



# INYO COUNTY LOCAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION



P.O. DRAWER Q  
INDEPENDENCE, CA 93526  
PHONE: (760) 878-0201  
FAX: (760) 878-2001

Michael Errante, Executive Director

## AGENDA

### INYO COUNTY LOCAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

#### Inyo County Board Chambers, 224 N. Edwards St., Independence

Justine Kokx is inviting you to a scheduled Zoom meeting.  
Topic: Inyo County Local Transportation Commission Meeting  
Time: Jul 19, 2023, 09:00 AM Pacific Time

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/86416275417?pwd=WGQ1MHQrcVJHaDBDS05GeGowRlRxdz09>

Meeting ID: 864 1627 5417

Passcode: 988487

• +1 669 900 9128 US (San Jose)

All members of the public are encouraged to participate in the discussion of any items on the Agenda. Questions and comments will be accepted via e-mail to: [jkokx@invocounty.us](mailto:jkokx@invocounty.us). Any member of the public may also make comments during the scheduled "Public Comment" period on this agenda concerning any subject related to the Inyo County Local Transportation Commission. PUBLIC NOTICE: In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the Transportation Commission Secretary at (760) 878-0201. Notification 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the Inyo County Local Transportation Commission to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting (28CFR 35. 102-35. ADA Title II).

### July 19, 2023

#### 9:00 a.m. Open Meeting

1. Introductions and Welcome to new LTC Commissioner, Jeffery Ray
2. Roll Call
3. Public Comment

### ACTION ITEMS

#### 1. Consent Agenda

- a. Staff of the Local Transportation Commission - Request approval of the minutes of the meeting of May 17, 2023.

2. Request Commission approve the Unmet Transit Needs list for 2023 via Resolution No. 2023-04.
3. Request Commission approve Resolution No. 2023-02 apportioning and allocating Local Transportation Funds (LTF) for fiscal year 2023-2024.
4. Request Commission approve Resolution No. 2023-03 allocating all of fiscal year 2023-2024 State Transit Assistance (STA) Funds as estimated in the amount of \$226,448 to Eastern Sierra Transit Authority (ESTA) for public transit operating and capital expenses.
5. Request Commission approve Resolution No. 2023-05 a resolution approving 1) the fiscal year 2022-2023 Federal Exchange Program and State Match Program Agreement, Agreement No. X22-6134(036) with the Department of Transportation in an amount of \$8,193; 2) apportioning and allocating Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds to the County of Inyo and City of Bishop based on population, and 3) authorize the Executive Director to sign the Agreement.

### **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

### **INFORMATIONAL ITEMS**

6. City of Bishop Report
7. ESTA Report
8. Caltrans Report
9. Tribal Report
10. DVNP Report
11. USFS Report
12. Executive Director's Report - Tri County MOU update
13. Reports from all members of the Inyo County LTC

### **CORRESPONDENCE**

None

### **ADJOURNMENT**

Adjourned until 9 a.m., Wednesday August 16, 2023

### **UPCOMING AGENDA ITEMS**

- RTP and ATP project prioritization
- MOU and negotiations Inyo County LTC, Mono County LTC, and Kern Cog
- Appoint Vice Chair to the LTC

Action Item No. 1

Consent Agenda



# INYO COUNTY LOCAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION



P.O. DRAWER Q  
INDEPENDENCE, CA 93526  
PHONE: (760) 878-0201  
FAX: (760) 878-2001

Michael Errante, Executive Director

## MINUTES

### INYO COUNTY LOCAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

#### Bishop City Council Chambers 301W. Line St., Bishop, CA 93514

All members of the public are encouraged to participate in the discussion of any items on the Agenda. Questions and comments will be accepted via e-mail to: [jkokx@invocounty.us](mailto:jkokx@invocounty.us). Any member of the public may also make comments during the scheduled "Public Comment" period on this agenda concerning any subject related to the Inyo County Local Transportation

Commission. PUBLIC NOTICE: In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the Transportation Commission Secretary at (760) 878-0201. Notification 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the Inyo County Local Transportation Commission to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting (28CFR 35. 102-35. ADA Title II).

### May 17, 2023

#### 9:02 a.m. Open Meeting

#### 1. Roll Call

##### Commissioners Present:

Stephen Muchovej

Celeste Berg

Scott Marcellin

Jennifer Roeser

Jose Garcia

##### Others Present:

Phil Moores ESTA

Nora Gamino City of Bishop Public Works Director

Kristina Amaya Inyo County Public Works

Justine Kokx Inyo County Public Works/LTC

Neil Peacock Caltrans

Mark Heckman Caltrans

Catharine Crayne Caltrans

Nathan Robinson: USFS

Mike Errante Inyo County Public Works Director

Maggie Ritter: Caltrans

Bob Strub: Member of the Public

Sabine Elia: Member of the Public

## 2. Public Comment

No public comment.

### **ACTION ITEMS**

#### 1. Consent Agenda

- a. Staff of the Local Transportation Commission - Request approval of the minutes of the meeting of April 19, 2023.
- b. Low Carbon Transit Operations Program (LCTOP) – Receive staff report and consider the allocation of \$46,584 of FY 2022-23 funds to Eastern Sierra Transit Authority (ESTA) via Resolution No. 2023-01 and authorize Executive Director to sign the letter of support.
- c. Request Commission 1) approve via Minute Order the Overall Work Program for the Inyo County LTC for FY 2023-2024, 2) authorize the Executive Director to sign related documents and 3) allow staff to make minor technical changes if required.

**\*Motion to approve the Consent Agenda with minor adjustments to the April 19, 2023, minutes was made by Commissioner Roeser and seconded by Commissioner Muchovej. All in favor.**

### **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

No Discussion items.

### **INFORMATIONAL ITEMS**

#### **2. City of Bishop Report**

Norah reminded everyone about the East Line Street Bridge meeting at 5:30 p.m. at Bishop City Hall. A presentation will go into details on the aesthetics about what the bridge will look like. Seeking public input on this as well.

#### **3. ESTA Report**

Phil answered questions about the ESTA report. Commissioner Muchovej was curious to know if there was a list that explains what the goals mean. Phil responded that there is a strategic business plan, and it has definitions and explanations. The red box means that ESTA did not meet the projected goals. Commissioner Roeser inquired if Phil received any comments on his public hearing regarding the Bishop Creek Shuttle. Phil said the hikers are vocal about wanting to keep the shuttle going. During the June 9<sup>th</sup> ESTA Board meeting there will be a discussion about the removal of that route.

#### **4. Caltrans Report**

Caltrans is working on getting an encroachment permit for Mule Days parade. The Clean California deadline of April 30 was extended to May 31. Dump Days and “Big Stuff” Days focusing on RVs, cars, mobile homes – large items. The point is to get rid of all the abandoned mobile homes. He has been working with Cap and Theresa and this is going on until June 30<sup>th</sup>. Strategic Highway Safety Plans Safety Summit is going to be held May 31<sup>st</sup> ; registration closes today. Working with County on spring runoff meetings, held May 3<sup>rd</sup> and May 11<sup>th</sup>. As for projects, the 168 bike and ped project it is out to bid right now. Caltrans will close 395 the first week of May due to spring runoff in Olancha for emergency culvert work. Two way left turn lane project is going out to bid because they did not receive any bids. East part of Inyo County 127 cap M they are hoping to fix ahead of schedule.

## 2. Tribal Report

None

## 3. DVNP Report

None

## 4. USFS Report

Nathan Robinson, Acting Forest Engineer for the Inyo National Forest, provided the USFS report, and some updates. The USFS opened the Starlite material pit for the County to access in order to address some of the issues on Buttermilk Road. He also reported that they have been working with the county on addressing some long-term maintenance concerns for Buttermilk Road. They had a meeting with the Forest Supervisor as well as County representatives on this issue and hopes to continue talks. Nathan also reported that he had a meeting with Shannon Platt to discuss some of the USFS perspectives regarding the long-term maintenance of the road.

He continued to report that their OHV program has started to work with a non-profit organization called Valley Outdoors to assist in road maintenance moving forward. Additionally, summer repairs of Coyote Flatts Rd. are set to begin, with particular emphasis on the switchback section which experienced significant damage. Nathan expressed concern over inconsistencies between roads reported closed by Inyo County, and those that are actually closed.

## 5. Executive Director’s Report

Mike Errante shared a map with information on Inyo County projects. County staff have been busy preparing for the runoff. The County will meet with Nathan from the USFS about aligning methods for road maintenance and how they can move forward on Buttermilk Road.

Commissioners Muchovej and Roeser brought up the complications of using roads through Starlite as alternate routes. Mike concurred that he wants to get Buttermilk Road passable to align with timing of grants for the installation of facilities up Buttermilk Road. North Round Valley Bridge moving along, guard rails to be installed today. They will be ready to pave in the

next week or two and then open to the public. Mike pulled up a camera (OX Blue) that is in real time of North Round Valley Bridge. Other projects: Working on a sidewalk project in Lone Pine. Working to get this out to bid. There has been a pause on Lower Rock Creek. The County wants to make sure they submit the right forms to get reimbursed for the work and ensure they don't fumble on reimbursement. That project should be out to bid by the end of the month. The County is submitting Clean California grant proposals for improvements at Diaz Lake. They are putting together estimates, and hopefully preliminary drawing for a gateway entrance for Whitney Portal.

Bob Strub of Lone Pine asked about sinkholes on the northern portion of Hay Street.

Mike will send a crew out to investigate the concern.

Bob also asked if the County does any erosion control for their assets. Mike responded that the County seeks reimbursement from outside agencies for repairs.

## 6. Reports from all members of the Inyo County LTC

Commissioner Roeser: Commissioner Marcellin and she began advocating in Sacramento regarding the MOU between Inyo, Mono and Kern. Trying to discuss how to use our political influence to be able to program projects using STIP funds even if STIP funds are in the red. It was determined its best to regroup regionally with the three counties since Kern has stated they are in support of reimbursing Inyo and Mono.

Justine Kokx: I reached out to Wendy and due to all the storm damage, she won't be able to meet until June. Since Mono County is fully in support of Inyo becoming whole, we can have some preliminary discussions on reimbursements.

Neil Peacock: Time is of the essence on this issue. We are in the leadup to the STIP cycle submittal process. Kern county has already initiated a series of workshops for its RTIP. There is a long lead time for this, and we are in it. I just want everyone to be aware of the timelines and schedules for this.

Commissioner Marcellin: Supervisor Griffiths and he had a good meeting with the Tribe last week. They don't have a report, but they would like to be consulted on projects. They like the sidewalk idea and Safe Routes to Schools, but there is a pathway called the Indian Trail that is closed which they would like opened so that they don't have to walk all the way around 395 or Line Street. They also would like consideration on some thoroughfares that go through their community. See Vee Lane is kind of bumpy, and they want consideration on their main roads. Another concern is on Meadow Lane at Hwy 168. No one knows who the pothole belongs to, and no one is taking the initiative.

Mark Heckman of Caltrans replied that he will follow up, it might be Caltrans' responsibility. He later confirmed that it is, the pothole will be addressed.

Commissioner Roeser: Justine and I met with the Big Pine tribe who is preparing to submit a proposal for an ATP project, on the south end of Big Pine.



