



Meeting of the Social Services Transportation Advisory Council

LOCATION

Madera County Transportation Commission
Board Room
2001 Howard Road, Suite 201
Madera, California 93637

SPECIAL NOTICE: Precautions to address COVID-19 (a.k.a the “Coronavirus”) will apply to this meeting. See below Special Notice for additional details.

DATE

April 1, 2022

TIME

1:30 PM

SOCIAL SERVICE TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COUNCIL MEMBERS

Frank Simonis, Chair	Potential Transit User Who Is Disabled
Fern Facchino	Potential Transit User 60 Years or Older
Rosalind Esqueda	Representative of a Transit Provider
Ellen Moy	Representative of a Transit Provider
Anabel Miranda	Local Social Service Provider for Persons of Limited Means
Vincent Parker	Representative of the Local Social Service Provider for Disabled
Michelle Hernandez	Representative of the Local Social Service Providers for Seniors
Alycia Falley	Representative of the Local Social Service Providers for Disabled
Olga Olivia Saucedo-Garcia	Representative of the Local Social Service Provider for Seniors

Representatives or individuals with disabilities should contact MCTC at (559) 675-0721 at least three (3) business days in advance of the meeting to request auxiliary aids or other accommodations necessary to participate in the public meeting.

Important Notice Regarding COVID 19

The meeting of April 1, 2022 will take place remotely in accordance with Government Code Section 54953(e) et seq. (AB 361), and Resolution No. 21-15 Amendment No. 6, as adopted by the Madera County Transportation Commission Policy Board on March 23, 2022. The Madera County Transportation Commission (MCTC) Board Room will be closed, and the SSTAC Members and staff will be participating in this meeting via GoToMeeting. In the interest of maintaining appropriate social distancing measures, members of the public may participate in the meeting electronically and shall have the right to observe and offer public comment during the meeting.

You are strongly encouraged to participate by joining the meeting from your computer, tablet, or smartphone.

<https://meet.goto.com/MaderaCTC/sstac-meeting>

You can also dial in using your phone.

United States: United States: [+1 \(646\) 749-3122](tel:+16467493122)

Access Code: 694-293-173

If you wish to make a comment on a specific agenda item during the meeting, please use the “Raise Hand” feature in GoToMeeting and you will be called on by the chair during the meeting. If you are participating via telephone only, you can submit your comments via email to publiccomment@maderactc.org or by calling 559-675-0721 ext. 7. Comments will be shared with the SSTAC and placed into the record at the meeting. Every effort will be made to read comments received during the meeting into the record, but some comments may not be read due to time limitations. Comments received after an agenda item will be made part of the record if received prior to the end of the meeting.

Regarding any disruption that prevents the SSTAC from broadcasting the meeting to members of the public, then (1) if public access can be restored quickly, the meeting will resume in five (5) minutes to allow re-connection of all members of the SSTAC and members of the public; or (2) if service cannot be restored quickly, the meeting shall stop, no further action shall be taken on the remaining agenda items and notice of the continued meeting will be provided.

AGENDA

At least 72 hours prior to each regular MCTC Social Services Transportation Advisory Council meeting, a complete agenda packet is available for review on the MCTC website at <http://www.maderactc.org> or at the MCTC office, 2001 Howard Road, Suite 201, Madera, California 93637. All public records relating to an open session item and copies of staff reports or other written documentation relating to items of business referred to on the agenda are on file at MCTC. Persons with questions concerning agenda items may call MCTC at (559) 675-0721 to make an inquiry regarding the nature of items described in the agenda.

INTERPRETING SERVICES

Interpreting services are not provided at MCTC's public meeting unless requested at least three (3) business days in advance. Please contact MCTC at (559) 675-0721 during regular business hours to request interpreting services.

Servicios de interprete no son ofrecidos en las juntas públicas de MCTC al menos de que se soliciten con tres (3) días de anticipación. Para solicitar éstos servicios por favor contacte a Evelyn Espinosa at (559) 675-0721 x 5 durante horas de oficina.

