



253 Elks Lane
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401
(805) 541-2228 fax (805) 781-1291
www.slorta.org

AGENDA

REGIONAL TRANSIT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Thursday, October 15, 2026
2:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.

253 Elks Lane, Cerro Conference Room
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

Chair: Alex Fuchs (SLO Transit)

Vice-Chair: Omar McPherson (South County Transit Committee)

Other RTAC Members:

Darcy Price (City of Atascadero)

Katie Franco (County of SLO)

Janeen Burlingame (City of Morro Bay)

Mark Dariz (Runabout/DAR)

Todd Katz (Fixed-Route Transit alternative)

Julia Wallerice (Cal Poly)

Mason Cleek (Cuesta College)

Ryan Cornell (City of Paso Robles)

Eric Greening (Fixed-Route Transit)

Lance Okuno (SLOCOG)

Individuals wishing accessibility accommodations at this meeting under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) may request such accommodations to aid hearing, visual, or mobility impairment (including Limited English Proficiency) by contacting the RTA offices at 805-541-2228 x4833. Please note that 48 hours advance notice will be necessary to honor your request.

RTA, de acuerdo con la Ley de Estadounidenses con Discapacidades (ADA), acomodará a las personas que requieran una modificación de la adaptación para participar en esta reunión. RTA también se compromete a ayudar a las personas con dominio limitado del inglés a acceder a los servicios públicos esenciales de la agencia y a la información pública en español. Para solicitar una adaptación, por favor llame al (805)541-2228 x4833. Requerimos al menos 48 horas de anticipación para proporcionar adaptaciones razonables.

1. CALL MEETING TO ORDER, ROLL CALL

- 2. PUBLIC COMMENTS:** This portion of the agenda is set aside for any members of the public to directly address the Regional Transit Advisory Committee on any items not on the agenda and within the jurisdiction of the Committee. Comments are limited to three minutes per speaker. The Committee will listen to all communication, but in compliance with the Brown Act, will not take any action on items that are not on the agenda.

3. A. INFORMATION AGENDA ITEMS:

A-1 Executive Director's Report (Verbal)

A-2 Member Comments / Reports from Jurisdictions (Verbal)

A-3 LTF Funding Need Projections (Receive)

B. ACTION AGENDA ITEMS:

B-1 Fiscal Year 2026-27 Operating and Capital Budget Amendment #1
(Recommend)

C. CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS:

The following item is considered routine and non-controversial by staff and will be approved by one motion if no member of the RTAC or the public wishes the 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 RTAC members, without the removal of the item from the Consent Agenda. Staff recommendations for each item are noted following the item.

C-1 RTAC Minutes of July 16, 2026 (Approve)

D. ADJOURNMENT

Next Regular Meeting: January 21, 2027

Future Regular Meeting Dates: April 8, 2027; July 15, 2027; October 21, 2027

****April meeting date moved up due to schedule conflicts**

**SAN LUIS OBISPO REGIONAL TRANSIT AUTHORITY
REGIONAL TRANSIT ADVISORY COMMITTEE
OCTOBER 15, 2026
STAFF REPORT**

AGENDA ITEM: A-3

TOPIC: Projected Use of LTF for Transit Purposes

PRESENTED BY: Tania Arnold, Deputy Director/CFO

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Receive and File

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE &
RTAC RECOMMENDATION:** Present the Projected Use of LTF for Transit Purposes to the Board as Information

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION:

The Fiscal Year 2026-27 RTA operating and capital budget was adopted on May 6, 2026. The budget report included fiscally constrained projections for FY26-27, as well as advisory projections for FY27-28 based on a range of stated assumptions. One key item in the budget is the use of Local Transportation Funds (LTF). LTF is derived from a ¼ cent sales tax collected statewide and are used by public transit agencies in SLO County primarily for transit operating purposes. As part of the budget development process, RTA staff continues to maximize all other transit funding sources first before determining our annual LTF claim that we submit to the San Luis Obispo Council of Governments.

Over the past few years, as operating and capital cost increases have risen more precipitously in comparison to LTF revenue levels, RTA staff has alerted the Board that the long-standing regional TDA funding formula is approaching a breaking-point – particularly for those municipalities that separately fund local public transit within their jurisdictional boundaries. In short, at least four of the eight RTA jurisdictions are projected to experience a transit-related need for LTF that will equal or exceed revenues in the next two years.

The SLOCOG Board discussed the LTF funding formula issue at its February 5, 2025 meeting under Agenda Item C-2 (see attached). The staff report included three possible alternative LTF Distribution Procedures, which will be examined in more detail as part of the on-going regional Long-Range Transit Plan study.

The RTA Joint Powers Agreement, Article III Financial Provisions Section 1 Budget provides the framework that staff uses in preparing the annual budget. There are several provisions in that section, which are summarized below:

1. The approval of the Overall Annual Budget shall be in accordance with those procedures prescribed by the Joint Powers Agreement of SLOCOG.

2. No member Agency shall be required to expend any of its general fund monies to support the operations of the RTA.
3. Each member agency shall make an annual contribution to the RTA in accordance with the adopted budget.
4. Any formula may be amended upon approval of all jurisdictions affected by that formula and ratified by the RTA.
5. All population percentages utilized shall be those annually adopted by SLOCOG for allocating Transportation Development Act Funds.

As alluded above, RTA staff annually develops a two-year operating budget and five-year capital budget with these provisos in mind. The RTA Board acknowledges that the first year of the operating and capital budgets are financially constrained, and outyears are presented for advisory purposes based on the assumptions stated in the budget report.

The table below provides a summary of net LTF apportionments over the past several years for each jurisdiction. Remember that TDA law prioritizes the use of LTF in our county as follows:

1. TDA Administration by SLOCOG,
2. Planning & Programming by SLOCOG,
3. Pedestrian and Bicycle as allocated to each jurisdiction by population,
4. Community Transit Services Agencies, which include Ride-On and the RTA, and
5. Transit, followed by streets/roads.

These LTF apportionments are adopted annually by the SLOCOG Board at its June Board meeting. For the purposes of this discussion, RTA staff assumed flat LTF revenues for FY27/28 and FY28/29 in the tables below.

Jurisdiction	LTF by Jurisdiction after Bikeway/Pedestrian funding								
	FY20/21	FY21/22	FY22/23	FY23/24	FY24/25	FY25/26	FY26/27	FY27/28	FY28/29
Arroyo Grande	656,191	889,752	1,239,867	1,141,119	1,056,586	975,520	1,090,559	1,090,559	1,090,559
Atascadero	1,116,106	1,512,030	2,092,200	1,901,241	1,781,205	1,646,818	1,834,891	1,834,891	1,834,891
Grover Beach	496,768	664,736	927,199	792,620	735,011	678,660	755,718	755,718	755,718
Morro Bay	383,195	512,511	714,822	652,834	605,786	557,926	633,510	633,510	633,510
Paso Robles	1,146,903	1,570,586	2,194,610	1,944,655	1,809,618	1,680,903	1,891,337	1,891,337	1,891,337
Pismo Beach	302,437	409,436	572,649	497,828	463,735	426,638	475,194	475,194	475,194
San Luis Obispo	2,030,024	2,672,979	3,864,246	3,512,306	3,337,916	3,128,215	3,567,302	3,567,302	3,567,302
SLO County	4,161,031	5,715,603	7,546,626	7,067,839	6,624,106	6,050,281	6,760,611	6,760,611	6,760,611
Total	10,292,655	13,947,633	19,152,219	17,510,442	16,413,963	15,144,961	17,009,122	17,009,122	17,009,122

As shown, net LTF revenue levels increased significantly year over year in the first three years from \$10.3M to \$19.2M. However, the apportionments declined in the ensuing three years back down to \$15.4M, with a rebound in FY26/27 to \$17M.

The table below presents the amount of LTF remaining after each jurisdiction makes its contributions for RTA core services and for local transit services operated by the RTA on their behalf. As shown, four jurisdictions will allocate LTF for transit purposes in future years that nearly equal or even exceed projected LTF apportionments based on: 1) the current TDA funding formula, 2) flat LTF revenues, and 3) a conservative FY28/29 3.5% inflation rate for RTA operating costs. Those affected cities are Arroyo Grande, Grover Beach, Morro Bay, and Pismo Beach. In particular, if the City of Morro Bay is unable to secure outside grant funding to replace a trolley vehicle in FY27/28, it will exceed its expected LTF apportionment in FY27/28 and FY28/29.

Jurisdiction	LTF by Jurisdiction after RTA Contribution								
	FY20/21	FY21/22	FY22/23	FY23/24	FY24/25	FY25/26	FY26/27	FY27/28	FY28/29
Arroyo Grande	447,961	653,702	565,513	397,945	388,116	172,590	87,715	116,193	82,955
Atascadero	761,931	1,202,523	1,485,668	1,131,703	1,060,931	844,682	1,139,846	1,027,663	870,870
Grover Beach	339,128	488,383	423,157	276,412	268,722	120,085	58,070	77,882	54,760
Morro Bay	261,595	397,025	509,219	388,595	346,089	72,624	133,192	-369,435	-77,470
Paso Robles	782,955	1,016,122	1,056,063	671,364	885,499	611,861	488,376	476,437	428,406
Pismo Beach	206,464	300,813	261,790	173,608	169,849	75,498	36,628	49,082	34,546
San Luis Obispo	1,286,416	2,084,383	2,647,859	1,953,244	1,957,532	1,827,786	2,163,753	1,971,866	1,918,912
SLO County	1,751,603	3,725,892	3,649,718	2,499,150	2,424,407	2,288,293	2,473,596	1,861,314	1,697,694
Total	5,838,053	9,868,843	10,598,987	7,492,021	7,501,145	6,013,419	6,581,176	5,211,002	5,010,673
% change in Jurisdiction LTF		169%	107%	71%	100%	80%	109%	79%	96%
For FY28/29 - Assuming 3.5% increase in LTF for operations based on historical increased in operating costs (adjusting for carryovers)									

It should be noted that the table above does not present the amount of LTF the City of San Luis Obispo claims for its local fixed-route services; the table only shows the net available to the City after making its RTA contribution. Based on transit service expansions identified in the City's 2025 Short-Range Transit Plan, RTA staff anticipates the City will need more LTF for its own local fixed-route services than will be available when those expanded services are implemented.

Staff Recommendation for Executive Committee on October 14th:

Recommend staff provide the projected use of LTF for transit purposes as an information item at the November 4, 2026 Board meeting.

Staff Recommendation to RTAC on October 15th:

Recommend staff provide the projected use of LTF for transit purposes as an information item at the November 4, 2026 Board meeting.

Staff Recommendation:

Receive and file the projected use of LTF for transit purposes.

This Page Left Intentionally Blank

SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

STAFF REPORT

APPROVED (under Consent Agenda) - RECEIVED INFORMATION

ITEM C-2

MEETING DATE: FEBRUARY 5, 2025

SUBJECT: Transportation Development Act (TDA) Funding Formula

STAFF CONTACT: Ivana Rodriguez, Lance Okuno

SUMMARY

The purpose of this staff report is to provide details on the formula used to fund the San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority's (RTA's) operations with each jurisdiction's Transportation Development Act (TDA) funds and present alternative TDA funding distribution methods. This is an information only item.

