

BEFORE THE  
COUNCIL OF FRESNO COUNTY GOVERNMENTS  
RESOLUTION 90-15

In the Matter of	)	RESOLUTION DEFINING
	)	"UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS"
TRANSPORTATION DEVELOP-	)	AND "REASONABLE TO
MENT ACT OF 1971	)	MEET"
	)	

WHEREAS, California Public Utilities Code, Section 99401.5 requires that the Council of Fresno County Governments, as the regional transportation planning agency, determine definitions of "unmet transit needs" and "reasonable to meet" as the basis for consideration of Unmet Transit Needs Findings;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Council of Fresno County Governments hereby determines the following definitions:

Unmet Transit Needs

"Those public transportation or specialized transportation services that are identified in the Regional Transportation Plan and/or documented through the COFCG's annual unmet transit needs public hearing process that have not been implemented or funded."

Reasonable to Meet

"Those public transportation services identified in the Regional Transportation Plan, or proposed amendment thereto, which meet the following criteria:

- (1) Services which, if implemented or funded, would not cause the responsible operator or service claimant to exceed its appropriations limitation as set forth by Proposition 4 (Gann Limit).
- (2) Services which, if implemented or funded, would not cause the responsible operator to incur expenditures in excess of the maximum amount of:
  - (a) Local Transportation Funds and State Transit Assistance Funds which may be available for such operator to claim;
  - (b) Urban Mass Transportation Administration (UMTA) funds or other support for public transportation services which are committed by Federal and/or State agencies by formula or tentative approval of specific grant requests; and
  - (c) Farebox and local funding in compliance with PUC Section 99268 et.seq.

The fact that an identified need cannot fully be met based on available resources, however, shall not be the sole reason for finding that a transit need is not reasonable to meet.

- (3) Services which, if implemented or funded, would result in the responsible operator or service claimant meeting the farebox recovery and local support requirements as set forth by PUC Section 99268 et. seq. Evaluation of existing operators shall be based on records provided to COFCG by operators pursuant to the Transit Productivity Evaluation Process (PUC Section 99244).

Evaluation of proposed new service shall be based upon a feasibility analysis which includes, but is not limited to:

- (a) Forecast of anticipated ridership if service is provided.
- (b) Estimate of capital and operating costs for the provision of such services.
- (c) Estimate of fares and local support in relation to estimated operating costs for providing such services.
- (d) An estimated fare which the COFCG Board would determine to be sufficient to meet farebox recovery requirements, but would not be so high that it would pose a financial burden on transit dependent patrons.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that these definitions remain in effect until such time a change is warranted.


THE FOREGOING RESOLUTION was passed and adopted by the Council of Fresno County Governments this 28th day of June, 1990.

AYES: Clovis, Fowler, Fresno, Fresno County, Huron, Kerman, Mendota, Orange Cove, Parlier, Reedley, San Joaquin, Sanger & Selma

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Coalinga, Firebaugh and Kingsburg

Signed:   
Lawrence R. Wilder, President

ATTEST:

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of a resolution of the Council of Fresno County Governments duly adopted at a regular meeting thereof held on the 28th day of June, 1990.

Signed:   
William Briam, Executive Director