MEETING CONDUCT

If this meeting is willfully interrupted or disrupted by one or more persons rendering orderly conduct of the meeting unfeasible, the Chair may order the removal of individuals who are willfully disrupting the meeting. Such individuals may be arrested. If order cannot be restored by such removal, the members of the Board may direct that the meeting room be cleared (except for representatives of the press or other news media not participating in the disturbance), and the session may continue.

RECORD OF THE MEETING

SSTAC meetings are recorded. Copies of recordings are available upon request, or recordings may be listened to at the MCTC offices by appointment.

Agenda

Item	Description	Enclosure	Action
1.	Call to order		
2.	Public Comment		
3.	New Member Orientation Roles and responsibilities Handout SSTAC Bylaws	Yes	Discussion
4.	Election of Officers Vice-Chair	No	Action
5.	Approve Minutes of the January 28, 2022 SSTAC Meeting	Yes	Action
6.	Approve Minutes of the February 4, 2022 SSTAC Meeting	Yes	Action
7.	SSTAC Member Vacancies – None	No	Discussion
8.	Unmet Transit Needs Definition Comment Letter Workshop Comments Comparison Table Next Steps	Yes	Action
9.	Previous Unmet Transit Needs Comments	Yes	Discussion
10.	Discuss Future Meetings UTN timeline 2022-2023 Quarterly Schedule	Yes	Discussion
11.	Miscellaneous	No	Discussion
12.	Adjournment		

Social Service Transportation Advisory Council

MINUTES

DATE

Friday, January 28, 2022

The regular meeting of the Social Service Transportation Advisory Council held Friday, January 28, 2022 via GoToWebinar and was called to order by Chair, Frank Simonis at 1:08 pm.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Frank Simonis, Chair Potential Transit User Who Is Disabled
Ellen Moy, Representative of a Transit Provider, Madera County
Rosalind Esqueda, Representative of a Transit Provider
Anabel Miranda, Representative of a Local Social Service Provider for Persons of Limited Means
Michelle Hernandez, Representative of the Local Social Service Provider for Seniors
Alycia Falley, Representative of the Local Social Service Provider for Disabled

STAFF PRESENT:

Dylan Stone, Madera County Transportation Commission
Jeff Findley, Madera County Transportation Commission
Evelyn Espinosa, Madera County Transportation Commission
Nicholas, Dybas, Madera County Transportation Commission
Sandy Ebersole, Madera County Transportation Commission

VISITORS PRESENT:

Monty Cox, Madera County
Nathaniel Findley, Planning Intern

I: Call to Order

Meeting started at 1:08 PM.

II: Public Comment

No public comment received.

III. New Member Orientation

The roles and responsibilities Handout was read out to the council members.
Overview of the roles and responsibilities and SSTAC bylaws handouts.

IV. Election of Officers

The vice-chair selection was postponed.

V: Minutes of the July 15, 2021, SSTAC Meeting

The minutes were approved with one correction. The name of the voted Chair, Frank Simonis, was included in the minutes.

VI: SSTAC Member Vacancies

The Council was informed of the two agencies vacancies: Representative of Social Services Provider for

Disabled and Representative of Social Services Provider for Seniors. They were informed that these vacancies would be advertised with the Madera County Transportation Commission February agenda among other outreach methods to fill the vacancies.

VII: Unmet Transit Needs Definition- Continued

The Council continued reviewing the definition using the worksheet. A proposed definition was agreed upon to recommend to the MCTC Board. The Council recommended a follow up email to review the updated definition and a short meeting to approve it. The meeting was proposed to be held the following Friday, February 4th. Staff to follow up with the Council members to set the time.

Staff discussed with Council members the next steps in regards to adoption and use of the proposed definition. Staff informed the Council members know that the Proposed New Definition would be released for public comment.

VIII: Short Range Transit Development Plan

Staff gave a brief presentation of the Short-Range Transit Development Plan. Chair requested the link to www.yourmadera2046.com which was shared during the presentation to be sent via email.

