovery ratio is at 19.5%. Fixed route ridership is up 8.2% over last year.

Mr. Straw concluded his Executive Director’s report.

President Mecham opened to Board comment.
Board Member Tony Ferrara inquired about the insurance rate increase under Administration on page A-1-5. Mr. Straw acknowledged office space rental insurance rate is higher than anticipated and is the annual cost. He said insurance rates are rising across the board.

Board Member Paul Teixeira asked how much it will cost to install the AVL system after the buses have been built and delivered. Mr. Straw said the contractor will need to come onsite and install the program. I don’t have the actual cost but based on my experience installing an AVL system in the past, I do not believe it will be significantly higher than if installed at the Gillig factory.

Vice President Higginbotham asked what efforts staff is making to educate Runabout riders about the benefits of taking the fixed routes. Mr. Straw answered that both RTA and SCAT are offering fare-free fixed route rides to ADA Paratransit eligible passengers with a Runabout card. We are adding to the brochures the cost to ride Runabout. We are also working with the City of San Luis Obispo to provide fare-free service on their fixed routes for Runabout riders. People receiving Medicare and Medi-Cal can use Ride-On Transportation for free and we try to educate these individuals of this option when they call.

President Mecham opened public comment.

Mr. Greening talked about the new Atascadero Transit Center. The center provides a nice combination of shade and ability for breezes to blow through. Other jurisdictions can use this center as a model, particularly for those with hot summers.

President Mecham closed public comment.

President Mecham closed Board comment.

B. ACTION AGENDA:

B-1 Mr. Straw briefly reviewed the budget and the core issues. This is a two-year operating and five-year capital budget. The budget retains core fixed route service. Runabout service must increase by 19% in order to meet current demand. This is a significant increase in costs. Route 15 is largely funded by Job Access Reverse Commute (JARC) funds that could end this fiscal year. The state has some residual funds available for which we’ve applied. The second year of this operating budget assumes we do not get JARC funding for the North Coast services. Additionally, we expect to begin service consolidation in the North County in May 2014, which partly impacts the next fiscal year. We are seeing an exciting time with improving financials in the state and county.
He reviewed two new columns. First is the North County consolidation, which only impacts Paso Robles and Atascadero. Staff is working with those two cities to establish a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). Second is the County consolidation. Administrative oversight expenses in this category are estimated to drop by half.

Next he discussed government assistance, non-TDA funding sources such as the State Transit Assistance (STA), Rural Transit Fund (RTF) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA). Overall these funds are down $678,000 for fiscal year 2013-14. This is a hole we have to fill. However, these funds increase by $74,000 the following year.

Mr. Straw next reviewed the TDA funds that come from local jurisdictions. He noted there is a backfill of $433,000 funds. There is a 13% increase in TDA funds required for FY13-14 over the current fiscal year.

Overall operating expenses are up 6.5%. The next fiscal year is expected to rise 4%. He highlighted the North County budget where the cities of Paso Robles and Atascadero will realize savings. We are proposing the use of $800,000 in Proposition 1B funding to pay down the tenant improvements loan. Added to the roughly $300,000 we normally pay will be a total of $1.1M reduction. We expect to pay down another $543,000 in FY14-15. This gets us much closer to the end goal of paying off the debt when the lease expires in 2017. No Local Transit Funds (LTF) are used for capital projects.

Administrative costs increase about 5.3% from the current fiscal year. Operating costs, which includes maintenance, goes up 8.3%. Included are four proposed new positions—one of which is the grant-funded account technician set to begin January 1, 2014. The other three positions are another full-time Runabout driver, an additional operations supervisor and a new dedicated maintenance service worker. Currently RTA hires vendors to empty trash and clean-up bus stops around the county. The service worker would assume those tasks.

Under service delivery, insurance increases 27.4% -- partly due to rising rates and partly because the cost to insure the new buses is higher. Maintenance labor is expected to go up 16.1% and includes wages for the new service worker. Overall we are looking at an increase of about 14.4%.

He briefly reviewed capital expenditures on page B-1-18. The first two fiscal years are fiscally constrained. The following three years are estimates. The lease ends in FY16-17.

Mr. Straw concluded his Report.

President Mecham opened Board comment.

President Mecham inquired about Special Events Revenue on page B-1-16. How does staff deal with large community events such as the Amgen Tour? Mr. Straw answered it will be very
difficult for RTA to receive revenue under this category because of Federal Transit Administration policies as well as the charter policy the Board adopted last year.

**Board Member John Ashbaugh** thanked Mr. Straw for preparing a two-year budget and clarified the Board is only being asked to adopt the budget for FY13-14. **Mr. Straw** confirmed this is correct.

**Board Member Debbie Peterson** pointed to page B-1-14 and asked about reserve funds. Are we using funds from reserves, or is this discussing the need for reserves for cash flow purposes. **Mr. Straw** said it is for cash flow, although we are proposing a small increase that will be realized at the end of the year.

**President Mecham** opened public comment.

**Mr. Greening** complimented staff on a job well-done. He pointed out that although TDA draw is going up, jurisdictions are receiving an even higher increase. One thing I don’t see room for is labor negotiations. It doesn’t appear to be much room for give and take for driver wages. It backs a tough negotiating stance. I would like to think there is a way to deal with give and take on both sides without worrying about cutting service.

**Mr. Pete Rodgers**, SLOCOG, said the budget looks solid. There are a lot of standees on the bus but not at the meeting. The LTF is the first call for transit. TDA funds are up 25% or about $2.5M for streets, roads and transit in the county. Unfortunately STA funds are down $550,000. Part of the swing is related to the state gas-tax swap of a few years ago. This budget will at least keep existing service rolling. We were also benefited by the windfall in the South County Urbanized Area designation, which will bring in additional $800,000 in new federal money. South County cities have a lot of that federal money to help displace lost TDA funds. Some jurisdictions are seeing an increase of 135% in new local money. Finally, I want to support the budget systems and integrity that we currently have. RTA went through difficult times over the last five years or so. It is now on a great track for the future. We are excited about the proposed integration in North County.