## **CORRESPONDENCE**

None

## **ADJOURNMENT**

Adjourned until 9 a.m., Wednesday June 21, 2023, Bishop City Council Chambers

## **UPCOMING AGENDA ITEMS**

- TDA Claims (STA & LTF)
- Adopt 2023 Unmet Transit Needs
- RSTP Exchange allocation
- RTP and ATP project prioritization
- MOU negotiations

## Action Item No. 2

2023 Unmet Transit Needs  
Adoption and Resolution



# INYO COUNTY LOCAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION



P.O. DRAWER Q  
INDEPENDENCE, CA 93526  
PHONE: (760) 878-0201  
FAX: (760) 878-2001

Michael Errante  
Executive Director

TO: Inyo County Local Transportation Commission  
FROM: Justine Kokx, Transportation Planner  
DATE: July 19, 2023  
SUBJECT: Unmet Transit Needs Findings

---

**Recommended Action** Your Commission is being asked to a) adopt Unmet Transit Needs Findings as presented by staff and b) approve Resolution No. 2023-04 regarding unmet transit needs.

*This item comes to your Commission after the July 1 deadline that is built into the TDA legislation and the ICLTC's internal policies. The lack of quorum for the June 21, 2023, meeting created extenuating circumstances that required the TDA apportionment and allocation approval to be scheduled to a later month's agenda. The operator, ESTA, is aware of and approves of the delay. To avoid a future audit finding for not meeting TDA claiming deadlines, this serves as documentation to explain the circumstances that were outside of the control of the Commission and staff.*

### **2023/2024 Unmet Transit Needs Hearing**

The Inyo County Local Transportation Commission should not allocate TDA funds to local streets and roads in the 2023/2024 year. All TDA funds should be allocated to public transit and TDA eligible set-asides (for TDA administration, 2% to bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and 5% for community transit services).

The SSTAC meeting and Unmet Transit Needs hearings were held in accordance with the Transportation Development Act and the Inyo County LTC Organization and Procedures Manual. The Unmet Transit Needs process is a valuable exercise in that it lets the Commission, Eastern Sierra Transit, and the public explore the strengths and weaknesses of the transit system. The dialogue at the SSTAC meeting and unmet transit needs hearing provides valuable information to transit entities of changing needs in the area. Eastern Sierra Transit has been effective at modifying their services to meet area transit needs and identifying new sources of funding to provide other services.

**Unmet Transit Needs Findings** Staff and ESTA has reviewed the information and discussion from the February 21, 2023, Social Services Transit Advisory Council meeting. There were no public comments at either Unmet Transit Needs Hearing (March 15, 2023 & April 19, 2023). Staff has compiled a list of the suggestions and requests. They are qualified as to whether they are an unmet need and whether they are possible to accommodate, i.e., "Reasonable to Meet".

First, the following are the definitions of “Unmet Transit Need” and “Reasonable to Meet.” The definitions were adopted by the ICLTC in 1995 and amended in 2007 and are as follows:

An Unmet Transit Need exists if an individual or individuals of any age or physical condition are unable to transport themselves from one location to another. An Unmet Transit Need is, at a minimum, those public transportation or specialized transportation services that are identified in the Regional Transportation Plan and that have not been implemented or funded.

A documented Unmet Transit Need is reasonable to meet if:

A service can be provided which meets a minimum farebox ratio of 10% of operating costs; and

- a) It is transit service for essential intra-county purposes which are defined as medical or dental services, shopping, employment, personal business, or social service appointments; or,
- b) It is a transit service for essential inter-county purposes which are defined as medical or dental services or social service appointments not available in this county or the out-of-county destination is the closest location where the services are available to the origin of the trip; and,

The origin and/or destination of the trip is within two miles of the established area of operation or cohesive community.

**Findings:**

The following findings are made in the attached resolution based on the analysis above:

1. A meeting of the SSTAC was held on February 21, 2023,
2. Duly noticed Unmet Transit Needs Hearings were held on March 15, 2023 & April 19, 2023,
3. There are two new transit needs identified that satisfy the definition of an *unmet transit need* and *reasonable to meet*.

Attachments:

- ICLTC Resolution No. 2023-04

Inyo County LTC Unmet Needs SSTAC Committee and Hearings  
 February, March, and April 2023

TRANSIT REQUEST	Unmet Need	Reasonable to Meet	Comments
Increase Frequency of Lone Pine / Bishop Connection	No	NA	the connection exists currently
Extend Bishop Dial-A-Ride Hours	Yes	Yes	Need met in FY2021-2022
Weekend US395 Service	Yes	Yes	Approved by ESTA Board in June 2023
Trailhead Service to Whitney, Horseshoe, Onion, Glacier, Buttermilk Rd Turnoff	Yes	No	insufficient funding
Weekend Mammoth Express Service	Yes	Yes	Approved by ESTA Board in June 2023
Fixed Route Service in Bishop	No	NA	service exists currently
Better Technology / Phone System for Dial-A-Ride	No	NA	service exists currently
On Demand scheduling software for dial a ride	No	NA	service exists currently with dispatchers
Tecopa to Pahrump Service	Yes	No	no service provider in the area
White Mountain Research Center	Yes	Yes	Need met in FY2021-2022
Dial-A-Ride Service to Keeler	Yes	Yes	Need Met in 2021
Owens River / Poleta Rd. Service	Yes	No	service operationally difficult
depart Bishop at 4PM instead of 2:30 on Benton Service 2 Days per Week	No	No	the connection exists currently

Inyo County LTC Unmet Needs SSTAC Committee and Hearings  
February, March and April 2023

TRANSIT REQUEST	Unmet Need	Reasonable to Meet	Comments
Increase Frequency of Lone Pine / Bishop Connection	No	NA	the connection exists currently
Extend Bishop Dial-A-Ride Hours	Yes	Yes	Need met in FY2021-2022
Weekend US395 Service	Yes	Yes	Approved by ESTA Board in June 2023
Trailhead Service to Whitney, Horseshoe, Onion, Glacier, Buttermilk Rd Turnoff	Yes	No	insufficient funding
Weekend Mammoth Express Service	Yes	Yes	Approved by ESTA Board in June 2023
Fixed Route Service in Bishop	No	NA	service exists currently
Better Technology / Phone System for Dial-A-Ride	No	NA	service exists currently
On Demand scheduling software for dial a ride	No	NA	service exists currently with dispatchers
Tecopa to Pahrump Service	Yes	No	no service provider in the area
White Mountain Research Center	Yes	Yes	Need met in FY2021-2022
Dial-A-Ride Service to Keeler	Yes	Yes	Need Met in 2021
Owens River / Poleta Rd. Service	Yes	No	service operationally difficult
depart Bishop at 4PM instead of 2:30 on Benton Service 2 Days per Week	No	No	the connection exists currently

**INYO COUNTY LOCAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION  
RESOLUTION 2023-04**

**A RESOLUTION REGARDING UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS**

**WHEREAS**, on February 21, 2023, the Social Services Transit Advisory Committee held a duly noticed meeting to receive testimony identifying or commenting on unmet transit needs that may exist in the County; and

**WHEREAS**, on March 15, 2023, and April 19, 2023, the Inyo County Local Transportation Commission (LTC) held duly noticed public hearings to receive testimony identifying or commenting on unmet transit needs that may exist in the County; and

**WHEREAS**, the LTC notified persons and organizations that it knows to have an interest in the subject of the hearings; and

**WHEREAS**, the LTC has also considered the following factors in its transportation planning process:

1. Identified the size and location of groups with potential transit dependence.
2. Evaluated the adequacy of existing transportation services.
3. Examined potential alternate transportation services and service improvements that would meet potential travel demands; and

**WHEREAS**, the LTC adopted its definition of "Unmet Transit Needs and "Reasonable to Meet" in 1995 and amended in 2007, which are:

"An Unmet transit need exists if an individual or individuals of any age or physical condition are unable to transport themselves from one location to another. Documentation regarding the unmet need and the person's residential address must be provided in a letter addressed to the Executive Director of the Inyo County Local Transportation Commission or by testimony at a public hearing held for the purpose of determining unmet transit needs. An unmet transit need is, at a minimum, those public transportation or specialized transportation services that are identified in the Regional Transportation Plan that have not been implemented or funded."

A documented unmet transit need is "reasonable to meet" if a service can be provided which meets a minimum farebox ratio of 10% of operating costs, and:

- a) It is a transit service for essential intra-county purposes, which are defined as medical or dental services, shopping, employment, personal business, or social service appointments, or
- b) It is a transit service for essential inter-county purposes, which are defined as medical or dental services, or social services appointments not available in this county or the out-of-county destination is the closest location where the services are available to the origin of the trip; and the origin and/or destination of the trip

is within two miles of the established area operation or a cohesive community;  
and

**WHEREAS**, the LTC has considered all available information, including that presented at the public hearings, all of which is contained in the ICLTC findings staff report dated July 19, 2023.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the ICLTC finds that through the 2023 unmet transit needs process, two new transit, medical or social services needs raised meet the definition of being an *unmet transit need* and are *reasonable to meet*.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that the ICLTC has determined that there will be no remaining Local Transportation Funds available to the City of Bishop and County of Inyo for local streets and roads.

Passed and adopted this 19<sup>th</sup> day of July 2023, by the following vote:

Ayes:

Noes:

Abstains:

Absent:

---

Celeste Berg, Chairperson  
Inyo County Local Transportation Commission

Attest:

---

Michael Errante, Executive Director  
Inyo County Local Transportation Commission



## Action Item No. 3

FY23-24 Local Transportation Funds  
Apportion and Allocate



# INYO COUNTY LOCAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

P.O. DRAWER Q INDEPENDENCE, CA 93526



Michael Errante Executive Director

PHONE: (760) 878-0201

FAX: (760) 878-2001

## S T A F F   R E P O R T

**MEETING:** July 19, 2023

**PREPARED BY:** Justine Kokx, Transportation Planner

**SUBJECT:** Fiscal Year 2023-2024 Transportation Development Act (TDA)  
Apportionment and Allocations

### Recommendation

Adopt Resolution No. 2023-02 apportioning and allocating Local Transportation Funds (LTF) for Fiscal Year 2023-2024.

*This item comes to your Commission after the July 1 deadline that is built into the TDA legislation and the ICLTC's internal policies. The lack of quorum for the June 21, 2023, meeting created extenuating circumstances that required the TDA apportionment and allocation approval to be scheduled to a later month's agenda. The operator, ESTA, is aware of and approves of the delay. To avoid a future audit finding for not meeting TDA claiming deadlines, this serves as documentation to explain the circumstances that were outside of the control of the Commission and staff.*

### Background

This report gives an overview of the combined TDA allocation resolution to be considered by your Commission at this meeting for Fiscal Year 2023-2024. TDA funds are derived from a ¼% of the California Sales Tax in Inyo County. The table on the next page summarizes the amount of TDA funds received by the Inyo County LTC and how those funds have been allocated in the last sixteen budget cycles. Section 4A of the Inyo County LTC Organization and Procedures Manual sets forth the procedures for allocation of TDA funds in the upcoming fiscal year.

The ICLTC shall make allocations from the TDA Fund annually in accordance with the following priorities:

1. To the ICLTC, such sums as are necessary to meet its expenses in the performance of the administrative duties assigned under the Act.
2. Thereafter, up to two percent (2%) of the remaining available funds county-wide may be set aside to be allocated for pedestrian and bicycle facilities anywhere in the County.