IX: Madera County Coordinated Public Transit Human Services Transportation Plan

Staff gave brief presentation.

X: Discuss Future Meetings

Staff to send availability poll.

XI: Miscellaneous

No miscellaneous items were discussed.

XII: Adjournment

**THE SOCIAL SERVICES TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT
1:45 PM**

Social Service Transportation Advisory Council

MINUTES

DATE

Friday, February 4, 2022

The regular meeting of the Social Service Transportation Advisory Council held Friday, February 4, 2022 via GoToWebinar and was called to order by Chair, Frank Simonis, at 1:34 pm.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Frank Simonis, Chair, Potential Transit User Who Is Disabled
Ellen Moy, Representative of a Transit Provider, Madera County
Rosalind Esqueda, Representative of a Transit Provider
Anabel Miranda, Representative of a Local Social Service Provider for Persons of Limited Means
Michelle Hernandez, Representative of the Local Social Service Provider for Seniors
Alycia Falley, Representative of the Local Social Service Provider for Disabled

STAFF PRESENT:

Dylan Stone, Madera County Transportation Commission
Jeff Findley, Madera County Transportation Commission
Troy McNeil, Madera County Transportation Commission
Evelyn Espinosa, Madera County Transportation Commission
Nicholas, Dybas, Madera County Transportation Commission
Sandy Ebersole, Madera County Transportation Commission

VISITORS PRESENT:

Monty Cox, Madera County

I: Call to Order

Meeting started at 1:30 PM.

II: Public Comment

No public comment received.

III. Approve the new Draft Unmet Needs Definition, and recommend MCTC Policy Board approval

The Social Service Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC) recommended to forward the draft unmet needs definition for MCTC Policy Board approval.

IV. Recommend use of new definition for the 2022-23 Unmet Transit Needs, following adoption by the MCTC Policy Board

The Social Service Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC) recommended the use of the new draft unmet needs definition after it got adopted by the MCTC Policy Board.

V: Adjournment

**THE SOCIAL SERVICES TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT
1:40 PM**



March 10, 2022
Madera County Transportation Commission
2001 Howard Rd, Ste 201
Madera, CA 93637

Submitted electronically via email to: publiccomment@maderactc.org

Re: Comments on Proposed Unmet Transit Needs Definition

Dear Commissioners,

We are writing to provide feedback on MCTC's proposed unmet transit needs definition. We are grateful for the opportunity to participate in this important public process and ask that the feedback we have received from community members on the ground be taken to heart and incorporated so that all Madera County residents have access to reliable, equitable, and affordable public transportation. Most notably, we are incredibly disappointed to see that the proposed definition does not make any noteworthy changes to the existing "unmet transit needs" definition, a definition under which MCTC has determined that there were no unmet needs that were "reasonable to meet" within Madera County, the City of Chowchilla, or the City of Madera for the past several years despite consistent community feedback about the unreliability of public transit in MCTC's jurisdiction.

Madera County Transportation Commission (MCTC) must immediately alter its definition of "unmet transit needs" so that the Commission can be truly responsive to comments from the public regarding their unmet transit needs. MCTC's current definition of "unmet transit needs" only "includes all essential trip requests by transit-dependent persons for which there is no other convenient means of transportation" and for which funding is already available to meet the need, which directly contradicts the Transit Development Act's requirements for defining "reasonable to meet."¹ This definition causes harm to communities lacking sufficient public transit options and to the region at large in the following ways.