RECOMMENDATION

APPROVED (under Consent Agenda) - RECEIVED INFORMATION

Staff: Receive information

SSTAC: Received information

TTAC: Received information

CTAC: Received information

BACKGROUND

The California Transportation Development Act (TDA) was enacted by the State Legislature in 1971 to make funds available for transit, pedestrian way and bikeway projects, transportation planning, ridesharing, and street and road improvements. Funds for the TDA come from two funding sources: the Local Transportation Fund (LTF) and the State Transit Assistance (STA). LTF is derived from a quarter cent (1/4) of the state sales tax and STA comes from the sales taxes on diesel fuel. These funds are allocated annually by the San Luis Obispo Council of Governments (SLOCOG) to eligible claimants under the two funding programs. LTF funds provide off-the-top funding for planning/administration. The remaining LTF is apportioned according to population for discretionary use on public transit, street/road improvements and bikeway/pedestrian facilities. STA funds are restricted for public transit purposes.

Since 1995, the seven cities and the County have financially supported the Regional Transit Authority's (RTA's) operations with their TDA dollars through the following formula:

- 49% of the costs of regional transit to the County
- 18% to the City of SLO
- Remaining balance split between the cities of Arroyo Grande, Atascadero, Grover Beach, Morro Bay, Paso Robles, and Pismo Beach based on their populations as shown in **Table 1**.

Table 1: FY 23/24 LTF Allocation per Population Distribution

	Population	CA Dept. of Finance 2023 Pop. %	LTF 2023/24
ARROYO GRANDE	17,922	6.44%	\$1,163,683
ATASCADERO	30,206	10.85%	\$1,938,835
GROVER BEACH	12,467	4.48%	\$808,293
MORRO BAY	10,275	3.69%	\$665,743
PASO ROBLES	30,692	11.03%	\$1,983,108
PISMO BEACH	7,865	2.83%	\$507,672
SAN LUIS OBISPO	56,589	20.33%	\$3,581,757
SLO COUNTY	112,332	40.36%	\$7,207,595
Total Apportioned	278,348	100.00%	\$17,856,687

At the time this formula was created, the County's jurisdictional population made up 43% of SLO County's total population, and the City of SLO's population made up 19% of SLO County's total population. All cities benefitted from the County paying a higher share than their population share. As of 2023, the County's jurisdictional population was 40% of the County's total population, and the City of SLO's population was 20% of SLO County's total population. All cities continue to benefit from the County paying a higher share towards the RTA's operations than their population share.

Prior to the use of this formula, each route in the RTA system had its own funding formula arrangement, sharing costs among the jurisdictions served by that particular route. Having multiple funding formulas created several problems:

1. There was no clear mechanism for funding any route revisions or service expansion. Each change in service required separate negotiation.
2. The funding ratios were not based on any measurable or trackable standard, and they were not directly tied to ridership or units of service provided.
3. The funding formulas did not encourage good route design.
4. Jurisdictions that wanted to fund local services as well as regional transit were faced with reductions in their local services to meet their obligations to the Joint Powers Agreement.

At the time that the current formula was created it was suggested that the RTA develop a "minimum level of service," which would become the backbone of the regional fixed route system. This "minimum level of service," is now referred to as the RTA's "core services," which include intercity fixed-routes along the US-101 and SR-1 corridors, and regional Americans with Disabilities Act complementary paratransit services, as described in the RTA's Joint Powers Agreement (JPA). RTA core services were defined in a 2020 amendment to the JPA with the consolidation of South County Transit. Despite the addition of housing developments in underserved areas of the county, the establishment of new large employment sites, and the growth of the San Luis Obispo County Regional Airport, the RTA's "core services" definition has not been updated since the consolidation of South County Transit.

In conclusion, jurisdictions continue to fund the RTA's operations with TDA dollars through the following formula:

- 49% of the costs of regional transit to the County
- 18% to the City of SLO
- Remaining balance split between the cities of Arroyo Grande, Grover Beach, Morro Bay, Paso Robles, and Pismo Beach based on their populations.

Section 1. Budget of the RTA's JPA states that any formula may be amended upon approval of all jurisdictions affected by that formula and ratified by the RTA.

According to Section 6. Boundaries and Service Levels of the RTA's JPA, any additional services beyond what is recommended in the Regional Transportation Plan or what is mandated by the Unmet Transit Needs Hearing (PUC Section 99401.5) would require unanimous approval by affected jurisdictions, with costs for the extra service to be distributed on the basis of formula developed by the RTA Board members representing the affected jurisdictions.

In consideration of language within the RTA's JPA for additional service level changes, SLOCOG staff will work to broaden the transit section and recommendations within the upcoming 2027 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) where information is lacking, or changes are appropriate. The ongoing Short Range Transit Plan (SRTP) for San Luis Obispo City Transit and the RTA service alternative recommendations will be included in this update.

Under state Transportation Development Act (TDA) rules, the Unmet Transit Needs process must occur annually and provides interested individuals the opportunity to testify on any transit deficiencies they experience or view as being an "unmet transit need." They can submit requests by e-mail, mail, fax, phone, social media, survey, or public testimony. Staff evaluate each request to determine whether it meets the criteria as an unmet transit need and is reasonable to meet. These definitions are adopted by the SLOCOG

Board annually, and if any requests meet the criteria SLOCOG staff will amend TDA allocations which includes the condition that any jurisdiction found to have an “unmet transit need, reasonable to meet,” must implement that transit service or have an implementation plan before receiving any TDA funds for streets and road improvements. Refer to item F-1 FY 2025/2026 Unmet Transit Needs and Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements Public Hearings in the February 5, 2025 Board agenda for the most recent update to the Unmet Transit Needs study this year. In the past decade, there have been no requests that have met all criteria and been mandated for implementation through the Unmet Transit Needs study. However, specific requests such as regional transit service to 825 Buckley Road ([2019-2020 Unmet Transit Needs Report](#)) and expanding SLO Transit service by running B-routes on weekends ([24-25UnmetTransitNeeds REPORT](#)) have sufficiently met criteria for an “unmet transit need.” The request for regional transit service to 825 Buckley Road was determined to be not “reasonable to meet” due to projected low ridership and farebox recovery, but staff recommended that this request be revisited in the future when the Avila Ranch development project and Buckley Road extension to South Higuera Street were completed. In the interim, SLO Regional Rideshare staff conducted and continues to conduct employer outreach to assist with trip reduction plans, vanpool programs, and seeks input through employee surveys. Similar to other requests within the 2024-2025 Unmet Transit Needs study, the request to run SLO Transit B-routes on weekends was not mandated due to existing plans for implementation and a lack of resources. This request was forwarded to SLO Transit and has been analyzed as a service recommendation in their upcoming S RTP which the 2027 RTP will cite.

DISCUSSION

It has been previously mentioned that “the formula may break” due to the cost of the services desired by the community and recommended in the Short Range Transit Plans being more money than the TDA funds can provide. TDA funds generally account for 50% of operating and 15% of vehicle replacement project costs. The SLOCOG Board requested staff to provide an update on how the TDA formula is currently allocated and what options for modifying the formula could look like.

STA funds are allocated by SLOCOG according to the adopted regional criteria based of:

- Vehicle Miles Travel Reduced
- Service Population
- Degree of Regional Integration
- Special Projects

SLOCOG apportions revenues from the LTF Fund according to the priorities outlined in the Public Utilities Code (PUC 99233). Below is a summary of LTF funding distributions in order of allocation based on priority.

Table 2: LTF Funding Distribution

PRIORITY	PURPOSE	ARTICLE, PUC SECTION	ELIGIBLE CLAIMANTS	AMOUNT AVAILABLE
1	TDA Administration	Article 3, PUC 99233.1	SLOCOG, as the RTPA	As necessary, approved in the annual OWP
2	Planning & Programming	Article 3, PUC 99233.2	SLOCOG, as the RTPA	As necessary, approved in the annual OWP
3	Pedestrian and Bicycle	Article 3, PUC 99233.3	7 Cities and SLO County	2% of remaining funds
4	Community Transit Services Agencies (CTSA)	Article 4.5, PUC 99233.7	CTSA(s)	Up to 5% of remaining funds
5	Transportation purposes, Other, Streets and Roads (determined by claimant)	Article 4, Article 8	7 Cities and SLO County	Balance of funds based on population

After funds have been apportioned based on priorities one through four, the claimants' total amount of TDA available will be adjusted to account for LTF contributions required to be made to the RTA. RTA applies the formula (49% SLO County, 18% City of San Luis Obispo) and the rest by relative population. It should be noted that the RTA has the authority to collect more during this phase of allocation but typically does not in order to preserve some discretionary funding for jurisdictions. The remaining amount is then left for each jurisdiction to allocate to either transit service or streets and roads.

Alternative TDA Funding Distribution Methods

The current policy for LTF apportionment from the TDA Statutes and California Code of Regulations states:

Generally, revenues from the county's LTF must be apportioned, by population, to areas within the county. For a county without a transit district, apportionments are made for the incorporated area of each city and for the county's unincorporated area.

Since there is no transit district, apportionments are made for incorporated areas and the county's unincorporated area by population. Alternative options to change the funding distribution method could include establishing new transit cost sharing procedures allowable in the Public Utilities Code (PUC), forming a transit district, or approving adjusting the TDA allocation to RTA.

1. Establishing New Transit Cost Sharing Procedures

Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPAs) are allowed to form apportionment procedures best suited for their needs and in accordance with the Public Utilities Code. Other RTPAs have statutes that detail their apportionment procedures if differing from the standard. For example, in lieu of allocating LTF revenues based on a population formula, the Stanislaus Council of Governments (StanCOG) adheres to Statute PUC 99233.11 in establishing the transit cost sharing formula that allocates LTF funding according to where the transit need is the greatest prior to the population allocation. Transit cost sharing is intended to maximize the effectiveness of LTF revenues by allowing these funds to be pooled together and transit costs to be paid off the top. Once transit costs have been determined, the remaining LTF is made available to the jurisdictions for other eligible transportation purposes, such as streets and roads based on a specified formula. By creating a statute that changes the order of the funding distribution, RTA and SLO Transit would be able to use the funding that is available *before* any money is allocated based on population. The amount leftover after transit operators allocated based on transit needs would then be distributed to the jurisdictions based on population. This could result in lower funding available for streets and road maintenance for the remaining jurisdictions, but ensures the amount needed for transit service is sufficient.

Current LTF Funding Distribution

- Priority 1-4 allocated based on Table 2
- Priority 5 Population Distribution to Jurisdictions
- RTA allocates portions of jurisdictions LTF for core services
- Jurisdictions allocate discretionary LTF to transit or streets and roads

Example LTF Funding Distribution

- Priority 1-4 allocated based on Table 2
- RTA and SLO Transit allocate funding to transit service
- Priority 5 Remaining funding is distributed by population to Jurisdictions
- Jurisdictions allocate discretionary LTF to transit or streets and roads

2. Transit District

Another approach is to form a Transit District organized pursuant to state law and designated in the enabling legislation as a transit district. Transit Districts generally encompass a specific geographic area and receive priority in the allocation of TDA funds. However, this approach entails significant administrative effort, potentially yielding similar TDA apportionment outcomes to the existing RTA structure, which already possesses the authority to collect additional LTF but has not exercised it. While both transit districts and transit agencies can access TDA funding, their organizational differences influence how they operate and manage those funds.

