Mono County Local Transportation Commission

PO Box 347 Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546 760.924.1800 phone, 924.1801 fax commdey@mono.ca.gov PO Box 8 Bridgeport, CA 93517 760.932.5420 phone, 932.54 www.monocounty.ca.gov

AGENDA

June 10, 2013 – 9:00 A.M.
Town/County Conference Room, Minaret Village Mall, Mammoth Lakes
Teleconference at CAO Conference Room, Bridgeport

*Agenda sequence (see note following agenda).

- 1. CALL TO ORDER & PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
- 2. PUBLIC COMMENT
- 3. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** May 13, 2013 **p.3**
- 4. COMMISSIONER REPORTS
- 5. **ADMINISTRATION** (approximately 1 hour)
 - A. Approve Resolution R13-06 allocating & apportioning Local Transit Funds (LTF) funds & provide desired direction to staff (*Mary Booher*) **p.7**
 - B. Approve Resolution R13-07 allocating & apportioning State Transit Assistance (STA) funds & provide desired direction to staff (*Mary Booher*) **p.12**
 - C. Receive audit response; no action (Mary Booher) p.23

6. LOCAL TRANSPORTATION ISSUES

Discuss Electric car-charging stations along US 395 & possible venture with Tesla auto company for its promotion, perhaps as part of our cooperation with Inyo-Kern on their highway expansion project; provide desired direction to staff (requested by Commissioner Lehman)

7. TRANSIT

- A. Eastern Sierra Transit Authority (ESTA) update
- B. Yosemite Area Regional Transportation System (YARTS) update

8. CALTRANS

Report activities in Mono County and provide pertinent statewide information

9. **COMMISSION WORKSHOP** (approximately 1 hour)

Further review commissioner LTC priorities & provide any desired direction to staff - p.26

10. UPCOMING AGENDA ITEMS

- MAP-21 update
- Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) update from Eastern California Transportation Planning Partnership (ECTPP)

More on back...

11. ADJOURN to July 8, 2013

*NOTE: Although the LTC generally strives to follow the agenda sequence, it reserves the right to take any agenda item – other than a noticed public hearing – in any order, and at any time after its meeting starts. The Local Transportation Commission encourages public attendance and participation.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, anyone who needs special assistance to attend this meeting can contact the commission secretary at 760-924-1804 within 48 hours prior to the meeting in order to ensure accessibility (see 42 USCS 12132, 28CFR 35.130).

Mono County Local Transportation Commission

PO Box 347 Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546 760.924.1800 phone, 924.1801 fax commdev@mono.ca.gov PO Box 8 Bridgeport, CA 93517 760.932.5420 phone, 932.54 www.monocounty.ca.gov

DRAFT MINUTES

May 13, 2013

COUNTY COMMISSIONERS: Tim Fesko, Larry Johnston, Fred Stump **TOWN COMMISSIONERS:** Jo Bacon, Sandy Hogan, Matthew Lehman

COUNTY STAFF: Scott Burns, Gerry Le Francois, Garrett Higerd, Mary Booher, Jeff Walters, C.D. Ritter

TOWN STAFF: Peter Bernasconi CALTRANS: Forest Becket ESTA: John Helm, Jill Batchelder

- 1. CALL TO ORDER & PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: Chair Larry Johnston called the meeting to order at 9:04 a.m. at the Town/County Conference Room, Minaret Village Mall, Mammoth Lakes, and Commissioner Bacon led the pledge of allegiance.
- 2. PUBLIC COMMENT: None.
- 3. **MINUTES:** April 8, 2013

<u>MOTION</u>: Adopt minutes of April 8, 2013, as amended: 1) Add to Item 5D: <u>MOTION</u>: Send letter to governor's office, where decisions are made, and also to CTC and legislators, including last letter as well. (Hogan/Stump. Ayes: 5. Absent: Lehman.); and 2) Item 5G: Commissioner Hogan Johnston reported that California Department of Fish and Wildlife agrees with deer/snow/safety fence along SR 203 and US 395 to airport (item 14) and **Commissioner Hogan** thought maybe the project could qualify for State Highway Operation & Protection Program (SHOPP). (Hogan/Bacon. Ayes: 4. Abstain: Lehman due to absence, Fesko.)

4. **COMMISSIONER REPORTS:** <u>Lehman</u>: Kudos for removing snow stakes. <u>Fesko</u>: Great progress on School Street Plaza in Bridgeport, additional walkways. <u>Stump</u>: Thanks for Chalfant bus stop pending approval from LADWP, design and funding completed. Johnston: Traveled over Tioga, virtually no snow.

5. ADMINISTRATION

A. **Unmet Needs Resolution R13-04:** Wendy Sugimura sent to all RPACs except Long Valley, which canceled two meetings. First need: Midweek Chalfant to Bishop. Cost: \$40,000 included anticipated revenue. Options: Reduce reserve by about 7%. Current route operates only two days/week. Shoppers, workers, students? John Helm indicated Tuesday/Thursday is designed for shoppers, not commuters or students.

Chalfant RPAC comment: Residents make many trips shuttling, practice, to/from work. Aim route at commuters 8-5, students could work around timing. Helm reminded that vanpool option doesn't exclude students. Cost of \$40,000 is fixed route, not vanpool, which is fully funded by riders who pay daily whether use or not. Sugimura noted no allocation from LTC for vanpool.

Commissioner Stump cited an ongoing request from Chalfant (bedroom community to Bishop), predicting increased ridership. Some residents live meagerly and would use the service. Change time? Helm noted a weekday route in addition to Benton-Bishop. Survey for vanpool market? Sugimura discussed actually funding, directives to ESTA, working with Social Services Transit Advisory Committee (SSTAC) volunteer to provide limited services. Stump indicated SSTAC wanted to use Benton community center for its office. No firm answer. If route were approved for one year and ridership fell short, would potential layoff or vehicle disposal occur? Helm confirmed enough fleet for additional route, non-benefitted driver (no guarantee of hours, so no layoff).

Commissioner Bacon wanted more information before approving additional service. Commissioner Johnston thought if commuter-oriented need exists, vanpool seems way to go (cheaper than car, not affect reserves). Commissioner Hogan thought a one-year pilot was not nearly enough. Conduct a survey on how many would use 8-5er or vanpool. Johnston noted two buses at Chalfant, none at June Lake, so leaned toward vanpool. Who actually would ride? Helm indicated a simple official survey, outlining vanpool and fixed route. Affect resolution? Burns indicated bus route could be initiated outside unmet needs process.

MOTION: Approve Unmet Needs Resolution R13-04. (Bacon/Fesko. Ayes: 5. No: Stump.)

In discussion after motion was seconded, Commissioner Stump suggested rewording to "due to lack of financial capability." Concern was already covered in the definition of "reasonable to meet," so motion stood as stated.

- B. **2012-13 Overall Work Plan (OWP) amendment #2:** Mary Booher indicated process would not be complete till next fiscal year. Yellow highlights? *Dollar amounts changed.* Mailboxes: Jeff Walters inventoried >400 mailboxes, about 75 were questionable and probably those at risk would reduce significantly. Commissioner Johnston stated this inquiry was a Grand Jury request.
- C. **2013-14 OWP:** Note: Mary Booher's staff report was inadvertently omitted. No estimated rollover until amount is known. Need staff-estimated cost of work elements. Eastern Sierra Transit Authority (ESTA) plan was carried over to Dec. 31, 2013. Commissioner Hogan noted missing County info several places. P. 136-137: Shift headings from Town/County/Total to Total/Town/County. Submit to Caltrans a rollover allocation report by December. Forest Becket noted LTC also would take action on approving signing of certifications and assurances; should submit all at once. Would LTC priorities fit into this? *Fit into some work elements, but some require project study reports.* Scott Burns suggested staff incorporate into Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

MOTION: Approve 2013-14 OWP with technical corrections. (Lehman/Fesko. Ayes: 5-0.)

D. **MAP-21:** Gerry Le Francois reported California Transportation Commission (CTC) met Tuesday to consider various assumptions for the 2014 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) fund estimate. Included in this item is administration's proposal to combine various trail/pedestrian programs into one process. The former Transportation Enhancement (TE) is Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) under MAP-21, and the Governor's proposal is called Active Transportation Program (ATP). As discussed with this commission, the funding formula is population based. Staff is concerned about how local and/or rural projects may have a hard time competing on a statewide basis for 50% of the total funding allocation to ATP.

By the next meeting, staff hopes to have a reasonable idea of fund shares for the 2014 STIP that may be available for Mono County. The fund estimate is adopted by the CTC in August. The 2014 STIP provides for a new five-year programming cycle for local and regional transportation projects.

Commissioner Stump noted Chalfant streets are in planning phase; would funding stay or disappear? Individual project components cannot be programmed. The complete project is required to be programmed through construction in order to get allocation approval to build the project. Garrett Higerd saw a chance that CTC could delay one year; funded but not allocated list. Le Francois noted past state Legislatures borrowed from state highway fund for everyday bills. Money would come back eventually to repay those loans. Staff reported that corrections at local level are going through counsels, will bring drafts of proposed changes to LTC next month. The more in the STIP process, the better, as Mono is factored in with 13 counties, not entire state.

E. **2011-12 LTC audit report:** Mary Booher solicited questions. Commissioner Bacon asked if LTC did last audit's recommendations. Did we fix what's wrong? *No response in past audits. Staff made Herculean efforts to work cooperatively and made progress. New finance director should clean up last audit.* Bacon suggested some place to say it's been resolved. Booher will provide next month, work with auditor to incorporate in future years.

6. LOCAL TRANSPORTATION ISSUES

A. **Resolution of Appreciation to Brad Mettam:** Scott Burns reported a well-attended sendoff, where several Mono representatives spoke. Commissioner Hogan described Mettam as always impressive, saw big picture, had every detail at his grasp. Commissioner Johnston read aloud the resolution.

MOTION: Approve resolution of appreciation to Brad Mettam. (Johnston/Hogan. Ayes: 6-0.)

B. LTC priorities: Commissioner Bacon noted similarities between lists. Funding sources? Items are listed but no funding is available. Separate meeting to delve into it, create one list. If LTC keeps delaying, not going to

get to it. Identify purpose, what to do with it, how to pursue. Commissioner Fesko noted he supported items stated by others, so didn't list them. Commissioner Johnston saw some as maintenance, others long term. Set workshop at end of meeting. Staff would know about funding sources.

