

DEFINITION OF "UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS," AND "NEEDS THAT ARE REASONABLE TO MEET"

Section 99401.5(c) of the California Public Utilities Code specifies, "The transportation planning agency shall determine its definitions of the terms 'unmet transit needs' and 'reasonable to meet' for the purposes of this section which shall be documented by resolution or within the minutes of the agency."

The Council of Fresno County Governments (COFCG) defined these terms by Resolution 1990-15, adopted on June 28, 1990, as follows:

A. Unmet Transit Needs

"Those public transportation or specialized transportation services that are identified in the Regional Transportation Plan and/or documented through COFCG's Annual Unmet Transit Needs Public Hearing Process that have not been implemented or funded."

B. 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 shall not be the sole reason for finding 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 Council of Fresno County Governments 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; and
- (d) An estimated fare, which the Council of Fresno County Governments Board would determine to be sufficient to meet farebox recovery requirements but would not be so high it would pose a financial burden on transit dependent patrons.”

Note: Fresno Council of Governments (Fresno COG) was called Council of Fresno County Governments (COFCG) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) was called the Urban Mass Transportation Administration (UMTA) at the time Resolution 1990-15 was adopted.