**Mr. Straw** said the current collective bargaining agreement expires at the end of January 2014. For budgetary purposes, we assumed the same level of wage levels as in previous year budgets. Depending upon the outcome of negotiations we will come back and present to the Board should any budget amendments be required.

**President Mecham** closed public comment.

**President Mecham** closed Board comment.

**Board Member Fred Strong** moved to approve Agenda Item B-1. **Board Member Teixeira** seconded, and the motion carried on a roll call vote.
Mr. Straw reviewed the request for reimbursement from South County Area Transit for the use of RTA Vehicles. South County Transit’s Hybrid Bus 208 is unreliable and has been parked since June 2012. We could not get it to run for more than an hour at a time. It will be replaced when the new buses arrive later this summer. However they needed a replacement until the new vehicles arrive. Staff reviewed the Daily Vehicle Inspection reports completed by South County Transit staff when RTA vehicles were used during the period of July 1, 2012 to February 28, 2013. During that time, 31,257 miles were operated on RTA vehicles in the provision of South County Transit service. We previously had no way to charge back the expense to them and staff is suggesting a per-mile reimbursement rate. To determine a cost per mile, various factors were evaluated, including fuel, parts, maintenance staff time and liability insurance. SCAT currently pays $1.82 per vehicle mile for use of their own buses based upon their budget. RTA is not looking to recover any depreciation costs or physical damage costs, since that would be “double-dipping.” Based upon the evaluation, the cost per mile is $1.70 would result in a charge of $53,136.90 through February 2013. Staff recommends approving this charge back for the use of RTA vehicles.

Mr. Straw concluded his report.

President Mecham opened Board comment.

Vice President Higginbotham said she was not at the last SCAT Board meeting and inquired about Board discussion at that meeting. Mr. Straw said it was on the Executive Committee agenda and they recommended moving forward. However, staff mistakenly did not include the item on the Board agenda, although the staff report was in the packet, and therefore it was not publicly noticed and the Board could not take action. No formal decisions took place. Vice President Higginbotham asked if the SCAT Board should discuss and approve it before the RTA Board makes a decision. Mr. Straw said both Boards must approve this reimbursement. Staff is currently working to reschedule the July SCAT Board to June.

Board Member Teixeira said the SCAT Board members discussed it briefly in April. He would like to discuss it at that meeting before making a motion at the RTA Board meeting. There are some issues here that SCAT needs to discuss before we bring it back to the full Board of RTA.

President Mecham opened public comment.

President Mecham closed public comment.

President Mecham closed Board comment.

Board Member Strong moved to defer Agenda Item B-2 until after the South County Area Transit Board had a chance to review, discuss and approve. Board Member Teixeira seconded, and the motion carried on a voice vote.
C. CONSENT AGENDA:

Mr. Straw said an old version was used on item C-7 and would like to note this for correction. The new President, Vice President and Past President were not listed correctly.

C-1 Trustee Change for Nationwide 457 (Approve)
C-2 Bus Procurement – Eight 40’ Coaches, Four Runabout Cutaways (Approve)
C-3 Equal Employment Opportunity Plan Update (Approve)
C-4 North County Transit Consolidation Term Sheet (Approve)
C-5 Summer Youth Ride Free Program (Approve)
C-6 Executive Committee Meeting Minutes of February 13, 2013 (Approve)
C-7 RTA Board Meeting Minutes of March 6, 2013 (Approve)
C-8 RTAC Meeting Minutes of October 17, 2012 (Approve)
C-9 RTAC Meeting Minutes of January 16, 2013 (Approve)
C-10 AGP Contract for Fiscal Year 2013-2014 (Approve)
C-11 Prop 1B Safety and Security for 2012/2013: Transit System Safety, Security and Disaster Response Account Program and Authorized Agent Signature Authority (Approve)

President Mecham opened public comment.

Mr. Greening requested to speak about Item C-4, the North County Consolidation Term Sheet. He was glad to see it is moving forward. He reviewed language regarding Atascadero Dial-A-Ride, which the city intends to keep operating. Given the difficulty of retaining fare box of 20%, it is very difficult for a stand-alone service such this to maintain a minimum fare box recovery ratio. I am wondering why Atascadero is not seeking consolidation. Maintaining the El Camino Shuttle fixed route service has helped to keep the fare box ratio up. Why keep this service and what actual prospects does the Atascadero DAR service have of making the 20% fare box? Would it not be better to enjoy the cost-savings all through a total consolidation?

Mr. Straw said it is a local decision made by the City of Atascadero. One of the things we are discussing is how fares and expenses will be booked on the Route 9 for residents who currently take the El Camino Shuttle.

President Mecham opened Board comment.

Past President Strong closed public comment.

Past President Strong closed Board comment.
Board Member Gibson moved to approve Consent Agenda Items. Board Member O’Malley seconded, and the motion carried on a roll call vote.

D: RTA CLOSED SESSION:

D-1 CLOSED SESSION ITEMS

None

E. BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS:

Board Member Hill announced Board Member Strong is now the Chair of LOSSAN.

Board Member Ashbaugh complimented Atascadero on their new transit center. San Luis Obispo is hoping to do something very similar.

F. ADJOURNMENT: President Mecham adjourned the RTA meeting at 9:48 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Anna Mafort-Lacy
RTA, Administrative Assistant
San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority
Executive Committee Meeting
Minutes 4/17/2013
C-3

Members Present: Frank Mecham, President
Shelly Higginbotham, Vice President

Members Absent: Fred Strong , Past President

Staff Present: Geoff Straw, Executive Director
Tania Arnold, CFO & Director of Administration
Anna Mafort-Lacy, Administrative Assistant
Whitney McDonald, County Counsel

Also Present: Ron De Carli, SLOCOG

1. **Call to Order and Roll Call:**
   President Frank Mecham called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m. Silent Roll Call was taken and a quorum was present.