Johnston distributed a draft deer safety project map created with Tim Taylor of California Department of Fish & Wildlife (CDFW), showing four or five crossings and an 8' combo snow/deer fence on southwest side of US 395. Commissioner Lehman opposed a fence on that "beautiful stretch of road." Johnston claimed the fence was not that intrusive; have CDFW explain. Johnston noted deer already use Mammoth Creek crossing, but it needs clearing up. Fence would exclude deer from airport runways and is not dependent on Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) approval. Johnston stated deer/car collisions cost thousands of dollars. Commissioner Stump described that section of US 395 as a "kill zone," vehicle damage, injuries. Johnston suggested building fence in phases, with undercrossing at strategic locations. Mary Booher cited this as a perfect example of project study, phasing, and funding. Peter Bernasconi referred to five-year biological study next fiscal year.

Fesko cited proposed project south of Walker to Burcham Flat Road, which Antelope Valley RPAC overwhelmingly opposed. Boxed in area, visual aspects a concern. Proceed with caution. Commissioner Hogan noted Lake Tahoe area has unobtrusive fence. Nevada has effective undercrossings and overcrossings as well. Beautiful metal sculptures of animals serve a purpose.

7. TRANSIT

A. **Eastern Sierra Transit Authority (ESTA):** Jill Batchelder noted Reno/Lancaster route has operated since 1990s. From January through March 2013 ESTA provided 416,719 passenger trips in Mono County, a huge increase of 312,820 riders from previous year, primarily due to addition of Mammoth Mountain Ski Area routes. Otherwise, total ridership was down by 8,837 passengers. Mammoth Dial-A-Ride lost ridership, likely due to large amount of free transit available.

Resolution R13-05 was not on agenda. Application is due at end of month, so add urgent item:

MOTION: Add "urgent" agenda item: "I move that the commission determine that there is a need to take immediate action with respect to the proposed agenda item, that the need for action came to the County's attention subsequent to the agenda being posted and, therefore, that the commission add the item to the agenda." (Bacon/Fesko. Ayes: 6-0.)

<u>MOTION</u>: Adopt Resolution R13-05 approving and authorizing the executive director to sign all required certifications and assurances for the Federal Transit Administration Section 5311(F) continued funding for operating assistance for the 395 interregional bus route. (Fesko/Hogan. Ayes: 6-0.)

- B. Yosemite Area Regional Transportation System (YARTS): Scott Burns noted Tioga Pass is open due to low snow amount. Commissioner Fesko noted everyone was happy it's open early, but could have opened earlier.
- 8. CALTRANS: None.

9. QUARTERLY REPORTS

A. **Town of Mammoth Lakes:** Peter Bernasconi noted Measure R funds additional interpretive signs. Commissioner Stump wondered why Department of Justice (DOJ) was reviewing contractor payroll records. *Projects awarded by USFS had major discrepancies (prevailing wage issue).* A few aspens would help shield eyesore equipment shed on Lakeview Road. Proposed traffic signal at Sierra Nevada Road/Meridian was opposed by Commissioner Johnston. Stump wondered if Mammoth Unified School District (MUSD) participated in safe routes to school. *Commissioner Bacon replied that money gets pedestrians all over town, not just to schools.* Johnston commended the Town as exceptional at securing grants. Commissioner Hogan cited local resistance to trails programs, noting residents don't realize many millions come as grants.

B. **Mono County:** Bridgeport: Garrett Higerd announced School Street Plaza is under way, Bridgeport street rehabilitation soon. No July Fourth construction will occur in Bridgeport even though rehab will not be completely finished. Preconstruction meeting next week to discuss details. <u>June Lake</u>: Pedestrian component to June Lake street rehabilitation, sidewalk. <u>Chalfant</u>: Does not want sidewalks, but needs rehabilitation of asphalt, including White Mountain Estates Road.

<u>Bridges</u>: Walters met with consultants and Caltrans bridge expert. Bridge projects require local match, and entail long, costly process. Caltrans expert suggested one bridge at a time, Topaz first. Budget has \$12,000. Higerd noted replacement costs are much higher for permitted, engineered, planned bridges. Walters indicated retrofit replacement was discussed for Cunningham Bridge, which is historic to residents. <u>Rock Creek Road</u>: Eastside Velo sent letter of support for upper road. <u>Convict Lake Road</u>: Grant application was submitted April 30, also with Eastside Velo support. Bus shelter in Chalfant was approved by LADWP, so now only needs Mono building permit. <u>Owens River Road</u>: Pave Gorge Road to Watterson Summit. Le Francois quoted a "Bradism": "Just because it seems outrageous doesn't mean it couldn't be on the list." Johnston recalled lots of streets got paved with help from MOUs.

C. **Caltrans:** Forest Becket indicated it's easier combining Inyo/Mono on a map. Commissioner Hogan found the map helpful. Sign replacement and restriping are occurring. Commissioner Fesko observed that restriping in area north of Bridgeport in February is all gone now. Plans to restripe? *Working north as things warm up. Rock bulges at High Point are fixed.* No accidents, so leave it as is! Commissioner Stump commented that the roadway hugs the hillside now, but will be far away when complete. Becket indicated the 25-mph construction speed was set by state law, and CHP has been citing violators.

Commissioner Johnston opined that chip-seal project is unacceptable to cyclists, and he's been getting serious complaints. Cars smooth out surface, so cyclists move into traffic lane. Chips never go away on shoulder, so why put them there? Experiment is slightly improved, but still unacceptable and unnecessary. Stump suggested adding more oil to make shoulder last longer.

Johnston stated there's no question Eastern Sierra has the best roads, thanks to Caltrans.

10. **INFORMATIONAL**

- A. High Point Curve update #15
- B. 2014 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Fund Estimate
- 11. **UPCOMING AGENDA ITEMS:** 1) Local Transit Funds (LTF) and State Transit Assistance (STA) allocations; 2) MOU drafts for Eastern Sierra Transportation Planning Partners (ESTPP); and 3) audit. Chair Johnston suggested a short business agenda and a workshop on LTC priorities list (bring giant post-its, Wendy to facilitate), ending in time for Mono picnic at 11:30. Lehman will be absent, but will provide photos.
- 12. **ADJOURN** at 11:28 a.m. to June 10, 2013.

Prepared by C.D. Ritter, LTC secretary



COUNTY OF MONO

P.O. BOX 696, BRIDGEPORT, CALIFORNIA 93517 (760) 932-5583 • FAX (760) 932-5411 mbooher@mono.ca.gov

> Mary Booher Financial Analyst

June 10, 2013

To: Mono County Local Transportation Commission

From: Mary Booher, Financial Analyst

RE: 2013-14 Local Transportation Funds Allocation

Recommended Action:

Approve Resolution 13-06 authorizing and allocating Local Transportation Funds for 2013/14 Fiscal Year.

Discussion:

Annually, the Director of Finance is required to provide the Local Transportation Commission (LTC) with estimates for the Local Transportation Fund revenue for the next fiscal year. For 2013-14, the Assistant Director of Finance estimates the revenue to be \$575,000. Staff estimates rollover to be \$56,457, for a total available balance for allocation of \$631,457.

Each year, the LTC must adopt a resolution establishing how these funds will be allocated. Based on direction from the Commission staff proposes the attached resolution 13-06.

If there are any questions regarding this item, please contact Mary Booher at 932-5583.

Attachment A-2012-13 Estimated Actuals Attachment B-2013-14 proposed budget Attachment C-Resolution 13-06

2012/13

LTF ESTIMATED ACTUALS	5/30/2013
FILESHMATED ACTUALS	5/30/2013

ETT ESTIMATED ACTUALS	3/30/2013	
	Budget	
Estimated Reserve forward Estimated 2012/13 Revenue Estimated Total Revenue	\$107,892.44 \$589,125.84 \$ 697,018.28	
Specific Allocations Reserve-15% Administration Bike Path-2% of balance ESTA-CTSA <5% of bal Senior Services YARTS 395 Routes allocation Mammoth Community transit Services	\$ 56,456.74 \$ 15,000.00 \$ 11,378.00 \$ 20,700.00 \$ 20,000.00 \$ 30,000.00 \$ 91,000.00 \$ 37,000.00	Mono County Year 2 \$ 30,709.18 Maximum
Remaining Balance Town of Mammoth Lakes Mono County	\$ 415,483.54 \$ 240,980.45 \$ 174,503.09	

2013/14 LTF ESTIMATES

	Budget	
Estimated Reserve forward Estimated 2013/14 Revenue Estimated Total Revenue	\$ 56,457.00 \$575,000.00 \$ 631,457.00	
Specific Allocations		
Reserve-15%	\$ 86,250.00	
Administration	\$ 15,000.00	
Bike Path-2% of balance	\$ 11,378.00	Mono County Year 3
ESTA-CTSA <5% of bal	\$ 20,700.00	\$ 25,941.45 Maximum
Senior Services	\$ 20,000.00	
YARTS	\$ 30,000.00	
395 Routes allocation	\$ 91,000.00	
Remaining Balance	\$ 357,129.00	
Town of Mammoth Lakes	\$ 207,134.82	
Mono County	\$ 149,994.18	

RESOLUTION R13-06

A RESOLUTION OF THE MONO COUNTY LOCAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION APPORTIONING AND ALLOCATING LOCAL TRANSPORTATION FUNDS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013-14

WHEREAS, the Mono County Local Transportation Commission (MCLTC) is the designated transportation planning agency pursuant to Government Code Section 29535 and by action of the Secretary of Business, Transportation and Housing, and, as such, has the responsibility to apportion and allocate Local Transportation Funds (LTF); and

WHEREAS, the County Auditor has estimated that \$575,000 of MCLTC moneys will be available for apportionment in fiscal year 2013-14, staff estimates that an additional \$56,457 of prior year rollover; for a total apportionment of \$631,457; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with the adopted MCLTC Commission Handbook, a reserve of 15% of the budgeted allocation will be established, totaling \$86,250; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the Transportation Development Act, the following funds are allocated and apportioned under priority 1:

• In accordance with the adopted MCLTC Overall Work Program, \$15,000 of LTF has been committed to LTF auditing and administration per 99233.1; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the Transportation Development Act, the following funds are allocated and apportioned under priority 3:

 Based upon prior action of the MCLTC, and in accordance with 99233.3 of the Transportation Development Act, 2% of the remaining LTC, or \$11,378, will be "set aside" for bike path construction. The 2013-14 apportionment and allocation is the THIRD year of a three-year allocation to Mono County; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the Transportation Development Act, the following funds are allocated and apportioned under priority 6:

 In accordance with 99233.7 of the Transportation Development Act, \$20,700 (less than 5% of the remaining LTF), is available for administration for ESTA serving as the Mono County Consolidated Transportation Service Agency (CTSA); and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the Transportation Development Act, the following funds are allocated and apportioned under priority 7:

- **\$20,000** of LTF will be allocated and apportioned to the Mono County Senior Program for medical escort service for seniors and other transit dependent adults,
- \$30,000 of LTF will be allocated and apportioned to YARTS for operating costs; and
- \$91,000 will be allocated and apportioned for the 395 Routes Service (TDA Section 99262).