3. Thereafter, up to five percent (5%) of the remaining funds may be set aside to be allocated under Article 4.5 of the Act for “community transit services, including such services for those, such as the disabled, who cannot use conventional transit services.” Claims may be filed under Article 4.5 of the Transportation Development Act.
4. Thereafter, to operators of public transportation systems, such monies as are approved by the ICLTC for claims presented pursuant to Article 4 Section 99260 of the P.U.C. Code; and to applicants contracting for public transportation services in accordance with Article 8 Section 99400(c).
5. Thereafter, to the County of Inyo and the City of Bishop such monies (up to and including the apportionment allowed based on the latest department of Finance figures) approved by the ICLTC for claims presented pursuant to Article 8, Section 99400(a) involving projects for local streets and roads including facilities provide for exclusive use by pedestrians and bicyclists.

### **Estimate**

In accordance with the above, the LTC is responsible for the apportionment and allocation of TDA funds. LTC staff notified Eastern Sierra Transit Authority (ESTA) of estimated TDA funds available for allocation in the 2023-2024 Fiscal Year. The estimate is a rolling ten-year average, as supplied by the Inyo County Auditor, of the amount of TDA funds received in the past. The resulting FY 2023-2024 estimate is \$940,308, 5% higher than last year’s. Staff recommends that you allocate the full estimated amount.

### **LTF Reserves**

In FY2023-2024, ESTA is requesting a Reserve distribution of \$160,000 to cover the cost increase of expanding services to include weekend service. Staff did an analysis of available reserves and pending allocations and determined that funding is available to meet this request.

# History

## Transit Apportionment by Population

Inyo County Findings of Apportionment Local Transportation Funds for Fiscal Year 2022-2023 <sup>1</sup>				
Jurisdiction	Pop. <sup>2</sup>	% of Total County Population	% of Population within ESTA District	Remaining Amount for ESTA
Bishop	3,804	20%	100%	\$164,572
Inyo Co.	15,212	80%	100%	\$657,329
<b>Total</b>	<b>19,016</b>	<b>100%</b>		<b>\$822,689</b>

<sup>1</sup> Estimate based on 10-year rolling average of FY 2021-2022.

<sup>2</sup> U.S. Census 2020

The Inyo County LTC is required to apportion TDA funds to the County and City in accordance with

Fiscal Year	Over / Under	Amount Received from State	ESTA Operating Expense <sup>1</sup>	ESAAA Operating Expenses	Bicycle and Pedestrian	Admin. & Audits	Total Allocations
09-10	<b>-65,502</b>	\$745,137	\$718,567	\$40,532	\$16,328	\$35,212	\$810,639
10-11	<b>+10,094</b>	\$808,953	\$716,689	\$37,762	\$15,413	\$28,212	\$798,859
11-12	<b>+76,257</b>	\$832,507	\$677,803	\$35,674	\$14,561	\$28,212	\$756,250
12-13	<b>+70,846</b>	\$868,134	\$705,770	\$37,145	\$15,161	\$39,212	\$797,288
13-14	<b>-85,170</b>	\$763,558	\$753,660	\$39,666	\$16,190	\$39,212	\$848,728
14-15	<b>-4,446</b>	\$850,948	\$770,108	\$40,531	\$16,543	\$28,212	\$855,394
15-16	<b>+60,722</b>	\$881,963	\$720,622	\$37,927	\$15,480	\$47,212	\$821,241
16-17	<b>-2,658</b>	\$846,572	\$748,582	\$39,399	\$16,060	\$46,189	\$849,230
17-18	<b>+103,290</b>	\$943,519	\$743,855	\$39,150	\$15,979	\$41,245	\$840,229
18-19	<b>+84,962</b>	\$988,844	\$782,785	\$41,199	\$16,816	\$63,078	\$903,882
19-20	<b>+111,738</b>	\$958,545	\$746,836	\$39,307	\$16,043	\$44,621	\$846,807
20-21	<b>+291,013</b>	\$986,804	\$576,866	\$30,361	\$12,392	\$76,171	\$695,791
21-22	<b>+444,452</b>	\$1,314,191	\$760,447	\$0	\$15,519	\$93,773	\$869,739
21-22	30%	Reserve Dist.	\$336,327	\$0	\$6,864	\$38,132	\$381,323
22-23	Estimate	\$892,140	\$741,005	\$0	\$15,123	\$136,012	\$892,140
22-23	30%	Reserve Dist.	\$342,458	\$0	\$6,989	\$38,827	\$388,274
<b>23-24</b>	<b>Estimate</b>	<b>\$940,308</b>	<b>\$822,689</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$16,790</b>	<b>\$100,829</b>	<b>\$940,308</b>
<b>23-24</b>		<b>Reserve Dist.</b>	<b>\$160,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$160,000</b>

the TDA Guidelines. For a county without a transit district, apportionments are made for the incorporated area of each city and for the county's unincorporated area. ESTA provides transit services to 100% of the City and of the County so the apportionment is more of a formal exercise than a practical one. Therefore, the amount of funds ESTA receives will not change. A fixed percentage of the funds to the transit agency will come from both the City and the County. Resolution No. 2023-02 will memorialize the apportionment shown below.

## **Allocation**

The following allocations are set forth as part of Resolutions No. 2023-02.

**Administrative Allocation** - The cost amount programmed for TDA Administration is 10% or \$94,031.

**Audits** –. The fiscal audit is budgeted at \$6,798.

**Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Allocation** - Two percent of the remaining amount is \$16,790. These funds will be set aside for bicycle and pedestrian facilities. To use these funds, the County and/or City will then need to gain approval from the LTC on a project-specific basis.

**Community Transit Services Allocation** - Article 4.5 of the TDA. There are currently no Community transit agencies expressing interest in TDA funding.

**ESTA Public Transit Service Allocation** - ESTA is an eligible public transit provider to receive funding under Article 4, Section 99260(a) of the TDA. The remaining TDA funds are eligible to be allocated for public transit services. The entire amount of \$822,689 is proposed for allocation to ESTA. The ESTA allocation request includes a preliminary budget for the upcoming fiscal year.

**LTF Reserves** – ESTA has requested \$160,000 in LTF reserve funding in FY2023-2024 to cover the increase in costs to expand services to include weekends.

## **Evaluation of Allocation Requests**

### **ESTA**

- A. ESTA is eligible to receive Article 4 TDA claim funds in Inyo County as a public transit operator. This was confirmed in the completion of the Triennial Performance Audit of ESTA.
- B. The ESTA claim is in compliance with the Inyo County LTC Regional Transportation Plan. The RTP generally describes the transit services available in Inyo County. The RTP also includes goals and policies generally in support of public transit.
- C. ESTA completes an annual fiscal audit of Transportation Development Act funds and provides this information to the Inyo County LTC.
- D. ESTA provides 100% of the public transit services in both the City of Bishop and Inyo County.
- E. The CHP has completed a terminal inspection of the ESTA headquarters within the last 13 months, as required.
- F. ESTA has specified that the funds are being used for purposes set forth in Article 4, Section 99262 of the Transportation Development Act (TDA). This portion of the TDA sets out the general uses for funds claimed under the TDA. The ESTA claim form complies with this general requirement.

### **Potential Productivity Improvements**

Under PUC Section 99244, the ICLTC is required to annually identify, analyze, and recommend potential productivity improvements which could lower the operating costs of those operators who operate at least 50 percent of their vehicle service miles within the area under its jurisdiction. At a minimum, the recommendations for improvements and productivity are to include, but not be limited to, those recommendations related to productivity made in the triennial performance audit of the transit operator.

Triennial performance audit findings are now included in the TDA Claim form as a “Prior Performance Audit Worksheet.” The FY2019-2020 through FY2021-2022 draft triennial performance audit of ESTA revealed no audit findings, only two functional recommendations, which are suggestions to improve operations. In it, ESTA staff indicates they are either in the process of responding to functional recommendations or have determined the implementation measure to meet it is cost prohibitive. Furthermore, ESTA’s draft performance audit verified compliance with the five performance indicators, which are, Operating Cost/Passenger, • Operating Cost/Vehicle Service Hour, • Passengers/Vehicle Service Hour, • Passengers/Vehicle Service Mile, and Vehicle Service Hours/Employee. Farebox revenue of greater than 10% was also demonstrated. Staff concurs that ESTA meets the requirements for this component of the claim.

#### Attachments:

- Resolution No. 2023-02 apportioning and allocating TDA revenues to ESTA
- ESTA Claim Forms

**INYO COUNTY LOCAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION  
RESOLUTION No. 2023-02**

**A RESOLUTION APPORTIONING AND ALLOCATING LOCAL  
TRANSPORTATION FUNDS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 2023-2024**

**WHEREAS**, the Inyo County Local Transportation Commission (ICLTC) 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 Transportation Development Act claimant(s) have submitted claims for FY 2023-2024 TDA funds pursuant to Article 4.5 and Article 8 of the California Public Utilities Code; and

**WHEREAS**, ICLTC has analyzed the claims and determined that the claims conform to the provisions of the Transportation Development Act including the provision of PUC 99275.5.

**WHEREAS**, it is estimated that **\$940,308** of ICLTC-administered funds will be available for apportionment and allocation in fiscal year 2023-2024; and

**WHEREAS**, LTF Reserve funds in the amount of \$160,000 will be available for allocation in fiscal year 2023-2024; and

**WHEREAS**, the following disbursements will be made. In accordance with the adopted ICLTC Overall Work Program, **\$94,031** of LTF (app. 10%) has been committed to administration per Section 99233.1., **\$6,798** has been committed to audits and based upon prior action of the ICLTC, and in accordance with Section 99233.3 of the Transportation Development Act, 2% of the remaining LTF, or **\$16,790**, will be “set-aside” for bicycle and pedestrian facilities. The ICLTC has reviewed the pending ESTA proposed Inyo County and City of Bishop transit system budget and allocates the remainder of TDA funds in FY 2023-2024 **\$822,689** to ESTA under Public Utilities Code Section 99260(a), and **\$160,000** of LTF Reserve funding to ESTA for transit purposes.

**NOW, THEREFORE BE IN RESOLVED** that the Inyo County Local Transportation Commission does hereby apportion and allocate FY 2023-2024 LTF funds as follows:

1. **\$94,031** for LTC administration, Public Utilities Code 99233.1.
2. **\$6,798** for LTC & ESTA auditing costs, Public Utilities Code 99233.1.
3. **\$16,790** or 2% of remaining LTF moneys for bicycle and pedestrian “set-aside” to be used anywhere in the County and/or City, Public Utilities Code 99233.3

4. **\$822,689** of remaining LTF apportioned and allocated to the Eastern Sierra Transit Authority for operating costs in Inyo County and the City of Bishop, Public Utilities Code Section 99260(a).
5. **\$160,000** of LTF Reserves.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that this action is taken in conformance with the Inyo 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 19th day of July 2023, by the following vote:

Ayes:  
Noes:  
Abstain:  
Absent:

---

Celeste Berg, Chair  
Inyo County Local Transportation Commission

Attest:

---

Kristina Amaya, Secretary  
Inyo County Local Transportation Commission



## Action Item No. 4

Allocate FY23-24 State Transit Assistance  
Funds



Michael Errante  
Executive Director

# INYO COUNTY LOCAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

P.O. DRAWER Q  
INDEPENDENCE, CA 93526  
PHONE: (760) 878-0201  
FAX: (760) 878-2001



## STAFF REPORT

**MEETING:** July 19, 2023

**PREPARED BY:** Justine Kokx, Transportation Planner

**SUBJECT:** Allocation of State Transit Assistance (STA) funds to the Eastern Sierra Transit Authority (ESTA) for operating & capital expenses

---

### Recommended Action

Approve Resolution 2023-03 allocating an estimated amount of \$226,448 in FY 2023-2024 STA funds to ESTA for operating and/or capital expenses.

