

MADERA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

EXECUTIVE MINUTES

Date: Wednesday, May 19, 2004
Time: 2:20 P.M.
Place: Madera County Government Center,
Board of Supervisor Chambers

Members Present: Chairman Frank Bigelow - Supervisor, Madera County
Vice-Chair Gordon Skeels - Councilman, City of Madera
Alfred Ginsburg - Councilman, City of Chowchilla
Ronn Dominici – Supervisor, Madera County
Gary Svanda - Councilman, City of Madera
Gary Gilbert – Supervisor, Madera County

Members Absent: None

Policy Advisory Committee: Above Members present and Caltrans Representatives:
Alan McCuen

MCTC Staff Present: Patricia S. Taylor-Maley, Executive Director
Derek Winning, Planner II
Lester Koga, Planner I
Sheila Kingsley, Administrative Assistant

MCTC sitting as the Transportation Policy Committee.

I. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

II. PUBLIC COMMENT

This portion of the meeting is reserved for person(s) wishing to address the MCTC on items within their jurisdiction but not on this agenda.

III. TRANSPORTATION CONSENT ITEMS

A. *State Highway Operation & Protection Program (SHOPP) – Status Report*

Per MCTC's agreement with Caltrans, Caltrans on a quarterly basis submits to MCTC a status report on Caltrans' State Highway Operation and Protection Program. Included in the Boards packet was a copy of the April 2004 status report.

Action: Information and Discussion Only.

B. *TEA-21 Renewal Plan Update*

Two-month TEA-21 Extension Bill sent to President

On April 29, just one day before the TEA-21 law was set to expire for the third time, the Senate passed a two-month extension bill (H.R. 4219), sending the legislation to the President for his signature. The U.S. House of Representatives initiated the extension measure, approving it April 28th on a 410-0 vote.

This extension through June 30th follows the same rules for allocating federal highway, transit and safety funds that are now in effect. Under the measure, states and local agencies will receive a prorated share of the program funds that have been previously appropriated for Fiscal Year 2004. It is now assumed that before June 30th the next extension bill will either provide a few additional weeks to complete negotiations

on a final six-year agreement or it will extend the TEA-21 law through September 30, 2005 to coincide with the end of the next federal fiscal year (FY 05).

Congressional Leaders, White House Struggle over Funding Levels

The challenges that Congress overcame in moving this extension are modest compared to the debate that is now underway among Congressional Republican leaders and White House officials over funding totals for the six-year reauthorization bill.

Unable to settle on a compromise spending level, Republican leaders and the White House switched gears and decided to initiate formal House-Senate talks on the spending bill.

Lawmakers met with White House Chief of Staff Andrew Card and said they would turn to House and Senate negotiators to thrash out a deal on the six-year highway bill that has eluded them for months. The White House has made some concessions during the meeting and agreeing to a new \$275 billion ceiling. That apparently remains too low for lawmakers wanting more money to fix the nation's roads and boost home-state economics.

House Speaker Dennis Hastert (R-IL), hoping to avoid confrontation with the White House and possibly President Bush's first veto, has tried to reach an agreement with the administration on an overall spending number before turning over the bill to congressional negotiators.

The Senate passed a \$318 billion bill this year, while the House, under pressure from a White House veto threat agreed on \$275 billion last month. The White House has disputed that number, saying the real cost of the House bill would be \$284 billion.

President Bush and Administration officials continue to argue that deficit concerns and other budgetary priorities dictate restraint in federal transportation commitments during this renewal cycle. Senate transportation leaders and many Senators on both sides of the aisle are insisting that the Senate's \$318 billion total is a threshold spending level. There is also considerable support in the House for a stronger multi-year funding commitment. Senate Majority Leader Bill Frist (R-TN) and House Speaker Dennis Hastert (R-IL), however, have signaled their intent to work with the White House and reach an agreement on funding levels, ensuring that President Bush will not be forced to veto a conference agreement.