WHEREAS, the LTC has accepted the pending ESTA proposed Mono County and Town of Mammoth Lakes transit system budget of \$399,135 for FY 2012-13; and

WHEREAS, the remaining available LTF moneys, **\$357,129**, will be split 58% for the Town of Mammoth Lakes and 42% for Mono County; and

WHEREAS, if revenues still exceed projections, the following allocations and apportionments will apply:

- 15% to be placed in reserve
- 49.3% (58% of balance) to the Town of Mammoth Lakes
- 35.7% (42% of balance) to Mono County.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Mono County Local Transportation Commission does hereby apportion and allocate **2013-14** LTF moneys as follows:

- 1. **\$86,250** into reserve
- 2. \$15,000 for LTC administration and auditing costs for the LTF, Public Utilities Code 99233.1.
- 3. \$11,378 or 2% of remaining LTF moneys for bicycle path "set-aside" to Mono County.
- 4. **\$20,700** (included in the ESTA budget) is apportioned and allocated to Eastern Sierra Transit Authority for CTSA administration, Public Utilities Code 99233.7.
- 5. **\$20,000** of remaining LTF to the Mono County Senior Program for medical escort service for seniors and other transit dependent adults.
- 6. \$30,000 is apportioned and allocated to YARTS for FY 2012-13 for operating costs.
- 7. **\$91,000** is apportioned and allocated to ESTA for the CREST service (TDA Section 99262).
- 8. \$357,129 of remaining LTF, Public Utilities Code 99400 (c) apportioned and allocated to Mono County and the Town of Mammoth Lakes for system operations (Town \$207,135; County \$149,994).

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Mono County Local Transportation Commission does hereby apportion and allocate **2013-14** LTF moneys in excess of budget projections as follows:

- 1. The following split will be used:
 - a. 15% to be placed in reserve
 - b. 49.3% (58% of balance) to the Town of Mammoth Lakes
 - c. 35.7% (42% of balance) to Mono County

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this action is taken in conformance with the Mono County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and with the commission's earlier action defining current "Unmet Needs" and that are "Reasonable to Meet."

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 10th day of June, 2013, by the following vote:

Ayes:		
Noes: Abstain:		
Absent:		
Larry Johnston, Chair Local Transportation Commission		
	ATTEST:	
	C.D. Ritter, Secretary	

Mono County Local Transportation Commission

PO Box 347 Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546 760.924.1800 phone, 924.1801 fax commdev@mono.ca.gov PO Box 8 Bridgeport, CA 93517 760.932.5420 phone, 932.5431 fax www.monocounty.ca.gov

June 10, 2013

TO: Mono County Local Transportation Commission

FROM: Mary Booher, Administrative Services Manager

RE: FY 2013-14 State Transit Assistance (STA) Fund Allocation

RECOMMENDATION

Adopt Resolution R13-07 apportioning \$127,289 of STA funds for fiscal year 2013-14 to the Eastern Sierra Transit Authority (ESTA).

FISCAL IMPLICATIONS

The 2013-14 estimate, as provided by the State Controller's Office for STA funding is \$127,289. Allocation of these funds is guided by the Transportation Development Act.

DISCUSSION

The State Controller has estimated that Mono County's share of 2013-14 allocation is \$127,289 (attached).

The allocation is based on the Public Utilities Code sections 99313 and 99314. It should be noted that the Section 99314 allocation is based on the Annual Report of Financial Transaction of Transit Operators, as submitted by ESTA. Reporting requirements result in ESTA submitting one report for all services in Inyo and Mono Counties. Therefore, the Section 99314 allocation actually reflects the regional allocation for both Mono and Inyo counties. Staff is working with ESTA to have a claimant letter on file for these funds, as required by the Transportation Development Act and state law (Public Utilities Code Section 99313 and 99314). The attached resolution allocates these funds to ESTA for transit operations.

ATTACHMENTS

Resolution R13-07 Attachment A State Controller Allocation FY 2013-14

RESOLUTION R13-07

A RESOLUTION OF THE MONO COUNTY LOCAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION ALLOCATING STATE TRANSIT ASSISTANCE FUNDS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013-14

WHEREAS, the Mono County Local Transportation Commission (MCLTC) is the designated transportation planning agency pursuant to Government Code Section 29535 and by action of the Secretary of Business, Transportation and Housing, and, as such, has the responsibility to apportion State Transit Assistance (STA) Funds; and

WHEREAS, the State Controller has allocated \$127,289 of State Transit Assistance funds for public transportation to the Mono County LTC for fiscal years 2013-14; and

WHEREAS, the MCLTC has received a request from the Eastern Sierra Transit Authority to allocate the STA Funds for transit operations in Mono County.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Mono County Local Transportation Commission does hereby allocate FY 2013-14 STA funds in the amount of \$127,289 to the Eastern Sierra Transit Authority. If additional funds are received, they will also be allocated to Eastern Sierra Transit Authority, upon receipt of an amended claimant letter.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this action is taken in conformance to the Mono County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP); with the commission's earlier action defining current "Unmet Needs" and those that are "Reasonable to Meet" and in conformance with requirements of Public Utilities Code Section 99313 and 99314.

Ayes:
Noes:
Abstain:
Absent:

Larry Johnston, Chair
Local Transportation Commission

Attest:

C.D. Ritter LTC Secretary

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 10th day of June, 2013 by the following vote:



January 25, 2013

COUNTY AUDITORS RESPONSIBLE FOR STATE TRANSIT ASSISTANCE FUNDS TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AGENCIES COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSIONS SAN DIEGO METROPOLITAN TRANSIT SYSTEM

Re: 2013-2014 State Transit Assistance Allocation Preliminary Estimate

Pursuant to section 99312.7 of the Public Utilities Code (PUC), the State Controller is required to provide a preliminary estimate of the amount of the State Transit Assistance (STA) funds to be allocated to each transportation planning entity for the purposes of sections 99313 and 99314 of the PUC.

The estimated amount of STA funds budgeted, according to the Department of Finance, for the 2013-14 fiscal year is \$391,972,000. We anticipate that the first quarter's allocation will be paid in October.

PUC section 99313 allocations are based on the latest available annual population estimates from the Department of Finance. PUC section 99314 allocations are based primarily on qualifying revenues from the Annual Report of Financial Transactions of Transit Operators and Non-Transit Claimants under the Transportation Development Act.

Enclosed are schedules indicating the estimated fund allocation for the fiscal year 2013-14 to each transportation planning entity. We are providing a detailed schedule of STA funds allocated under the PUC section 99314. Since the detail for PUC section 99313 allocations is not reported to the Controller's Office, the SCO is only able to provide eligible amounts for each county for PUC section 99313.

Any questions you have regarding the STA program should be directed to Mike Silvera of the Division of Accounting and Reporting at (916) 323-0704.

STATE CONTROLLER'S OFFICE STATE TRANSIT ASSISTANCE FUND ALLOCATION ESTIMATE FISCAL YEAR 2013-2014 SUMMARY

Regional Entity	PUC 99313 Allocations	PUC 99314 Allocations	2013-2014 Allocations
TRPA	\$ 501,880	\$ 119,252	\$ 621,132
MTC	37,708,786	102,525,536	140,234,322
SACOG	9,388,576	4,555,230	13,943,806
Alpine	5,706	186	5,892
Amador	193,081	10,053	203,134
Butte	1,150,957	70,378	1,221,335
Calaveras	233,236	0	233,236
Colusa	112,821	5,759	118,580
Del Norte	147,874	10,850	158,724
El Dorado	808,588	81,609	890,197
Fresno	4,919,140	615,162	5,534,302
Glenn	146,277	0	146,277
Humboldt	700,058	93,237	793,295
Imperial	922,964	33,465	956,429
Inyo	96,025	0	96,025
Kern	4,421,328	408,156	4,829,484
Kings	792,811	38,117	830,928
Lake	329,080	26,130	355,210
Lassen	177,721	10,488	188,209
Los Angeles	51,415,161	64,076,632	115,491,793
Madera	791,017	0	791,017
Mariposa	92,150	813	92,963
Mendocino	455,508	48,365	503,873
Merced	1,345,822	69,122	1,414,944
Modoc	49,758	0	49,758
Mono	74,855	52,434	127,289
Monterey	2,188,115	454,738	2,642,853
Nevada	505,495	19,605	525,100
Orange	15,894,780	6,192,167	22,086,947
Placer	1,477,759	271,924	1,749,683
Plumas	102,564	0	102,564
Riverside	11,586,798	1,711,239	13,298,037
San Benito	290,323	0	290,323
San Bernardino	10,735,527	2,303,069	13,038,596
SANDAG	4,064,763	1,707,125	5,771,888
San Diego MTS	12,285,862	6,298,657	18,584,519
San Joaquin	3,618,961	930,980	4,549,941
San Luis Obispo	1,412,126	130,714	1,542,840
Santa Barbara	2,222,440	792,573	3,015,013
Santa Cruz	1,383,507	1,375,762	2,759,269
Shasta	924,951	60,293	985,244
Sierra	16,395	0	16,395
Siskiyou	232,191	13,584	245,775
Stanislaus	2,704,481	205,516	2,909,997
Tehama	328,617	0	328,617
Trinity	71,375	2,475	73,850
Tulare	2,345,056	218,743	2,563,799
Tuolumne	280,019	0	280,019
Ventura	4,332,715	445,862	4,778,577
State Totals	\$ 195,986,000	\$ 195,986,000	\$ 391,972,000
	, -,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	- 1,2,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	+ 272,772,000

Regional Entity and Operator(s)		evenue Basis	 Fund Allocation
TRPA			
Tahoe Transportation District	\$	2,108,901	\$ 119,252
MTC			
Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District		*	**
Alameda County Congestion Management			
Agency - Corresponding to Altamont Commuter Express		NA	139,903
City of Benicia		138,480	7,831
Central Contra Costa Transit Authority		10,231,519	578,563
City of Dixon		78,869	4,460
Eastern Contra Costa Transit Authority		4,531,432	256,239
City of Fairfield		2,028,003	114,678
Golden Gate Bridge Highway and			
Transportation District		79,398,121	4,489,733
City of Healdsburg		80,734	4,565
Livermore-Amador Valley Transit Authority		4,076,133	230,493
Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency		813,056	45,976
Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board		89,429,084	5,056,954
Petaluma		373,015	21,093
City of Rio Vista		161,864	9,153
City of San Francisco		*	**
San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District		*	**
San Mateo County Transit District		85,683,751	4,845,167
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority		219,251,144	12,398,014
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority - Corresponding			
to Altamont Commuter Express		NA	187,976
City of Santa Rosa		1,826,399	103,278
County of Sonoma		2,786,506	157,569
City of Union City		781,353	44,183
City of Vallejo		9,511,024	537,821
Western Contra Costa Transit Authority		5,140,764	290,695
Regional Entity Totals	1	,807,301,763	 102,525,536
SACOG			
City of Davis		2,540,424	143,654
City of Elk Grove		1,714,213	96,934
City of Folsom		788,032	44,561
Sacramento Regional Transit System		70,330,832	3,977,004
Yolo County Transportation District		3,767,239	213,026
Yuba Sutter Transit Authority		1,415,650	80,051
Regional Entity Totals		80,556,390	 4,555,230
			(Continued)

^{*} The combined revenue basis for Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District, San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District, and the City of San Francisco is \$1,290,980,512.