*This item comes to your Commission after the July 1 deadline that is built into the TDA legislation and the ICLTC's internal policies. The lack of quorum for the June 21, 2023, meeting created extenuating circumstances that required the TDA apportionment and allocation approval to be scheduled to a later month's agenda. The operator, ESTA, is aware of and approves of the delay. To avoid a future audit finding for not meeting TDA claiming deadlines, this serves as documentation to explain the circumstances that were outside of the control of the Commission and staff.*

### Background

The State Controller's Office has provided an estimate of STA funds that will be received in FY 2023-2024. The State Controller's Office allocates funds under two sections of the Public Utilities Code. The Inyo County LTC will receive an estimate of \$226,448 under Public Utilities Code (PUC) Section 99313. This amount is based on annual population estimates per PUC Section 99312.7.

### Analysis

The role of the Inyo County LTC is to confirm the information provided by ESTA in the claim forms is correct. The following findings are made. For the *Claim for TDA Funds*

form:

- A. ESTA is eligible to receive Article 4 TDA claim funds in Inyo County as a public transit operator. This was confirmed in the completion of the latest Triennial Performance Audit of ESTA where all five performance indicators were met. ESTA can use these funds for capital and operating expenses. ESTA met the two-year efficiency standard No.1 for FY20-21-FY21-22, therefore, none of the STA funds are capital restricted. (See the discussion on pg. 2 of Efficiency Standards). The funds can also be used as matching funds for Federal Transit Administration grants.
- B. The ESTA claim is in compliance with the Inyo County LTC Regional Transportation Plan. The RTP generally describes the transit services available in Inyo County. The RTP also includes goals and policies generally in support of public transit. ESTA is maintaining their existing services.
- C. ESTA completes an annual fiscal audit of Transportation Development Act funds and provides this information to the Inyo County LTC.
- D. ESTA provides 100% of the public transit services in both the City of Bishop and Inyo County.
- E. The CHP has completed a terminal inspection of the ESTA headquarters within the last 13 months.
- F. ESTA has specified that the funds are being used for purposes set forth in Article 4, Section 99262 of the Transportation Development Act (TDA). This portion of the TDA sets out the general uses for funds claimed under the TDA. The draft ESTA budget for FY 2023-2024 is attached. The ESTA claim form complies with this general requirement. This was demonstrated by the completion of the Triennial Performance Report of ESTA.

The Inyo County LTC *Request for Allocation of TDA funds for transit-related purposes* form repeats some of the above questions and sets forth other requirements. The analysis below will cover those portions of this form not discussed above.

### **Reasonable Effort**

ESTA has claimed TDA funds from the Inyo County LTC in the past year. As such, the LTC is required to determine if “The above claimant made a reasonable effort to implement recommendations made by the ICLTC.” The Inyo County LTC, in the Unmet Transit Needs hearing process, did find new proposed transit services that met the definition of an “unmet transit need.” Two unmet needs were determined to be “reasonable to meet”. Staff has marked the “Yes” box to indicate that ESTA has made a reasonable effort to implement recommendations made by the Inyo County LTC.

### **Efficiency Standards Analysis**

ESTA is claiming STA funds this year for operating and/or capital expenditures. To receive funds for operating expenses, ESTA is required to meet the efficiency standards set out by Section 99314.6 of the Public Utilities Code. In FY20-21 through FY21-22, ESTA’s operating cost per service hour increased less than the California Consumer Price Index (CPI) over the same period. Therefore, ESTA’s budget has met the efficiency standards and has therefore not triggered restrictions of capital funding. The

entire STA allocation of \$226,448 is available for use on operations, capital expenditures or matching funds for FTA section 5311 grants at ESTA's discretion.

**Scope of Service**

The scope of services provided by ESTA will remain the same.

**Change in Capital Costs**

ESTA's operating costs per service hour did not increase in FY21-22 over FY20-21 per the latest performance audit.

**Proposed Budget**

ESTA has included its preliminary budget for 2023-2024 as part of this allocation request.

- Attachments: -Resolution No. 2023-03  
-State Controller Estimate of State Transit Assistance funds  
- FY23-24 TDA claim form and STA Qualifying Criteria Worksheet

**INYO COUNTY LOCAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION  
RESOLUTION No. 2023-03**

**A RESOLUTION ALLOCATING \$226,448 OF  
STATE TRANSIT ASSISTANCE FUNDS RECEIVED BY THE INYO  
COUNTY LOCAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION TO  
EASTERN SIERRA TRANSIT AUTHORITY TO BE USED FOR  
OPERATING AND CAPITAL EXPENDITURES**

**WHEREAS**, in accordance with the Transportation Development Act, and pursuant to Section 99312.7 of the Public Utilities Code (PUC), and in accordance with the Inyo County Local Transportation Commission (ICLTC) Organization and Procedures Manual, the ICLTC shall make allocations from the State Transit Assistance Fund for the purposes of Section 99313 of the PUC in accordance with the following priorities:

**WHEREAS**, Section 99313 allocations are based on the latest available annual population estimates from the Department of Finance, and

**WHEREAS**, Inyo County's portion of the State Transit Assistance (STA) Fund, Section PUC 99313 for FY 2023/2024 is estimated to be \$226,448, and

**WHEREAS**, the Eastern Sierra Transit Authority is a valid STA claimant under PUC Section 99313, and

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, that the Inyo County Local Transportation Commission does hereby allocate all (estimated to be \$226,448) of its State Transit Assistance Fund from FY 2023/2024, and all interest earned on these funds, for use by Eastern Sierra Transit Authority for operating and capital expenditure of the transit system; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that this allocation of funds is in conformity with the 2019 Inyo County Regional Transportation Plan.

Passed and adopted this 19<sup>h</sup> day of July 2023, by the following vote:

Ayes:  
Noes:  
Abstain:  
Absent:

---

Celeste Berg, Chair  
Inyo County Local Transportation Commission

Attest:

---

Kristina Amaya, Secretary  
Inyo County Local Transportation Commission

**APPENDIX B**

**Forms – Request for Allocation of Funds**

Amended September 28, 2022

## CLAIM FOR TDA FUNDS

**TO:** Inyo County Local Transportation Commission  
Attention: Executive Director  
PO Drawer Q  
Independence, CA 93526

REQUEST FOR ALLOCATION OF TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT (TDA)  
FUNDS FOR TRANSIT RELATED PURPOSES - FISCAL YEAR 23-24

1. THIS REQUEST IS FOR AN ALLOCATION OF:  

\$ 982,688	LOCAL TRANSPORTATION FUNDS
\$ 226,448	STATE TRANSIT ASSISTANCE FUNDS
  
2. NAME OF CLAIMANT: Eastern Sierra Transit  
  
NAME AND TITLE OF  
CONTACT PERSON: Phil Moores  
ADDRESS: 565 Airport rd, Bishop, CA 93514
  
3. THE ABOVE CLAIMANT DECLARES THE FOLLOWING:
  - A. That we are eligible to receive TDA funds.
  - B. That the proposed expenditures are in conformity with the latest Regional Transportation Plan adopted by the ICLTC and the rules and regulations as set forth in the latest update of the TDA.
  - C. That we have (or will) submitted to a fiscal audit of any TDA funds received during the past fiscal year.
  - D. That we are eligible to receive 100% of the total Inyo County TDA allocation based on the current population split between the County and City of Bishop as estimated by the latest State Department of Finance figures.
  - E. That we received a satisfactory terminal inspection from the California Highway Patrol within the past 13 months, which evidences are compliance with Section 1808.1 of California Vehicle Code.

F. That these funds will be used for purposes as specified in Article 4, Section 99262 of the TDA as follows:

4. THE AMOUNTS REQUESTED FOR THE UPCOMING FISCAL YEAR ARE:

	<u>LTF</u>	<u>STA</u>
1 <sup>ST</sup> Quarter	\$245,672	\$56,612
2 <sup>nd</sup> Quarter	\$ 245,672	\$56,612
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quarter	\$ 245,672	\$56,612
4 <sup>th</sup> Quarter	\$ 245,672	\$56,612
<b>TOTAL</b>	\$982,688	\$226,448

Signed: 

Title: Executive Director

Date: 5/4/23



**TO:** Inyo County Local Transportation Commission  
Attention: Executive Director  
PO Drawer Q  
Independence, Ca 93526

REQUEST FOR ALLOCATION OF TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT (TDA) FUNDS  
FOR TRANSIT-RELATED PURPOSES FISCAL YEAR 23-24

1. THIS REQUEST IS FOR AN ALLOCATION OF:  LOCAL TRANSPORTATION FUNDS  
 STATE TRANSIT ASSISTANCE FUNDS

2. NAME OF TRANSIT SERVICE: Eastern Sierra Transit

NAME OF CONTACT PERSON: Phil Moores

ADDRESS: 565 Airport Rd, Bishop, CA 93514\_

TELEPHONE #: 805-235-5807

3. THE ABOVE CLAIMANT IS QUALIFIED TO RECEIVE FUNDS UNDER ARTICLE 4, SECTION 99262 OF THE TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT.

HAS THE ABOVE CLAIMANT RECEIVED ANY TDA FUNDS DURING THE PAST FISCAL YEAR?  YES  NO

**THE ABOVE CLAIMANT MADE A REASONABLE EFFORT TO IMPLEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS MADE BY THE ICLTC.  YES  NO**  
ICLTC Staff completed this box. Initials

ARE THE PROPOSED EXPENDITURES IN CONFORMITY WITH THE INYO COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN?  YES  NO

4. AMOUNT REQUESTED FOR THE UPCOMING FISCAL YEAR (OR YEARS):

DIRECT ALLOCATION: \$822,688

RESERVE FUNDS: \$160,000

OTHER: \_\_\_\_\_

5. THESE FUNDS WILL BE USED FOR PURPOSES AS SPECIFIED IN ARTICLE 4, SECTION 99262 AS FOLLOWS:

6. PROJECTED REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES:

	REVENUE		EXPENDITURE		
	FARES	OTHER	OPERATIONS	MAINTENANCE	CAPITAL
CURRENT FY	\$2,405,107	\$4,327,101	\$5,934,854	\$750,733	\$1,960,491
NEXT FY	\$2,052,269	\$5,407,310	\$6,731,326	\$728,253	\$1,406,204

7. EFFICIENCY STANDARDS REQUIRED UNDER SECTION 99314.6 (A) AND (B) OF THE PUBLIC UTILITIES CODE WERE VERIFIED PRIOR TO THE ALLOCATION OF STA FUNDS. USE SMALLEST PERCENTAGE OF EITHER (A) OR (B) STANDARDS IF FUNDS MUST BE RESTRICTED FOR CAPITAL PURPOSES. USE OPERATOR'S STA QUALIFYING CRITERIA WORKSHEET \*\* the (A) efficiency standard is the smallest and demonstrates no increase in operational costs. See attached worksheet.
8. IF OPERATING BUDGET SHOWS AN INCREASE OVER PRECEDING YEAR, PLEASE IDENTIFY INCREASES: \*No increase
9. IF THERE IS A SUBSTANTIAL INCREASE OR DECREASE IN SCOPE OF OPERATION SINCE PRECEDING YEAR, PLEASE IDENTIFY; \*No increase.
10. IF THERE IS A SUBSTANTIAL INCREASE OR DECREASE IN CAPITAL BUDGET PROVISIONS SINCE PRECEDING YEAR, PLEASE IDENTIFY: \*No increase
11. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE SERVICE YOU PROVIDE INCLUDING ROUTES, METHOD OF OPERATION, CUSTOMERS, NUMBER OF PATRONS SERVED ETC.: \*