Decisions on Conferees, Funding Levels slated for early May

Discussions among Senate Republican leaders and the White House officials are ongoing, as the legislative calendar dictates that a decision needs to be made soon so that Congressional leaders can act upon another longer-term extension or develop a full six-year reauthorization plan. The back and forth talks which are limited to Congressional Republican leaders and White House officials has ranked Congressional Democratic leaders who fear that a decision on what the nation commits to its surface transportation infrastructure throughout the remainder of this decade will be decided without them. Moreover, there are concerns that these negotiations will set the tone for how Democratic transportation leaders will be involved in the many funding and policy decisions as a House/Senate conference committee agreement is hammered out.

In addition to the debate over funding, Senate Majority Leader Frist has indicated his intention to force action next week on the appointment of Senate conferees, a point of contention with Minority Leader Tom Daschle (D-SD) who has insisted upon firm assurances about the participation of Democrats in the conference committee deliberations.

Radanovich Announces Funds to Improve Transportation Projects in the Valley

Congressman Radanovich announced the authorization of San Joaquin Valley transportation funds in H.R. 3550, the Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy For Users" (TEA-LU), a copy of the press release was included in the Commissioner's packet. The bill was approved by a voice vote in the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure in March 2004. The 19th Congressional District received \$14 million total

in funding. The highway funds are authorized for six years. The highway allocation for Madera County is as follows:

- \$1,500,000 to improve the Avenue 12, State Route 99 interchange in Madera. This project includes creating five lanes and installing traffic signals as well as constructing a Road 29 entrance east of the interchange.

Action: Information and Discussion Only.

C. *MCTC Public Participation Plan – Resolution 04-05*

The Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21) and its predecessor, the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) requires that MCTC, as the MPO for Madera County, establish, review, and update public involvement procedures which assure early and continued public awareness of and access to the transportation decision-making process. This Public Participation Plan must not only respond to the requirements of TEA-21, but also those of related Federal legislation, which include, but are not limited to the Clean Air Act, Title VI, and the Americans with Disabilities Act.

The goal of the Public Participation Plan is to create an effective set of policies and procedures to provide complete information, timely public notice and full access to key decisions to the public. MCTC is committed in its efforts to explore ways to reach a larger audience to provide information, develop public awareness and to facilitate an enhanced level of public involvement in the decision-making process.

The Draft Public Participation Plan has undergone the required 45 day review period, initiated on February 18, 2004. To date, there have been no comments or suggestions for improvement of the Draft plan. MCTC staff recommends approval of the 2004 MCTC Public Participation Plan.

Action: Approve the MCTC Public Participation Plan by Resolution 04-05.

D. *Draft FY 2004/05 Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) Overall Goal for Madera County Transportation Commission*

The MCTC is required to establish a Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) Program in accordance with regulations of the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT), 49 CFR Part 26. MCTC is eligible to receive federal financial assistance from the DOT and as a condition of receiving this assistance, MCTC is required to sign an assurance that it will comply with 49 CFR Part 26.

The proposed policy of MCTC to ensure that DBEs, as defined in part 26, have an equal opportunity to receive and participate in DOT-assisted contracts is as follows:

- To ensure nondiscrimination in the award and administration of DOT-assisted contracts;
- To create a level playing field on which DBEs can compete fairly for DOT-assisted contracts;
- To ensure that the DBE Program is narrowly tailored in accordance with applicable law;
- To ensure that only firms that fully meet 49 CFR Part 26 eligibility standards are permitted to participate as DBEs;
- To help remove barriers to the participation of DBEs in DOT-assisted contracts; and
- To assist the development of firms that can compete successfully in the market place outside the DBE Program.

MCTC Staff has developed a DBE Overall Goal methodology consistent with Caltrans and U.S. DOT guidance. The Overall Goal for FY2004/05 for DOT assisted contracts is proposed to be set at 6.59%, which is based upon the percentage of DBE firms available to perform work in Madera County.

Action: Initiate 45-day review of MCTC FY2004/05 DBE Overall Goal.

Transportation Consent Calendar Action: Upon motion by Commissioner Gilbert, seconded by

Commissioner Dominici to approve the Transportation Consent Calendar (Items IV A-D). A vote was called and the motion carried.

IV. TRANSPORTATION ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. Public Hearing: “Unmet Transit Needs” within Madera County For FY 2004/05 – Video Conference Locations: Oakhurst Community College, North Fork Public Library and Chowchilla Public Library

A Spanish interpreter was provided for the public hearing.

Commissioner Bigelow opened the public hearing at 2:25 p.m.