^{**} The combined allocation estimate for Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District, Bay Area Rapid Transit District, and the City of San Francisco is \$73,001,192.

Regional Entity and Operator(s)	Revenue Basis	Fund Allocation
Alpine County of Alpine	3,284	186
Amador Amador Regional Transit System	177,782	10,053
Butte Butte County Association of Governments	1,244,587	70,378
Calaveras	None	None
Colusa County of Colusa	101,841	5,759
Del Norte Redwood Coast Transit Authority	191,879	10,850
El Dorado El Dorado County Transit Authority	1,443,207	81,609
Fresno City of Clovis City of Fresno Fresno County Rural Transit Agency Regional Entity Totals	433,639 9,053,247 1,391,858 10,878,744	24,521 511,935 78,706 615,162
Glenn	None	None
Humboldt City of Arcata City of Eureka City of Fortuna Humboldt Transit Authority Regional Entity Totals	188,973 260,128 11,189 1,188,553 1,648,843	10,686 14,709 633 67,209 93,237
Imperial Imperial County Transportation Commission (ICTC) Imperial County Transportation Commission (ICTC)-Specialized Service Regional Entity Totals	550,102 41,708 591,810	31,107 2,358 33,465
Inyo	None	None (Continued)

Regional Entity and Operator(s)	Revenue Basis	Fund Allocation

Kern	52 520	2.026
City of Arvin	53,520	3,026
City of California City	25,513	1,443
City of Delano	117,246	6,630
Golden Empire Transit District	5,818,655	329,028
County of Kern	797,434	45,093
City of Ridgecrest	214,122	12,108
City of Shafter	41,390	2,340
City of Taft	119,548	6,760
City of Tehachapi	4,867	275
City of Wasco	25,703	1,453
Regional Entity Totals	7,217,998	408,156
Kings		
City of Corcoran	79,476	4,494
Kings County Area Public Transit Agency	594,593	33,623
Regional Entity Totals	674,069	38,117
Lake		
Lake Transit Authority	462,094	26,130
Lassen		
County of Lassen	185,480	10,488
Los Angeles		
Antelope Valley Transit Authority	15,487,402	875,768
City of Arcadia	1,360,919	76,956
City of Claremont	373,982	21,148
City of Commerce	1,717,618	97,126
City of Culver City	7,985,279	451,544
Foothill Transit Zone	45,657,559	2,581,802
City of Gardena	9,528,945	538,834
City of La Mirada	899,431	50,860
Long Beach Public Transportation Company	49,805,574	2,816,360
City of Los Angeles	60,627,875	3,428,330
Los Angeles County Metropolitan	33,027,078	5,.20,550
Transportation Authority	782,995,111	44,276,094
City of Montebello	15,245,944	862,114
City of Norwalk	6,856,125	387,694
City of Redondo Beach	2,353,809	133,101
City of Santa Monica	38,702,487	2,188,513
Southern California Regional Rail Authority	152,257,754	2,100,313
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority	132,237,734	4,582,100
Orange County Transportation Authority		4,562,100 ***
Riverside County Transportation Commission		***
San Bernardino Associated Governments		***

Ventura County Transportation Commission	12,525,627	708,288
City of Torrance Regional Entity Totals	12,323,027	64,076,632
Regional Entity Totals	1,204,301,441	(Continued)

^{***} The amounts allocated to the member agencies of Southern California Regional Rail Authority are paid by their corresponding regional transportation authority.

Regional Entity and Operator(s)	Revenue Basis	Fund Allocation
Madera	None	None
Mariposa	14,202	012
County of Mariposa	14,383	813
Mendocino		
Mendocino Transit Authority	855,309	48,365
Merced		
Transit Joint Powers Authority of Merced County	763,104	43,151
Transit Joint Powers Authority of Merced County - Specialized Service	459,278	25,971
Regional Entity Totals	1,222,382	69,122
Modoc	None	None
Mono		
Eastern Sierra Transit Authority	927,267	52,434
Monterey		
City of Greenfield	7,769	439
City of King City	28,898	1,634
Monterey-Salinas Transit	7,994,600	452,071
City of Soledad	10,509	594
Regional Entity Totals	8,041,776	454,738
Nevada		
County of Nevada	346,701	19,605
Orange		
City of Laguna Beach	1,131,319	63,973
Orange County Transportation Authority	75,211,537	4,252,994
Orange County Transportation Authority - Corresponding		
to Southern California Regional Rail Authority	NA	1,875,200
Regional Entity Totals	76,342,856	6,192,167
Placer		
City of Auburn	29,465	1,666
City of Lincoln	44,308	2,505
County of Placer	3,696,636	209,034
City of Roseville	1,038,414	58,719
Regional Entity Totals	4,808,823	271,924
Plumas	None	None
		(Continued)

