

No. 515-15

**Resolution of the  
Tuolumne County Transportation Council  
Readopting Definitions of “Unmet Transit Needs” and  
“Unmet Transit Needs that are Reasonable to Meet”**

- Whereas,** pursuant to Article 8, Section 99401.5, of the Public Utilities Code, as Tuolumne County’s Regional Transportation Planning Agency, the Tuolumne County Transportation Council (TCTC) is mandated to consider and make findings regarding the adequacy of existing transportation services throughout the Tuolumne County Region on an annual basis; and,
- Whereas,** pursuant to Article 8, Section 99401.5(c), of the Public Utilities Code, the TCTC is mandated to adopt definitions of "Unmet Transit Needs" and criteria for determining “Unmet Transit Needs that are Reasonable to Meet”; and,
- Whereas,** the original unmet transit needs definitions and reasonable to meet criteria were adopted by the TCTC in August 1992 through Resolution No. 97; and,
- Whereas,** in April 1997, the TCTC adopted Resolution No. 161-97, which revised the definitions of “Unmet Transit Needs” and the “Reasonable to Meet” criteria to provide more clarity in the standards to be used in determining unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet and to incorporate Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) conformity regulations to the definitions; and,
- Whereas,** in April 2004, the TCTC reviewed the existing definitions and criteria, determined no changes were needed and readopted them through Resolution 301-04, and again in 2010 through Resolution 428-10; and,
- Whereas,** the TCTC desires to continue to review the unmet transit needs definitions and reasonable to meet criteria every few years to provide new members input in the process and determine if revisions are warranted; and
- Whereas,** the TCTC Social Services Advisory Committee have reviewed Resolution 428-10 and recommends the TCTC readopt the existing definitions and criteria with no changes; and,
- Whereas,** the TCTC Technical Advisory Committee and Citizens Committee have reviewed Resolution 428-10 and also recommend the TCTA readopt the existing definitions and criteria with no changes.

**Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved** that the Tuolumne County Transportation Council defines “Unmet Transit Needs” as, “Public transit services not currently provided for persons who rely on public transit to maintain independence, participate in their community, reach employment and other services.”

**Be It Further Resolved** that the Tuolumne County Transportation Council defines “Unmet Transit Needs” to specifically include:

- 1) Transit or specialized transportation needs identified in Tuolumne County’s Americans with Disabilities Act Paratransit Plan which are not yet implemented or funded; and
- 2) Transit or specialized transportation needs identified and proven by the Social Services Transportation Advisory Council through testimony or reports which are not yet implemented or funded.

**Be It Further Resolved** that the Tuolumne County Transportation Council defines “Unmet Transit Needs” to specifically exclude:

- 1) Minor operational improvements or changes, involving issues such as bus stops, schedules and minor route


- changes;
- 2) Improvements funded or scheduled for implementation in the following fiscal year;
  - 3) Trips for any purpose outside of Tuolumne County; and
  - 4) Future transportation needs.

**Be It Further Resolved** that the Tuolumne County Transportation Council's findings of "Unmet Transit Needs that are Reasonable to Meet" will be based on analysis using the following criteria:

- A) *Cost Effectiveness.* 1) The new, expanded or revised transit service, if implemented or funded, would not cause the responsible operator or service claimant to incur expenses in excess of the maximum allocation of Transportation Development Act funds. 2) The new, expanded or revised transit service, if implemented or funded, would allow the responsible operator or service claimant to meet the required farebox revenue to operating cost ratios.
- B) *Community Acceptance.* Support exists for the public subsidy of the new, expanded or revised transit service, as indicated through the public hearing process or other means of communication.
- C) *Equity.* 1) The new, expanded or revised transit service is needed by, and will benefit, either the general public or the elderly and disabled population as a whole. Transit service cannot be provided for a specific subset of these groups. 2) Complimentary paratransit services cannot exceed the level of service provided to the general public.
- D) *Operational Feasibility.* 1) The new, expanded or revised transit service must be safe to operate and there must be adequate roadways and turnouts for transit vehicles. 2) Potential providers are available to implement the service.
- E) *Financial Feasibility.* 1) Supporting data indicates sufficient ridership and revenue potential exists for the new, expanded or revised transit service to meet or exceed the required farebox revenue to operating cost ratios on a stand alone basis.
- F) *ADA Conformity.* The new, expanded or revised transit service, in conforming with the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act, will not impose an undue financial burden on the transit operator or claimant if complementary paratransit services are subsequently required.
- G) *System Impact.* The effect of the new, expanded or revised transit service on the overall system's measures of efficiency and effectiveness, such as the cost per passenger trip, cost per vehicle service hour, passenger trips per vehicle service hour, passenger trips per service mile, on-time performance and vehicle service hours per employee shall not be significantly adversely impacted.
- H) *Impact Limits.* Implementation of the new, expanded or revised transit service will be considered reasonable if the projected average cost per trip, by type of service, can be provided at a cost no higher than 10% above the average cost per passenger trip, by type of service, of the overall transit system.

**Passed and Adopted** by the Tuolumne County Transportation Council this 11<sup>th</sup> day of February 2015 by the following vote:

**Ayes:** John Gray, Mike Ayala, Ron Stearn, Evan Royce, Bill Canning  
**Noes:** None  
**Absent:** None

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Michael Ayala, Chair

**Attest:**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Darin C. Grossi, Executive Director