2. **Public Comments:**
   None

3. **Information Items**

   A. Information Items:

   A-1 Executive Director’s Report

   **Mr. Straw** began by giving an update on the Runabout No-Show policy, which was fully implemented March 1. As of March 31, 2013, staff sent out 28 suspension notification
letters to 16 people. Several people received multiple warnings. He reviewed the policy with the committee and discussed how it works.

RTA began a new Bus Operator training class for four new hires in late February. Two of the four did not make it through the training program. Of the two remaining, Clark worked previously worked for the Sacramento Regional Transit Authority. Both are excellent and we are happy to have them.

Paso Robles City Council last night passed the term sheet for the North County Transit Consolidation. Next the county will need to address it and then RTA will bring it back to the Board at the May 1 meeting.

Staff continues to be involved with the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) study. North Coast Surveys are set to begin the week of April 22 and will get feedback from passengers on route 12, 14 and 15.

Mr. Straw presented a draft schedule for the North County Summer Beach Shuttle service. President Mecham inquired if the schedule accommodates requests for a stop at the Charles Paddock Zoo in Atascadero. Mr. Straw said he would verify.

Staff submitted an FTA Section 5304 planning grant application to Caltrans for a joint Short Range Transit Plan study with San Luis Obispo Transit. This effort would help the two transit agencies better coordinate service and capital plans.

Item B-2 discusses reimbursement from South County Area Transit for the continual use of an RTA bus. Paso Robles City Council last night approved the amended RTA Joint Powers Agreement (JPA). Staff will submit the amended JPA to the Secretary of State within 30 days. Pension reform and the Affordable Care Act may impact our ability to timely execute FTA grants, if any affected unions in the State protest our grant applications. Staff is waiting to see how the Department of Labor will respond to union protests regarding pension reform.

Staff received two proposals from commercial real estate appraisers and will provide an update to the Board at the conclusion of the 6-8 week process.

Mr. Straw concluded the Executive Directors report.

4. Action Items

B-1 FY13-14 and FY14-15 Operating Budget and FY13-14 through FY17-18 Capital Budget
Mr. Straw presented a balanced budget for both operating and capital. Staff is forecasting the same core levels of service for fixed route, trolley and demand response services. We anticipate an 11% increase in demand for Runabout that requires the addition of one more full-time driver.

The North Coast Connector service on Route 15 is partially funded by a Job Access Reverse Commute (JARC) grant. Funds were eliminated in to the new Map-21 surface transportation bill. The state has some left-over money for which we’ve applied and hope to receive over the next three years. If funding is not granted, staff will maintain status-quo service levels in FY14-15 with Local Transit Funds (LTF). Other options, should funding get cut, include reducing service or modifying Route 15 into a deviated fixed route. Vice President Higginbotham inquired how much a deviated fixed route would impact ridership. Mr. Straw said this is RTA’s least cost-effective route and ridership is relatively low, with a fare box ratio of about 11%. Vice President Higginbotham suggested we modify the service. Ms. Tania Arnold said the federal funding RTA receives is more than we would save by cutting the service. Mr. Ron DeCarli, SLOCOG, pointed out the federal funding program has been consolidated into other grants but has not gone away entirely. President Mecham voiced concern about the farebox recovery ratio only being about 11%. Mr. DeCarli said because the region is rural, the ratio is set at 10%, so we meet this requirement. Also, Route 15 only does 5 runs per day, whereas the other routes operate 16-18 weekday runs.

The newly-designated Arroyo Grande—Grover Beach Urbanized Area is now eligible for federal funding. RTA will receive some of this for Route 10. The South County region is no longer eligible for Rural Transit Funds (RTF). LTF is up about 28% on average throughout the county. The State Transit Assistance (STA) funds are down about $550,000 countywide, which reduces RTA’s share by about $256,514.

Mr. Straw said no fare increases are projected for the next two years, but this can be used as a back-fill option for lost funding if needed. Administrative expenses are up just over 5%. Staff is proposing three entry-level positions and one additional road supervisor. We currently run about 9.2% overtime with the supervisors, who are often doing activities outside of their normal job duties. We need one additional full-time Runabout driver to help meet demand. Another budgeted position is for a new service worker who would focus on bus stop maintenance. Finally, we are proposing an entry-level accounting technician position, which will primarily be funded by FTA and will help with maintenance data entry and the new Arroyo Grande—Grover Beach Urbanized Area.

Based upon current projected funding, a 2% annual cost of living (COLA) adjustment will be budgeted for non-union employees. The Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) identifies annual increases based upon longevity of bus operators and mechanics.
Runabout ridership is up 9%. Fixed route ridership rose nearly 8% for the first half of FY12-13. This impacts our projected farebox revenue.

The challenges next year will be to implement all of the projects and the North County consolidation.

**Mr. Straw** reviewed with the Committee the budget as presented beginning on page B-1-14, which outlines Non-TDA funding sources. He acknowledged some funding is going away and others are one-time sources. **Vice President Higginbotham** inquired why STA funding dropped so much. **Mr. Straw** said it is based upon the sales tax on diesel fuel and many believe it will not drop as much as projected. **Mr. DeCarli** stated that revenue is now being used to fund a portion of Proposition 1B. They took a portion of the diesel fuel tax using a complicated formula. **Mr. Straw** pointed out STA has traditionally been an unpredictable funding source and he believes it is best used for capital needs. Page B-1-15 showcases TDA local funding sources.

**Mr. Straw** pointed to FY14-15 projected budget and the sizeable jump in LTF funds required from local jurisdictions. He noted RTA maximized all state and federal funding prior to factoring local funding sources. **Vice President Higginbotham** asked if adding four new positions to an already-constrained budget is fiscally prudent. This looks good next year, but the next year doesn’t look so great. **Mr. Straw** reviewed the four suggested positions and how they may be prioritized should funding be limited.

