Drive.

The attached memo gives an example of what would happen if the County chooses to expand service on Route 5 (Commonwealth).

From having better transit service in the County, the existing service. Of course, the City's customers would gain an increase in their contribution from the General Fund. Just to fund its equal share of the FOA, the City would have to for the state and Federal funding remaining. That, an adding additional service would increase the total operating costs of operating assistance (FOA).

The problem issue arises when the County chooses to add additional routes and there is no additional state and Federal share that equally.

I think that everyone agrees that should the County add service and provide nearly 50% credit to the County for that route.

For night service (Route 24) the City has secured FARC funds contributing toward (5 and 10) they get a 40% credit.

For Route 5, the City. This year 40% of our operating costs are covered by FOA. For routes that the County Operating Assistance (FOA) as the City. The County the same share of Federal and State funding (formula). The current proposal for County funding of existing routes gives
The FY 2008 approach proposed in Table 2 below provides a 40 percent federal to the County for Route 5 and to the City receiving share with the County the FOA that

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projected FY 2008 CTS</th>
<th>Total Operating Cost in $</th>
<th>12/30/06</th>
<th>4/1/07</th>
<th>7/1/07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CTS</td>
<td>$4,255,347</td>
<td>$3,329,347</td>
<td>$2,999,344</td>
<td>$2,441,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Share</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Operating Cost</td>
<td>$2,270,456</td>
<td>$1,830,224</td>
<td>$1,601,123</td>
<td>$1,300,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Service Hours</td>
<td>13,740</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>12,060</td>
<td>11,087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTS Total Service Hours</td>
<td>27,480</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>24,120</td>
<td>22,174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Share</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 - Summary of CTS Service Operated in the County FY 2005-2007

City receives but there has not been agreement on the details of how this will be done. CTS would transfer the federal and State formula operating assistance (FOA) that the

City received. All the federal funds would remain in the County for Route 5 and to the City receiving share with the County the FOA that CTS would transfer the federal and State formula operating assistance (FOA) that the

City received. All the federal funds would remain

BACKGROUND

City received. All the federal funds would remain

However, I am not recommending this approach to sharing FOA for any County service expansion.

The approach highlighted in Table 2 below for sharing FOA with the City

Subject: Cost of Possible FY 2008 CTS Service Expansion

From: Bill Watson, CTS Manager

To: Budget Review Team

Date: January 19, 2007
Table 4 - FY 2008 Revised Cost of CTS Service to County (38.3 percent FOA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Revenue Cost</th>
<th>Credit Cost</th>
<th>Freight Cost</th>
<th>Revenue Credit</th>
<th>Freight Credit</th>
<th>Foam</th>
<th>Foam Credit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 - FY 2008 Proposed Route 5 Service Improvement (Operating and Capital)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Revenue Cost</th>
<th>Credit Cost</th>
<th>Freight Cost</th>
<th>Revenue Credit</th>
<th>Freight Credit</th>
<th>Foam</th>
<th>Foam Credit</th>
<th>CTS Service Expansion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed 50 percent credit to the county for Route 24, which is eligible for JARC funding.

By the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation (State Aid), in addition to JARCs and other federal, state, and local funds.
dollars for transit in the future. Having a pre-determined and equitable way of splitting these funds
depends on a formal vote of the city and county. We actually see some decent increases in fare and federal matching
funds and our goal is to maintain the same cut at the state and federal level on the transit service.

Outside of that, there isn't much we can do other than educating the public about the benefits of transit.

Which brings us to the open letter to the City Council. I will not read the letter in its entirety, but there are some
key points. First, the City Council is under the impression that the County will not be able to support transit
on our own. This is false. The County has never been asked to support transit on their own and they have
more than enough resources to do so.

Second, the City Council is under the impression that the County is asking for more than the County can provide.
This is also false. The County is only asking for what they have already committed to provide.

Therefore, we are calling on the City Council to support transit in the County and to support the County's plan.

The City Council has the power to make this happen, and we urge them to do so.