Under the California Transportation Development Act, this hearing opportunity is provided annually to take testimony on potential unmet transit needs within the region. The Commission must, subsequent to the hearing, make a determination whether the needs presented are “reasonable” to meet. After all “reasonable” needs have been met through the expansion of existing services, or the creation of new transit systems, the Commission may release remaining TDA funds for street and road purposes (repair, reconstruction, etc.).

The public, interested agencies, and civic groups are encouraged to appear and state those transportation needs which they feel are not currently being met by existing transit services. Testimony should be as specific as possible with regard to those citizens, or groups of citizens, not currently served by transit, the requested type and amount of transit service, the geographic area in which service is needed, and any other supporting evidence of information which will help in the evaluation of the “reasonableness” of the requested service.

The Social Service Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC) will meet on May 26, 2004 to review the testimony from this hearing and will make their recommendation along with MCTC staff at the Commission’s next Board meeting on June 23, 2004. At that time the MCTC Policy Board must determine that public transportation needs within Madera County will be reasonably met in FY 2004/05 prior to approving claims of Local Transportation Funds for streets and roads purposes

Chairman Bigelow allowed this time for the public to comment on any unmet transit needs within Madera County.

Unmet Transit Needs written public comments where present to the Board for review. Written comments are as follows:

Mia Brown (4/22/04) Oakhurst, CA

1. Ms. Brown believes that the Senior Bus service is underutilized. One of the drivers for the Senior Bus reiterated her concern by acknowledging that the service is “hardly used.” Ms. Brown feels that opening the Senior Bus to the general public will be a better use of existing resources. She has recounted a number of instances in which she has seen a dozen or more people walking to work, whom were not elderly, thus unable to use the service.
2. Ms Brown also feels that the Oakhurst area needs a Dial-A-Ride service similar to the one in the City of Madera for general use. She cites the need for a public transit system that can take residents to work, school or shopping. She acknowledges the existence of the Escort service, but it is available only for residents who have medical appointments in the City of Fresno and Clovis. In her opinion, 50-75 Oakhurst residents would use such a service, 40% of which are transit dependent.

**Betty Lyons (4/28/04)
North Fork, CA**

1. Many residents of North Fork would benefit from more frequent Madera County Connection (MCC) service. There are currently only three stops in North Fork per day: 7:00 a.m.; 11:08 a.m.; and 7:01 p.m..

**Mary Proper (4/28/04)
Kings-View
North Fork, CA**

1. Ms. Proper works with residents of North Fork who have lost their drivers license because of DUIs. These residents become transit dependent and have difficulty working because of the limited amount of MCC service to and from the area. North Fork residents would benefit from more frequent service.

**Curtis Kirk (4/28/04)
North Fork, CA**

1. Mr. Kirk recommends more frequent MCC service to Oakhurst so residents can have better access to grocery stores and other shopping destinations. There is currently one market in North Fork, but it will run out of needed items such as toilet paper. Those residents who rely on public transportation must either find someone to drive them to Oakhurst or wait over six hours between services. If a North Fork resident wants to travel to Oakhurst to shop, the only available MCC service is at 7:00 a.m. or 11:08 a.m. In the case of a resident leaving at 11:00 a.m., a return trip is not available until 6:30 p.m. Four trips to Oakhurst would best suit North Fork residents.

**Lorraine Inaba Brueggemann (5/4/04)
Public Health Department Madera County**

1. Clients of the Public Health Department –specifically WIC – often have trouble making appointments. The most often cited reason is uncertainty of the bus schedule and the infrequency of buses. Bus schedules should be available at various locations within the Public Health Department. A one-half hour headway would better fit the needs of residents. Those patients that don't have access to MAX (walking distance is an issue for pregnant women) must resort to using Dial-A-Ride which has poor on-time performance. If patients do not have a consistent/reliable form of transportation, they will not be able to take advantage of the benefits that the WIC program provides. On average, 30% of patients do not show for their appointments; the number of no-shows due to inconsistent transit is unknown.