3. RTA Board approves more LTF Funding Apportioned

Currently, after initial funds have been apportioned, claimant allocations are modified to account for the LTF contributions made to the RTA. RTA has procedurally only taken from each jurisdiction the baseline amount to maintain “core services” (see page C-2-2). In order to increase service or work towards their capital plan the RTA would need to take more than this baseline amount. Under the public utility code, RTA has the authority to do this, but before making this type of policy change, if taking more than customary, it would be beneficial to have Board approval. Even if this change is made, the “formula breaking” could result in a funding deficit within each jurisdiction beyond allocation from the population formula. As mentioned previously, a possible solution would be to amend the TDA funding distribution procedure within the public utility code which StanCOG has completed to allocate transit funding first before the population distribution.

Table 3: Alternative LTF Funding Distribution

	Alternative LTF Funding Distribution Procedure	Main Change	Benefits	Constraints	Feasibility of Implementing
1	Establishing New Transit Cost Sharing Procedures	Transit allocation from each jurisdiction is taken before the funding is distributed by a population formula instead of the transit allocation being taken with the sum of each jurisdiction's population formula	Ensure more funding is available for transit even if funding needs for a jurisdiction were greater than their population distribution	Less funding would ultimately be available for each jurisdiction for local streets and roads	Medium Modifications to the existing transit policy would need to take place with final approval from the SLOCOG Board
2	Transit District	Forming a transit district requires a ballot measure and formally establishes a transit district with a governing board	Transit Districts have authority to prioritize TDA funds for transit and potentially levy taxes to supplement TDA funds	Less funding would ultimately be available for each jurisdiction for local streets and roads	Difficult The formation of a transit district necessitates significant effort and would require a comprehensive restructuring of the existing transit governance framework.
3	RTA Board approves more LTF Funding Apportioned	Board takes action to prioritize more funding for transit. Transit allocation order remains the same.	This would take the least amount of administrative work to prioritize funding for transit services	Less funding would ultimately be available for each jurisdiction for local streets and roads	Medium RTA already has authority to allocate more LTF funds from each jurisdiction. Board approval to ensure on the agreeance that less funding would be available for streets and roads would be requested to make sure everyone is on the same page about that decision

In summary, increased investment in transit services through LTF will require a corresponding reduction in discretionary LTF available to individual jurisdictions. In Fiscal Year 2024/2025 the amount of discretionary LTF dollars spent on streets and road maintenance was approximately five million dollars. Without a replacement funding source, it is unlikely to have consensus on amending the TDA funding distribution method. However, there are existing resources that could act as replacement funding sources such as general sales tax revenue within jurisdictions and Senate Bill 1 (SB1) funding. It is important to note that if a region-wide sales tax is approved in the future that could fund streets and road maintenance, amending one of the above options becomes more feasible if no other replacement sources of funding are utilized.

**SAN LUIS OBISPO REGIONAL TRANSIT AUTHORITY
REGIONAL TRANSIT ADVISORY COMMITTEE
OCTOBER 15, 2026
STAFF REPORT**

AGENDA ITEM: B-1

TOPIC: Fiscal Year 2026-27 Operating and Capital Budget Amendment #1

PRESENTED BY: Tania Arnold, Deputy Director/CFO

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Adopt Budget Amendment #1 as Presented

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE &
RTAC RECOMMENDATION:** Bring the Fiscal Year 2026-27 Budget Amendment #1 as Presented to the Board for Approval

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION:

The Fiscal Year 2026-27 RTA operating and capital budget was adopted on May 6, 2026 and was based on a range of assumptions, including pending delivery/completion dates for FY25-26 capital projects. Staff is now bringing back capital items that are being carried over from FY25-26 to FY26-27. Staff is also making one adjustment to operating revenue, but this adjustment results in no overall revenue impact. Please note, none of these adjustments require additional/new funds.

Additionally, as noted at the October 7, 2026 San Luis Obispo Council of Governments (SLOCOG) meeting, an increase to the State Transit Assistance (STA) allocated to the region totaling approximately \$538,650 resulted in an increase in funding available for the RTA and the transit services the RTA operates on behalf of consolidated jurisdictions. The total change for RTA core service is just over \$220,000. Staff has included this in the budget amendment, including increasing the projection for FY27-28, with all additional STA funds for FY26-27 being rolled forward into FY27-28. In light of potential future funding challenges, including with possible farebox ratio penalties, staff is carrying over the additional STA funds to FY27-28 to minimize the impact of possible future funding declines.

The proposed changes in this budget amendment are highlighted in yellow in the ensuing pages.

The budgets for the Cities of Morro Bay and Atascadero have an additional adjustment for the close out transfer of their transit funds to the RTA.

Similar to prior years, as part of the reconciliation process to determine fund balances at the start of FY26-27, the amounts have been adjusted by the Governmental Accounting

Standards Board (GASB) Statement 68, which is used to improve the accounting and financial reporting by state and local governments for pensions. This adjustment is completed with the assistance of our annual financial and compliance auditor as part of the financial statements but does not impact the current level of funding for the agency and is noted in the changes included below. One additional adjustment was related to GASB 68: in the RTA financial statements the operating expenses used to calculate the farebox recovery ratio is now also net of the GASB 68 adjustment, in addition to depreciation. One final adjustment that began with the FY23-24 financial statements was to the farebox recovery ratio related to the addition of “Other Local Support – Federal Grants” to the net operating revenue in accordance with CA Public Utility Code § 99268.19.

Changes in Operating Revenue for FY26-27 for RTA (see page B-1-5):

- Update the **OFFSET RESERVE TO CARRYOVER TO FUTURE FISCAL YEARS** line-item to \$220,060
- Update **STATE TRANSIT ASSISTANCE (STA) INCLUDING SB1** by \$220,060 to \$886,060

Changes in Capital Revenue for FY26-27 for RTA (see page B-1-6):

- The **BEGINNING CAPITAL PROJECTS RESERVE** line-item has been increased from \$1,031,550 to \$1,240,850, which is as a result of STA from FY25-26 that was allocated to projects but was not completed of \$209,300
- Changes in **NON-TDA SOURCES** includes:
 - **STATE OF GOOD REPAIR (SGR)** funds of \$838,410 (from \$0 to \$838,410):
 - Part of the local match for four electric buses, and
 - Local match for photovoltaic/battery energy storage systems projects and electric vehicle servicing equipment projects.
 - **SB125** for Tap2Ride fare program of \$290,540 (from \$0 to \$290,540)
 - **RURAL TRANSIT FUND** of \$673,420 (from \$120,450 to \$793,870):
 - Part of the local match for four electric buses, and
 - Part of the local match for demand response vehicles.
 - Carryover **FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION (FTA)(Section 5307)** funds for:
 - Photovoltaic/battery energy storage systems projects and electric vehicle servicing equipment projects of \$529,430,
 - **Fixed Route Electric** vehicles of \$1,478,210,
 - **Demand Response Non-Electric** vehicle of \$1,521,240,
 - **Support Vehicles** of \$25,690 (from \$41,880 to \$67,570), and
 - **Dispatch Software Upgrade** of \$137,710.
 - Carryover **FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION (FTA)(Section 5339)** funds for:
 - **Fixed Route Electric** vehicles of \$1,325,120.

Changes in Capital Expenditures (in total) (see page B-1-7):

- Carryover balance of **Computer System Maintenance/Upgrades** of \$250,000 (from \$117,150 to \$367,150),

- Carryover balance for **Support Vehicles** of \$46,630 (from \$76,900 to \$123,530),
- Carryover balance for **Fixed Route Vehicles** (four battery electric buses) of \$5,839,940 (from \$2,212,100 to \$8,052,040)
- Carryover balance for **Trolley Vehicles** (Avila Trolley) replacement of \$285,400 (entire amount carried forward adjust for full purchase price),
- Carryover balance for **Demand Response Vehicles** of \$1,823,250 (from \$350,300 to \$2,173,550),
- Carryover balance for **Regional Contactless Fare Payment System** (Tap2Ride) of \$319,630 (from \$0),
- Carryover balance for **Regional Facility Projects** (PV/BESS and EVSE) of \$951,520 (from \$0), and
- Carryover balance for **Master Planning & Implementation – Offsite fast charging** (bus charging electrification study) of \$138,770 (from \$0).

These amendments do **not** require any additional LTF funds for FY26-27. The capital planning pages for vehicle replacements are attached for reference.

Staff Recommendation for Executive Committee on October 14th:

Recommend staff provide Budget Amendment #1 to the Board for approval at the November 4, 2026 Board meeting.

Staff Recommendation to RTAC on October 15th:

Recommend staff provide Budget Amendment #1 to the Board for approval at the November 4, 2026 Board meeting.

Staff Recommendation:

Adopt Budget Amendment #1 as presented.