Riverside	Regional Entity and Operator(s)	Revenue Basis	Fund Allocation
City of Baming	regional Zinti) and operator(o)		
City of Corona	Riverside		
City of Corona 336,493 19,028 20,000 3388 20,000 20,	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	122,598	6,933
Palo Verde Valley Transit Ageney 60,090 3.398 City of Riverside County Transportation Commission - Corresponding Riverside County Transportation Regional Rail Authority NA 633,676 Riverside County Transportation Regional Rail Authority NA 633,676 Riverside Transit Agency 10,394,834 587,798 Sunline Transit Agency 7,797,622 440,933 Regional Entity Totals 9,056,004 1,711,239 San Bentio None None San Bentardino San Bernardino \$90,069 22,273 Mornago Basin Transit Authority 390,069 22,057 Omitirans 390,069 22,057 Omitirans 81,625 381,625 San Bernardino Associated Governments - Corresponding NA 1,255,299 Victor Valley Transit Service Authority NA 1,255,299 Victor Valley Transit Service Authority 1,853,582 104,815 Regional Entity Totals 30,189,445 1,707,125 San Diego County Transit 9,397,257 **** Altamont Commuter Express Authority 9,397,257 *****<	City of Beaumont	0	0
City of Riverside 344,367 19,473 Riverside County Transportation Commission - Corresponding to Southern California Regional Rail Authority 10,948,34 587,798 Sunline Transit Agency 10,948,34 587,798 Sunline Transit Agency 7,797,622 440,933 Regional Entity Totals 19,056,004 1,711,239 San Benito None None San Bernardino None None San Bernardino None None San Bernardino 15,766,004 22,273 Morongo Basin Transit Authority 310,666 29,273 Montain Area Regional Transit Authority 310,666 29,273 Montain Area Regional Transit Authority 310,666 29,273 Montain Area Regional Endity Totals 15,767,839 891,625 San Bernardino Associated Governments - Corresponding to Southern California Regional Rail Authority 1,853,582 104,815 Regional Entity Totals 11,853,582 104,815 Regional Entity Totals 11,853,582 104,815 Regional Entity Totals 30,189,445 1,707,125 San Diego County Transit Development Board 30,189,445 1,707,125 San Diego MTS 111,387,808 6,298,657 San Joaquin Regional Rail Commission 20,509 City of Ripon 1,184 67 6,200 City of Ripon 1,255,337 709,968 Regional Entity Totals 2,255,337 709,968 Regional Entity Totals 2,255,337 709,968 City of Morro Bay 2,200,210 9,300,300 City of Atascadero 10,2342 5,787 City of Paso Robles Transit District 2,555,337 709,968 City of Jana Riso Obispo 30,300 34,132 City of San Luis Obispo 30,300 34,132 City of San Luis Obispo 30,300 34,132 County Agent Entity Totals 30,301 30,301 County Agent Entity Totals 30,301 County Agent Entity Totals 30,301 County Agent Entity Totals 30,301 County Agent Entity Regiona		336,493	19,028
Riverside County Transportation Commission - Corresponding to Southern California Regional Rail Authority (10,394,834) (587,798) (587,	Palo Verde Valley Transit Agency	60,090	3,398
no Southern California Regional Rail Authority NA 633,676 Riverside Transit Agency 10,394,834 587,798 Sunline Transit Agency 7,797,622 440,933 Regional Entity Totals 19,056,004 1,711,239 San Bernito None None San Bernardino 517,666 29,273 Mountain Area Regional Transit Authority 300,069 22,057 Omnitrans 15,767,839 891,625 San Bernardino Associated Governments - Corresponding 15,767,839 891,625 To Southern California Regional Rail Authority NA 1,255,299 Victor Valley Transit Service Authority 1,853,582 104,815 Regional Entity Totals 30,189,445 1,707,125 San Diego County Transit 30,189,445 1,707,125 San Diego MTS 111,387,808 6,289,657 San Joaquin 9,397,257 20,000 Alameda County Congestion Management Agency **** Alameda County Congestion Management Agency 1,184 6,7 Alameda County Congestion Management Agency 2,20,01	City of Riverside	344,367	19,473
Riverside Transit Agency 10,394,824 587,798 Sunline Transit Agency 7,797,622 440,933 Regional Entity Totals 19,056,004 17,11,239 San Beniardino None None San Bernardino Morongo Basin Transit Authority 517,666 29,273 Mountain Area Regional Transit Authority 390,069 22,057 Omnitrans 15,767,839 81,625 San Bernardino Associated Governments - Corresponding NA 1,255,299 Yictor Valley Transit Service Authority 18,833,852 104,815 Regional Entity Totals 18,259,156 2,303,069 SANDAG 111,387,808 6,298,657 San Diego MTS 111,387,808 6,298,657 San Joaquin 9,397,257 **** Altumont Commuter Express Authority 9,397,257 **** Altumont Commuter Express Authority 9,397,257 **** Altumot Lorr Authority 9,397,257 **** San Joaquin Regional Rail Commission 9,397,257 **** San Joaquin Regional Rail Commi	Riverside County Transportation Commission - Corresponding		
Sunline Transit Agency 7,797,622 440,933 Regional Entity Totals 19,056,004 1,711,239 San Benito None None San Benito None None San Bernardino \$17,666 29,273 Mountain Area Regional Transit Authority 390,069 22,057 Omnitrans 15,767,839 891,625 San Bernardino Associated Governments - Corresponding to Southern California Regional Rail Authority NA 1,255,299 Victor Valley Transit Service Authority 1,853,582 104,815 Regional Entity Totals 8,291,56 2,303,069 SANDAG 8,291,56 2,303,069 SANDAG 1,853,582 104,815 Regional Entity Totals 8,591,56 1,707,125 San Diego County Transit 11,387,808 6,298,657 San Diego MTS 111,387,808 6,298,657 San Joaquin 9,397,257 1,825 Alamont Commuter Express Authority 9,397,257 2,825 Alamont Commuter Express Authority 9,397,257 2,825 Al	to Southern California Regional Rail Authority	NA	633,676
Regional Entity Totals 19,056,004 1,711,239 San Benito None None San Bernardino San Bernardino Surviva Monoring Basin Transit Authority 517,666 29,273 Mountain Area Regional Transit Authority 390,069 22,057 Omnirans 15,767,839 891,625 San Bernardino Associated Governments - Corresponding to Southern California Regional Rail Authority 18,576,839 891,625 San Bernardino Associated Governments - Corresponding to Southern California Regional Rail Authority 1,853,582 104,815 Regional Entity Totals 18,529,156 2,303,069 SANDAG 18,529,156 2,303,069 SANDAG 11,387,808 6,298,657 San Diego MTS 111,387,808 6,298,657 San Diego MTS 111,387,808 6,298,657 San Joaquin 4 4 Altamont Commuter Express Authority 9,397,257 4 Altamont Commuter Express Authority 9,397,257 4 Altamont Clary Olago, Transportation Authority 9,397,257 203,509 City of Lodi 30,30,30	Riverside Transit Agency	10,394,834	587,798
San Bernito None None San Bernardino Morongo Basin Transit Authority 517,666 29,273 Mountain Area Regional Transit Authority 390,069 22,057 Omnitrans 15,767,839 891,625 San Bernardino Associated Governments - Corresponding to Southern California Regional Rail Authority NA 1,255,299 Victor Valley Transit Service Authority 1,853,582 104,815 Regional Entity Totals 18,529,156 2,303,069 SANDAG San Diego County Transit Development Board 30,189,445 1,707,125 San Joaquin 9,397,257 ***** Altamont Commuter Express Authority 9,397,257 ***** Almela County Congestion Management Agency ***** San Joaquin Regional Rail Commission 203,509 City of Lodi 308,336 17,436 City of Ripon 1,184 67 San Joaquin Regional Transit District 12,555,337 709,968 Regional Entity Totals 22,262,114 930,980 San Luis Obispo 102,342 <td>Sunline Transit Agency</td> <td>7,797,622</td> <td>440,933</td>	Sunline Transit Agency	7,797,622	440,933
San Bernardino Morongo Basin Transit Authority 517.666 29.273 Mountain Area Regional Transit Authority 390,069 22.057 Omnitrans 15,767,839 891,625 San Bernardino Associated Governments - Corresponding 15,767,839 891,625 San Bernardino Associated Governments - Corresponding NA 1,255,299 Victor Valley Transit Service Authority 1,853,582 104,815 Regional Entity Totals 30,189,445 2,303,069 SANDAG North San Diego County Transit 111,387,808 6,298,657 San Diego MTS 111,387,808 6,298,657 San Joaquin 9,397,257 **** Altamont Commuter Express Authority 9,397,257 ***** San Joaquin Regional Rail Commission 308,336 17,436 City of Lodi 308,336 17,436 City of Ripon 1,184 57 <td>Regional Entity Totals</td> <td>19,056,004</td> <td>1,711,239</td>	Regional Entity Totals	19,056,004	1,711,239
Morongo Basin Transit Authority 517,666 29,273 Mountain Area Regional Transit Authority 390,069 22,057 Omnitrans 15,767,839 891,625 San Bernardino Associated Governments - Corresponding to Southern California Regional Rail Authority NA 1,255,289 Victor Valley Transit Service Authority 1,853,582 104,815 Regional Entity Totals 18,59,156 2,303,069 SANDAG North San Diego County Transit 30,189,445 1,707,125 San Diego MTS 111,387,808 6,298,657 San Joaquin 4 **** Altamont Commuter Express Authority 9,397,257 **** Alameda County Congestion Management Agency **** **** San Joaquin Regional Rail Commission 203,509 203,509 City of Lodi 308,336 17,436 City of Ripon 1,184 67 San Joaquin Regional Transit District 12,555,337 709,968 Regional Entity Totals 20,812 1,516 City of Assocadero 102,342 5,787 City of Paso Robles	San Benito	None	None
Morongo Basin Transit Authority 517,666 29,273 Mountain Area Regional Transit Authority 390,069 22,057 Omnitrans 15,767,839 891,625 San Bernardino Associated Governments - Corresponding to Southern California Regional Rail Authority NA 1,255,289 Victor Valley Transit Service Authority 1,853,582 104,815 Regional Entity Totals 18,59,156 2,303,069 SANDAG North San Diego County Transit 30,189,445 1,707,125 San Diego MTS 111,387,808 6,298,657 San Joaquin 4 **** Altamont Commuter Express Authority 9,397,257 **** Alameda County Congestion Management Agency **** **** San Joaquin Regional Rail Commission 203,509 203,509 City of Lodi 308,336 17,436 City of Ripon 1,184 67 San Joaquin Regional Transit District 12,555,337 709,968 Regional Entity Totals 20,812 1,516 City of Assocadero 102,342 5,787 City of Paso Robles	San Bernardino		
Mountain Area Regional Transit Authority 390,069 22,057 Omnitrans 15,767,839 891,625 San Bernardino Associated Governments - Corresponding to Southern California Regional Rail Authority NA 1,255,299 Victor Valley Transit Service Authority 1,853,582 104,815 Regional Entity Totals 8,529,156 2,303,069 SANDAG SANDAG North San Diego County Transit 30,189,445 1,707,125 San Diego MTS 111,387,808 6,298,657 San Joaquin 4 2,387,257 Altamont Commuter Express Authority 9,397,257 ***** Altamoda County Congestion Management Agency ***** 203,509 San Joaquin Regional Rail Commission 9,397,257 203,509 City of Lodi 308,336 17,436 City of Ripon 1,184 67 San Joaquin Regional Transit District 12,555,337 709,968 Regional Entity Totals 22,262,114 930,980 San Luis Obispo 102,342 5,787 City of Asascadero		517.666	29.273
Omnitrans 15,767,839 891,625 San Bernardino Associated Governments - Corresponding to Southern California Regional Rail Authority NA 1,255,299 Victor Valley Transit Service Authority 1,853,582 104,815 Regional Entity Totals 18,529,156 2,303,069 SANDAG North San Diego County Transit Development Board 30,189,445 1,707,125 San Diego MTS 111,387,808 6,298,657 San Joaquin Altamont Commuter Express Authority 9,397,257 Alameda County Congestion Management Agency ***** San Joaquin Regional Rail Commission 203,509 City of Lodi 308,336 17,436 City of Ripon 1,184 67 San Joaquin Regional Transit District 12,555,337 709,968 Regional Entity Totals 22,262,114 930,980 San Luis Obispo 102,342 5,787 City of Atascadero 102,342 5,787 City of San Luis Obispo 603,600 34,132 City of San Luis Obispo 603,600 34	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
San Bernardino Associated Governments - Corresponding to Southern California Regional Rail Authority NA 1,255,299 Victor Valley Transit Service Authority 1,853,582 104,815 Regional Entity Totals 18,529,156 2,303,069 SANDAG North San Diego County Transit Development Board 30,189,445 1,707,125 San Diego MTS 111,387,808 6,298,657 San Joaquin Altamont Commuter Express Authority 9,397,257 ***** Alameda County Congestion Management Agency ***** ***** San Joaquin Regional Rail Commission 203,509 203,509 City of Lodi 308,336 17,436 City of Ripon 1,184 67 San Joaquin Regional Transit District 12,555,337 709,688 Regional Entity Totals 22,262,114 303,089 San Luis Obispo City of Paso Robles Transit 102,342 5,787 City of Paso Robles Transit 103,42 5,787 City of Paso Robles Transit 603,600 34,132 City of San Luis Obispo	·		