David

Chief, Customer Service

On 1/5/07, Kevin Lough, Adelheit Cercone, & the County Wide Transit Planning Team sent this letter:

[Letter Text]

Finally, in a related matter, I met with the IMPACT folks and talked about transit and Sunday service.

__________________________
Support additional CTS service.

Alternative: If not appropriated, the TransIt Division will not have the funding necessary to provide the planned maintenance, and customer service staff needed to fulfill its functions.

This proposal will allow CTS to implement service improvements as outlined in the TransIt Development Plan.

The City and County have agreed to an approach to costing CTS service expansion that recognizes the need to provide service not only during, but also between, maintenance, customer service, and other service intervals. This plan will allow the County to fulfill its local match for all aspects of CTS service.

Chesapeake Regional Transportation Planning Board recommends that the City and County fully implement the schedule of FY 2007. The CTS proposal for service improvements has been reviewed and approved.

Discussion: The City, County, University, and the Metropolitan Planning Organization are engaged in a study of how to make public transportation in the Chesapeake region more efficient.

Table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Service Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Route 5 &amp; 6, Cost Sharing Route 2B</td>
<td>$250,000 - funds from Albemarle County to expand</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Management:

- Leslie Beane, Manager, Budget and Performance
- Bill Whetston, Manager Public Works

Appropriation:

- July 16, 2007

Revised By:

- Judy Miller, Public Works Director

Staff Contact:

- Judy Miller, Public Works Director

Action Required:

- July 16, 2007

Agenda Date:

- July 16, 2007
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this appropriation is conditioned upon the receipt of $250,000 from Albemarele County.

$5,176
Cost Center: 2801001000
G/L Account: 511040
Fund: 246

$226,655
Cost Center: 2801001000
G/L Account: 511030
Fund: 246

$1,187
Cost Center: 2801001000
G/L Account: 511020
Fund: 246

$39,981
Cost Center: 2801001000
G/L Account: 511010
Fund: 246

$31,897
Cost Center: 2801001000
G/L Account: 510030
Fund: 246

$14,562
Cost Center: 2801001000
G/L Account: 510010
Fund: 246

$149,348
Cost Center: 2801001000
G/L Account: 432030
Fund: 245

Expenditures - $260,000

Revenue - $260,000

WHEREAS, the Charlottesville Transit Service recommends the operation of additional Charlottesville Transit Service bus routes in Albemarele County.

30.2.1.1 recommends the operation of additional Charlottesville Transit Service, Route 2B and for Charlottesville

WHEREAS, the Charlottesville Transit Development Plan, July 1, 2006 to June $260,000

Funding from Albemarele County to expand Route 5 & Cost-Share Route 2B

APPROPRIATION
### Service Hours - All Routes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Revenue HR Annual</th>
<th>(\times) 50</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$4.751 $300.269</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$4.060 $264.731</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.40 $210</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.02 $17.57</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.02 $1.771</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.35 $0.406</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.84 $0.45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Net Cost per Service Hour

- 34.64
- 4.16
- 22.89
- 4.1%
- 2.74\% Federal/State Rev.
- 66.69

### Operating Expenditures

- 67.28\% Federal Aid
- 91.2\% Operating Budget

### Historical Abemarle County Contribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Base</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY15</td>
<td>74.48%</td>
<td>74.48%</td>
<td>$6,699.972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY14</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>$7,033.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY13</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>$7,225.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY12</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>$6,800.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>$6,800.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Funded + Previously Unfunded

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route 7</th>
<th>26.26%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Route 7</td>
<td>21.74%</td>
<td>21.74%</td>
<td>$1,555.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 7</td>
<td>19.34%</td>
<td>19.34%</td>
<td>$1,059.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 7</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>$79.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Routes Served Percent of County, Not County-Funded

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route 7</th>
<th>100%</th>
<th>100%</th>
<th>$15,959.95</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Route 7</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$1,990.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 7</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$9,600.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 7</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$1,990.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 7</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$9,600.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FY15 Abemarle County Cost Allocation Estimate

24-Sep-13