I. "Persons for Which There is no Other Convenient Means of Transportation" are Not the Only People with Unmet Transit Needs in the Region

First, the definition operates on an assumption that public transit is a last resort for mobility wherever personal vehicles are not available (i.e. "transit-dependent persons *for which there is no other convenient means of transportation*"). As you know, the San Joaquin Valley is the most polluted air basin in the United States, and is consistently in violation of EPA standards for air quality. As the coronavirus pandemic has shown us, through the significant, short-term improvements in air quality correlated with the vast reduction in vehicle miles traveled occurring during the 2020 shelter-in-place orders, a significant amount of pollution in the San Joaquin Valley stems from emissions from vehicles. Rather than solely define unmet transit needs as gaps in access to essential services where no other option is available, MCTC should recognize *all*

¹ ["Transportation Development Act: Statutes and California Codes of Regulations,"](#) CalTrans, May 2003. Pg. 113, section (3)(c).

unmet transit needs in order to address *all* gaps in services that have widespread community acceptance, and move forward towards creating an effective transit system that encourages ridership and reduces vehicle miles traveled in the region. This recommendation is consistent with goal number nine from the current Regional Transportation Plan which commits “to protect the environment and health of our residents by improving air quality and encouraging active transportation,” as well as goal number two which aims to “promote intermodal transportation systems that are fully accessible” (pg. 1-8, 1-9). Beyond the air quality benefits of reducing emissions from single passenger vehicles, we believe that planning transit infrastructure that is well designed based on community input surrounding *all* residents’ needs will draw in greater ridership, thus bringing in more fare revenue to the transit system for a greater return on investments in these programs.

II. Unmet Transit Needs Go Beyond “Essential Trip Requests”

Second, the proposed definition limits MCTC’s understanding of “unmet transit needs” to “essential trip requests by transit-dependent persons.” Furthermore, MCTC has not proposed a definition for “essential trip requests,” thus making the unmet transit needs definition unclear, and further limiting the Commission’s understanding of “unmet transit needs.” Transit-dependent persons and *all* Madera County residents have the right to live full lives that are not solely limited to their homes and to essential services.

III. MCTC’s Definition of Unmet Transit Needs is Too Narrow

Third, as indicated by the issues highlighted above, the current definition is unreasonably narrow. In fact, the Commission’s working definition is so narrowly crafted that it allowed MCTC to determine that none of the public comments received in the last three years’ Unmet Transit Needs process qualified as “unmet needs” that were “reasonable to meet.” These needs included requests for additional bus stops along existing routes, increased frequency of existing routes, improvements to the Dial-a-Ride hotline to make it more consistent, user-friendly, and language-accessible, hygiene improvements to buses, clear signage on buses and bus stops, and pursuit of additional funding to explore innovations to rural transit for unincorporated communities. All of these comments constitute clear needs related to the accessibility, reliability, and effectiveness of the region’s transit system, yet, under this definition, MCTC has determined that “there are no unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet within the jurisdiction of the City of Madera, County of Madera, and City of Chowchilla” for the past several years.

As a result of these three issues with the working definition of “unmet transit needs,” the definition must be amended to include *all* unmet transit needs of Madera County residents that are reasonable to meet.

IV. MCTC Must Alter the Criteria for Needs that are “Reasonable to Meet”

In addition to changing the definition of “unmet transit needs,” the Commission must alter the criteria being used to determine if a need is “reasonable to meet” in the following ways in order to honor this important public process, meaningfully respond to comments, and work towards accomplishing the goals defined in the Regional Transportation Plan:

- A. The Commission must define “feasible.”
- B. The Commission must define what constitutes serving a “significant number of the population.” Furthermore, the definition of “significant number of the population”

should be based on projected ridership should the unmet needs outlined in public comments be met, rather than on current ridership numbers.

- C. Regarding criteria (4) which indicates that unmet needs which are reasonable to meet must be “economical,” MCTC must publish and present updates to the public to demonstrate that the Commission is making every effort to pursue all relevant funding sources at the regional, state, and federal level that could meet the unmet needs addressed in residents’ comments in an economically feasible way.

Furthermore, according to CalTrans, under the Transit Development Act of 1971, *“the fact that an identified transit need cannot be fully met based on available resources shall not be the sole reason for finding that a transit need is not reasonable to meet.”*² MCTC’s proposed definition for “reasonable to meet” directly contradicts this requirement because the primary funding-related criteria in the proposed definition reads: *“The proposed service can be provided with available Transportation Development Act (TDA) funding and/or other funding sources (per State law, the lack of available resources shall not be the sole reason for finding that a transit need is not reasonable to meet).”*

Please do not hesitate to reach out should you have any questions regarding our comments or your unmet transit needs process requirements under the Transportation Development Act.