to Southern California Regional Rail Authority NA 1,255,299 Victor Valley Transit Service Authority 1,853,582 104,815 Regional Entity Totals 18,529,156 2,303,069 SANDAG North San Diego County Transit San Diego County Transit 1,707,125 San Diego MTS 111,387,808 6,298,657 San Joaquin 30,189,445 1,707,125 Alameda County Congestion Management Agency **** ***** Sant Joaquin Regional Rail Commission 9,397,257 ***** San Joaquin Regional Rail Commission 90,397,257 ***** City of Lodi 308,336 17,436 17,436 City of Ripon 1,184 67 San Joaquin Regional Transit District 12,555,337 709,968 Regional Entity Totals 22,262,114 930,980 San Luis Obispo 102,342 5,787 City of Adascadero 102,342 5,787 City of Paso Robles Transit 168,558 9,531 City of Paso Robles Transit 6168,558 9,531 City of San Luis Obispo <td></td> <td>10,707,000</td> <td>0,1,020</td>		10,707,000	0,1,020
Victor Valley Transit Service Authority 1,853,882 104,815 Regional Entity Totals 18,529,156 2,303,069 SANDAG North San Diego County Transit Development Board 30,189,445 1,707,125 San Diego MTS 111,387,808 6,298,657 San Joaquin Altamont Commuter Express Authority 9,397,257 ***** Alameda County Congestion Management Agency ***** \$305,009 City of Lodi 308,336 17,436 City of Ripon 1,184 67 San Joaquin Regional Transit District 12,555,337 709,688 Regional Entity Totals 22,262,114 930,980 San Luis Obispo 102,342 5,787 City of Atascadero 102,342 5,787 City of Paso Robles Transit 168,558 9,531 City of San Luis Obispo 603,600 34,132 City of San Luis Obispo 603,600 34,132 County of San Luis Obispo 603,600 34,132 City of San Luis Obispo 603,600 3,164 <td></td> <td>NA</td> <td>1 255 299</td>		NA	1 255 299
Regional Entity Totals 18,529,156 2,303,069 SANDAG North San Diego County Transit 30,189,445 1,707,125 San Diego MTS 111,387,808 6,298,657 San Joaquin 9,397,257 ***** Altamont Commuter Express Authority 9,397,257 ***** Alameda County Congestion Management Agency ***** ***** San Joaquin Regional Rail Commission 203,509 City of Lodi 308,336 17,436 City of Ripon 1,184 67 San Joaquin Regional Transit District 12,555,337 709,968 Regional Entity Totals 22,262,114 930,980 San Luis Obispo 102,342 5,787 City of Atascadero 102,342 5,787 City of Morro Bay 26,812 1,516 City of Paso Robles Transit 168,558 9,531 City of San Luis Obispo 603,600 34,132 County of San Luis Obispo 38,206 2,160 San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority 1,256,844 71,071 South County Area Transit 115,242	•		
North San Diego County Transit 30,189,445 1,707,125 San Diego MTS 111,387,808 6,298,657 San Joaquin ***********************************	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		2,303,069
North San Diego County Transit 30,189,445 1,707,125 San Diego MTS 111,387,808 6,298,657 San Joaquin ***********************************	CANDAC		
Development Board 30,189,445 1,707,125 San Diego MTS 111,387,808 6,298,657 San Joaquin Altamont Commuter Express Authority 9,397,257 Alameda County Congestion Management Agency ***** Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority 203,509 City of Lodi 308,336 17,436 City of Ripon 1,184 67 San Joaquin Regional Transit District 12,555,337 709,968 Regional Entity Totals 22,262,114 930,980 San Luis Obispo 102,342 5,787 City of Atascadero 102,342 5,787 City of Morro Bay 26,812 1,516 City of Paso Robles Transit 168,558 9,531 City of San Luis Obispo 603,600 34,132 County of San Luis Obispo 38,206 2,160 San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority 1,256,844 71,071 South County Area Transit 115,242 6,517 Regional Entity Totals 2,311,604 130,714			
San Diego MTS 111,387,808 6,298,657 San Joaquin ***** Altamont Commuter Express Authority 9,397,257 Alameda County Congestion Management Agency ***** Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority ***** San Joaquin Regional Rail Commission 203,509 City of Lodi 308,336 17,436 City of Ripon 1,184 6 San Joaquin Regional Transit District 12,555,337 709,968 Regional Entity Totals 22,262,114 930,980 San Luis Obispo 102,342 5,787 City of Atascadero 102,342 5,787 City of Morro Bay 26,812 1,516 City of Paso Robles Transit 168,558 9,531 City of San Luis Obispo 38,206 2,160 San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority 1,256,844 7,107 Regional Entity Totals 2,311,604		20 190 445	1 707 125
San Joaquin Altamont Commuter Express Authority 9,397,257 Alameda County Congestion Management Agency **** Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority **** San Joaquin Regional Rail Commission 203,509 City of Lodi 308,336 17,436 City of Ripon 1,184 67 San Joaquin Regional Transit District 12,555,337 709,968 Regional Entity Totals 22,262,114 930,980 San Luis Obispo City of Atascadero 102,342 5,787 City of Paso Robles Transit 168,558 9,531 City of Paso Robles Transit 168,558 9,531 City of San Luis Obispo 603,600 34,132 County of San Luis Obispo 38,206 2,160 San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority 1,256,844 71,071 South County Area Transit 115,242 6,517 Regional Entity Totals 2,311,604 130,714	Development Board	30,189,445	1,/0/,125
Altamont Commuter Express Authority 9,397,257 Alameda County Congestion Management Agency ***** Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority ***** San Joaquin Regional Rail Commission 203,509 City of Lodi 308,336 17,436 City of Ripon 1,184 67 San Joaquin Regional Transit District 12,555,337 709,968 Regional Entity Totals 22,262,114 930,980 San Luis Obispo 26,812 1,516 City of Atascadero 102,342 5,787 City of Morro Bay 26,812 1,516 City of Paso Robles Transit 168,558 9,531 City of San Luis Obispo 603,600 34,132 County of San Luis Obispo 38,206 2,160 San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority 1,256,844 71,071 South County Area Transit 115,242 6,517 Regional Entity Totals 2,311,604 130,714	San Diego MTS	111,387,808	6,298,657
Alameda County Congestion Management Agency **** Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority **** San Joaquin Regional Rail Commission 203,509 City of Lodi 308,336 17,436 City of Ripon 1,184 67 San Joaquin Regional Transit District 12,555,337 709,968 Regional Entity Totals 22,262,114 930,980 San Luis Obispo 102,342 5,787 City of Atascadero 102,342 5,787 City of Morro Bay 26,812 1,516 City of Paso Robles Transit 168,558 9,531 City of San Luis Obispo 603,600 34,132 County of San Luis Obispo 38,206 2,160 San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority 1,256,844 71,071 South County Area Transit 115,242 6,517 Regional Entity Totals 2,311,604 130,714	San Joaquin		
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority **** San Joaquin Regional Rail Commission 203,509 City of Lodi 308,336 17,436 City of Ripon 1,184 67 San Joaquin Regional Transit District 12,555,337 709,968 Regional Entity Totals 22,262,114 930,980 San Luis Obispo 102,342 5,787 City of Atascadero 102,342 5,787 City of Morro Bay 26,812 1,516 City of Paso Robles Transit 168,558 9,531 City of San Luis Obispo 603,600 34,132 County of San Luis Obispo 38,206 2,160 San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority 1,256,844 71,071 South County Area Transit 115,242 6,517 Regional Entity Totals 2,311,604 130,714	Altamont Commuter Express Authority	9,397,257	
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority **** San Joaquin Regional Rail Commission 203,509 City of Lodi 308,336 17,436 City of Ripon 1,184 67 San Joaquin Regional Transit District 12,555,337 709,968 Regional Entity Totals 22,262,114 930,980 San Luis Obispo 102,342 5,787 City of Atascadero 102,342 5,787 City of Morro Bay 26,812 1,516 City of Paso Robles Transit 168,558 9,531 City of San Luis Obispo 603,600 34,132 County of San Luis Obispo 38,206 2,160 San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority 1,256,844 71,071 South County Area Transit 115,242 6,517 Regional Entity Totals 2,311,604 130,714	Alameda County Congestion Management Agency		****
San Joaquin Regional Rail Commission 203,509 City of Lodi 308,336 17,436 City of Ripon 1,184 67 San Joaquin Regional Transit District 12,555,337 709,968 Regional Entity Totals 22,262,114 930,980 San Luis Obispo 102,342 5,787 City of Atascadero 102,342 5,787 City of Morro Bay 26,812 1,516 City of Paso Robles Transit 168,558 9,531 City of San Luis Obispo 603,600 34,132 County of San Luis Obispo 38,206 2,160 San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority 1,256,844 71,071 South County Area Transit 115,242 6,517 Regional Entity Totals 2,311,604 130,714			****
City of Ripon 1,184 67 San Joaquin Regional Transit District 12,555,337 709,968 Regional Entity Totals 22,262,114 930,980 San Luis Obispo V V City of Atascadero 102,342 5,787 City of Morro Bay 26,812 1,516 City of Paso Robles Transit 168,558 9,531 City of San Luis Obispo 603,600 34,132 County of San Luis Obispo 38,206 2,160 San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority 1,256,844 71,071 South County Area Transit 115,242 6,517 Regional Entity Totals 2,311,604 130,714			203,509
San Joaquin Regional Transit District 12,555,337 709,968 Regional Entity Totals 22,262,114 930,980 San Luis Obispo City of Atascadero 102,342 5,787 City of Morro Bay 26,812 1,516 City of Paso Robles Transit 168,558 9,531 City of San Luis Obispo 603,600 34,132 County of San Luis Obispo 38,206 2,160 San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority 1,256,844 71,071 South County Area Transit 115,242 6,517 Regional Entity Totals 2,311,604 130,714	City of Lodi	308,336	17,436
San Joaquin Regional Transit District 12,555,337 709,968 Regional Entity Totals 22,262,114 930,980 San Luis Obispo City of Atascadero 102,342 5,787 City of Morro Bay 26,812 1,516 City of Paso Robles Transit 168,558 9,531 City of San Luis Obispo 603,600 34,132 County of San Luis Obispo 38,206 2,160 San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority 1,256,844 71,071 South County Area Transit 115,242 6,517 Regional Entity Totals 2,311,604 130,714	City of Ripon	1,184	67
Regional Entity Totals 22,262,114 930,980 San Luis Obispo	San Joaquin Regional Transit District	12,555,337	709,968
City of Atascadero 102,342 5,787 City of Morro Bay 26,812 1,516 City of Paso Robles Transit 168,558 9,531 City of San Luis Obispo 603,600 34,132 County of San Luis Obispo 38,206 2,160 San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority 1,256,844 71,071 South County Area Transit 115,242 6,517 Regional Entity Totals 2,311,604 130,714			930,980
City of Atascadero 102,342 5,787 City of Morro Bay 26,812 1,516 City of Paso Robles Transit 168,558 9,531 City of San Luis Obispo 603,600 34,132 County of San Luis Obispo 38,206 2,160 San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority 1,256,844 71,071 South County Area Transit 115,242 6,517 Regional Entity Totals 2,311,604 130,714	San Luis Obispo		
City of Morro Bay 26,812 1,516 City of Paso Robles Transit 168,558 9,531 City of San Luis Obispo 603,600 34,132 County of San Luis Obispo 38,206 2,160 San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority 1,256,844 71,071 South County Area Transit 115,242 6,517 Regional Entity Totals 2,311,604 130,714		102.342	5 787
City of Paso Robles Transit 168,558 9,531 City of San Luis Obispo 603,600 34,132 County of San Luis Obispo 38,206 2,160 San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority 1,256,844 71,071 South County Area Transit 115,242 6,517 Regional Entity Totals 2,311,604 130,714	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
City of San Luis Obispo 603,600 34,132 County of San Luis Obispo 38,206 2,160 San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority 1,256,844 71,071 South County Area Transit 115,242 6,517 Regional Entity Totals 2,311,604 130,714	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
County of San Luis Obispo 38,206 2,160 San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority 1,256,844 71,071 South County Area Transit 115,242 6,517 Regional Entity Totals 2,311,604 130,714			
San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority 1,256,844 71,071 South County Area Transit 115,242 6,517 Regional Entity Totals 2,311,604 130,714	•		
South County Area Transit 115,242 6,517 Regional Entity Totals 2,311,604 130,714			
Regional Entity Totals 2,311,604 130,714			
	Regional Littly Totals	2,511,004	(Continued)