Service Delivery is increasing by 7.8%, largely due to Runabout demand.

He next reviewed the two-year budget overview on page B-1-17 and use of capital over the next five years on page B-1-18. The ensuing pages break down the budget by route.

**President Mecham** inquired how the capital budget proposal lines up in conjunction with an anticipated drop in funding for FY14-15. **Mr. Straw** said the allocated funds are listed on the budget only if we are reasonably sure we will obtain the funds. Nothing beyond FY15 is funded at this point. Page B-1-25 is the breakdown for the North County Services and factors the added Route 9 runs that will begin in May and the anticipated consolidation.

**Mr. Straw** concluded his report.

**Vice President Higginbotham** moved to review and approve Item B-1 and **President Mecham** seconded. The motion passed on a voice vote with **Past President Fred Strong** absent.
B-2 South County Area Transit use of RTA vehicles

Mr. Straw briefly reviewed the request for reimbursement from SCAT for the use of RTA vehicles, totaling $53,137 through February 2013 at $1.70 cost per mile. This does not include depreciation but does factor in fuel, parts, labor and insurance costs. The year-to-date expenditures for SCAT remains under budget after adding this expense and helps keep RTA under budget as well.

Vice President Higginbotham asked if in the past there has been any cost recovery built in for vehicle usage. Ms. Arnold said no. It has been very difficult to track. Staff has to manually go through the daily vehicle inspection reports to review miles and determine if the bus was at RTA or SCAT. It has taken some time to complete this process. We are trying to utilize an intern for this project. She noted when RTA had so many issues with maintenance during the transition in-house; the agency was paying over $7,000 per month to lease vehicles. This excludes the additional operating expense.

President Mecham opened public comment.
President Mecham closed public comment.

Vice President Higginbotham moved to review and approve Item B-2 and President Mecham seconded. The motion passed on a voice vote with Past President Fred Strong absent.

5. Consent Agenda Items

C-1 Executive Committee Meeting Minutes of February 13, 2013

Vice President Higginbotham moved to approve Item C-1 and President Mecham seconded. The motion passed on a voice vote with Past President Fred Strong absent.

6. Agenda Review:

Mr. Straw briefly reviewed the Board agenda.

7. Closed Session Items:

D-1 None
8. **Adjournment:** President Mecham adjourned the meeting at 3:30 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Anna Mafort-Lacy
Administrative Assistant

Acknowledged by,

Frank Mecham
RTA President
AGENDA ITEM: C-4

TOPIC: Title VI Plan Updates

PRESENTED BY: Geoff Straw

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approve Title VI Policy Statement and Plan

RTAC RECOMMENDATION:

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION:

In September 2010, the Title VI Policy was adopted. In order to maintain compliance with current FTA regulations, there are various revisions and updates that are needed. There are revisions to the Title VI Plan that changes it to a three year plan instead of annually. The Limited English Proficiency (LEP) Plan is part of the Title VI Plan and is attached for your reference. These changes are based on the new Title VI regulations in Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Circular 4702.1.B.

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin in programs and activities receiving Federal financial assistance. Specifically, Title VI provides that "no person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance" (42 U.S.C. Section 2000d).

Staff Recommendation

Approve Title VI Policy Statement and Plan as presented via the resolution in Appendix H.
SAN LUIS OBISPO REGIONAL TRANSIT AUTHORITY

TITLE VI PLAN

ADAPTED: JULY 10, 2013


Contact Information:

Tania Arnold
Chief Financial Officer & Director of Administration
Office: 805.781.4397
tarnold@slorta.org

The Regional Transit Authority is a Joint Powers Agency serving residents and visitors of:
Arroyo Grande Atascadero Grover Beach Morro Bay Paso Robles Pismo Beach San Luis Obispo and The County of San Luis Obispo
TITLE VI PLAN

I. PLAN STATEMENT

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin in programs and activities receiving Federal financial assistance. Specifically, Title VI provides that "no person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance" (42 U.S.C. Section 2000d).

The San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority is committed to ensuring that no person is excluded from participation in, or denied the benefits of its transit services on the basis of race, color, or national origin, as protected by Title VI in Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Circular 4702.1.B.

This plan was developed to guide the San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority in its administration and management of Title VI-related activities.

Title VI Coordinator Contact information:
Chief Financial Officer & Director of Administration
San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority
179 Cross Street, Suite A
San Luis Obispo, California 93401

II. TITLE VI INFORMATION DISSEMINATION

Title VI information posters shall be prominently and publicly displayed in the San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority facility and on their revenue vehicles. The name of the Title VI coordinator is available on the San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority website, at www.slorta.org. Additional information relating to nondiscrimination obligation can be obtained from the San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority Title VI Coordinator.

Title VI information shall be disseminated to San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority employees annually via the Employee Education form (see Appendix A) in payroll envelopes. This form reminds employees of the San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority’s policy statement, and of their Title VI responsibilities in their daily work and duties. During New Employee Orientation, new employees shall be informed of the provisions of Title VI, and the San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority’s expectations to perform their duties accordingly.

All employees shall be provided a copy of the Title VI Plan and are required to sign theAcknowledgement of Receipt (see Appendix B).

III. SUBCONTRACTS AND VENDORS

All subcontractors and vendors who receive payments from the San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority where funding originates from any federal assistance are subject to the provisions of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 as amended.
Written contracts shall contain non-discrimination language, either directly or through the bid specification package which becomes an associated component of the contract.

IV. RECORD KEEPING:

The Title VI Coordinator will maintain permanent records, which include, but are not limited to, signed acknowledgements of receipt from the employees indicating the receipt of the San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority’s Title VI Plan, copies of Title VI complaints or lawsuits and related documentation, and records of correspondence to and from complainants, and Title VI investigations.