Gratefully,

Madeline Harris
Regional Policy Manager

Leticia Casillas Luquin
Policy Advocat

² [“Transportation Development Act: Statutes and California Codes of Regulations,”](#) CalTrans, May 2003. Pg. 113, section (3)(c).

Current Definition	SSTAC Recommended Definition	Updated Proposed Definition
<p>The Madera County Transportation Commission has determined that its definition of the term “unmet transit needs” includes all essential trip requests by transit-dependent persons for which there is no other convenient means of transportation.</p>	<p>The Madera County Transportation Commission adopted the following definitions for its Unmet Transit Needs process: <u>UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS</u>: The term “unmet transit needs” includes all essential trip requests by transit-dependent persons for which there are no other convenient means of transportation.</p>	<p>The Madera County Transportation Commission adopted the following definitions for its Unmet Transit Needs process: <u>UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS</u>: An unmet transit need is an expressed or identified need that is not currently being met through existing public transportation services. An unmet transit need also is a need required to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).</p>
<p>The Commission has determined that its definition of the term “reasonable to meet” shall apply to all related public or specialized transportation services that:</p>	<p><u>REASONABLE TO MEET</u>: The term “reasonable to meet” shall apply to public or specialized transportation services that meet the following minimum criteria:</p>	<p><u>REASONABLE TO MEET</u>: The term “reasonable to meet” shall apply to public or specialized transportation services that meet the following minimum criteria:</p>
<p>Are feasible;</p>	<p><u>Feasibility</u></p>	<p><u>Feasibility</u></p>
	<p>The proposed service can be provided with available Transportation Development Act (TDA) funding and/or other funding sources (per State law, the lack of available resources shall not be the sole reason for finding that a transit need is not reasonable to meet).</p> <p>Sufficient ridership potential exists for new, expanded, or revised transit services.</p> <p>The proposed transit service will be safe and comply with local, State and federal law.</p>	<p>The proposed service can be provided with available Transportation Development Act (TDA) funding and/or other funding sources (per State law, the lack of available resources shall not be the sole reason for finding that a transit need is not reasonable to meet per PUC § 99401.5 (c).</p> <p>Sufficient ridership potential exists for the new, expanded, or revised transit service.</p> <p>The proposed transit service complies with local, State, and federal law.</p>
<p>Have community acceptance;</p>	<p><u>Community Acceptance</u></p>	<p><u>Community Acceptance</u></p>
	<p>The proposed transit service has community support from the general public, community groups, and/or community leaders.</p>	<p>The proposed transit service has community support from the general public, community groups, and/or community leaders.</p>
<p>Serve a significant number of the population;</p>	<p><u>Benefit to Population</u></p>	<p><u>Benefit to Population</u></p>
	<p>The proposed transit service serves a significant number of residents where it is needed and would benefit the general public and/or senior and disabled persons as a whole.</p>	<p>The proposed transit service serves a significant number of residents where it is needed and would benefit the general public and/or senior and disabled persons as a whole.</p>
<p>Are economical; and</p>	<p><u>Cost-Effective</u></p>	<p><u>Cost-Effective</u></p>

<p>Can demonstrate cost effectiveness by having a ratio of fare revenues to operating costs at least equal to 10 percent.</p>	<p>The proposed transit service will not affect the ability of the overall system of the implementing agency or agencies to meet the applicable transit system performance objectives or the State farebox ratio requirement after any exemption(s) period(s) if the service is eligible for an exemption(s).</p>	<p>The proposed transit service will not affect the ability of the overall system of the implementing agency or agencies to meet applicable transit system performance objectives or the State farebox ratio requirement after any exemption(s) period(s) if the service is eligible for an exemption(s).</p>
		<p>The proposed transit service, if implemented or funded, would not cause the responsible operator to incur expenditures in excess of the maximum amount of LTF, STA, FTA funds, and fare revenues and local support.</p>
	<p><u>Consistent with Intent of Existing Transit Service(s)</u></p>	<p><u>Consistent with Intent of Existing Transit Service(s) and Plans</u></p>
	<p>Once established, the proposed transit service will not abuse or obscure the intent of existing transit service(s).</p>	<p>Once established, the proposed transit service will not abuse or obscure the intent of existing transit service(s).</p>
		<p>The proposed transit need should be in conformance with the goals included in the Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy, and consistent with the intent of the goals of the adopted Short Range Transit Plan.</p>