This Page Left Intentionally Blank

SAN LUIS OBISPO REGIONAL TRANSIT AUTHORITY
OPERATING REVENUE BUDGET FOR 2026/2027

		2025/26 Combined Actual	2025/26 Amended Combined Budget	2025/26 Amended RTA Core Budget	2026/27 Adopted Combined Budget	2026/27 Amended Combined Budget	2026/27 Adopted RTA Core Budget	2026/27 Amended RTA Core Budget	2027/28 Projected Combined Budget	2027/28 Projected RTA Core Budget
FUNDING SOURCES:										
GENERAL RESERVES		4,874,169	5,726,480	3,501,760	4,022,130	4,242,930	2,597,610	2,597,610	4,568,420	2,811,920
1.	ESTIMATED FUND BALANCE	4,874,169	5,726,480	3,501,760	4,022,130	4,242,930	2,597,610	2,597,610	4,568,420	
2.										
LESS REQUIRED RESERVES FOR FISCAL YEAR										
CASH FLOW REQUIREMENTS PER TDA		3,462,130	3,462,130	2,337,610	3,773,560	3,773,560	2,591,860	2,591,860	4,034,260	2,801,890
OFFSET RESERVE TO CARRYOVER TO FUTURE FISCAL YEARS		560,000	200,000	-	35,410	794,860	-	220,060	128,720	-
TOTAL		4,022,130	3,662,130	2,337,610	3,808,970	4,568,420	2,591,860	2,811,920	4,162,980	2,801,890
3.										
FUND BALANCE AVAILABLE		852,039	2,064,350	1,164,150	213,160	(325,490)	5,750	(214,310)	405,440	10,030
NON TDA SOURCES										
FARES		966,145	1,148,820	849,760	968,710	968,710	704,190	704,190	978,390	711,230
INTEREST		234,641	135,000	135,000	230,440	230,440	230,440	230,440	230,440	230,440
STATE TRANSIT ASSISTANCE (STA) INCLUDING SB1		1,598,122	1,561,990	494,440	1,629,280	2,167,930	666,000	886,060	1,505,390	376,100
RURAL TRANSIT FUND (Including Administration)		30,000	285,410	285,410	-	-	-	-	-	-
FEDERAL TRANSIT ADM (FTA) (Section 5307) - San Luis Obispo		850,500	850,500	850,500	867,600	867,600	867,600	867,600	885,040	885,040
FEDERAL TRANSIT ADM (FTA) (Section 5311) - Operating		800,258	800,000	800,000	802,260	802,260	712,460	712,460	804,260	708,300
FEDERAL TRANSIT ADM (FTA) (Section 5307-N. County) - Operating		1,742,500	1,742,500	1,155,700	2,294,000	2,294,000	1,695,500	1,695,500	2,329,500	1,719,060
FEDERAL TRANSIT ADM (FTA) (Section 5307) - S. County Operating		2,006,500	2,006,500	969,600	2,353,960	2,353,960	1,224,260	1,224,260	2,391,910	1,244,050
CUESTA CONTRIBUTION FOR ROUTE 12 AND 14		113,670	113,670	113,670	121,330	121,330	121,330	121,330	129,620	129,620
CUESTA CONTRIBUTION NORTH COUNTY		40,580	40,580	-	40,580	40,580	-	-	40,580	-
SPECIAL EVENTS REVENUE/OTHER		-	454,990	377,390	305,970	305,970	190,000	190,000	305,970	190,000
4.										
SUB TOTAL		8,382,917	9,139,960	6,031,470	9,614,130	10,152,780	6,411,780	6,631,840	9,601,100	6,193,840
5.										
TOTAL FUND BALANCE & NON TDA FUNDING		9,234,955	11,204,310	7,195,620	9,827,290	9,827,290	6,417,530	6,417,530	10,006,540	6,203,870
TDA REQUIRED										
CITY OF ARROYO GRANDE		774,778	774,778	361,707	978,122	978,122	387,112	387,112	949,648	453,583
CITY OF ATASCADERO		754,623	754,623	610,453	653,329	653,329	653,329	653,329	765,511	765,511
CITY OF GROVER BEACH		538,989	538,989	251,629	680,449	680,449	269,302	269,302	660,640	315,544
CITY OF MORRO BAY		469,201	469,201	206,871	486,181	486,181	221,401	221,401	673,278	259,418
CITY OF PASO ROBLES		1,020,544	1,020,544	623,114	1,360,380	1,360,380	666,880	666,880	1,372,318	781,388
CITY OF PISMO BEACH		338,828	338,828	158,183	427,755	427,755	169,293	169,293	415,302	198,362
CITY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO		1,206,522	1,206,522	1,206,522	1,291,264	1,291,264	1,291,264	1,291,264	1,512,985	1,512,985
COUNTY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO		3,561,094	3,561,094	3,284,421	4,062,569	4,062,569	3,515,108	3,515,108	4,674,848	4,118,680
TDA REQUIREMENTS BEFORE 5311 EXCHANGE		8,664,580	8,664,580	6,702,900	9,940,050	9,940,050	7,173,690	7,173,690	11,024,530	8,405,470
LESS: RURAL TRANSIT FUND/5311 EXCHANGE		(800,258)	(800,000)	(800,000)	-	-	-	-	-	-
6.										
NET TDA REQUIREMENTS		7,864,322	7,864,580	5,902,900	9,940,050	9,940,050	7,173,690	7,173,690	11,024,530	8,405,470
7.										
TOTAL FUNDING SOURCES		17,099,277	19,068,890	13,098,520	19,767,340	19,767,340	13,591,220	13,591,220	21,031,070	14,609,340
8.										
FUNDING USES:										
ADMINISTRATION		2,803,662	3,060,070	2,085,030	3,002,210	3,002,210	2,055,460	2,055,460	3,190,110	2,206,180
PERS BUYOUT		178,308	178,310	178,310	-	-	-	-	-	-
SERVICE DELIVERY		14,117,306	15,606,510	10,691,260	16,530,730	16,530,730	11,382,940	11,382,940	17,591,590	12,238,410
CONTINGENCY		-	224,000	143,920	234,400	234,400	152,820	152,820	249,370	164,750
9.										
TOTAL FUNDING USES		17,099,277	19,068,890	13,098,520	19,767,340	19,767,340	13,591,220	13,591,220	21,031,070	14,609,340

SAN LUIS OBISPO REGIONAL TRANSIT AUTHORITY
CAPITAL AND PLANNING REVENUE BUDGET FOR 2026/2027

		2025/26 Combined Acutal Capital Expense	2025/26 Amendment #1 Combined Capital Budget	2025/26 Adopted RTA Core Capital Budget	2026/27 Adopted Combined Capital Budget	2026/27 Amended Combined Capital Budget	2026/27 Adopted RTA Core Capital Budget	2026/27 Amended RTA Core Capital Budget	2027/28 Projected Combined Capital Budget	2027/2028 Revised Projected Combined Capital Budget
FUNDING SOURCES:										
BEGINNING CAPITAL PROJECTS RESERVE		1,556,815	1,590,170	1,187,950	1,384,910	1,683,300	1,031,550	1,240,850	1,113,830	1,113,830
1.	ESTIMATED FUND BALANCE	1,556,815	1,590,170	1,187,950	1,384,910	1,683,300	1,031,550	1,240,850	1,113,830	1,113,830
2.										
LESS REQUIRED RESERVES FOR FISCAL YEAR										
CAPITAL PROJECTS RESERVE		1,447,258	1,384,910	1,031,550	1,113,830	1,113,830	788,170	788,170	1,343,050	1,343,050
TOTAL		1,447,258	1,384,910	1,031,550	1,113,830	1,113,830	788,170	788,170	1,343,050	1,343,050
3.										
FUND BALANCE AVAILABLE		109,557	205,260	156,400	271,080	569,470	243,380	452,680	(229,220)	(229,220)
NON TDA SOURCES										
STATE TRANSIT ASSISTANCE (STA)		393,168	442,280	294,740	174,560	174,560	36,850	36,850	652,520	554,550
LOW CARBON TRANSIT OPERATIONS PROGRAM (LCTOP)		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
STATE OF GOOD REPAIR (SGR)		335,591	618,280	407,570	37,000	1,101,290	-	838,410	465,700	465,700
SB125		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Infrastructure (including fare program)		652,831	8,654,010	6,462,090	-	458,400	-	290,540	166,600	166,600
Fixed Route Electric		-	1,220,000	804,230	-	-	-	-	1,197,400	1,197,400
RURAL TRANSIT FUND (Capital)		1,706,749	2,425,690	1,455,200	185,810	1,166,370	120,450	793,870	-	-
FEDERAL TRANSIT ADM (FTA) (Section 5307)		183,903	-	-	-	529,430	-	529,430	-	-
Fixed Route Electric		-	2,280,400	1,503,250	-	2,280,400	-	1,478,210	1,281,600	3,126,900
Fixed Route Non-Electric		-	-	-	1,769,700	1,769,700	1,147,160	1,147,160	1,863,100	1,242,070
Demand Response Electric		200,923	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	270,640
Demand Response Non-Electric		-	646,810	451,500	140,400	1,674,240	-	1,521,240	208,300	-
ADA Minivans		-	517,700	517,700	148,200	148,200	-	-	-	-
Support Vehicles		174,449	280,120	268,380	61,600	98,900	41,880	67,570	30,300	30,300
Trolley		-	200,920	-	-	228,300	-	-	280,000	280,000
Planning		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bus Stop Improvements		88,999	123,230	83,150	87,800	87,800	55,790	55,790	89,200	89,200
Dispatch Software Upgrade		56,997	200,000	200,000	-	200,000	-	137,710	-	-
Vehicle Maintenance Equipment		69,459	150,900	138,390	40,400	40,400	27,840	27,840	41,000	41,000
FEDERAL TRANSIT ADM (FTA) (Section 5339)		512	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vehicle Engine Rehab		570,583	469,460	269,470	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fixed Route Electric		3,965,661	6,615,210	4,360,790	-	2,044,240	-	1,325,120	427,200	509,600
Fixed Route Non-Electric		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	994,030	538,700
Dial-A-Ride Vehicle Replacement		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
OTHER		750,000	1,271,570	818,730	-	-	-	-	-	-
4.										
SUB TOTAL		9,149,825	26,116,580	18,035,190	2,645,470	12,002,230	1,429,970	8,249,740	8,512,660	8,512,660
5.										
TOTAL FUND BALANCE & NON TDA FUNDING		9,259,382	26,321,840	18,191,590	2,916,550	12,571,700	1,673,350	8,702,420	8,283,440	8,283,440
TDA REQUIRED										
CITY OF ARROYO GRANDE		24,718	24,718	24,718	24,718	24,718	24,718	24,718	24,718	24,718
CITY OF ATASCADERO		41,717	41,717	41,717	41,717	41,717	41,717	41,717	41,717	41,717
CITY OF GROVER BEACH		17,196	17,196	17,196	17,196	17,196	17,196	17,196	17,196	17,196
CITY OF MORRO BAY		14,137	14,137	14,137	14,137	14,137	14,137	14,137	329,667	329,667
CITY OF PASO ROBLES		42,582	42,582	42,582	42,582	42,582	42,582	42,582	42,582	42,582
CITY OF PISMO BEACH		10,810	10,810	10,810	10,810	10,810	10,810	10,810	10,810	10,810
CITY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO		82,451	82,451	82,451	82,451	82,451	82,451	82,451	82,451	82,451
COUNTY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO		224,449	224,449	224,449	224,449	224,449	224,449	224,449	224,449	224,449
6.										
TDA REQUIREMENTS FOR TIFIA LOAN REPAYMENT		458,060	458,060	458,060	458,060	458,060	458,060	458,060	773,590	773,590
7.										
TOTAL FUNDING SOURCES		9,717,453	26,779,900	18,649,650	3,374,610	13,029,760	2,131,410	9,160,480	9,057,030	9,057,029
8.										
FUNDING USES:										
CAPITAL		8,085,863	17,600,740	11,729,500	2,916,550	11,161,770	1,673,350	7,460,350	9,074,870	8,598,970
LOAN PAYMENTS		430,555	458,060	458,060	458,060	458,060	458,060	458,060	458,060	458,060
SHORT RANGE TRANSIT PLAN		67,072	67,100	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
REGIONAL CONTACTLESS FARE PAYMENT SYSTEM		68,372	388,000	255,650	-	319,630	-	202,580	-	-
REGIONAL CONTACTLESS CHARGING		16,861	2,266,000	2,096,120	-	-	-	-	-	-
REGIONAL BUS CHARGING PROJECTS		964,271	4,000,000	2,740,220	-	951,530	-	951,530	-	-
MASTER PLANNING & IMPLEMENTION- OFFSITE FAST CHARGING		84,459	2,000,000	1,370,100	-	138,770	-	87,960	-	-
9.										
TOTAL FUNDING USES		9,717,453	26,779,900	18,649,650	3,374,610	13,029,760	2,131,410	9,160,480	9,532,930	9,057,030