^{****} The amounts allocated to the member agencies of Altamont Commuter Express Authority are paid by their corresponding regional transportation authority.

Regional Entity and Operator(s)	Revenue Basis	Fund Allocation
Santa Barbara		
City of Guadalupe	101,900	5,762
City of Cuaddatupe City of Lompoc	216,279	12,230
County of Santa Barbara	91,462	5,172
Santa Barbara Metropolitan Transit District	11,438,372	646,807
City of Santa Maria	2,088,243	118,084
City of Solvang	79,900	4,518
Regional Entity Totals	14,016,156	792,573
Santa Cruz		
Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District	24,329,498	1,375,762
Shasta		
Redding Area Bus Authority	1,066,243	60,293
Sierra	None	None
Siskiyou		
County of Siskiyou	240,220	13,584
Stanislaus		
City of Modesto	3,090,970	174,785
County of Stanislaus	397,413	22,473
City of Turlock	146,029	8,258
Regional Entity Totals	3,634,412	205,516
Tehama	None	None
Trinity		
County of Trinity	43,775	2,475
Tulare		
City of Exeter	15,619	883
City of Porterville	443,908	25,102
City of Tulare	395,891	22,386
County of Tulare	314,221	17,768
City of Visalia	2,698,700	152,604
Regional Entity Totals	3,868,339	218,743
Tuolumne	None	None
Ventura		
Gold Coast Transit	3,225,701	182,404
Ventura County Transportation Commission - Corresponding		
to Southern California Regional Rail Authority	NA	263,458
Regional Entity Totals	3,225,701	445,862
STATE TOTALS	\$ 3,465,890,085	\$ 195,986,000



Eastern Sierra Transit Authority

703 Airport Road P.O. Box 1357 Bishop, CA 93515 760.872.1901

June 3, 2013

Ms. Mary Booher Administrative Services Manager County of Mono P.O. Box 476 Bridgeport, CA 93517

Dear Ms. Booher:

This letter will document the request by Eastern Sierra Transit for Local Transportation Funds (LTF) and for State Transit Assistance (STA) funds for the 2013/14 fiscal year. The estimates provided in your previous correspondence indicate estimated LTF funds available to ESTA of \$468,829. In addition, the State Controller's Office January estimate indicates a total of \$127,289 in STA funds available for Mono County. It is important to note that 30% of the STA Section 99314 funds (\$15,730) will be directed to Inyo County transit services as their proportionate share of that funding.

Eastern Sierra Transit is requesting a total of \$596,118.00 in TDA funding for the 2013/14 fiscal year. Approximately \$21,000 of the LTF funding will be used for CTSA administration, and \$91,000 of the LTF funds will be used as the matching funds for our Section 5311(f) intercity bus service (Reno and Lancaster routes).

Please contact me if you have any questions regarding ESTA's request for TDA funds for FY 2013/14, or if you need any additional information. We appreciate the Commission's continued support for the funding of the transit services that Eastern Sierra Transit provides to the residents and visitors to our region.

Regards,

John Helm

Executive Director

Mono County Local Transportation Commission

PO Box 347 Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546 760- 924-1800 phone, 924-1801 fax monocounty.ca.gov PO Box 8 Bridgeport, CA 93517 760- 932-5420 phone, 932-5431 fax

Staff Report

June 10, 2013

TO: Mono County Local Transportation Commission

FROM: Mary Booher, Administrative Services Manager

SUBJECT: 2011-12 LTC Audit Report-response to recommendations

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Receive staff response to recommendations in the 2011-12 Local Transportation Commission Audit Report and provide any desired direction to staff.

FISCAL IMPLICATIONS:

None.

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE: N/A

RTP / RTIP CONSISTENCY:

N/A

DISCUSSION:

The 2011/12 audit has been completed, and the auditor has made three recommendations. The Commission has requested that staff respond to these recommendations.

- County Trial Balance reports do not reconcile to Prior Year Audited Financial Statements. This condition is a result of the County requiring accrual information prior to the partners having the billing information necessary for the OWP. LTC staff has initiated discussions with the County Finance Director to resolve this issue.
- 2. Recording of OWP expenditures. LTC staff continues to increase tracking and accountability for OWP expenditures, and will work with County Finance staff to implement this recommendation for the 2013/14 fiscal year.
- 3. Transfer of funds to outside agencies and state billings. During the 2011/12 fiscal year, staff made great progress on bringing billings current with the State of California, and were current as of December 31, 2012. By the end of the 2011/12 fiscal year, all OWP billings were current. Since the quarter ends on June 30th, and the invoice for this quarter is due to the State by August 31st, there will always be accrual entries. Staff from the Town of Mammoth Lakes has also worked with LTC staff to comply with the state-established deadlines, despite their minimal staffing levels.

Attachments:

Pages 34-35 of 2011-12 LTC Audit

Mono County Local Transportation Commission Current Year Recommendations

1. County Trial Balance Reports do not Reconcile to Prior Year Audited Financial Statements

During the course of our audit, we noticed that the trial balances provided to us did not reconcile to the prior year audited financial statements. We had to record a number of journal entries in order to properly reconcile the trial balances to the prior year audit report.

Effect of Condition

Due to the fact the trial balances and fund balance do not reconcile to the prior year audited financial statements, it is difficult to maintain accountability over the assets and liabilities of the Commission's funds.

Recommendation

We recommend that Commission staff work closely with the independent auditor and the County staff in order to record the journal entries that resulted from the audit.

2. Recording of OWP expenditures

During the course of our audit, we noticed that the Commission's procedure to record OWP expenditures (for grant billing purposes) is to record expenditures in an Excel spreadsheet by work element. The Commission currently does not reconcile expenditures of this spreadsheet to the expenditures recorded on the general ledger.

Effect of Condition

Due to the fact that the Commission does not currently record the expenditures by work element on their general ledger, this could result in either the under-billing or overbilling of grant funds due to the fact that each expenditure may not be properly recorded on the Excel spreadsheet.

Recommendation

We recommend that Commission staff establish in the County general ledger expense accounts for each of the work elements in the OWP. As each expense is paid, it should be recorded to the proper work element. If implemented, the Commission would be assured that each expenditure was properly accounted for by work element.

We have noted, however, that Commission staff has made significant progress in this area and we expect it to be fully integrated in with the general ledger on a quarterly basis for the 2012/2013 fiscal year.

Mono County Local Transportation Commission Current Year Recommendations

3. Transfer of funds to outside agencies and state billings

During the course of our audit we noted that Commission staff had not yet transferred expenditures incurred on Commission projects to the Commission's STIP/PPM fund or its RPA fund. Additionally, it had not yet billed the state for these items at the balance sheet date.

Effect of Condition

This can result in deficit cash balances. It also is difficult from a tracking perspective as the billing & expenditure amounts are not matched up in a timely manner.

Recommendation

We recommend that the Commission issue billings to the state in a timely manner and that it also records its expenditures in its general ledger in a timely manner as well.

Mono County Local Transportation Commission

PO Box 347 Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546 760.924.1800 phone, 924.1801 fax commdev@mono.ca.gov PO Box 8 Bridgeport, CA 93517 760.932.5420 phone, 932.5431 fax www.monocounty.ca.gov

Staff Report

June 10, 2013

TO: Mono County Local Transportation Commission

FROM: Wendy Sugimura, Mono County CDD Analyst

Gerry Le Francois, Mono County Principal Planner

Scott Burns, Mono County CDD Director

SUBJECT: Workshop on Commissioner LTC Priorities

RECOMMENDATION: Participate in a discussion on how to sort and evaluate the list of Commission priorities, and provide direction to staff.

FISCAL IMPLICATIONS:

None until/unless projects are selected for further development, at which time funding sources will be identified and allocated.

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE: N/A

POLICY CONSISTENCY:

Identification of priorities and issues of interest feeds directly into policy and project development, providing the basis for the update of the Regional Transportation Plan, future Overall Work Plans, and future transportation projects.

DISCUSSION:

At the February meeting, Commissioner Johnston presented a list of items for the Local Transportation Commission to consider for further development. Other Commissioners added items at this meeting and over the next three months, resulting in a list of priorities from each Commissioner (Attachment 1).

The list of priorities is a mix of policy development, transportation projects, and annual work program elements, with varying degrees of consensus, funding/resource availability, and urgency. In order to sort through these layers in an organized manner, staff will facilitate a workshop with the Commission to clarify the purpose of the prioritization exercise and establish a common framework for sorting and evaluating the list within the LTC's context and mission. Staff will then utilize the framework to sort and evaluate Commissioner priorities for continued discussion at the July meeting.

Depending on the degree of consensus, the July meeting could result in decisions about which items to integrate into the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) update, prioritize for project study reports and future programming, and integrate into the current or future Overall Work Program(s) [OWP].