Route	Type	Days of Week							Hours	Service Period	Description
		S	M	T	W	T	F	S			
Walker DAR	DAR		X	X	X	X	X		8am-4:30pm	year-round	1 bus, expand to Bridgeport 1 days
Bridgeport - Carson	LL				X				11am-6:30pm	year-round	1 roundtrip on Wednesday
Walker to Mammoth	LL		X	X	X	X	X		8am-5pm	Tuesdays	Operated by Walker DAR driver. Res. Only
Mammoth DAR	Par		X	X	X	X	X		8am-5pm	year-round	Provides ADA paratransit backup
Purple Line	Cor	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	7am-6pm	year-round	1 bus with 30-minute headways
Mammoth Winter Trolley	Cor	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	5:40p-2am	Through April 21	2 buses with 30-minutes service till 2am
Mammoth Shoulder Season Trolley	Cor	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	7am-10pm	mid-April to mid-June Labor Day till Nov.	2 buses with 30-minutes service till 2am
Mammoth Summer Trolley	Cor	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	7am-2am	May 26-Nov 16	3 buses with 30-minutes service until 10pm. Reduced till 2am
Mammoth Lakes Basin Trolley	Cor	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	8am-6pm	after Labor Day till Oct. 1	2 buses with 30-minutes service, 3 on Sat. 1 bus with 60-minute service and 2 on Sat.
Red Line	Cor	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	7am-5:30pm	Thru April	3 buses with 20-minute service As many as 6 buses on busy days
Blue Line	Cor	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	7am-5:20pm	Thru April	1 bus with 15-minute service
Green Line	Cor	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	7:30am-5:30pm	Thru April	1 bus with 15-minute service
Yellow Line	Cor	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	7:30am-5:30pm	Thru April	1 bus with 20-minute service
Mammoth Express	Com		X	X	X	X	X		see schedule	year-round	8 trips daily
395 Reno	Cor		X	X	X	X	X		see schedule	year-round	1 roundtrip daily
395 Lancaster	Cor		X	X	X	X	X		see schedule	year-round	1 roundtrip daily
Benton - Bishop	LL			X				X	8:30am leave 2:30pm return	year-round	1 roundtrip daily, 2 days per week
Bishop DAR	DAR	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	7am-6:30pm (M-F) 8:30am-6pm (Sat) 8am-1pm (Sun)	year-round	Door-to-door service in Bishop
Nite Rider	DAR							X	6pm-2am	year-round	Friday and Saturday nights (and New Years Eve & Tri-county Fair Sunday)
Bishop Creek Shuttle	MD	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	8am-9:45a 4pm-5:45pm	Weather permitting June 16-Labor Day	RECOMMEND DISCONTINUATION
Lone Pine - Bishop	Com		X	X	X	X	X	X	see schedule	year-round	8 trips daily
Lone Pine DAR	DAR		X	X	X	X	X	X	see schedule	year-round	1 bus - door-to-door service
Reds Meadow Shuttle	Cor	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	7am-8pm	June 16-Labor Day	6-11 buses with 20-minute service

12. ATTACH A COPY OF PROPOSED BUDGET FOR PENDING FISCAL YEAR.

Revenue

State and Federal Grant Revenues	22-23 Estimate	23-24 Estimate	Variance
LTF	\$1,590,020	\$1,692,903	\$102,883
STA*	\$478,055	\$617,902	\$139,847
Interest from Treasury	\$35,000	\$20,000	-\$15,000
State Grants Other	\$158,854	\$163,000	\$4,146
Federal Grants	\$961,739	\$1,303,408	\$341,669
Other Agencies	\$1,078,792	\$1,022,854	-\$55,938
Fares & Fees	\$2,405,107	\$2,052,269	-\$352,838
Miscellaneous	\$24,000	\$28,000	\$4,000
Total	\$6,731,567	\$6,900,336	\$168,769

Expense

Operating Expense Categories	22-23 Estimate	23-24 Estimate	Variance
Salaries & Benefits	\$3,360,000	\$3,359,388	-\$612
Insurance	\$325,000	\$395,470	\$70,470
Maintenance	\$630,000	\$725,000	\$95,000
Fuel	\$822,000	\$842,338	\$20,338
Facilities	\$275,000	\$229,540	-\$45,460
Services	\$288,915	\$250,948	-\$37,967
All Other	\$817,000	\$1,156,288	\$339,288
Capital Replacement	\$145,780	\$145,780	\$0
Total	\$6,663,695	\$7,104,752	\$441,057

13. ATTACH COPIES OF ANY CONTRACTS UPON WHICH PROVISIONS OF YOUR SERVICE DEPENDS. Attached two contracts (MMSA & TOML)

14. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS: \*

\* Attach additional sheets as necessary.

\*\* ICLTC staff to provide "Operator's STA Qualifying Criteria Worksheet.xlsx" to operator annually as a part of the TDA allocation notification process.

Signed:



Title: Executive Director

Date: 5/4/23

# CLAIM FOR TDA FUNDS

## Prior Performance Audit Worksheet

**TO:** Inyo County Local Transportation Commission  
Attention: Executive Director  
PO Drawer Q  
Independence, CA 93526

REQUEST FOR ALLOCATION OF TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT (TDA)  
FUNDS FOR TRANSIT RELATED PURPOSES - FISCAL YEAR 23-24

Note that this worksheet is only required to be completed by claimants for public transit services under Article 4 of the Public Utilities Code.

Each recommendation from the latest performance audit	Action(s) taken to date to address the recommendation	Conclusion
Develop a Marketing Plan	We received a quote for a marketing plan. \$4,000	Good idea, but more than we need to spend on this right now.
Have a better system for distributing and maintaining brochure locations	We are developing a location list to make sure we know where the brochures are located, and when they were last stocked.	

**Operator's STA Qualifying Criteria (99314.6) - Worksheet**

**FY 2023/24**

FISCAL YEAR (Audited Data)	FY 2018/19	FY 2019/20	FY 2020/21	FY 2021/22
A. Operating Cost	\$5,512,820	\$5,218,120	\$5,118,141	\$4,762,338
B. Operating Cost Exclusions: (Depreciation already excluded)	\$960,210.00	\$456,544	\$472,053	
C. Adjusted Operating Cost (A-B)	\$4,552,610	\$4,761,576	\$4,646,088	\$4,762,338
D. Revenue Vehicle Hours (RVH)	56,757	52,466	49,069	52,095
E. RVH Exclusions: (add sheets if required)				
F. Adjusted RHV (D-E)	56,757	52,466	49,069	52,095
G. Operating Cost per RVH (C/F)	\$80.21	\$90.76	\$94.68	\$91.42
I. Operating Cost per RVH	\$80.21 W	\$90.76 X	\$94.68 Y	\$91.42 Z
H. % Change in CPI				7.10%
% Change in CPI 3 prior years (change in annual CPI between first year of first fiscal year and last year of last fiscal year)	3.97%			

[https://data.bls.gov/pdq/SurveyOutputServlet?data\\_tool=dropmap&series\\_id=CUUR0400SA0, CUUS0400SA0](https://data.bls.gov/pdq/SurveyOutputServlet?data_tool=dropmap&series_id=CUUR0400SA0, CUUS0400SA0)

Use average of half-year data for fiscal year

**Enter CPI Data**

Efficiency Standard A	FY 21-22	299.252	
	FY 20-21	279.412	
	Change	19.8405	
	%	7.10%	
Efficiency Standard B	19-20	272.959	18-19
	20-21	279.412	19-20
	21-22	299.252	20-21
	Average	283.874	Average
	Change	10.831	273.043
	%	3.97%	

**Efficiency Standard A:**

Z must be less than or equal to (Y)\*(CPI%) [CPI% = average percentage change in the CPI%]

Z =	\$91.42	Difference:	-\$9.99	<= must be negative to qualify
Y =	\$94.68	Percentage:	-9.85%	<= must be negative to qualify
[Y + Y * (CPI)] =	\$101.41			

**Efficiency Standard B:**

[(X + Y + Z) / 3] must be less than or equal to [(W + X + Y) / 3] (3-year CPI%)

[(X + Y + Z) / 3] =	\$92.29	Difference:	\$0.22	<= must be negative to qualify
[(W + X + Y) / 3] =	\$88.55	Percentage:	0.24%	<= must be negative to qualify
[(W + X + Y) / 3] + [(W + X + Y) / 3]*CPI =	\$92.06			

**For RTPA Use Only**

Operator qualifies under:

- Standard A:  Yes  No  
 Standard B:  Yes  No

**State Controller's Office**

**Allocation Detail of State Transit Assistance Pursuant to Public Utilities Code (PUC) section 99313.**

**Fiscal Year 2023-2024 Estimate**

**Revised as of February 9, 2023**

**More information at [http://www.sco.ca.gov/ard\\_local\\_apportionments.html](http://www.sco.ca.gov/ard_local_apportionments.html)**

**For assistance, please call Mike Silvera at 916-323-0704.**

<b>County</b>	<b>PUC Section 99313 Funds from Revenue and Taxation Code sections 7102(a)(3), 6051.8(a), and 6201.8(a)</b>	<b>PUC Section 99313 Funds from Revenue and Taxation Code sections 6051.8(b), and 6201.8(b)</b>	<b>PUC section 99313 Total Amount</b>
Metropolitan Transportation Commission (Alameda County Treasurer)	\$49,936,188.00	\$40,911,426.00	\$90,847,614.00
Alpine County Transportation Commission (Alpine County Treasurer)	\$7,870.00	\$6,448.00	\$14,318.00
Amador County Transportation Commission (Amador County Treasurer)	\$264,297.00	\$216,532.00	\$480,829.00
Butte County Association of Governments (Butte County Treasurer)	\$1,322,293.00	\$1,083,321.00	\$2,405,614.00
Calaveras County Local Transportation Commission (Calaveras County Treasurer)	\$295,464.00	\$242,066.00	\$537,530.00
Colusa County Local Transportation Commission (Colusa County Treasurer)	\$143,026.00	\$117,178.00	\$260,204.00
Del Norte County Local Transportation Commission (Del Norte County Treasurer)	\$178,516.00	\$146,253.00	\$324,769.00
El Dorado County Local Transportation Commission (El Dorado County Treasurer)	\$1,140,249.00	\$934,177.00	\$2,074,426.00
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (El Dorado County Treasurer1)	\$707,740.00	\$579,833.00	\$1,287,573.00
Fresno County Council of Governments (Fresno County Treasurer)	\$6,632,672.00	\$5,433,976.00	\$12,066,648.00
Glenn County Local Transportation Commission (Glenn County Treasurer)	\$188,564.00	\$154,485.00	\$343,049.00
Humboldt County Association of Governments (Humboldt County Treasurer)	\$886,531.00	\$726,312.00	\$1,612,843.00
Imperial County Transportation Commission (Imperial County Treasurer)	\$1,176,171.00	\$963,607.00	\$2,139,778.00
Inyo County Local Transportation Commission (Inyo County Treasurer)	\$124,472.00	\$101,976.00	\$226,448.00
Kern Council of Governments (Kern County Treasurer)	\$5,967,222.00	\$4,888,791.00	\$10,856,013.00
Kings County Association of Governments (Kings County Treasurer)	\$997,079.00	\$816,881.00	\$1,813,960.00
Lake County/City Council of Governments (Lake County Treasurer)	\$442,105.00	\$362,205.00	\$804,310.00
Lassen County Local Transportation Commission (Lassen County Treasurer)	\$198,559.00	\$162,674.00	\$361,233.00
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Los Angeles County Treasurer)	\$64,677,155.00	\$52,988,318.00	\$117,665,473.00
Madera County Local Transportation Commission (Madera County Treasurer)	\$1,032,319.00	\$845,752.00	\$1,878,071.00
Mariposa County Local Transportation Commission (Mariposa County Treasurer)	\$111,794.00	\$91,590.00	\$203,384.00
Mendocino Council of Governments (Mendocino County Treasurer)	\$590,280.00	\$483,601.00	\$1,073,881.00