		Actual Capital Expense FY 2024-25	Actual Capital Expense FY 2025-26	Adopted Amended Capital Budget FY 2025-26	Adopted Capital Budget FY 2026-27	Amended Capital Budget FY 2026-27	Projected Capital Budget FY 2027-28	Revised Projected Capital Budget FY 2027-28	Projected Capital Budget FY 2028-29	Projected Capital Budget FY 2029-30	Projected Capital Budget FY 2030-31
Capital and Planning Expenditures											
Capital/Studies:											
Computer System Maintenance/Upgrades		25,043	241,792	504,040	117,150	367,150	123,010	123,010	229,160	135,620	142,400
Miscellaneous Capital											
Maintenance Equipment		19,299	80,170	188,650	50,400	50,400	51,200	51,200	52,000	52,800	53,600
Vehicle ITS/Camera System		16,694	6,662	-	-	-	-	-	500,000	-	-
Bus Stop Improvements		135,288	111,254	147,000	109,700	109,700	111,400	111,400	113,260	115,000	106,800
Large Capital Repairs		76	724,232	586,820	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vehicles											
Support Vehicles		-	218,065	353,010	76,900	123,530	37,800	37,800	81,700	220,400	205,400
Fixed Route Vehicles		121,887	6,232,693	13,843,000	2,212,100	8,052,040	7,080,300	6,604,430	4,091,910	2,568,990	5,557,600
Trolley vehicles		42,053	-	251,150	-	285,400	700,000	700,000	-	-	-
Demand Response Vehicles		442,011	470,996	1,727,070	350,300	2,173,550	338,300	338,300	589,500	154,850	-
Fixed Route Cutaway Vehicles			-		-		466,260	466,260	739,280	-	796,100
Total Capital Outlay		802,351	8,085,863	17,600,740	2,916,550	11,161,770	8,908,270	8,432,400	6,396,810	3,247,660	6,861,900
Loan Repayments		444,635	430,555	458,060	458,060	458,060	458,060	458,060	458,060	458,060	458,060
Short Range Transit Plan		92,668	67,072	67,100	-	-	-	-	-	300,000	-
Regional Contactless Fare Payment System		-	68,372	388,000	-	319,630	-	-	-	-	-
Regional Contactless Charging		-	16,861	2,266,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Regional Facility Projects		50,537	964,271	4,000,000	-	951,520	-	-	-	-	-
Master Planning & Implementation - Offsite fast charging		-	84,459	2,000,000	-	138,770	166,600	166,600	101,700	-	-
TOTAL FUNDING USES		1,390,191	9,717,454	26,779,900	3,374,610	13,029,750	9,532,930	9,057,060	6,956,570	4,005,720	7,319,960

		Total Adopted Budget	Weekday Adopted Budget	Weekday Amended Budget	Express Adopted Budget	Express Amended Budget	Saturday Adopted Budget	Saturday Amended Budget	Sunday Adopted Budget	Sunday Amended Budget	Total Adopted Budget	Total Amended Budget	Total Projected Budget
Route 9		FY 2025-26	FY 2026-27	FY 2026-27	FY 2026-27	FY 2026-27	FY 2026-27	FY 2026-27	FY 2026-27	FY 2026-27	FY 2026-27	FY 2026-27	FY 2027-28
Measure:													
Annual Hours		12,760	10,100	10,100	1,290	1,290	720	720	490	490	12,600	12,600	12,600
Annual Miles		320,340	254,390	254,390	27,220	27,220	20,500	20,500	13,810	13,810	315,920	315,920	315,920
Administration:													
Total Administration (Net of Contracts)		\$ 464,180	\$ 368,700	\$ 368,700	\$ 43,710	\$ 43,710	\$ 27,800	\$ 27,800	\$ 18,830	\$ 18,830	\$ 459,040	\$ 459,040	\$ 475,080
Service Delivery:													
Labor - Operations													
Basis:													
hourly													
Bus Operators	hourly	\$ 881,840	\$ 796,990	\$ 796,990	\$ 101,790	\$ 101,790	\$ 56,820	\$ 56,820	\$ 38,670	\$ 38,670	\$ 994,270	\$ 994,270	\$ 1,031,670
Training Staff	hourly	\$ 59,530	\$ 48,490	\$ 48,490	\$ 6,190	\$ 6,190	\$ 3,460	\$ 3,460	\$ 2,350	\$ 2,350	\$ 60,490	\$ 60,490	\$ 61,820
Operations Supervisors/Schedulers	hourly	\$ 215,020	\$ 185,200	\$ 185,200	\$ 23,650	\$ 23,650	\$ 13,200	\$ 13,200	\$ 8,990	\$ 8,990	\$ 231,040	\$ 231,040	\$ 238,990
Ops. Mgt. / Oversight	hourly	\$ 67,700	\$ 59,210	\$ 59,210	\$ 7,560	\$ 7,560	\$ 4,220	\$ 4,220	\$ 2,870	\$ 2,870	\$ 73,860	\$ 73,860	\$ 75,690
Labor - Operations Workers Comp	hourly	\$ 54,240	\$ 48,750	\$ 48,750	\$ 6,230	\$ 6,230	\$ 3,480	\$ 3,480	\$ 2,370	\$ 2,370	\$ 60,830	\$ 60,830	\$ 63,890
Labor - Maintenance	miles	\$ 371,920	\$ 337,240	\$ 337,240	\$ 36,090	\$ 36,090	\$ 27,180	\$ 27,180	\$ 18,310	\$ 18,310	\$ 418,820	\$ 418,820	\$ 428,020
Labor - Maintenance Workers Comp	miles	\$ 19,800	\$ 18,070	\$ 18,070	\$ 1,930	\$ 1,930	\$ 1,460	\$ 1,460	\$ 980	\$ 980	\$ 22,440	\$ 22,440	\$ 23,730
Fuel	miles	\$ 294,300	\$ 202,490	\$ 202,490	\$ 21,670	\$ 21,670	\$ 16,320	\$ 16,320	\$ 10,990	\$ 10,990	\$ 251,470	\$ 251,470	\$ 257,750
Insurance	miles	\$ 214,810	\$ 178,110	\$ 178,110	\$ 19,060	\$ 19,060	\$ 14,350	\$ 14,350	\$ 9,670	\$ 9,670	\$ 221,190	\$ 221,190	\$ 241,580
Maintenance (parts, supplies, materials)	miles	\$ 174,180	\$ 144,600	\$ 144,600	\$ 15,470	\$ 15,470	\$ 11,650	\$ 11,650	\$ 7,850	\$ 7,850	\$ 179,570	\$ 179,570	\$ 185,130
Maintenance Contract Costs	miles	\$ 26,840	\$ 22,640	\$ 22,640	\$ 2,420	\$ 2,420	\$ 1,820	\$ 1,820	\$ 1,230	\$ 1,230	\$ 28,110	\$ 28,110	\$ 27,170
Total Operations		\$ 2,380,180	\$ 2,041,790	\$ 2,041,790	\$ 242,060	\$ 242,060	\$ 153,960	\$ 153,960	\$ 104,280	\$ 104,280	\$ 2,542,090	\$ 2,542,090	\$ 2,635,440
Capital/Studies:													
Total Capital Outlay		\$ 5,573,600	\$ 513,930	\$ 2,020,790	\$ 60,930	\$ 239,570	\$ 38,760	\$ 152,370	\$ 26,250	\$ 103,210	\$ 639,870	\$ 2,515,940	\$ 1,781,520
Contingency	hourly	\$ 30,480	\$ 25,800	\$ 25,800	\$ 3,300	\$ 3,300	\$ 1,840	\$ 1,840	\$ 1,250	\$ 1,250	\$ 32,190	\$ 32,190	\$ 33,270
PERS Buyout	operations cost	\$ 39,690	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Loan Repayment	operations cost	\$ 101,980	\$ 82,160	\$ 82,170	\$ 9,740	\$ 9,740	\$ 6,200	\$ 6,200	\$ 4,200	\$ 4,200	\$ 102,300	\$ 102,310	\$ 98,640
TOTAL FUNDING USES		\$ 8,590,110	\$ 3,032,380	\$ 4,539,250	\$ 359,740	\$ 538,380	\$ 228,560	\$ 342,170	\$ 154,810	\$ 231,770	\$ 3,775,490	\$ 5,651,570	\$ 5,023,950
TOTAL NON-CAPITAL EXPENDITURES		\$ 2,914,530	\$ 2,436,290	\$ 2,436,290	\$ 289,070	\$ 289,070	\$ 183,600	\$ 183,600	\$ 124,360	\$ 124,360	\$ 3,033,320	\$ 3,033,320	\$ 3,143,790

		Total Adopted Budget FY 2025-26	Weekday Proposed Budget FY 2026-27	Weekday Amended Budget FY 2026-27	Express Adopted Budget FY 2026-27	Express Amended Budget FY 2026-27	Saturday Adopted Budget FY 2026-27	Saturday Amended Budget FY 2026-27	Sunday Adopted Budget FY 2026-27	Sunday Amended Budget FY 2026-27	Total Adopted Budget FY 2026-27	Total Amended Budget FY 2026-27	Total Projected Budget FY 2027-28
Route 10	Measure:												
	Annual Hours	11,100	8,610	8,610	600	600	680	680	400	400	10,290	10,290	10,290
	Annual Miles	332,440	260,690	260,690	18,100	18,100	20,640	20,640	12,380	12,380	311,810	311,810	311,810
Administration:													
Total Administration (Net of Contracts)		\$ 439,870	\$ 342,400	\$ 342,400	\$ 23,820	\$ 23,820	\$ 27,080	\$ 27,080	\$ 16,080	\$ 16,080	\$ 409,380	\$ 409,380	\$ 423,710
Service Delivery:													
Labor - Operations													
Basis:													
Labor - Operations		hourly											
Bus Operators	hourly	\$ 767,120	\$ 679,410	\$ 679,410	\$ 47,350	\$ 47,350	\$ 53,660	\$ 53,660	\$ 31,560	\$ 31,560	\$ 811,980	\$ 811,980	\$ 842,530
Training Staff	hourly	\$ 51,780	\$ 41,340	\$ 41,340	\$ 2,880	\$ 2,880	\$ 3,260	\$ 3,260	\$ 1,920	\$ 1,920	\$ 49,400	\$ 49,400	\$ 50,490
Operations Supervisors/Schedulers	hourly	\$ 187,060	\$ 157,880	\$ 157,880	\$ 11,000	\$ 11,000	\$ 12,470	\$ 12,470	\$ 7,330	\$ 7,330	\$ 188,680	\$ 188,680	\$ 195,170
Ops. Mgt. / Oversight	hourly	\$ 58,880	\$ 50,470	\$ 50,470	\$ 3,520	\$ 3,520	\$ 3,990	\$ 3,990	\$ 2,340	\$ 2,340	\$ 60,320	\$ 60,320	\$ 61,820
Labor - Operations Workers Comp	hourly	\$ 47,190	\$ 41,560	\$ 41,560	\$ 2,900	\$ 2,900	\$ 3,280	\$ 3,280	\$ 1,930	\$ 1,930	\$ 49,670	\$ 49,670	\$ 52,180
Labor - Maintenance	miles	\$ 385,960	\$ 345,600	\$ 345,600	\$ 24,000	\$ 24,000	\$ 27,360	\$ 27,360	\$ 16,410	\$ 16,410	\$ 413,370	\$ 413,370	\$ 422,450
Labor - Maintenance Workers Comp	miles	\$ 20,550	\$ 18,520	\$ 18,520	\$ 1,290	\$ 1,290	\$ 1,470	\$ 1,470	\$ 880	\$ 880	\$ 22,160	\$ 22,160	\$ 23,420
Fuel	miles	\$ 305,410	\$ 207,500	\$ 207,500	\$ 14,410	\$ 14,410	\$ 16,430	\$ 16,430	\$ 9,850	\$ 9,850	\$ 248,190	\$ 248,190	\$ 254,400
Insurance	miles	\$ 222,930	\$ 182,530	\$ 182,530	\$ 12,670	\$ 12,670	\$ 14,450	\$ 14,450	\$ 8,670	\$ 8,670	\$ 218,320	\$ 218,320	\$ 238,440
Maintenance (parts, supplies, materials)	miles	\$ 180,760	\$ 148,180	\$ 148,180	\$ 10,290	\$ 10,290	\$ 11,730	\$ 11,730	\$ 7,040	\$ 7,040	\$ 177,240	\$ 177,240	\$ 182,720
Maintenance Contract Costs	miles	\$ 27,850	\$ 23,200	\$ 23,200	\$ 1,610	\$ 1,610	\$ 1,840	\$ 1,840	\$ 1,100	\$ 1,100	\$ 27,750	\$ 27,750	\$ 26,820
Total Operations		\$ 2,255,490	\$ 1,896,190	\$ 1,896,190	\$ 131,920	\$ 131,920	\$ 149,940	\$ 149,940	\$ 89,030	\$ 89,030	\$ 2,267,080	\$ 2,267,080	\$ 2,350,440
Capital/Studies:													
Total Capital Outlay		\$ 5,424,030	\$ 477,280	\$ 1,876,700	\$ 33,200	\$ 130,570	\$ 37,740	\$ 148,390	\$ 22,410	\$ 88,110	\$ 570,630	\$ 2,243,770	\$ 1,588,870
Contingency	hourly	\$ 26,510	\$ 21,990	\$ 21,990	\$ 1,530	\$ 1,530	\$ 1,740	\$ 1,740	\$ 1,020	\$ 1,020	\$ 26,280	\$ 26,280	\$ 27,170
PERS Buyout	operations cost	\$ 37,620	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Loan Repayment	operations cost	\$ 96,630	\$ 76,300	\$ 76,310	\$ 5,310	\$ 5,310	\$ 6,030	\$ 6,030	\$ 3,580	\$ 3,580	\$ 91,220	\$ 91,230	\$ 87,970
TOTAL FUNDING USES		\$ 8,280,150	\$ 2,814,160	\$ 4,213,590	\$ 195,780	\$ 293,150	\$ 222,530	\$ 333,180	\$ 132,120	\$ 197,820	\$ 3,364,590	\$ 5,037,740	\$ 4,478,160
TOTAL NON-CAPITAL EXPENDITURES		\$ 2,759,490	\$ 2,260,580	\$ 2,260,580	\$ 157,270	\$ 157,270	\$ 178,760	\$ 178,760	\$ 106,130	\$ 106,130	\$ 2,702,740	\$ 2,702,740	\$ 2,801,320