V. TITLE VI COMPLAINT PROCEDURES

How to file a Title VI Complaint?
The complainant may file a signed, written complaint up to thirty (30) days from the date of the alleged discrimination. The complaint should include the following information:

- Your name, mailing address, and how to contact you (i.e., telephone number, email address, etc.)
- How, when, where and why you believe you were discriminated against. Include the location, names and contact information of any witnesses.
- Other information that you deem significant

The Title VI Complaint Form (see Appendix C) may be used to submit the complaint information. The complaint may be filed in writing with the San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority at the following address:

Title VI Coordinator  
Chief Financial Officer & Director of Administration  
San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority  
179 Cross Street, Suite A  
San Luis Obispo, California 93401

NOTE: The San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority encourages all complainants to certify all mail that is sent through the U.S. Postal Service and/or ensure that all written correspondence can be tracked easily. For complaints originally submitted by facsimile, an original, signed copy of the complaint must be mailed to the Title VI Coordinator as soon as possible, but no later than 30 days from the alleged date of discrimination.

What happens to the complaint after it is submitted?
All complaints alleging discrimination based on race, color or national origin in a service or benefit provided by the San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority will be directly addressed by the San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority. The San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority shall also provide appropriate assistance to complainants, including those persons with disabilities, or who are limited in their ability to communicate in English. Additionally, the San
Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority shall make every effort to address all complaints in an expeditious and thorough manner.

A letter of acknowledging receipt of complaint will be mailed within thirty (30) days (Appendix D). Please note that in responding to any requests for additional information, a complainant's failure to provide the requested information may result in the administrative closure of the complaint.

**How will the complainant be notified of the outcome of the complaint?**
The San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority will send a final written response letter (see Appendix E or F) to the complainant. In the letter notifying complainant that the complaint is not substantiated (Appendix F), the complainant is also advised of his or her right to 1) appeal within seven calendar days of receipt of the final written decision from the San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority, and/or 2) file a complaint externally with the U.S. Department of Transportation and/or the FTA. Every effort will be made to respond to Title VI complaints within 60 working days of receipt of such complaints, if not sooner.

In addition to the complaint process described above, a complainant may file a Title VI complaint with the following offices:

**Federal Transit Administration Office of Civil Rights**
Attention: Title VI Program Coordinator
East Building, 5th Floor – TCR
1200 New Jersey Ave., SE
Washington, DC 20590

**VI. LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY (LEP) PLAN**

San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority (RTA) has developed a Limited English Proficiency Plan (LEP) to help identify reasonable steps to provide language assistance for LEP persons seeking meaningful access to RTA services as required by Executive Order 13166. A Limited English Proficiency person is one who does not speak English as their primary language and who has a limited ability to read, speak, write, or understand English. This plan has detail procedures on how to identify a person who may need language assistance, the ways in which assistance may be provided, training staff, how to notify LEP persons that assistance is available, and information for future plan updates. In developing the plan RTA’s determined the extent of obligation to provide LEP services, the RTA has undertook the U.S. Department of Transportation four factor LEP analysis which considers the following: 1) The number or proportion of LEP persons eligible in the RTA service area who maybe served or likely to encounter an RTA program, activity, or service; 2) the frequency with which LEP individuals come in contact with an RTA service; 3) the nature and importance of the program, activity or service provided by the RTA to the LEP population; and 4) the resources available to RTA and overall costs to provide LEP assistance.

**VII. COMMUNITY OUTREACH**

As an agency receiving federal financial assistance, we have made the following community outreach efforts:
The San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority holds public meetings bi-monthly. At these meetings the public is welcome to attend and share in discussion with a variety of Community Outreach discussions. Additionally, the San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority works with the other transit agencies in the service area and other stakeholder organizations to review and discuss the planning and have involvement in the decision making process. The San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority from time to time will provide on-board survey hand-outs to customers for their feedback about a variety of issues.

The San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority submits to the California Department of Transportation and Federal Transit Administration annually an application for funding. The application requests funding for both capital and operating assistance. Part of the annual application is a public notice, which includes a 30-day public comment period.

VIII. ACTIVE INVESTIGATION, LAWSUIT OR COMPLAINT

The San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority has had no active investigations, lawsuits or complaints alleging discrimination on the basis of race, color or national origin.

IX. SUBRECIPIENTS MONITORING

Primary recipients shall ensure subrecipients are complying with Title VI. Subrecipient Title VI program shall be submitted every three years in line with the primary recipients program. Subrecipients will also submit annual complaint logs to primary recipient which will be kept in an electronic storage device for further review by FTA as necessary.

X. BOARD DEMOGRAPHICS

RTA board of directors is all elected members. Therefore, this does not apply.

XI. EQUITY ANALYSIS FOR BUILDING SITE

An equity analysis was not required when RTA built the Tenant Improvements for the current operating and maintenance facility four years ago. This was a pre-existing site that RTA lease and then did the Tenant Improvement without any federal funds. Therefore, this does not apply.

XII. RESOLUTION APPROVING TITLE VI PLAN

A copy of this resolution can be found in Appendix H of this Plan.

XIII. SERVICE STANDARDS

Vehicle Load Standards

RTA uses a standard of 1.5 ratio as the maximum vehicle load on a peak trip. The average of all loads during the peak operating period should not exceed vehicles’ achievable capacities, which are 36 passengers for a 15’ mini-bus, 55 passengers for low-floor 40-foot buses, and 63
passengers for standard 40-foot buses. The exact maximum passenger capacity may be affected by specific manufacturer’s recommendations which may be different for certain vehicle types.

**Vehicle Headway Standards**
Service operates on regional trunk lines every 60 minutes (more frequently during peak a.m. and p.m. commute times) from early morning to late in the evening, five days a week, with the exception of the less populated North Coast Route #15. On weekends, service operates 5 times per day on Saturdays and 3 times per day on Sundays, throughout RTA’s system.