<b>County</b>	<b>PUC Section 99313 Funds from Revenue and Taxation Code sections 7102(a)(3), 6051.8(a), and 6201.8(a)</b>	<b>PUC Section 99313 Funds from Revenue and Taxation Code sections 6051.8(b), and 6201.8(b)</b>	<b>PUC section 99313 Total Amount</b>
Merced County Association of Governments (Merced County Treasurer)	\$1,864,898.00	\$1,527,862.00	\$3,392,760.00
Modoc County Local Transportation Commission (Modoc County Treasurer)	\$56,995.00	\$46,695.00	\$103,690.00
Mono County Local Transportation Commission (Mono County Treasurer)	\$87,749.00	\$71,891.00	\$159,640.00
Transportation Agency for Monterey County (Monterey County Treasurer)	\$2,844,628.00	\$2,330,530.00	\$5,175,158.00
Nevada County Local Transportation Commission (Nevada County Treasurer)	\$664,019.00	\$544,014.00	\$1,208,033.00
Orange County Transportation Authority (Orange County Treasurer)	\$20,740,327.00	\$16,992,013.00	\$37,732,340.00
Placer County Transportation Planning Agency (Placer County Treasurer)	\$2,083,907.00	\$1,707,291.00	\$3,791,198.00
Plumas County Local Transportation Commission (Plumas County Treasurer)	\$124,236.00	\$101,783.00	\$226,019.00
Riverside County Transportation Commission (Riverside County Treasurer)	\$15,973,963.00	\$13,087,054.00	\$29,061,017.00
Sacramento Area Council of Governments (Sacramento County Treasurer)	\$12,981,068.00	\$10,635,053.00	\$23,616,121.00
Council of San Benito County Governments (San Benito County Treasurer)	\$429,459.00	\$351,845.00	\$781,304.00
San Bernardino County Transportation Authority (San Bernardino County Treasurer)	\$14,348,315.00	\$11,755,203.00	\$26,103,518.00
San Diego Association of Governments (San Diego County Treasurer)	\$6,218,238.00	\$5,094,442.00	\$11,312,680.00
San Diego Metropolitan Transit System (San Diego County Treasurer1)	\$15,342,331.00	\$12,569,574.00	\$27,911,905.00
San Joaquin Council of Governments (San Joaquin County Treasurer Trans Authority)	\$5,144,003.00	\$4,214,348.00	\$9,358,351.00
San Luis Obispo Area Council of Governments (San Luis Obispo County Treasurer)	\$1,841,175.00	\$1,508,427.00	\$3,349,602.00
Santa Barbara County Association of Governments (SBCAG) (Santa Barbara County Treasurer)	\$2,919,713.00	\$2,392,045.00	\$5,311,758.00
Santa Cruz County Transportation Commission (Santa Cruz County Treasurer)	\$1,748,323.00	\$1,432,355.00	\$3,180,678.00
Shasta Regional Transportation Agency (Shasta County Treasurer)	\$1,184,055.00	\$970,066.00	\$2,154,121.00
Sierra County Local Transportation Commission (Sierra County Treasurer)	\$21,178.00	\$17,351.00	\$38,529.00
Siskiyou County Local Transportation Commission (Siskiyou County Treasurer)	\$287,469.00	\$235,516.00	\$522,985.00
Stanislaus Council of Governments (Stanislaus County Treasurer)	\$3,603,802.00	\$2,952,502.00	\$6,556,304.00
Tehama County Transportation Commission (Tehama County Treasurer)	\$426,659.00	\$349,551.00	\$776,210.00
Trinity County Transportation Commission (Trinity County Treasurer)	\$105,091.00	\$86,098.00	\$191,189.00
Tulare County Association of Governments (Tulare County Treasurer)	\$3,115,491.00	\$2,552,441.00	\$5,667,932.00
Tuolumne County Transportation Council (Tuolumne County Treasurer)	\$362,639.00	\$297,101.00	\$659,740.00
Ventura County Transportation Commission (Ventura County Treasurer)	\$5,467,703.00	\$4,479,547.00	\$9,947,250.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$257,008,000.00</b>	<b>\$210,560,000.00</b>	<b>\$467,568,000.00</b>

2022 Bishop Yard

**SAFETY COMPLIANCE REPORT/  
TERMINAL RECORD UPDATE**

CHP 343 (Rev. 12-17) OPI 062

NEW TERMINAL INFORMATION <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	CA NUMBER 352394	FILE CODE NUMBER 308618	COUNTY CODE 14	BED
TERMINAL TYPE <input type="checkbox"/> Truck <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Bus <input type="checkbox"/> Mod Limo	CODE B	OTHER PROGRAM(S) G	LOCATION CODE 825	SUBAREA 0001

CARRIER LEGAL NAME <b>EASTERN SIERRA TRANSIT AUTHORITY</b>	TERMINAL NAME (IF DIFFERENT)	TELEPHONE NUMBER (W/ AREA CODE) <b>(760) 872-1901</b>
---	------------------------------	--

TERMINAL STREET ADDRESS (NUMBER, STREET, CITY, ZIP CODE)

**703 B Airport Rd. Bishop, CA 93514**

MAILING ADDRESS (NUMBER, STREET, CITY, ZIP CODE) (IF DIFFERENT FROM ABOVE)

**P O Box 1357 Bishop, CA 93515**

INSPECTION LOCATION (NUMBER, STREET, CITY OR COUNTY)

**SAME**

**LICENSE, FLEET AND TERMINAL INFORMATION**

HM LIC. NO.	HWT REG. NO.	IMS LIC. NO.	TRUCKS AND TYPES	TRAILERS AND TYPES	PASS VEH. BY TYPE <b>I 9 II</b>	DRIVERS <b>14</b>	BIT FLEET SIZE <b>Powered</b>
EXP. DATE	EXP. DATE	EXP. DATE	REG. CT.	HW VEH.	HW CONT.	PPB/CSAT <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<b>Towed</b>

TERMINALS IDENTIFIED IN SECTION 34515(b) CVC

Yes  No

FILE CODE NUMBERS OF TERMINALS INCLUDED IN INSPECTION AS A RESULT OF SECTION 34515(b) CVC

**EMERGENCY CONTACTS (In Calling Order of Preference)**

EMERGENCY CONTACT (NAME) <b>PHILL MOORES</b>	DAY TELEPHONE NO. (W/ AREA CODE) <b>(760) 872-1901</b>	NIGHT TELEPHONE NO. (W/ AREA CODE) <b>(805) 235-5807</b>
EMERGENCY CONTACT (NAME) <b>JARETT SHYTKA</b>	DAY TELEPHONE NO. (W/ AREA CODE) <b>(760) 872-1901</b>	NIGHT TELEPHONE NO. (W/ AREA CODE) <b>(808) 482-0967</b>

**ESTIMATED CALIFORNIA MILEAGE FOR THIS TERMINAL FOR LAST YEAR [ 2021 ]**

A <input type="checkbox"/> UNDER 15,000	B <input type="checkbox"/> 15,001 — 50,000	C <input type="checkbox"/> 50,001 — 100,000	D <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 100,001 — 500,000	E <input type="checkbox"/> 500,001 — 1,000,000	F <input type="checkbox"/> 1,000,001 — 2,000,000	G <input type="checkbox"/> 2,000,001 — 5,000,000	H <input type="checkbox"/> 5,000,001 — 10,000,000	I <input type="checkbox"/> MORE THAN 10,000,000
--	---	--	--	---	---	---	--	--

**OPERATING AUTHORITIES OR PERMITS**

PUC <input type="checkbox"/> T	<input type="checkbox"/> TCP <input type="checkbox"/> PSC	MOTOR CARRIER OF PROPERTY PERMIT ACTIVE <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	IMS FITNESS EVALUATION <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
USDOT 1891175	<input type="checkbox"/> MC <input type="checkbox"/> MX	REASON FOR INSPECTION <b>BUS ANNUAL</b>	

<b>INSPECTION FINDINGS</b>	<b>INSPECTION RATINGS: S = Satisfactory U = Unsatisfactory C = Conditional UR = Unrated N/A = Not Applicable</b>					
REQUIREMENTS	VIOL	MAINTENANCE PROGRAM	DRIVER RECORDS	REG. EQUIPMENT	HAZARDOUS MATERIALS	TERMINAL
MAINTENANCE PROGRAM		1 S 2 S 3 S 4 S	1 S 2 S 3 S 4 S	1 S 2 S 3 S 4 S	1 N/A 2 N/A 3 N/A 4 N/A	1 S 2 S 3 S 4 S
DRIVER RECORDS		No. 4 Time 1.5	No. 11 Time 3.0	No. 4 Time 2.5	TIME	TOTAL TIME 7.0
DRIVER HOURS		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No H/M Transported <input type="checkbox"/> No H/M violations noted		CONTAINERS/TANKS No. Time	VEHICLES PLACED OUT-OF-SERVICE Vehicles Units	
BRAKES		REMARKS				
LAMPS & SIGNALS		<b>SEE ATTACHED PAGES FOR INSPECTION FINDINGS AND RATING STATEMENT.</b>				
CONNECTING DEVICES						
STEERING & SUSPENSION						
TIRES & WHEELS						
EQUIPMENT REQUIREMENTS	<b>1</b>					
CONTAINERS & TANKS						
HAZARDOUS MATERIALS						

INSPECTION TYPE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> I <input type="checkbox"/> R	NON-BIT <input type="checkbox"/>	CPSS <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	CHP 345 <input type="checkbox"/>	CHP 100D COL. <input type="checkbox"/>	INSPECTION DATE(S) 11/02,03/2022	TIME IN 07:00	TIME OUT 13:30
INSPECTED BY (NAME(S)) <b>O. LUGO</b>					ID NUMBER(S) A15949	SUSPENSE DATE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Auto <input type="checkbox"/> None	

**MOTOR CARRIER CERTIFICATION**

I hereby certify that all violations described hereon and recorded on the attached pages (2 through 10), will be corrected in accordance with applicable provisions of the California Vehicle Code and the California Code of Regulations. I understand that I may request a review of an unsatisfactory rating by contacting the Motor Carrier Safety Unit Supervisor at (909) 806-2414 within 5 business days of the rating.