		Total Adopted Budget	Weekday Adopted Budget	Weekday Amended Budget	Weekday Rte 14 Adopted Budget	Weekday Rte 14 Amended Budget	Saturday Adopted Budget	Saturday Amended Budget	Sunday Adopted Budget	Sunday Amended Budget	Total Adopted Budget	Total Amended Budget	Total Projected Budget
Route 12, and Route 14 Tripper		FY 2025-26	FY 2026-27	FY 2026-27	FY 2026-27	FY 2026-27	FY 2026-27	FY 2026-27	FY 2026-27	FY 2026-27	FY 2026-27	FY 2026-27	FY 2027-28
Measure:													
Annual Hours		7,690	6,480	6,480	110	110	510	510	440	440	7,540	7,540	7,540
Annual Miles		198,980	170,060	170,060	1,800	1,800	12,390	12,390	11,050	11,050	195,300	195,300	195,300
Administration:													
Total Administration (Net of Contracts)		\$ 283,720	\$ 240,940	\$ 240,940	\$ 3,390	\$ 3,390	\$ 18,320	\$ 18,320	\$ 16,040	\$ 16,040	\$ 278,690	\$ 278,690	\$ 288,440
Service Delivery:													
Labor - Operations		hourly											
Bus Operators	hourly	\$ 531,450	\$ 511,340	\$ 511,340	\$ 8,680	\$ 8,680	\$ 40,240	\$ 40,240	\$ 34,720	\$ 34,720	\$ 594,980	\$ 594,980	\$ 617,360
Training Staff	hourly	\$ 35,870	\$ 31,110	\$ 31,110	\$ 530	\$ 530	\$ 2,450	\$ 2,450	\$ 2,110	\$ 2,110	\$ 36,200	\$ 36,200	\$ 37,000
Operations Supervisors/Schedulers	hourly	\$ 129,580	\$ 118,820	\$ 118,820	\$ 2,020	\$ 2,020	\$ 9,350	\$ 9,350	\$ 8,070	\$ 8,070	\$ 138,260	\$ 138,260	\$ 143,010
Ops. Mgt. / Oversight	hourly	\$ 40,800	\$ 37,990	\$ 37,990	\$ 640	\$ 640	\$ 2,990	\$ 2,990	\$ 2,580	\$ 2,580	\$ 44,200	\$ 44,200	\$ 45,300
Labor - Operations Workers Comp	hourly	\$ 32,700	\$ 31,280	\$ 31,280	\$ 530	\$ 530	\$ 2,460	\$ 2,460	\$ 2,120	\$ 2,120	\$ 36,390	\$ 36,390	\$ 38,230
Labor - Maintenance	miles	\$ 231,010	\$ 225,450	\$ 225,450	\$ 2,390	\$ 2,390	\$ 16,430	\$ 16,430	\$ 14,650	\$ 14,650	\$ 258,920	\$ 258,920	\$ 264,600
Labor - Maintenance Workers Comp	miles	\$ 12,300	\$ 12,080	\$ 12,080	\$ 130	\$ 130	\$ 880	\$ 880	\$ 780	\$ 780	\$ 13,870	\$ 13,870	\$ 14,670
Fuel	miles	\$ 182,790	\$ 135,360	\$ 135,360	\$ 1,430	\$ 1,430	\$ 9,860	\$ 9,860	\$ 8,800	\$ 8,800	\$ 155,450	\$ 155,450	\$ 159,340
Insurance	miles	\$ 133,440	\$ 119,070	\$ 119,070	\$ 1,260	\$ 1,260	\$ 8,680	\$ 8,680	\$ 7,740	\$ 7,740	\$ 136,750	\$ 136,750	\$ 149,340
Maintenance (parts, supplies, materials)	miles	\$ 108,200	\$ 96,670	\$ 96,670	\$ 1,020	\$ 1,020	\$ 7,040	\$ 7,040	\$ 6,280	\$ 6,280	\$ 111,010	\$ 111,010	\$ 114,440
Maintenance Contract Costs	miles	\$ 16,670	\$ 15,140	\$ 15,140	\$ 160	\$ 160	\$ 1,100	\$ 1,100	\$ 980	\$ 980	\$ 17,380	\$ 17,380	\$ 16,800
Total Operations		\$ 1,454,810	\$ 1,334,310	\$ 1,334,310	\$ 18,790	\$ 18,790	\$ 101,480	\$ 101,480	\$ 88,830	\$ 88,830	\$ 1,543,410	\$ 1,543,410	\$ 1,600,090
Capital/Studies:													
Total Capital Outlay		\$ 3,693,820	\$ 335,850	\$ 1,320,590	\$ 4,730	\$ 18,600	\$ 25,540	\$ 100,440	\$ 22,360	\$ 87,920	\$ 388,480	\$ 1,527,550	\$ 1,081,640
Contingency	hourly	\$ 18,370	\$ 16,550	\$ 16,550	\$ 280	\$ 280	\$ 1,300	\$ 1,300	\$ 1,120	\$ 1,120	\$ 19,250	\$ 19,250	\$ 19,910
PERS Buyout	operations cost	\$ 24,260	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Loan Repayment	operations cost	\$ 62,340	\$ 53,690	\$ 53,690	\$ 760	\$ 760	\$ 4,080	\$ 4,080	\$ 3,570	\$ 3,570	\$ 62,100	\$ 62,100	\$ 59,890
TOTAL FUNDING USES		\$ 5,537,320	\$ 1,981,340	\$ 2,966,080	\$ 27,950	\$ 41,820	\$ 150,720	\$ 225,620	\$ 131,920	\$ 197,480	\$ 2,291,930	\$ 3,431,000	\$ 3,049,970
TOTAL NON-CAPITAL EXPENDITURES		\$ 1,781,160	\$ 1,591,800	\$ 1,591,800	\$ 22,460	\$ 22,460	\$ 121,100	\$ 121,100	\$ 105,990	\$ 105,990	\$ 1,841,350	\$ 1,841,350	\$ 1,908,440

		Total Adopted Budget	Weekday Adopted Budget	Weekday Amended Budget	Saturday Adopted Budget	Saturday Amended Budget	Sunday Adopted Budget	Sunday Amended Budget	Total Adopted Budget	Total Amended Budget	Total Projected Budget
		FY 2025-26	FY 2026-27	FY 2026-27	FY 2026-27	FY 2026-27	FY 2026-27	FY 2026-27	FY 2026-27	FY 2026-27	FY 2027-28
Route 15											
	Measure:										
	Annual Hours	3,590	2,720	2,720	620	620	390	390	3,730	3,730	3,730
	Annual Miles	104,680	83,580	83,580	16,560	16,560	9,970	9,970	110,110	110,110	110,110
Administration:											
Total Administration (Net of Contracts)		\$ 140,360	\$ 108,960	\$ 108,960	\$ 23,230	\$ 23,230	\$ 14,330	\$ 14,330	\$ 146,520	\$ 146,520	\$ 151,650
Service Delivery:	Basis:										
Labor - Operations	hourly										
Bus Operators	hourly	\$ 248,100	\$ 214,630	\$ 214,630	\$ 48,920	\$ 48,920	\$ 30,770	\$ 30,770	\$ 294,320	\$ 294,320	\$ 305,410
Training Staff	hourly	\$ 16,750	\$ 13,060	\$ 13,060	\$ 2,980	\$ 2,980	\$ 1,870	\$ 1,870	\$ 17,910	\$ 17,910	\$ 18,300
Operations Supervisors/Schedulers	hourly	\$ 60,500	\$ 49,880	\$ 49,880	\$ 11,370	\$ 11,370	\$ 7,150	\$ 7,150	\$ 68,400	\$ 68,400	\$ 70,750
Ops. Mgt. / Oversight	hourly	\$ 19,050	\$ 15,940	\$ 15,940	\$ 3,630	\$ 3,630	\$ 2,290	\$ 2,290	\$ 21,860	\$ 21,860	\$ 22,410
Labor - Operations Workers Comp	hourly	\$ 15,270	\$ 13,130	\$ 13,130	\$ 2,990	\$ 2,990	\$ 1,880	\$ 1,880	\$ 18,000	\$ 18,000	\$ 18,910
Labor - Maintenance	miles	\$ 121,540	\$ 110,800	\$ 110,800	\$ 21,950	\$ 21,950	\$ 13,220	\$ 13,220	\$ 145,970	\$ 145,970	\$ 149,180
Labor - Maintenance Workers Comp	miles	\$ 6,470	\$ 5,940	\$ 5,940	\$ 1,180	\$ 1,180	\$ 710	\$ 710	\$ 7,830	\$ 7,830	\$ 8,270
Fuel	miles	\$ 96,170	\$ 66,530	\$ 66,530	\$ 13,180	\$ 13,180	\$ 7,940	\$ 7,940	\$ 87,650	\$ 87,650	\$ 89,840
Insurance	miles	\$ 70,200	\$ 58,520	\$ 58,520	\$ 11,590	\$ 11,590	\$ 6,980	\$ 6,980	\$ 77,090	\$ 77,090	\$ 84,200
Maintenance (parts, supplies, materials)	miles	\$ 56,910	\$ 47,510	\$ 47,510	\$ 9,410	\$ 9,410	\$ 5,670	\$ 5,670	\$ 62,590	\$ 62,590	\$ 64,520
Maintenance Contract Costs	miles	\$ 8,780	\$ 7,440	\$ 7,440	\$ 1,470	\$ 1,470	\$ 890	\$ 890	\$ 9,800	\$ 9,800	\$ 9,470
Total Operations		\$ 719,740	\$ 603,380	\$ 603,380	\$ 128,670	\$ 128,670	\$ 79,370	\$ 79,370	\$ 811,420	\$ 811,420	\$ 841,260
Capital/Studies:											
Total Capital Outlay		\$ 352,900	\$ 8,920	\$ 94,660	\$ 1,900	\$ 20,190	\$ 1,170	\$ 12,450	\$ 11,990	\$ 127,300	\$ 475,970
Contingency	hourly	\$ 8,570	\$ 6,950	\$ 6,950	\$ 1,580	\$ 1,580	\$ 1,000	\$ 1,000	\$ 9,530	\$ 9,530	\$ 9,850
PERS Buyout	operations cost	\$ 12,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Loan Repayment	operations cost	\$ 30,830	\$ 24,280	\$ 24,280	\$ 5,180	\$ 5,180	\$ 3,190	\$ 3,190	\$ 32,650	\$ 32,650	\$ 31,490
TOTAL FUNDING USES		\$ 1,264,400	\$ 752,490	\$ 838,230	\$ 160,560	\$ 178,850	\$ 99,060	\$ 110,340	\$ 1,012,110	\$ 1,127,420	\$ 1,510,220
TOTAL NON-CAPITAL EXPENDITURES		\$ 880,670	\$ 719,290	\$ 719,290	\$ 153,480	\$ 153,480	\$ 94,700	\$ 94,700	\$ 967,470	\$ 967,470	\$ 1,002,760