Scheduling involves the consideration of a number of factors including: ridership productivity, transit/pedestrian friendly streets, density of transit-dependent population and activities, relationship to the Regional Transportation Plan, relationship to major transportation developments, land use connectivity, and transportation demand management.

**On-Time Performance Standards**
Fixed route service is considered on-time if at no point the bus is six or more minutes late. The goal is 90% or greater. As presented below, RTA has far surpassed the goal during each month of FY12-13

![Fixed Route On Time Performance FY 2013](image)

RTA continuously monitors on-time performance and system results are published and posted as part of monthly performance reports covering all aspects of operations.

**Service Availability Standards**
RTA will try to distribute transit service so that 100% of all regional fixed route service are within a 3/4 mile walk of intercity bus transfer points.

**XIII. SERVICE POLICIES**

**Vehicle Assignment Policy**
Bus assignments take into account the operating characteristics of buses of various lengths, which are matched to the operating characteristics of the route. Local routes with lower ridership may be assigned 15-foot buses rather than the 35 or 40-foot buses. Some routes requiring tight turns on narrow streets are operated with 35-foot rather than 40-foot buses.
All buses are also equipped with air conditioning and some of the newer vehicles have automated stop announcement systems.

**Transit Amenities Policy**
Installation of transit amenities along bus and rail routes are based on the number of passenger boardings at stops and stations along those routes.
Appendix A  Employee Annual Education Form

Title VI Policy

No person shall, on the grounds of race, color or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance.

All employees of the San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority are expected to consider, respect, and observe this policy in their daily work and duties. If a citizen approaches you with a question or complaint, direct him or her to the Director, Finance & Administration who is the Title VI Coordinator.

In all dealings with citizens, use courtesy titles (i.e. Mr., Mrs., Ms., or Miss) to address them without regard to race, color or national origin.
Appendix B   Acknowledgement of Receipt of Title VI Plan

I hereby acknowledge the receipt of the San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority’s Title VI Plan. I have read the plan and am committed to ensuring that no person is excluded from participation in, or denied the benefits of its transit services on the basis of race, color, or national origin, as protected by Title VI in Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Circular 4702.1.B.

_________________________________
Your signature

_________________________________
Print your name

_________________________________
Date
Appendix C  TITLE VI COMPLAINT FORM

Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act requires that “No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance.” If you feel you have been discriminated against in transit services, please provide the following information in order to assist us in processing your complaint and sent it to:

Provide address here

Please print clearly:

Name: ___________________________________________________________________

Address: __________________________________________________________________

City, State, Zip Code: _______________________________________________________

Telephone Number: ____________ (home) ____________ (cell) ____________ (work)

Person discriminated against: _______________________________________________

Address of person discriminated against: ______________________________________

City, State, Zip Code: _______________________________________________________

Please indicate why you believe the discrimination occurred:

_____ Race
_____ Color
_____ National Origin
_____ Other

What was the date of the alleged discrimination? __________________________

Where did the alleged discrimination take place? __________________________

Please describe the circumstances as you saw it: __________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
Please list any and all witnesses’ names and phone numbers:
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

Have you previously filed a Title VI complaint with this agency?
[ ] Yes [ ] No

Have you filed this complaint with any other Federal, State, or local agency, or with any Federal or State court?
[ ] Yes [ ] No

If yes, check all that apply:
[ ] Federal Agency: _________________________
[ ] Federal Court____________________________   [ ] State Agency_______________
[ ] State Court _____________________________   [ ] Local Agency ______________

Please provide information about a contact person at the agency/court where the complaint was filed.
Name: ______________________________________________________
Title: ______________________________________________________
Agency: _____________________________________________________
Address: _____________________________________________________
 Telephone: ___________________________________________________

Please attach any documents you have which support the allegation. Then date and sign this form and send to the Title VI Coordinator at:

Title VI Coordinator  
Chief Financial Officer & Director of Administration  
San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority  
179 Cross Street, Suite A  
San Luis Obispo, California 93401

_________________________________   _________________________________
Your signature      Date

_________________________________
Print your name
APPENDIX D  Sample Letter Acknowledging Receipt of Complaint

Today’s Date

Ms. Jo Doe
1234 Main St.
San Luis Obispo, California 93401

Dear Ms. Doe:

This letter is to acknowledge receipt of your complaint against the San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority alleging _____________________________ __________________________.

An investigation will begin shortly. If you have additional information you wish to convey or questions concerning this matter, please feel free to contact this office by telephoning _____ _____ ______, or write to me at this address.

Sincerely,

Title VI Coordinator
Chief Financial Officer & Director of Administration
San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority
179 Cross Street, Suite A
San Luis Obispo, California 93401
APPENDIX E  Sample Letter Notifying Complainant that the Complaint Is Substantiated

Today’s Date

Ms. Jo Doe
1234 Main St.
San Luis Obispo, California 93401

Dear Ms. Doe:

The matter referenced in your letter of ____________ (date) against the San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority alleging Title VI violation has been investigated. (An/Several) apparent violation(s) of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, including those mentioned in your letter (was/were) identified. Efforts are underway to correct these deficiencies.

Thank you for calling this important matter to our attention. You were extremely helpful during our review of the program. *(If a hearing is requested, the following sentence may be appropriate.)* You may be hearing from this office, or from federal authorities, if your services should be needed during the administrative hearing process.

Sincerely,

**Title VI Coordinator**  
Chief Financial Officer & Director of Administration  
San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority  
179 Cross Street, Suite A  
San Luis Obispo, California 93401
APPENDIX F  Sample Letter Notifying Complainant that the Complaint Is Not Substantiated

Today’s Date

Ms. Jo Doe
1234 Main St.
San Luis Obispo, California 93401

Dear Ms. Doe:

The matter referenced in your complaint of _____________ (date) against the San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority alleging ____________________________ has been investigated.