WORKSHOP AGENDA:

- 1. Introduction: LTC context, timing and purpose
- 2. Policy umbrella
- 3. Proposed categories for sorting/evaluation Commissioner requests:
 - a. Non-LTC projects
 - b. Policy issues
 - Ongoing/existing policies
 - New policy additions to the RTP
 - c. Projects
 - Prior projects/proposals
 - Locally funded projects (County or Town)
 - State/Federally funded projects (e.g. MAP-21, STIP)
 - Caltrans projects
 - d. Staff work program (e.g. Overall Work Program)
 - e. Opportunities to partner with Caltrans
- 4. Integration with existing policies and projects, and external proposals/drivers

ATTACHMENTS:

1. LTC Commissioners' 2013 priority list

LTC PRIORITIES 2013*

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON

- 1. US 395 shoulders in north Mono
- 2. Auchoberry Pit repair
- 3. Deer fence at Sonora Junction
- 4. BP yard landscape, lighting
- 5. North Conway passing lane
- 6. Conway cut slopes
- 7. Tioga Pass Heritage Highway
- 8. June Lake Loop rumble strip
- 9. SR 158 as State Scenic Highway
- 10. Crestview rest area year round
- 11. Snow-free bike path for SR 203
- 12. Berms at sheriff's substation
- 13. Airport Road improvements
- 14. Deer/snow/safety fence along SR 203 & US 395 to airport
- 15. N. Sherwin Grade improvements
- 16. Downtown parking ordinance
- 17. Mono County entry signs
- 18. Self-weathering steel guardrails
- 19. US 395 as State Scenic Highway
- 20. Anti-drowsy driver: US 395
- 21. Geographic signing on US 395

* The above chart summarizes priorities of LTC commissioners discussed or submitted prior to the June meeting.

COMMISSIONER LEHMAN

- 1. Sidewalk on SR 203 from Whiskey Creek to Village
- 2. Signage for Mammoth mileage in Nevada &/or I-15

COMMISSIONER STUMP

- Trails & connections at Rock Creek Canyon & Rock Creek Ranch
- 2. Chalfant bus stops
- 3. BLM ore-processing pit in Inyo near Laws, >200 trucks/day on US 6. Left turn lane both N & S
- 4. McGee/US 395: Right turn lane southbound
- 5. US 6 flood control issues (bridges, culverts)

COMMISSIONER BACON

- 1. Transportation Asset Management Plan matrix
- 2. Caltrans MOU on snow management for SR 203 (Main St. & Minaret Rd.)
- 3. Main St. implementation (yearround pedestrian/bike access, signal on Main St., sidewalks, encroachments on SR 203/frontage road)

COMMISSIONER FESKO

1.

COMMISSIONER HOGAN

- Airport deer fences (Caltrans SHOPP project?)
- 2. Airport road improvements
- 3. Caltrans snow management on SR 203, bike path & sidewalk
- 4. N. Mono US 395 shoulder widening/improvement
- 5. Signage at US 6 / SR 120 / Benton Crossing: Junction with US 395 leads to Mammoth as well as Yosemite

CD Ritter

From:

Jo Bacon <jbacon@ci.mammoth-lakes.ca.us>

Sent:

Tuesday, April 09, 2013 7:38 AM

To:

CD Ritter

Subject:

My List of Priorities for LTC Priority Discussion

Hi CD,

Please add the following to the matrix (these are not in priority order):

- 1. Transportation Asset Management Plan incorporate all transportation assets (roads, signals, etc.) into TOML Asset Management Plan Matrix
- 2. Complete MOU with CalTrans on snow management for Highway 203 (Main Street and Minaret Road portions).
- 3. Continuing Main Street implementation pedestrian and bike access year-round, signal project on Main Street (location TBD), cooperation on sidewalk projects, and changing encroachments on highway/frontage road.

If appropriate, please forward to all Commissioners and staff for their information.

Thanks,

Jo Bacon
Councilmember, Town of Mammoth Lakes
jbacon@ci.mammoth-lakes.ca.us mailto:jbacon@ci.mammoth-lakes.ca.us 760.934.4932 (h)
760.914.2506 (c)

CD Ritter

From:

Scott Burns

Sent:

Thursday, March 28, 2013 3:50 PM

To: Cc: Sandy Hogan CD Ritter

Subject:

RE: LTC priorities

Great - thanks Sandy. We will input these into the proposed priority list for next LTC meeting

Scott

From: Sandy Hogan [mailto:sandyqhoqan@verizon.net]

Sent: Thursday, March 28, 2013 3:38 PM

To: Scott Burns

Subject: LTC priorities

Scott: you asked us to send you our suggested LTC priorities by the 28th, so here are mine. Since Larry's list was so exhaustive, I just worked from it, noting ones that I think would be my highest priorities.

- Airport deer fences (perhaps CalTrans/CTC might consider this as a SHOP project, since it's a true safety issue with recent deaths/incidents)
- Airport road improvements
- Cal Trans snow management (removal/trucking) from SR 203/Main Street, including bike path/sidewalk clearance (similar to SLT)
- North Mono 395 shoulder widening/improvement (continue this project)
- Add to Hwy 6 signage (& Hwy 120/Benton Crossing) words indicating that the junction with Hwy 395 leads to Mammoth Lakes/Hwy 203 (Yosemite is noted on both signs, otherwise it's just highways)

(not sure I got "SHOP" right, but I'm sure you know what I mean, as it's how we got High Point done (safety project). Thanks, Sandy

Possible Mono County LTC Projects

From - Monday, February 11, 2013 LTC meeting

Larry's LTC List 2/15/13

- 1. Continue to add shoulders along two lane sections of US Hwy 395 as has been occurring in the northern part of the county. Utilize 8' wide shoulders where possible and environmentally acceptable, but shoulders of 2' up to 8' would be useful, particularly for multimodal transportation.
- 2. Repair the Auchoberry Pit (in Antelope Valley) highly eroding slopes (e.g., 2' deep gullies). This would take little in the way of mitigation (re-grade/install erosion control wattles).
- 3. Re-initiate and complete the deer fence / grade separation project at Sonora Junction. This was started and materials were purchased by Caltrans, but the project was put on hold. Deer are still getting killed and vehicles are suffering extensive damage from deer/vehicle collisions.
- 4. Plant a landscape screen on the south/west side of the Bridgeport Yard to hide the unsightly yard and equipment stored there. This project would also replace non-compatible Dark Sky light fixtures. It would utilize the similar plant materials as is used by Caltrans at the landscaped McGee Creek Maintenance Station in Long Valley along Hwy 395.
- 5. Pursue the completion of the north Conway passing lane project as a State Transportation Improvement Plan (STIP) project.
- 6. Complete the evaluation / trial mitigation for the Conway Summit cut slopes (several erosion control/rock-fall measures were installed about 5 years ago); schedule reconstruction and stabilization of the slopes utilizing results of the mitigation studies.
- 7. Design and construct the Tioga Pass Heritage Highway project along SR 120 from just west of Lee Vining to Tioga Pass. This project is a re-configured Caltrans State Transportation Improvement Plan (STIP) project originally proposed in the 1990s but was over-zealous in its design (significantly long passing lane in Bighorn Sheep territory). The revised project is envisioned to emulate the "Going to the Sun Road" in Glacier National Park, which would dramatically transform the character of the road from a utilitarian-like eastern entrance to Yosemite National Park, to grand park-like eastern entrance. Special wall treatments, scenic turnouts, and interpretive sites would be included. Nevertheless, safety and functional vehicular improvements (both for vehicles and bicycles) are envisioned. These include much-enhanced rock-fall protection, specially designed (and aesthetic) guardrail installation, and strategically integrated passing / turnout opportunities in already disturbed areas. State "TAP" funding (formerly Transportation Enhancement) and possibly SHOPP funding may be available. Conceptually this would become an economically enhancing visitor attraction into itself, much like the Going to the Sun Road in Glacier Park has become.
- 8. When the next maintenance occurs, revise or remove the rumble strip on the June Lake Loop (1+ mile section of SR 158 near S. Jct. with US Hwy 395). The 2' wide ruble strip is placed in a 5' wide shoulder making cycling more dangerous (i.e., narrow width /debris hazard, etc.). As an alternative, consider utilization of narrower (4" wide) fog line rumble strip as is used on other state routes (e.g., Hwy 120/108 just east of Oakdale).
- 9. Designate SR 158 as an official State Scenic Highway. Currently it is "eligible" but not officially designated (www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArdh/scenic_highways/index.htm).
- 10. Find a way to keep the Crestview rest area open all year long.

Possible Mono County LTC Projects

From - Monday, February 11, 2013 LTC meeting

- 11. In keeping with multimodal, context sensitive operations, allow the sidewalk/bikepath along SR 203 (Main Street) in Mammoth Lakes to be clear of snow in the winter.
- 12. Build a natural landscape berm around the south and east sides of the old Sherriff Substation to help hide from Scenic Hwy 395 the site and heavy equipment stored there.
- 13. Fast forward improvements to the Mammoth Airport Road. Consider interim measures to fill/mitigate large cross-cracks. Seek funding and re-prioritize. Re-align the intersection with Fish Hatchery Road so that Airport Road is main road, i.e., have F.H. Road tee off it.
- 14. Create a combined deer, snow, and airport safety fence along SR 203 and Hwy 395 in proximity to the Mammoth Yosemite Airport. This four-pronged project is envisioned to be a combo deer/snow fence along the south side of Hwy 395 from 203 to south of the Benton Crossing Road (would prevent deer from crossing the highway and would help stop wind blown snow from premature closures of the highway during severe winter storms). Under-crossings for deer and other animals would be provided at strategic locations. Deer fencing would be located along the north side of the highways and would also encircle Mammoth Yosemite Airport thus implementing both airport safety and FAA security issues.
- 15. Consider re-initiating the north Sherwin Grade Hwy 395 improvement project.
- 16. Complete downtown parking ordinance revisions (consistent with current County general plan provisions), e.g., allow on-street parking to be counted toward parking requirements, form parking districts, etc.
- 17. The special Mono County entry signs should be repainted and placed on a periodic maintenance schedule. The wording "Wild by Nature" should be a much lighter color as it is currently dark blue and not easily readable.
- 18. Utilize self-weathering steel guardrails in all projects in Mono County (e.g., these have been tested and are in place in wetter environments on the west side along Hwy 120 just east of Groveland).
- 19. Seek to work with the Inyo County Board and LTC to consider designating all of US Hwy 395 as an officially designated State Scenic Highway.
- 20. Consider adding anti-drowsy driver "singing highway" segments along remote sections of four-lane US Hwy 395.
- 21. Add special signing along US Hwy 395 that points out geographic features (e.g., Mt. Whitney, Mt. Morrison, Mammoth Mountain, etc.)

Commissioner Lehman

- 1. Sidewalk from Whiskey Creek and to 8050 (SR 203)
- 2. Signage for "Mammoth miles" in Nevada and/or at I-15/395

Commissioner Stump

- 1. Trails and or trail connections around Rock Creek Canyon and Rock Creek Ranch
- 2. Chalfant bus stops coordinate with ESTA and Bishop Unified

Keep this item for future agendas and other commissioners / public input.