		Total Adopted Budget FY 2025-26	Total Adopted Budget FY 2026-27	Total Amended Budget FY 2026-27	Total Projected Budget FY 2027-28
Runabout					
	Measure:				
	Annual Hours	25,120	25,660	25,660	28,230
	Annual Miles	396,690	373,520	373,520	410,870
Administration:					
Total Administration (Net of Contracts)		\$ 756,890	\$ 761,830	\$ 761,830	\$ 867,300
Service Delivery:	Basis:				
Labor - Operations	hourly				
Bus Operators	hourly	\$ 1,736,050	\$ 2,024,830	\$ 2,024,830	\$ 2,311,430
Training Staff	hourly	\$ 117,190	\$ 123,190	\$ 123,190	\$ 138,520
Operations Supervisors/Schedulers	hourly	\$ 423,340	\$ 470,520	\$ 470,520	\$ 535,440
Ops. Mgt. / Oversight	hourly	\$ 133,270	\$ 150,420	\$ 150,420	\$ 169,590
Labor - Operations Workers Comp	hourly	\$ 106,780	\$ 123,860	\$ 123,860	\$ 143,150
Labor - Maintenance	miles	\$ 460,560	\$ 495,170	\$ 495,170	\$ 556,670
Labor - Maintenance Workers Comp	miles	\$ 24,520	\$ 26,530	\$ 26,530	\$ 30,870
Fuel	miles	\$ 364,440	\$ 297,310	\$ 297,310	\$ 335,220
Insurance	miles	\$ 266,010	\$ 261,520	\$ 261,520	\$ 314,190
Maintenance (parts, supplies, materials)	miles	\$ 215,690	\$ 212,320	\$ 212,320	\$ 240,770
Maintenance Contract Costs	miles	\$ 33,230	\$ 33,250	\$ 33,250	\$ 35,330
Total Operations		\$ 3,881,080	\$ 4,218,920	\$ 4,218,920	\$ 4,811,180
Capital/Studies:					
Total Capital Outlay		\$ 3,147,300	\$ 62,390	\$ 2,287,860	\$ 396,280
Contingency	hourly	\$ 60,000	\$ 65,550	\$ 65,550	\$ 74,550
PERS Buyout	operations cost	\$ 64,730	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Loan Repayment	operations cost	\$ 166,280	\$ 169,770	\$ 169,770	\$ 180,070
TOTAL FUNDING USES		\$ 8,076,280	\$ 5,278,460	\$ 7,503,930	\$ 6,329,380
TOTAL NON-CAPITAL EXPENDITURES		\$ 4,762,700	\$ 5,046,300	\$ 5,046,300	\$ 5,753,030

Project Information

Project Title	Heavy Duty Fixed Route Vehicles
Anticipated Start Date	Ongoing Program
Anticipated Completion	Ongoing Program
Estimated Project Cost	\$48,183,130

Project Scope

The RTA uses a mix of fuel types – diesel and battery electric – for Fixed Route Services in various communities. This is one replacement for each vehicle.

Service Life: 12 years; 500,000-mile vehicle
 All over 14,400 GVW and subject to the Innovative Clean Transit fleet rule


Funding Information

FTIP Year	FTIP Amount/ Estimate	Local Match	PO Calendar Year	Delivery Year	Budget FY	Number of Vehicles	Vehicle Type
Adopted FY25	\$4,324,640	\$1,515,300	2026	2026	FY26	4	Electric
Adopted FY25	\$1,769,675	\$442,425	2026	2027	FY27	3	Diesel
Adopted FY25	\$2,272,500	\$401,030	2027	2028	FY28	2	Electric
Adopted FY26	\$1,364,000	\$320,400	2027	2028	FY28	1	Electric
Adopted FY26	\$1,780,700	\$465,800	2027	2028	FY28	3	Diesel
Adopted FY27	\$1,441,000	\$254,300	2028	2029	FY29	1	Electric
Adopted FY27	\$1,917,300	\$479,300	2028	2029	FY29	3	Diesel
Projected FY28	\$1,484,210	\$261,950	2028	2029	FY30	1	Electric
Projected FY28	\$658,220	\$164,640	2028	2029	FY30	1	Diesel
Projected FY29	\$4,723,900	\$833,700	2030	2031	FY31	3	Electric
Projected FY31	\$3,144,520	\$786,120	2031	2033	FY33	2	Electric
Projected FY33	\$3,336,020	\$834,000	2033	2035	FY35	2	Electric
Projected FY34	\$1,718,050	\$429,510	2034	2036	FY36	1	Electric
Projected FY35	\$8,847,900	\$2,212,000	2035	2037	FY37	5	Electric
Total	\$38,782,635	\$9,400,475				32	

5 Year Budget Plan

2026-2027	2027-2028	2028-2029	2029-2030	2030-2031	Future Years	Total Estimate
\$2,212,125	\$6,604,420	\$4,091,900	\$2,569,020	\$5,557,600	\$27,148,065	\$48,183,130

Project Information	
Project Title	Heavy Duty Fixed Route Electric Vehicles Battery Replacements
Anticipated Start Date	Ongoing Program
Anticipated Completion	Ongoing Program
Estimated Project Cost	\$6,321,560

Project Scope
The RTA uses battery electric vehicles for Fixed Route Services in various communities.
This is for midlife battery replacements for each heavy duty fixed route electric vehicle.
Service Life: 12 years; 500,000-mile vehicle All over 14,400 GVW and subject to the Innovative Clean Transit fleet rule



Funding Information							
FTIP Year	FTIP Amount/ Estimate	Local Match	PO Calendar Year	Delivery Year	Budget FY	Number of Vehicles	Project Type
Projected FY31	\$892,000	\$223,000	2031	2031	FY32	2	Battery Replacement
Projected FY32	\$2,288,150	\$572,050	2032	2032	FY33	5	Battery Replacement
Projected FY33	\$1,877,080	\$469,280	2033	2033	FY34	4	Battery Replacement
Total	\$5,057,230	\$1,264,330				11	

5 Year Budget Plan						
2026-2027	2027-2028	2028-2029	2029-2030	2030-2031	Future Years	Total Estimate
\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$6,321,560	\$6,321,560

Project Information	
Project Title	Fixed Route Cutaway Vehicles
Anticipated Start Date	Ongoing Program
Anticipated Completion	Ongoing Program
Estimated Project Cost	\$2,833,660

Project Scope
The RTA uses a mix of vehicle types including low-floor cutaway and cutaway vehicles for Fixed Route Services in various communities. This is one for one replacement for each vehicle. Service Life: 7 years; 200,000-mile vehicle All over 14,400 GVW and subject to the Innovative Clean Transit fleet rule



Funding Information

FTIP Year	FTIP Amount/ Estimate	Local Match	PO Calendar Year	Delivery Year	Budget FY	Number of Vehicles	Vehicle Type
Adopted FY27	\$373,000	\$93,200	2027	2028	FY28	2	Gas (1)
Projected FY28	\$314,190	\$55,450	2028	2029	FY29	1	Electric (2)
Projected FY28	\$295,680	\$73,960	2028	2029	FY29	2	Gas (1)
Projected FY30	\$676,700	\$119,400	2030	2031	FY31	2	Electric (2)
Projected FY31	\$707,260	\$124,820	2031	2032	FY32	2	Electric (2)
Total	\$2,366,830	\$466,830				9	

- (1) Vehicles are over 14,400 gross vehicle weight and subject to the Innovative Clean Transit fleet rule but there is not currently a vehicle that meets the FTA required Altoona testing requirement
- (2) Vehicles are over 14,400 gross vehicle weight and subject to the Innovative Clean Transit fleet rule. Although there is not currently a vehicle that meets the Altoona testing requirement staff anticipates a vehicle being available when the PO will be issued

5 Year Budget Plan

2026-2027	2027-2028	2028-2029	2029-2030	2030-2031	Future Years	Total Estimate
\$0	\$466,200	\$739,280	\$0	\$796,100	\$832,080	\$2,833,660

Project Information	
Project Title	Demand Response Vehicles
Anticipated Start Date	Ongoing Program
Anticipated Completion	Ongoing Program
Estimated Project Cost	\$3,256,250

Project Scope
The RTA uses a mix of low-floor minivans, mobility transit and cutaway vehicles for the ADA paratransit service (Runabout).
For Dial-A-Ride service, the RTA uses a mix of vehicle types including low-floor minivans and cutaway vehicles in various communities.
This is one for one replacement for each vehicle.