CURRENT TERMINAL RATING <b>SATISFACTORY</b>	CARRIER REPRESENTATIVE'S SIGNATURE 	DATE 11/03/2022
CARRIER REPRESENTATIVE'S PRINTED NAME <b>JARETT SHYDKA</b>	TITLE <b>SUPERVISOR</b>	DRIVER LICENSE NUMBER STATE



**SAFETY COMPLIANCE REPORT/  
TERMINAL RECORD UPDATE**

CHP 343 (Rev. 12-17) OPI 062

NEW TERMINAL INFORMATION <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		CA NUMBER 352394	FILE CODE NUMBER 310683	COUNTY CODE 14	BED
TERMINAL TYPE <input type="checkbox"/> Truck <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Bus <input type="checkbox"/> Mod Limo		CODE B	OTHER PROGRAM(S) G	LOCATION CODE 825	SUBAREA 0001

CARRIER LEGAL NAME <b>EASTERN SIERRA TRANSPORTATION AUTH</b>	TERMINAL NAME (IF DIFFERENT)	TELEPHONE NUMBER (W/ AREA CODE) <b>(760) 872-1901</b>
---	------------------------------	--

TERMINAL STREET ADDRESS (NUMBER, STREET, CITY, ZIP CODE)

1900 S MAIN ST LONE PINE, CA 93545

MAILING ADDRESS (NUMBER, STREET, CITY, ZIP CODE) (IF DIFFERENT FROM ABOVE)

P O Box 1357 Bishop, CA 93515

INSPECTION LOCATION (NUMBER, STREET, CITY OR COUNTY)

703 AIRPORT ROAD BISHOP, CA 93514

**LICENSE, FLEET AND TERMINAL INFORMATION**

HM LIC. NO.	HWT REG. NO.	IMS LIC. NO.	TRUCKS AND TYPES	TRAILERS AND TYPES	PASS VEHs BY TYPE I 1 II	Mod Limo	DRIVERS 5	BIT FLEET SIZE
EXP. DATE	EXP. DATE	EXP. DATE	REG. CT.	HW VEH.	HW CONT.	PPB/CSAT <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A		Powered Towed
TERMINALS IDENTIFIED IN SECTION 34515(b) CVC <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No			FILE CODE NUMBERS OF TERMINALS INCLUDED IN INSPECTION AS A RESULT OF SECTION 34515(b) CVC					

**EMERGENCY CONTACTS (In Calling Order of Preference)**

EMERGENCY CONTACT (NAME) <b>JARETT CHYTKA</b>	DAY TELEPHONE NO. (W/ AREA CODE) <b>(760) 872-1901</b>	NIGHT TELEPHONE NO. (W/ AREA CODE) <b>(808) 482-0967</b>
EMERGENCY CONTACT (NAME) <b>CARLA WISHLER</b>	DAY TELEPHONE NO. (W/ AREA CODE) <b>(760) 872-1901</b>	NIGHT TELEPHONE NO. (W/ AREA CODE) <b>(760) 614-0030</b>

**ESTIMATED CALIFORNIA MILEAGE FOR THIS TERMINAL FOR LAST YEAR [ 2021 ]**

A <input type="checkbox"/> UNDER 15,000	B <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 15,001 — 50,000	C <input type="checkbox"/> 50,001 — 100,000	D <input type="checkbox"/> 100,001 — 500,000	E <input type="checkbox"/> 500,001 — 1,000,000	F <input type="checkbox"/> 1,000,001 — 2,000,000	G <input type="checkbox"/> 2,000,001 — 5,000,000	H <input type="checkbox"/> 5,000,001 — 10,000,000	I <input type="checkbox"/> MORE THAN 10,000,000
--	--	--	---	---	---	---	--	--

**OPERATING AUTHORITIES OR PERMITS**

PUC <input type="checkbox"/> T	<input type="checkbox"/> TCP <input type="checkbox"/> PSC	MOTOR CARRIER OF PROPERTY PERMIT ACTIVE <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	IMS FITNESS EVALUATION <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
USDOT USDOT NUMBER 1891175	<input type="checkbox"/> MC <input type="checkbox"/> MX	<input type="checkbox"/> MC <input type="checkbox"/> MX	REASON FOR INSPECTION BUS ANNUAL

**INSPECTION FINDINGS**      **INSPECTION RATINGS: S = Satisfactory U = Unsatisfactory C = Conditional UR = Unrated N/A = Not Applicable**

REQUIREMENTS	VIOL	MAINTENANCE PROGRAM	DRIVER RECORDS	REG. EQUIPMENT	HAZARDOUS MATERIALS	TERMINAL
MAINTENANCE PROGRAM		1 <u>S</u> 2 <u>S</u> 3 <u>S</u> 4 <u>S</u>	1 <u>S</u> 2 <u>S</u> 3 <u>S</u> 4 <u>S</u>	1 <u>S</u> 2 <u>S</u> 3 <u>S</u> 4 <u>S</u>	1 <u>N/A</u> 2 <u>N/A</u> 3 <u>N/A</u> 4 <u>N/A</u>	1 <u>S</u> 2 <u>S</u> 3 <u>S</u> 4 <u>S</u>
DRIVER RECORDS		No. 1 Time 0.5	No. 5 Time 1.0	No. 1 Time 1.0	TIME	TOTAL TIME 2.5
DRIVER HOURS		HAZARDOUS MATERIALS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No H/M Transported <input type="checkbox"/> No H/M violations noted	CONTAINERS/TANKS No. Time	VEHICLES PLACED OUT-OF-SERVICE Vehicles Units		
BRAKES		REMARKS				
LAMPS & SIGNALS		See attached pages for inspection findings and rating statement.				
CONNECTING DEVICES						
STEERING & SUSPENSION						
TIRES & WHEELS						
EQUIPMENT REQUIREMENTS						
CONTAINERS & TANKS						
HAZARDOUS MATERIALS						

INSPECTION TYPE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> I <input type="checkbox"/> R	NON-BIT <input type="checkbox"/>	CPSS <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	CHP 345 <input type="checkbox"/>	CHP 100D COL. 9	INSPECTION DATE(S) 7/28/22	TIME IN 12:30	TIME OUT 15:00
---	-------------------------------------	---	-------------------------------------	--------------------	-------------------------------	------------------	-------------------

INSPECTED BY (NAME(S)) <b>O. LUGO</b>	ID NUMBER(S) A15949	SUSPENSE DATE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Auto <input type="checkbox"/> None
--	------------------------	---

**MOTOR CARRIER CERTIFICATION**

I hereby certify that all violations described hereon and recorded on the attached pages (2 through 7), will be corrected in accordance with applicable provisions of the California Vehicle Code and the California Code of Regulations. I understand that I may request a review of an unsatisfactory rating by contacting the Motor Carrier Safety Unit Supervisor at (909) 806-2414 within 5 business days of the rating.

CURRENT TERMINAL RATING <b>SATISFACTORY</b>	CARRIER REPRESENTATIVE'S SIGNATURE 	DATE 07/28/2022
CARRIER REPRESENTATIVE'S PRINTED NAME <b>JARETT CHYTKA</b>	TITLE Operations Supervisor	DRIVER LICENSE NUMBER STATE

## Action Item No. 5

Distribute FY22-23 RSTP Exchange



# INYO COUNTY LOCAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION



P.O. DRAWER Q  
INDEPENDENCE, CA 93526  
PHONE: (760) 878-0201  
FAX: (760) 878-2001

Michael Errante  
Executive Director

## STAFF REPORT

**MEETING:** July 19, 2023

**PREPARED BY:** Justine Kokx, Transportation Planner

**SUBJECT:** Regional Surface Transportation Program Federal Exchange Program for FY 2022/2023

---

### **Recommended Action**

Approve Resolution No. 2023-05 which memorializes the following actions:

1. The FY 2022/2023 Federal Apportionment Exchange Program and State Match Program Agreement, Agreement No. X22-6134(036) with the California Department of Transportation in the amount of \$8,193.
2. Allocate the funds to the City of Bishop, and
3. Authorize the Executive Director to sign the Agreement.

### **SUMMARY DISCUSSION:**

Section 182.6 of the Streets and Highways Code allows counties of less than 200,000 people to exchange Regional Surface Transportation Programs (RSTP) Federal funds provided under the "Fixing America's Surface Transportation" (FAST) act for unrestricted State Highway Account funds. In addition, Section 182.9 of the Streets and Highways Code requires the allocation of unobligated State Matching moneys from the State Highway Account to counties choosing to exchange their Federal funds. The State funds are not restricted, whereas the Federal funds are restricted to work on roads that have a federal designation (otherwise known as "On-System" Roads). Consequently, the exchange for State funds allows the County and City a greater degree of discretion and flexibility in how the funds are spent on maintenance of County and City roads. The County Minimum Exchange (182.6(d)(2)) is always \$673,353. In order to streamline the exchange of funds, Caltrans offers the exchange directly to eligible counties and Regional Transportation Planning Agencies and prepares the Fund Exchange Agreement in advance.

Annually, this agreement is usually received during the fourth quarter of the current County fiscal year, and it normally takes somewhere between four and six months to complete processing of the agreement and invoice and to receive actual payment of the RSTP funds. As a result, the funds are usually received during the following fiscal year. The City should budget the 2022/2023 funds for expenditure during the 2023/2024 fiscal year.

**Apportionment to LTC**

RSTP funds are allocated by the State based on two formulas set forth under Section 182.6(d)(1) and (d)(2) of the Streets and Highways Code. The 182.6(d)(2) funds are allocated to County Road / Public Works Department in a population adjusted amount not less than 110% of the 1991 apportionment. The additional 182.6(d)(1) funds that we are currently discussing are to be distributed by the Local Transportation Commission.

**FY 2022-2023 Allocation**

Historically, of the additional 188.6(d)(1) RSTP funds, the LTC has received approximately \$120,000 annually. This year, the allocation is significantly lower because of the timing of the IJA’s estimates and prior year adjustments. Caltrans accounting staff have indicated that next year’s allocation will likely return to typical levels. Staff will continue to monitor the status of future RSTP funding. The RSTP Exchange Breakdown is attached for reference.

**LTC Apportionment to City and County**

The table below shows options for the apportionment of the funds to the City and the County. In the last several years the LTC allocated the funds to the City and County via a population-based formula. The three options for the allocation of these funds are included for reference.

Regional Surface Transportation Program Apportionment Option							
	Option 1 - Population based			Option 2 - lane miles based			Option 3 - Average of 1 & 2
Agency	Population (2020 Census)	Percent	Amount	Federal Aid Routes	Percent	Amount	Average of Previous Two Amounts
City of Bishop	3,804	20%	\$1,639	5.5 miles	1.5%	\$123	\$881
County of Inyo	15,212	80%	\$6,554	358.2 miles	98.5%	\$8,070	\$7,312
<b>Total</b>	<b>19,016</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>\$8,193</b>	<b>363.7</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>\$8,193</b>	<b>\$8,193</b>

Other transportation planning agencies allocate the funds via a variety of ways. Since the funding is specifically related to Federal Aid Routes, some comparable jurisdictions base their RSTP allocations on the relative percentage of Federal Aid Routes. El Dorado County Transportation Commission doubles the amount of funds going to Placerville due to a “County seat offset” where a high percentage of the County’s traffic is funneled into Placerville. This would be similar to the City of Bishop’s position. Some jurisdictions

allocate the funds to specific projects. Other jurisdictions calculate the allocation to smaller entities by averaging the Federal Aid Route proportion with the population percentage. Another factor is the relatively small amount of funds the City of Bishop is receiving. It is for this reason that staff would recommend allocating the funds based on the relative population between the City of Bishop and the County.