Note: Proposed Changes in **Bold**

Analysis of Comments Received During the FY 21/22 Unmet Transit Needs Process

Comment #	Agency Affiliation	Transit Service/Jurisdiction	Public Comments	Is it an "Unmet Transit Need"	If identified as an "Unmet Transit Need", is it "Reasonable to Meet"	Notes
Comments submitted via phone						
1	City of Madera	Madera Metro	A bus stop is needed at Roosevelt and Olive across from Sierra Vista Elementary.			
2	City of Madera	Madera Metro	There is currently a bus stop on Sunrise between A and Vineyard, a bus shelter is needed for shade and protection from inclement weather.			
3	City of Madera	Madera Metro	There is currently a bus stop at Olive and Martin near Planet Fitness, a bus shelter is needed for shade and protection from inclement weather.			
Comments submitted via public comment email						
4	County	MCC/Eastern Madera County	Why isn't YARTS year-round on HWY 41? We live in Coarsegold, near YLP. If you don't have a car, unable to get to Oakhurst or Fresno.			
Comments submitted via Unmet Transit Needs Online Survey						
5	ALL	Madera Metro, DAR, Chowchilla Area Transit, Madera County Connection	More on-time schedules.			
6	ALL	Madera Metro, DAR, Chowchilla Area Transit, Madera County Connection	Not being skipped by dial-a-ride			
Comments from Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability						
7	City of Madera	Madera Metro	Transit users in the City of Madera report up to one hour wait times for buses on occasion, and expressed the need for routes in the City of Madera to run more frequently.			

8	ALL	ALL	Residents and transit users report a need to expand rate assistance programs to provide free rides to people who are unable to pay their bus fare but who have transit needs nonetheless. This need was raised during the COVID-19 pandemic, during which many transit users have experienced additional financial hardships.
9	County	County	Residents and transit users report a need for street lighting in La Vina and Fairmead to ensure transit users' first and last miles are safely lit.
10	City of Madera	Madera Metro	Residents and transit users continue to elevate the need for wastebaskets at bus stops in the City of Madera.
11	County	County	Residents and transit users in unincorporated communities have identified streets that need repavement and clean mobility infrastructure like sidewalks, crosswalks, and street lighting in order to facilitate their first and last miles, and thus, their use of public transit. A few examples that were elevated in our conversations were sidewalks and street lighting along Avenue 9 and within the subdivision of homes located in La Vina, and road repavement to Rd 26 in Madera Acres, Rd 29 in Parksdale, and Valerie Avenue in Madera Acres.
12	ALL	ALL	Resident and transit users report the need for electronic bus signs on buses and at bus stops. At bus stops, an electronic sign should indicate the estimated time of arrival of the bus and its destination along its current route, and electronic signs on the buses should confirm the direction in which the bus is travelling along its route with its final destination. Residents report that this will greatly improve the user-friendliness of public transit in Madera County and encourage ridership.

13 Madera County Connection MCC/Eastin Arcola-Ripperdan-La Vina Residents and transit users in La Vina continue to elevate the need for more frequent routes between La Vina and the City of Madera. Currently, the bus only runs on Wednesdays and Fridays, leaving transit-dependent persons with no other means of transportation without access to basic amenities (including healthcare, food, and other emergency services) most days of the week.