Funding Information							
FTIP Year	FTIP Amount/ Estimate	Local Match	PO Calendar Year	Delivery Year	Budget FY	Number of Vehicles	Vehicle Type
Adopted FY23	\$538,880	\$98,840	2025	2026	FY26	4	Gas (1)
Adopted FY24	\$464,640	\$85,720	2026	2026	FY26	4	Gas (2)
Adopted FY24	\$153,000	\$38,250	2026	2027	FY27	1	Gas (2)
Adopted FY25	\$517,720	\$91,350	2026	2026	FY26	7	Gas (3)
Adopted FY26	\$148,200	\$37,000	2027	2027	FY27	2	Gas (3)
Adopted FY27	\$270,600	\$67,700	2028	2028	FY28	1	Electric (4)
Projected FY28	\$501,000	\$88,500	2029	2029	FY29	6	Gas (3)
Projected FY29	\$123,850	\$31,000	2030	2030	FY30	1	Gas (3)
Total	\$2,717,890	\$538,360				26	

- (1) Vehicles are over 14,400 gross vehicle weight (Service life: 7 years; 200,000-mile) and subject to the Innovative Clean Transit (ICT) fleet rule but there is not currently a vehicle that meets the FTA required Altoona testing requirement.
- (2) Currently the vehicles are over 14,400 gross vehicle weight (Service life: 7 years; 200,000-mile) and subject to the ICT fleet rule but are being replaced with vehicles that are under 14,400 (mobility transit vehicles, Service life: 4 years; 100,000-mile)
- (3) Low floor minivans (Service life: 4 years; 100,000-mile) and mobility transits vehicles (Service life: 4 years; 100,000-mile) are under 14,400 gross vehicle weight and not subject to the ICT fleet rule. Staff is researching if minivans or mobility transit vehicles should be purchased to replace these vehicles (all have a Service life: 4 years; 100,000-mile)
- (4) Vehicle is over 14,400 gross vehicle weight (Service life: 7 years; 200,000-mile) and subject to the ICT fleet rule. Although there is not currently a vehicle that meets the requirement staff anticipates a vehicle being available when the PO will be issued.

5 Year Budget Plan						
2026-2027	2027-2028	2028-2029	2029-2030	2030-2031	Future Years	Total Estimate
\$376,450	\$338,300	\$589,500	\$154,850	\$0	\$1,797,150	\$3,256,250

Project Information

Project Title	Trolley Vehicles
Anticipated Start Date	Ongoing Program
Anticipated Completion	Ongoing Program
Estimated Project Cost	\$1,796,900

Project Scope

The RTA uses replica trolleys that mimic nostalgic, turn-of-the-century cable cars while providing modern, heavy-duty transit capabilities. This is one for one replacement for each vehicle.

Service Life: 7 years; 200,000-mile vehicle

All over 14,400 GVW and subject to the Innovative Clean Transit fleet rule


Funding Information

FTIP Year	FTIP Amount/ Estimate	Local Match	PO Calendar Year	Delivery Year	Budget FY	Number of Vehicles	Vehicle Type
Adopted FY22	\$228,300	\$57,100	2025	2026	FY26	1	Gas
Morro Bay - locally funded		\$350,000	2028	2028	FY28	1	Gas
Adopted FY27	\$280,000	\$70,000	2027	2028	FY28	1	Gas
Projected FY30	\$649,200	\$162,300	2031	2031	FY32	1	Electric
Total	\$1,157,500	\$639,400				4	

5 Year Budget Plan

2026-2027	2027-2028	2028-2029	2029-2030	2030-2031	Future Years	Total Estimate
\$0	\$700,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,096,900	\$1,796,900

Project Information	
Project Title	Support Vehicle Replacements
Anticipated Start Date	Ongoing Program
Anticipated Completion	Ongoing Program
Estimated Project Cost	\$914,665

Project Scope
The RTA uses a variety of non-revenue vehicles to support the various transit services provided.
Various useful lives.
None subject to the Innovative Clean Transit fleet rule.



Project Justification

There are small support cars that are used by the administrative staff, Operations Supervisors, and for employee swaps (in lieu of swapping buses). The four trucks that are used for road calls, equipment transportation, and bus stop maintenance. Other support vehicles include a forklift, utility cart and scissor lift.

Anticipated Impact to Operations

Support vehicles are vital to ensure the most effective use of resources and keep operating costs down.

Funding Information

FTIP Year	FTIP Amount/ Estimate	Local Match	PO Calendar Year	Delivery Year	Budget FY	Number of Vehicles	Vehicle Type
Adopted FY24	\$37,300	\$9,325	2027	2027	FY26	1	Electric Car
Adopted FY26	\$61,600	\$15,400	2027	2027	FY27	1	Gas Truck
Adopted FY27	\$30,300	\$7,500	2028	2028	FY28	1	Propane or Electric Forklift
Projected FY28	\$65,300	\$16,400	2029	2029	FY29	1	Gas Truck
Projected FY29	\$176,200	\$44,100	2030	2030	FY30	5	Electric Car
Projected FY30	\$164,300	\$41,100	2031	2031	FY31	4	Electric Car
Projected FY32	\$33,890	\$8,470	2033	2033	FY33	1	Electric Scissor Lift
Projected FY32	\$87,120	\$21,780	2033	2033	FY33	2	Electric Car
Projected FY33	\$75,660	\$18,920	2034	2034	FY34	1	Electric Truck
Total	\$731,670	\$182,995				17	

5 Year Budget Plan

2026-2027	2027-2028	2028-2029	2029-2030	2030-2031	Future Years	Total Estimate
\$77,000	\$37,800	\$81,700	\$220,300	\$205,400	\$292,465	\$914,665

SAN LUIS OBISPO REGIONAL TRANSIT AUTHORITY
REGIONAL TRANSIT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

July 16, 2026

DRAFT MINUTES

C-1

Members Present:

Janeen Burlingame	City of Morro Bay
Mark Dariz	Paratransit User
Alex Fuchs (<i>Vice Chair</i>)	City of San Luis Obispo
Eric Greening	Fixed Route User
Todd Katz	Fixed Route User Alternate
Omar McPherson (<i>Chair</i>)	Fixed Route Service in South County
Lance Okuno	SLOCOG
Darcy Price	City of Atascadero

Members Absent:

Mason Cleek	Cuesta College
Ryan Cornell	City of Paso Robles
Katie Franco	County of San Luis Obispo Alternate
Colin Pollington	Cal Poly

Staff Present:

Geoff Straw	RTA
Tania Arnold	RTA
Anthony Kalvans	RTA

1. **CALL MEETING TO ORDER, ROLL CALL:** Chair Omar McPherson called the meeting to order at 2:01 p.m. Roll call was taken, and a quorum was established.
2. **PUBLIC COMMENTS:**
Mr. Erick Schmidt introduced himself and said that he was looking forward to learning more about RTAC.
3. **ELECTION OF OFFICERS: Elect RTAC Chair & Vice Chair**
Mr. Omar McPherson opened the floor for nominations and nominated Mr. Alex Fuchs to be the RTAC Chair. Ms. Janeen Burlingame seconded the nomination. The nomination was approved by unanimous consent of those present. It was agreed that Mr. Fuchs would take over as RTAC Chair at the next meeting.

Ms. Burlingame nominated Mr. McPherson to be the RTAC Vice Chair. Mr. Mark Dariz seconded the nomination. The nomination was accepted by unanimous consent of those present.
4. **Annual ADA Appeal Committee Assignment**
Mr. McPherson asked the current ADA Appeals Committee to stay in their post. Mr. Eric Greening asked if the Appeals Committee had to meet this past year. Mr. McPherson said no.

Mr. Greening made a motion to reappoint the ADA Appeals Committee for another year. **Mr. McPherson** seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous consent of those present.

5. A. INFORMATION AGENDA ITEMS:

A-1 Executive Director's Report (Verbal, Receive)

Mr. Geoff Straw introduced his report and gave an overview of the recent events at the RTA. He announced that the RTA has been talking with SLO Transit about Cal Poly class start time and opportunities for alignment.

Mr. Straw reported that both the bus charging project and the photovoltaic system are still progressing. He also noted that four more battery electric buses will enter the manufacturing line at the end of September. **Mr. Todd Katz** asked what percentage of the RTA's fleet will be electrified. **Mr. Straw** said roughly one-third.

Mr. Straw also mentioned SLOCOG's work on developing mobility hubs as part of the Long-Range Transit Plan Study.

A-2 Member Comments / Reports from Jurisdictions (Receive)

Mr. Fuchs reported that over the years SLO Transit has been studying different options regarding aligning services to better meet the needs of Cal Poly. A discussion ensued regarding the types of riders that both RTA and SLO Transit serve to Cal Poly.

Mr. Fuchs also mentioned that SLO Transit just transitioned to MV Transportation as their contractor. In addition, he noted that SLO Transit has eight battery electric buses in service, which is ten out of sixteen buses being emission free.

Ms. Burlingame noted that Morro Bay's public works director left the position and the city is actively recruiting candidates to fill the vacancy.

Mr. Greening announced that the Ludwig Center would be hosting a Disabilities 101 session. In addition, he asked for clarification on what members of the RTAC can communicate to the public regarding the upcoming sales tax ballot measure. Discussion ensued.

Ms. Darcy Price announced the upcoming El Camino Cruise Night in Atascadero.

Mr. Lance Okuno said that the Mariposa Card received over six hundred applicants for two hundred cards.

Mr. Katz announced that he likes serving on the RTAC but would step down if someone else was interested in his position. RTAC members expressed their appreciation for Mr. Katz's knowledge and perspective.

Mr. McPherson noted that the RTA transitioned to Ecolane as its dispatching software for all demand response services with the goal of increasing efficiencies.

A-3 Present Fare and Tap2Ride Change Results (Verbal)

Ms. Tania Arnold introduced the item and noted that during last month, 2700 riders used contactless payments while 1,600 riders used Token Transit. She noted that the most usage for the Tap2Ride program comes from Route 10.

Ms. Arnold reported that there has been an effort to register more people for discount cards and to increase usage of the tap to ride system; highlighting that Ms. Mary Gardner was conducting outreach. **Mr. Fuchs** noted that his own data suggested that none of the SLO Transit riders reached the 30-day fare cap. **Mr. Straw** recognized Mr. Anthony Kalvans for developing a form letter to support discount riders in the Morro Bay Area. **Mr. Okuno** mentioned that SLOCOG did an Instagram reel about the Tap2Ride system.

A-4 Atascadero Dial-A-Ride and Morro Bay Transit Update (Verbal)

Mr. McPherson introduced the item and presented the ridership statistics for both services. He noted that over the past year the Atascadero Dial-A-Ride carried 4,515 riders, Morro Bay Call-A-Ride carried 900 riders, Morro Bay weekday service carried 7,700 riders, and the seasonal weekend only Morro Bay trolleys carried 3,200 riders.

Mr. Greening asked if there was any data regarding Atascadero Dial-A-Ride users traveling between the Atascadero and Templeton fare zones. **Mr. McPherson** said he would investigate the data further.

B. ACTION AGENDA ITEMS:

There were no action agenda items.

C. CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS:

C-1 RTAC Minutes of October 16, 2025 (Approve)

C-2 RTAC Minutes of April 9, 2026 (Approve)

Mr. Fuchs noted a typo regarding the April 9th minutes, revising the year to 2026 from 2025.

Mr. Greening made a motion to approve the consent agenda with the suggested correction. **Ms. Burlingame** seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous consent of those present.

D. ADJOURNMENT AND COMMITTEE COMMENTS:

Mr. McPherson adjourned the meeting at 3:10 p.m.

Next Regular Meeting: October 15, 2026

Future Regular Meeting Dates: January 21, 2027; April 8, 2027; July 15, 2027

Respectfully Submitted,

Acknowledged by,

Anthony Kalvans
Administrative Assistant

Omar McPherson
RTAC Chairperson

This Page Left Intentionally Blank