Public testimony present to the Board is as follows:

Jim Flanagan – North For Chambers of Commerce

1. Mr. Flanagan noted that many of the residents who submitted written Unmet Transit Needs (UTN) comments are located in the North Fork area, signifying a need for more transit service. He believes that an audit of the MCC service is needed to see if the residents of the mountain communities are being adequately served. According to Mr. Flanagan, the MCC bus does not meet the farebox requirement of 10% of total cost of the system, proving that it is not the most feasible form of transit to use in the area. The MCC suffers from poor on time performance and does not fit the needs of North Fork residents who depend on the service for work and other services. An alternative to the current MCC service is a demand response service, similar to the City of Madera's Dial-A-Ride. There are a lot of transit dependent residents in the North Fork area.

2. Mr. Flanagan believes that the current MCC brochure needs to be changed. A colorful brochure is not needed, instead a black-and-white copy would suffice and be easier to photocopy.

Donelle Ferrett - Madera Area Express (MAX) driver

1. Ms. Ferrett cites the problematic Highway 145/Highway 99 intersection as a major factor for delays to the Madera Area Express (MAX) system, especially hurting the on-time performance to the Public Health department.
2. The clean air buses—compressed natural gas (CNG)—used on the MAX fixed route system are not as powerful as regular diesel buses. According to Ms. Ferrett, the CNG buses are underpowered, thus providing slower service. She also notes that there are more maintenance problems associated with the CNG buses.
3. Ms. Ferrett believes that bus shelters are needed. It is her understanding that bus shelters are owned by the City of Madera, but they are not installing them. The MAX system must also do a better job of informing the public on schedule times and routes.
4. Timing for the MAX system needs to be changed. At the P street bust stop, the bus either goes to the Madera Community Hospital or the Public Health department. Residents located near P street must wait one hour if they miss the bus to the Public Health department. Ms. Ferrett also cites the need to allot more time on the bus schedules to board wheelchairs on MAX buses. Wheelchair passengers take time to board, which throws off the schedule. Perhaps allocating time between stops would give the drivers a better opportunity to reach bus stops on time. She believes it is better to arrive at a stop earlier as opposed to later.

Lorraine Serrano

1. Ms. Serrano is speaking on behalf of her grandmother who is 95 years old. Ms. Serrano's grandmother lives on Sunset and Granada and has problems with the Dial-A-Ride system when she wants to go to the Frank Bergon Senior Center because of poor on-time performance. Dial-A-Ride is also always late picking her up to go to medical appointments and she will purposefully make her Dial-A-Ride appointment one to two hours earlier than her actual medical appointment time to compensate for the systems poor on-time performance. Ms. Serrano's grandmother has to ride the bus for two hours just to get home on the Dial-A-Ride system, which normally only takes 10 minutes by automobile.

Jerry Oman and Joanne Foster (via Oakhurst)

1. MCC service does not have wheelchair accessibility. The Escort Service van also needs to be able to accommodate wheelchairs. Handicapped and senior residents need a wheelchair lift in the Escort van. A former driver for the Escort service had to lift wheelchair residents by hand into the van.
2. The Escort Service and Senior Bus needs to expand its boundaries since some residents are located beyond the designated limit, therefore unable to use the service.
3. The Community Action Agency's website has outdate information, including phone numbers that are years old.
4. An individual in the Oakhurst area advertised in a local paper to get a ride to Fresno a few times per week since there is no transit service that will take her to Fresno. Her contact number as listed in the paper is: 642-6415.

* Supervisor Gary Gilbert inquired about Senior Bus funding and was informed that it is funded entirely by farebox and Local Transportation Fund (LTF) dollars. He believes that the service should be expanded to include other residents who are not elderly or disabled.

Action: Receive Testimony – Information and Discussion Only.

B. Regional Transportation Plan – Regional Prioritizations of Projects

The MCTC, as the regional transportation planning agency for Madera County, is responsible for the preparation of regional transportation plans and programs that lead to the timely delivery of improvement projects along the State highway system and along the local street and road systems. A key component of this planning process is the identification and prioritization of candidate improvement projects that will benefit the region.

In August 2003, the Commission authorized MCTC staff to retain VRPA Technologies to assist with preparation of the *2004 Madera County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Prioritization of Projects Study*. Over the past six months, MCTC staff and VRPA Technologies have been working closely with City of Chowchilla, City of Madera, and Madera County engineering and planning staff to identify and evaluate candidate State highway and local street and road improvement projects as part of that study process. Results of this technical evaluation process have led to a draft priority list of regional capacity increasing projects for inclusion in the RTP.