The results of the investigation did not indicate that the provisions of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, had in fact been violated. As you know, Title VI prohibits discrimination based on race, color, or national origin in any program receiving federal financial assistance.

The San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority has analyzed the materials and facts pertaining to your case for evidence of the city’s failure to comply with any of the civil rights laws. There was no evidence found that any of these laws have been violated.

I therefore advise you that your complaint has not been substantiated, and that I am closing this matter in our files.

You have the right to 1) appeal within seven calendar days of receipt of this final written decision from San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority, and/or 2) file a complaint externally with the U.S. Department of Transportation and/or the Federal Transit Administration at Federal Transit Administration Office of Civil Rights Attention: Title VI Program Coordinator East Building, 5th Floor - TCR 1200 New Jersey Ave., SE Washington, DC 20590

Thank you for taking the time to contact us. If I can be of assistance to you in the future, do not hesitate to call me.

Sincerely,

Title VI Coordinator
Chief Financial Officer & Director of Administration
San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority
179 Cross Street, Suite A
San Luis Obispo, California 93401
APPENDIX G  Samples of Narrative to be included in Posters to be Displayed in Revenue Vehicles and Facilities

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin in programs and activities receiving Federal financial assistance. Specifically, Title VI provides that "no person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance" (42 U.S.C. Section 2000d).

The San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority is committed to ensuring that no person is excluded from participation in, or denied the benefits of its transit services on the basis of race, color, or national origin, as protected by Title VI in Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Circular 4702.1.B. If you feel you are being denied participation in or being denied benefits of the transit services provided by the San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority, or otherwise being discriminated against because of your race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability, you may contact our office at:

Title VI Coordinator
Chief Financial Officer & Director of Administration
San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority
179 Cross Street, Suite A
San Luis Obispo, California 93401

For more information, visit our website at www.slorta.org
APPENDIX H
SAN LUIS OBISPO REGIONAL TRANSIT AUTHORITY

RESOLUTION NO. 13-_____

RESOLUTION ADOPTING A TITLE VI POLICY STATEMENT AND PLAN

WHEREAS, The San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority (RTA) was formed to provide public transportation to all of the citizens of San Luis Obispo County; and

WHEREAS, Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, and national origin in programs and activities receiving federal financial assistance; and

WHEREAS, RTA commits to assure that no person shall, on the grounds of race, color, national origin, or sex, as provided by Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, be excluded from participation in, denied the benefits of, or be otherwise subjected to discrimination under any RTA program or activity regardless of the funding source; and

WHEREAS, RTA as the administrative agent for the City of Paso Robles, City of Atascadero, and City of Arroyo Grande and Grover Beach (South County Transit) receives Federal transportation funding;

WHEREAS, RTA receives Federal funding from other agencies that also have Title VI requirements.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Directors of The San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority approves the proposed Title VI Policy Statement and Plan in order to meet Title VI and attendant federal requirements. The Chief Financial Officer/Director of Administration, in her capacity, will serve as the Title VI Coordinator and is authorized to revise and update the plan as necessary.

Upon motion of Director ____________, seconded by Director _____________, and on the following roll call, to wit:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAINING:

The foregoing resolution is hereby passed and adopted by the San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority of San Luis Obispo County, State of California, at a regular meeting of said Board of Directors held on the 10th day of July 2013.
Frank Mecham
President of the RTA Board

ATTEST:

Geoff Straw
Executive Director

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND LEGAL EFFECT:

By: ______________________________
    Timothy McNulty
    RTA Counsel

Dated: ______________________
(Original signature in BLUE ink)
LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY (LEP) PLAN

SAN LUIS OBISPO REGIONAL TRANSIT AUTHORITY (RTA)

Adopted 7-10-2013

Introduction

This Limited English Proficiency (LEP) Plan has been prepared to address San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority’s responsibilities as a recipient of federal financial assistance as they relate to the needs of individuals with limited English language skills. The plan has been prepared in accordance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Federal Transit Administration Circular 4702.1B dated October 1, 2012, which state that no person shall be subjected to discrimination on the basis of race, color or national origin.

Executive Order 13166, titled Improving Access to Services for Persons with Limited English Proficiency, indicates that differing treatment based upon a person’s inability to speak, read, write or understands English is a type of national origin discrimination. It directs each federal agency to publish guidance for its respective recipients clarifying their obligation to ensure that such discrimination does not take place. This order applies to all state and local agencies which receive federal funds.

Plan Summary

RTA has developed this LEP Plan to help identify reasonable steps for providing language assistance to persons with limited English proficiency who wish to access services provided by RTA. As defined in Executive Order 13166, LEP persons are those who do not speak English as their primary language and have limited ability to read, speak, write or understand English.

This plan outlines how to identify a person who may need language assistance, the ways in which assistance may be provided, staff training that may be required, and how to notify LEP persons that assistance is available.

In order to prepare this plan, RTA undertook the U.S. Department of Transportation (U.S. DOT) four-factor LEP analysis which considers the following factors:

1. The number or proportion of LEP persons in the service area who may be served or are likely to encounter a RTA program, activity or service.
2. The frequency with which LEP persons comes in contact with RTA programs, activities or services.
3. The nature and importance of programs, activities or services provided by RTA to the LEP population.
4. The resources available to RTA and overall cost to provide LEP assistance.

A summary of the results of the RTA four-factor analysis is in the following section.
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Four-Factor Analysis

1. The number or proportion of LEP persons in the service area who may be served or are likely to encounter a RTA program, activity or service.

RTA staff reviewed the 2006-2010 America Community Survey Report and determined that 42,264 persons in San Luis Obispo County [16.7 % of the population] speak a language other than English. Of this number, 16,646 persons [6.6%] have limited English proficiency; that is, they speak English “not well” or “not at all.”

In San Luis Obispo County, of those persons with limited English proficiency, 13,917 speak Spanish, 1,897 speak Asian and Pacific Island languages, and 832 speak other Indo-European languages.