Each agency is required by the RSTP Exchange agreement to establish a special account for the purposes of depositing all RSTP Exchange funds in their budget a) for cities within their Special Gas Tax Streets Improvement Fund and b) for counties within their County Road Fund.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

The Commission could use another allocation formula.

**OTHER AGENCY INVOLVEMENT:**

Caltrans will process the Agreement and make payment of the funds.

Attachment:

- Draft Resolution No. 2023-05
- FY 2022/2023 Federal Apportionment Exchange Program and State Match Program Agreement, No. X23-6134(036)
- FFY 2022-2023 Inyo RSTP Exchange Breakdown.xlsx

**INYO COUNTY LOCAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION  
RESOLUTION No. 2023-05**

**A RESOLUTION APPORTIONING AND ALLOCATING  
REGIONAL SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM FUNDS  
FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 2022-2023**

**WHEREAS**, the Inyo County Local Transportation Commission (ICLTC) is the designated transportation planning agency pursuant to Government Code Sections 29532 and 29535, and by action of the Secretary of Business, Transportation and Housing, and, as such, has the responsibility to allocate Regional Surface Transportation Program funds (RSTP); and

**WHEREAS**, the California Department of Transportation provides the option to the ICLTC to participate in the RSTP Federal Exchange Program for FY 2022-2023; and

**WHEREAS**, the California Department of Transportation has allocated **\$8,193** of RSTP funds to the ICLTC to be allocated to eligible local jurisdictions; and

**WHEREAS**, based on the 2020 census population for Inyo County where 80% of the County resides in unincorporated parts of the County and 20% of the residents reside in the City of Bishop, the following disbursements will be made, **\$6,554** of RSTP funds will be apportioned to Inyo County and **\$1,639** will be apportioned to the City of Bishop.

**NOW, THEREFORE BE IN RESOLVED** that the Inyo County Local Transportation Commission approves the following:

1. The FY 2022-2023 RSTP Federal Exchange Program and State Match Program Agreement, No. X22-6134(036) with the California Department of Transportation in the amount of \$8,193.
2. **\$6,554** of RSTP funds are allocated to the County of Inyo and **\$1,639** are allocated to the City of Bishop.
3. The Executive Director is authorized to execute this agreement.

Passed and adopted this 19th day of July 2023, by the following vote:

Ayes:  
Noes:  
Abstain:  
Absent:

---

Michael Errante, Executive Director, ICLTC

Attest:

---

Secretary, ICLTC

RSTP Exchange amounts are based on apportionments distributed/adjusted between March to February.  
 FFY 2022 RSTP Exchange captured March 2021 to February 2022.  
 FFY 2023 RSTP Exchange captured March 2022 to February 2023.

**FFY 2022:**

FFY 2021 Advance vs Actual Adjustment (11/5/21):	\$	(15)
FFY 2022 Advance RSTP Flex Apportionment (12/9/21):	\$	797,486
Less FFY 2022 CTAP Adjustment:	\$	(245)
Net FFY 2022 Advance RSTP Flex Apportionment:	\$	797,241
Less FFY 2022 LS&R Needs Assessment:	\$	-
Adjusted RSTP Flex Appn available to exchange:	\$	797,226
Less County Minimum Exchange:	\$	(673,353)
FFY 2022 RTPA Exchange:	\$	123,873

**FFY 2023:**

FFY 2022 Updated Advance RSTP Flex Appn (9/21/22):	\$	(57,782)
FFY 2022 Advance vs Actual Adjustment (10/19/22):	\$	1,247
Net FFY 2022 RSTP Flex Apportionment Adjustments:	\$	(56,535)
FFY 2023 Advance RSTP Flex Apportionment (11/9/22):	\$	738,326
Less CTAP Adjustment:	\$	(245)
Net FFY 2022 Advance RSTP Flex Apportionment:	\$	738,081
Less FFY 2023 LS&R Needs Assessment:	\$	-
Adjusted RSTP Flex Appn available to exchange:	\$	681,546
Less County Minimum Exchange:	\$	(673,353)
FFY 2023 RTPA Exchange:	\$	8,193

FEDERAL APPORTIONMENT EXCHANGE PROGRAM  
CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AGENCY

District: 09  
Agency: Inyo County Transportation Commission

Agreement No. X23-6134(036)  
AMS Adv ID:0923000040

THIS AGREEMENT is made on \_\_\_\_\_, by Inyo County Transportation Commission, a Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) designated under Section 29532 of the California Government Code, and the State of California, acting by and through the Department of Transportation (STATE).

WHEREAS, RTPA desires to assign RTPA's portion of federal apportionments made available to STATE for allocation to transportation projects in accordance with Section 182.6 of the Streets and Highways Code (Regional Surface Transportation Program/Regional Surface Transportation Block Grant Program [RSTP/RSTBGP] funds) in exchange for nonfederal State Highway Account funds:

NOW, THEREFORE, the parties agree as follows:

1. As authorized by Section 182.6(g) of the Streets and Highways Code, RTPA agrees to assign to STATE the following portion of its estimated annual RSTP/RSTBGP apportionment:

\$8,193.00 for Fiscal Year 2022/2023

The above referenced portion of RTPA's estimated annual RSTP/RSTBGP apportionment is equal to the estimated total RSTP/RSTBGP apportionment less (a) the estimated minimum annual RSTP/RSTBGP apportionment set for the County under Section 182.6(d)(2) of the Streets and Highways Code, (b) any Federal apportionments already obligated for projects not chargeable to said County's annual RSTP/RSTBGP minimum apportionment, and (c) those RSTP/RSTBGP apportionments RTPA has chosen to retain for future obligation.

2. RTPA agrees the exchange for County's estimated annual RSTP/RSTBGP minimum apportionment under Section 182.6(d)(2) of the Streets and Highways Code will be paid by STATE directly to Inyo County.

---

For Caltrans Use Only

---

I hereby Certify upon my own personal knowledge that budgeted funds are available for this encumbrance

---

Accounting Officer	Date	\$
--------------------	------	----

*Jennie Yee*

3/21/2023

8,193.00



3. Subject to the availability of STATE funds following the receipt of an RTPA invoice evidencing RTPA's assignment of those estimated RSTP/RSTBGP funds under Section 1 to STATE, STATE agrees to pay to RTPA an amount not to exceed \$8,193.00 of non-federal exchange funds ("Funds") that equals the sum of the estimated RSTP/RSTBGP apportionment assigned to State in Section 1 above.

4. RTPA agrees to allocate all of these Funds only for those projects implemented by cities, counties, and other public transportation agencies as are authorized under Article XIX of the California State Constitution, in accordance with the requirements of Section 182.6(d)(1) of the Streets and Highways Code.

5. RTPA agrees to provide to STATE annually by each August 1 a list of all local project sponsors allocated Funds in the preceding fiscal year and the amounts allocated to each sponsor.

6. RTPA agrees to require project sponsors receiving those Funds provided under this AGREEMENT to establish a special account for the purpose of depositing therein all payments received from RTPA pursuant to this Agreement: (a) for cities within their Special Gas Tax Street Improvement Fund, (b) for counties, within their County Road Fund, and (c) for all other sponsors, a separate account.

7. RTPA agrees, in the event a project sponsor fails to use Funds received hereunder in accordance with the terms of this AGREEMENT, to require that project sponsor to return those exchange Funds to RTPA for credit to the account established under Section 6 above. In the event of any such requirement by STATE, RTPA shall provide written verification to STATE that the requested corrective action has been taken.

8. STATE reserves the right to reduce the STATE Funds payment required hereunder to offset such additional obligations by the RTPA or any of its sponsoring agencies against any RSTP/RSTBGP federal apportionments as are chargeable to, but not included in, the assignment made under Section 1 above.

#### 9. COST PRINCIPLES

A) RTPA agrees to comply with, and require all project sponsors to comply with Office of Management and Budget Supercircular 2 CFR 200, Cost Principles for State and Local Government and the Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Cooperative Agreements to State and Local Governments.

B) RTPA will assure that its fund recipients will be obligated to agree that (A) Contract Cost Principles and Procedures, 48 CFR, Federal Acquisition Regulations System, Chapter 1, Part 31, Et Seq., shall be used to determine the allowability of individual project cost items and (B) Those parties shall comply with Federal Administrative Procedures in accordance with 2 CFR 200, Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Cooperative Agreements To State And Local Governments. Every sub-recipient receiving funds as a contractor or sub-contractor under this agreement shall comply with Federal administrative procedures in accordance with 2 CFR 200, Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Cooperative Agreements to State and Local Governments.

C) Any fund expenditures for costs for which RTPA has received payment or credit that are determined by subsequent audit to be unallowable under Office of Management and Budget Supercircular 2 CFR 200 are subject to repayment by RTPA to STATE. Should RTPA fail to reimburse fund moneys due STATE within 30 days of demand, or within such other period as may be agreed in writing between the parties, hereto, STATE is authorized to intercept and withhold future payments due RTPA and STATE or any third-party source, including but not limited to, the State Treasurer, The State Controller and the CTC. The implementation of the Supercircular will cancel 49 Cfr Part 18.

#### 10. THIRD PARTY CONTRACTING

A) RTPA shall not award a construction contract over \$10,000 or other contracts over \$25,000 [excluding professional service contracts of the type which are required to be procured in accordance with Government Code Sections 4525 (d), (e) and (f)] on the basis of a noncompetitive negotiation for work to be performed using Funds without the prior written approval of STATE.

B) Any subcontract or agreement entered into by RTPA as a result of disbursing Funds received pursuant to this AGREEMENT shall contain all of the fiscal provisions of this Agreement; and shall mandate that travel and per diem reimbursements and third-party contract reimbursements to subcontractors will be allowable as project costs only after those costs are incurred and paid for by the subcontractors.

C) In addition to the above, the preaward requirements of third party contractor/consultants with RTPA should be consistent with Local Program Procedures as published by STATE.

#### 11. ACCOUNTING SYSTEM

RTPA, its contractors and subcontractors shall establish and maintain an accounting system and records that properly accumulate and segregate Fund expenditures by line item. The accounting system of RTPA, its contractors and all subcontractors shall conform to Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP), enable the determination of incurred costs at interim points of completion, and provide support for reimbursement payment vouchers or invoices.

#### 12. RIGHT TO AUDIT

For the purpose of determining compliance with this AGREEMENT and other matters connected with the performance of RTPA's contracts with third parties, RTPA, RTPA's contractors and subcontractors and STATE shall each maintain and make available for inspection all books, documents, papers, accounting records, and other evidence pertaining to the performance of such contracts, including, but not limited to, the costs of administering those various contracts. All of the above referenced parties shall make such materials available at their respective offices at all reasonable times for three years from the date of final payment of Funds to RTPA. STATE, the California State Auditor, or any duly authorized representative of STATE or the United States Department of Transportation, shall each have access to any books, records, and documents that are pertinent for audits, examinations, excerpts, and transactions, and RTPA shall furnish copies thereof if requested.

13. TRAVEL AND SUBSISTENCE

Payments to only RTPA for travel and subsistence expenses of RTPA forces and its subcontractors claimed for reimbursement or applied as local match credit shall not exceed rates authorized to be paid exempt non-represented State employees under current State Department of Personnel Administration (DPA) rules.

If the rates invoiced are in excess of those authorized DPA rates, then RTPA is responsible for the cost difference and any overpayments shall be reimbursed to STATE on demand.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
Department of Transportation

Inyo County Transportation Commission

By: \_\_\_\_\_

Office of Project Management Oversight  
Division of Local Assistance

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

By: \_\_\_\_\_

Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_