The RTP is updated every three years; therefore projects in the Plan can change as anticipated development and funding conditions change over time. The 2004 RTP Update must be adopted by MCTC in July to meet the September 1, 2004 deadline, so time is of the essence. The draft list of priority improvement projects will also be used by MCTC to identify candidate projects that the Commission believes are the most critical to the region and present those projects as funding becomes available.

The draft priority list of projects have been reviewed with the three local agencies' policy boards and MCTC staff received comments and recommendations from the three local agencies' policy boards. In addition to the background information presented above, the presentations also included a discussion of the following:

- ◆ An assessment of available funding sources
- ◆ A description of the project evaluation process
- ◆ A comparison of project costs to available funding
- ◆ MCTC's staff recommendation regarding the priority list of projects
- ◆ Requested input from the Councils and Board of Supervisors
- ◆ A review of the next steps in the Study process

Copies of the presentation and other related materials were distributed to the local agencies' policy boards.

Three RTP Priority Project Alternatives will be presented for STIP funded projects only. The three alternatives are as follows:

1. Regional Project Priorities of Capacity Increasing Projects – allocation of 100% STIP funds
2. Regional Project Priorities of Capacity Increasing Projects considering an allocation of 65% STIP funds and the remaining 35% allocated to rehabilitation projects
3. Continue allocating STIP funding based on population share for capacity increasing projects of 65% STIP and 35% allocated to rehabilitation projects

MCTC recommends the MCTC Policy Board establish policy by approving the MCTC staff recommendation as indicated in Alternative 1 – Regional Project Priorities of Capacity Increasing Projects – allocation of 100% STIP funds consistent with the project priority list.

MCTC staff will place the resulting list of project priorities in the RTP.

There was a detailed discussion among the Board on which Alternative to choose.

Action: Upon motion by Commissioner Dominici, seconded by Commissioner Svanda to go with Alternative B – Regional Project Priorities of Capacity Increasing Projects considering an allocation of 65% STIP funds and the remaining 35% allocated to rehabilitation projects. A vote was called and the motion carried. Commission Gilbert opposed the vote. Caltrans abstained from the vote.

V. REAFFIRM ALL ACTIONS TAKEN WHILE SITTING AS THE TRANSPORTATION POLICY COMMITTEE

Action: Upon motion by Commissioner Skeels, seconded by Commissioner Gilbert to reaffirm all actions taken while sitting as the Transportation Policy Committee. A vote was called and the motion carried.

VI. ADMINISTRATIVE CONSENT ITEMS

A. Executive Minutes of March 16, 2004

Included in the Commissioner's packet was a copy of the March 16, 2004 Executive Minutes for review.

Action: Approve Executive Minutes of May 16, 2004.

B. FY 2003/04 STA Transportation Funds – Resolution 03-09 Amendment No. 02

The City of Madera requested to carryover prior Fiscal Years 2001/02 unexpended funds from the Dial-A-Ride account into Fiscal Year 2003-04 Fixed Route Bus System. The funds to be carried over total \$13,185. The amendment is as follows:

FY 2003/04 increase City of Madera Fixed Route Bus System by \$13,185

Action: Approve Resolution 03-09 Amendment No. 2.

C. Conflict of Interest – Resolution 91-01 Amendment No. 2

Included in the Commissioner's packet was a copy of the letter that was received by MCTC staff regarding Filing of State Form 700 with the County of Madera Clerk-Recorder. The County has informed the Madera County Transportation Commission that they will no longer be the filing officer for MCTC effective May 1, 2004.

Pursuant to Government Code section 87500. subsections (j), (k) and (o), those persons within MCTC organization who are required to complete Form 700 shall file their original Form 700's with a person designated as MCTC organization's "filing officer," who shall review, log in and keep the original forms for audit and/or public review. The filing officer may be the organization chair, chief executive officer, and secretary or office manager, as designated by MCTC Board of Directors or Trustees. By adopting Resolution 91-01 Amendment #2 the MCTC Policy Board designates MCTC's Administrative Assistant as the organizations "filing officer."

Action: Approve -Resolution 91-01 Amendment No. 2.