2. The frequency with which LEP persons come in contact with RTA programs, activities or services.

RTA assessed the frequency with which staff and drivers have, or could have, contact with LEP persons. This includes documenting phone inquiries and surveying vehicle operators for requests for interpreters and translated documents. To date, the most frequent contact between LEP persons are with dispatchers. Translated documents have included postings on the buses, relating to fares and transit rules written in Spanish. All schedules and ride guides are also written in Spanish.

3. The nature and importance of programs, activities or services provided by RTA to the LEP population.

The largest proportion of LEP individuals in the RTA service area speaks Spanish. Three concentrated areas have been identified in San Luis Obispo County. The City of Paso Robles and City of Atascadero has 17% of adult speakers who speak English less than very well. The City of San Luis Obispo has 13.9% of adult speakers who speak English less than very well. And the City of Nipomo has 19.8% of adult speakers who speak English less than very well. Services provided by RTA that are most likely to encounter LEP individuals are the fixed route system which serves the general public and the demand-response (Dial-A-Ride) system which serves primarily senior and disabled persons.

4. The resources available to RTA and overall cost to provide LEP assistance.

RTA assessed its available resources that could be used for providing LEP assistance, including determining how much a professional interpreter and translation service would cost on an as needed basis, which of its documents would be the most valuable to be translated if the need should arise, and taking an inventory of available organizations that RTA could partner with for outreach and translation efforts. The amount of staff and vehicle operating training that might be needed was also considered. Based on the four-factor analysis, RTA developed its LEP Plan as outlined in the following section.
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Limited English Proficiency (LEP) Plan Outline

How RTA staff may identify a LEP person who needs language assistance:

1. Examine records to see if requests for language assistance have been received in the past, either at meetings or over the phone, to determine whether language assistance might be needed at future events or meetings.

2. Have a staff person greet participants as they arrive at RTA sponsored events. By informally engaging participants in conversation it is possible to gauge each attendee’s ability to speak and understand English.

3. Have Census Bureau Language Identification Flashcards available at RTA meetings. This will assist RTA in identifying language assistance needs for future events and meetings.

4. Have Census Bureau Language Identification Flashcards on all transit vehicles to assist vehicle operators in identifying specific language assistance needs of passengers. If such individuals are encountered; vehicle operators will be instructed to try to obtain contact information to give to RTA’s management for follow-up.

5. Vehicle operators and other front-line staff, like dispatchers, dial-a-ride schedulers, and service development planners, will be surveyed annually on their experience concerning any contacts with LEP persons during the previous year.

Language Assistance Measures

There are numerous language assistance measures available to LEP persons, including both oral and written language services. There are also various ways in which RTA staff responds to LEP persons, whether in person, by telephone or in writing.

- RTA will provide Hispanic Education and Outreach Programs which will continue to provide vital information to LEP groups on RTA programs and services;

- Network with local human service organizations that provide services to LEP individuals and seek opportunities to provide information on RTA programs and services;

- Provide a bilingual Community Outreach Coordinator at community events, public hearings and Board of Director meetings. Placement of statements in notices and publications that interpreter services are available for these meetings, with 48 hours advance notice per Brown Act;

- Survey bus drivers and other front-line staff, like dispatchers, dial-a-ride schedulers, and service development planners, annually on their experience concerning any contacts with LEP persons during the previous year;
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- Provide Language Identification Flashcards onboard the RTA fleet, in Road Supervisor vehicles and at transit systems administrative offices;

- Post the RTA Title VI Policy and LEP Plan on the agency website, www.slorta.org;

- Provide group travel training to LEP persons with the assistance of bilingual staff;

- Include language “Spanish a plus” on bus driver recruitment flyers and onboard recruitment posters;

- When an interpreter is needed for a language other than Spanish, in person or on the telephone, staff will attempt to access language assistance services from a professional translation service or qualified community volunteers. A list of volunteers will need to be developed.

Staff Training
The following training will be provided to RTA staff:

1. Information on the RTA Title VI Procedures and LEP responsibilities
2. Description of language assistance services offered to the public
3. Use of Language Identification Flashcards
4. Documentation of language assistance requests
5. How to handle a potential Title VI/LEP complaint

Outreach Techniques

When staff prepares a document or schedules a meeting, for which the target audience is expected to include LEP individuals, then documents, meeting notices, flyers, and agendas will be printed in an alternative language based on the known LEP population. Interpreters may be available as needed.

Monitoring and Updating the LEP Plan

RTA will update the LEP as required by U.S. DOT. At minimum, the plan will be reviewed and updated when data from the 2010 U.S. Census is available, or when it is clear that higher concentrations of LEP individuals are present in the RTA service area. Updates will include the following:

- The number of documented LEP person contacts encountered annually
- How the needs of LEP persons have been addressed
- Determination of the current LEP population in the service area
- Determination as to whether the need for translation services has changed
- Determine whether local language assistance programs have been effective and sufficient to meet the need
- Determine whether RTA’s financial resources are sufficient to fund language assistance resources needed
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• Determine whether RTA has fully complied with the goals of this LEP Plan
• Determine whether complaints have been received concerning RTA’s failure to meet the needs of LEP individuals

Dissemination of the RTA LEP Plan

A link to the RTA LEP Plan and the Title VI Procedures is included on the RTA website at www.slorta.org. Any person or agency with internet access will be able to access and download the plan from the RTA website. Alternatively, any person or agency may request a copy of the plan via telephone, fax, mail, or in person and shall be provided a copy of the plan at no cost. LEP individuals may request copies of the plan in translation which RTA will provide, if feasible. Questions or comments regarding the LEP Plan may be submitted to the San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority, Title VI Coordinator:

San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority
179 Cross Street, Suite A
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401
Phone: 805-781-4833
Fax: 805-781-1291
Email: tarnold@slorta.org (Title VI Coordinator)