D. Final Transportation Development Act (LTF & STA) – Fund Estimates and Apportionment, LTF Resolution 04-07 and STA Resolution 04-08

Included in Commissioner's packet was a copy of the 2004/05 Transportation Development Act (TDA) Fund estimates and apportionment's for each agency.

MCTC releases preliminary TDA apportionment estimates in February of each year to provide timely budget information for the City of Madera, City of Chowchilla, and County of Madera. The State has released the population and housing estimates for California cities and counties. Included in Commissioner's packet was the final TDA apportionment and reflects the population changes.

Local Transportation Fund (LTF): On February 1, 2004, the county auditor provided MCTC an estimate of moneys to be available for apportionment and allocation during the ensuing fiscal year. The estimate for FY2004-05 is \$2,685,221. The estimate includes moneys anticipated to be deposited in the fund during the ensuing fiscal year and the unrestricted balance anticipated to be available in the fund at the end of the current fiscal year. The unrestricted balance is the balance that is neither allocated, reserved, nor retained in the fund as an unallocated apportionment pursuant to Section 6655.1. The county auditor makes an estimate from such data including those which may be furnished by the State Board of Equalization. The county auditor will furnish a revised or updated estimate of funds available when requested by MCTC staff.

State Transit Assistance (STA): Pursuant to Public Utilities Code Section 99312.7, the State Controller is directed to send a preliminary estimate of STA Funds to each transportation planning agency. For fiscal year 2004/05, there is a \$101,280,432 budgeted according to the most currently information from the Department of Finance. STA allocation estimate for the Madera County area is \$186,678.

Action: Approve Final Transportation Development Act (LTF & STA) – Fund Estimates and Apportionment, LTF Resolution 04-07 and STA Resolution 04-08.

Administrative Consent Items: Upon motion by Commissioner Dominici, seconded by Commissioner Gilbert to approve the Administrative Consent Items as presented. A vote was called and the motion carried.

VII. ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. Report of TDA allocations for Fiscal Years ended June 30, 2003 and June 30, 2002 – City of Madera and County of Madera

MCTC received the Report of Examination of the Revenues and Expenses of the Transportation Development Act (TDA) allocations for the Fiscal Years ended June 30, 2002 and June 30, 2001 for the City of Madera, and County of Madera. This report was done in accordance with Section 99245 of the Public Utilities Code by Dedekian, George & Small Accountancy Corporation.

We are pleased to report that there are no adverse findings. However, it is recommended that the local jurisdictions submit their claims in a timelier manner.

Action: Upon motion by Commissioner Gilbert, seconded by Commissioner Dominici to approve the Report of TDA allocations for Fiscal Years ended June 30, 2003 and June 30, 2002 – City of Madera and County of Madera. A vote was called and the motion carried.

B. FY 2004-05 MCTC Overall Work Program and Line Item Budget – Resolution 04-06

Included in the Commissioner's packet was the 2004-05 MCTC Overall Work Program and Line Item Budget – Final. This document is prepared annually pursuant to Caltrans. The OWP discusses the MCTC, its organizational structure, regional planning issues, and presents work element descriptions and budgets. The draft document was circulated for local agency and Caltrans review beginning in February. Comments received are reflected in the final document.

Action: Upon motion by Commissioner Gilbert, seconded by Commissioner Dominici to approve the FY 2004-05 MCTC Overall Work Program and Line Item Budget – Resolution 04-06. A vote was called and the motion carried.

VIII. Miscellaneous

A. *Items from Caltrans*

Alan McCuen reported that Caltrans current layoff process has been terminated.

B. *Items from Staff*

No items from staff.

C. *Items from Commissioners*

No Items from the Commissioners.

IX. Closed Session

Public employee performance evaluation, Pursuant to Government Code Section 54957 – Executive Director.

Report of Closed Session Actions. Pursuant to Government Code Section 54957.1 and 54957.7, any required reports of closed session actions will be made at this time.

Board went into Closed Session at 3:40 p.m.

The Board reconvened at 3:45 p.m.

This Item will be continued until next the regular Board meeting.

X. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

Next meeting set for Wednesday, June 23, 2004.

Respectfully Submitted,

Patricia S. Taylor-Maley, Executive Director
Madera County Transportation Commission