14 Madera County Connection MCC/Chowchilla-Fairmead Lastly, residents and transit users in Fairmead have elevated the need to continue working towards installation of a second bus stop in Fairmead. As we understand it, the status of this project is pending collaboration between the Fresno EOC and Madera County Public Works. We ask that MCTC direct these agencies to continue their work on this project as soon as possible, and oversee progress to ensure this project stays on track.

15 Madera County Transportation Commission Madera County Transportation Commission Lastly, our organization requests a breakdown of transportation funding (whether from general fund dollars, local tax revenue, grant funding, or any other source of revenue) and expenditures on transportation and transit-related projects during the past two years in Madera County, the City of Madera, and the City of Chowchilla. This will be helpful in order for us to better understand the transportation and transit projects MCTC & other relevant agencies in Madera County have prioritized with the funding that has been available in the last few years.

UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS

Public Comment Process

There will be a PUBLIC HEARING on Wednesday, April 20, 2022 at 3:00 pm at the Madera County Board Chambers at 200 West 4th St, 1st Floor, Madera CA 93637 for public comments on public transit needs in Madera County.

Please register here to participate virtually:

<https://attendee.gotowebinar.com/register/1681053644796044048>

If you wish to call in, you will be in listen only mode unless you register and join online. Listen only phone:

213-929-4221

877-309-2074 (toll free)

Access code: 657-098-138

To participate via telephone only,
submit comments via email to
publiccomment@maderactc.org or
call 559-675-0721 ext. 7

Attendance is not mandatory for participation. If you are unable to attend the GoToWebinar hearing, please send written comments to:

2001 Howard Road, Suite 201
Madera, CA 93637

Or email: evelyn@maderactc.org

Or call: 559-675-0721 ext. 5



NECESIDADES DE TRÁNSITO NO SATISFECHAS

Proceso de comentario público

Habrà una AUDIENCIA PÚBLICA el miércoles 20 de abril de 2022 a las 3:00 p. m. en las Cámaras de la Junta del Condado de Madera en 200 West 4th St, 1st Floor, Madera CA 93637 para comentarios públicos sobre las necesidades de transporte público en el Condado de Madera.

Regístrese aquí para participar virtualmente:

<https://attendee.gotowebinar.com/register/1681053644796044048>

Si desea llamar, estará en modo de solo escuchar a menos que se registre y se una en línea. Para solo escuchar:

213-929-4221

877-309-2074 (gratuito)

Código de acceso 657-098-138

Para participar solo por telefono, envíe comentarios a:

publiccomment@maderactc.org o

llame al 559-675-0721 ext. 7

Ir en persona no es obligatorio para participar. Si no puede asistir a la audiencia de GoToWebinar, envíe sus comentarios por escrito a:

2001 Howard Road, Suite 201

Madera, CA 93637

O correo: evelyn@maderactc.org

Or llame: 559-675-0721 ext. 5



Current Definition	SSTAC Recommended Definition	Updated Proposed Definition
<p>The Madera County Transportation Commission has determined that its definition of the term “unmet transit needs” includes all essential trip requests by transit-dependent persons for which there is no other convenient means of transportation.</p>	<p>The Madera County Transportation Commission adopted the following definitions for its Unmet Transit Needs process: <u>UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS</u>: The term “unmet transit needs” includes all essential trip requests by transit-dependent persons for which there are no other convenient means of transportation.</p>	<p>The Madera County Transportation Commission adopted the following definitions for its Unmet Transit Needs process: <u>UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS</u>: An unmet transit need is an expressed or identified need that is not currently being met through existing public transportation services. An unmet transit need also is a need required to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).</p>
<p>The Commission has determined that its definition of the term “reasonable to meet” shall apply to all related public or specialized transportation services that:</p>	<p><u>REASONABLE TO MEET</u>: The term “reasonable to meet” shall apply to public or specialized transportation services that meet the following minimum criteria:</p>	<p><u>REASONABLE TO MEET</u>: The term “reasonable to meet” shall apply to public or specialized transportation services that meet the following minimum criteria:</p>
<p>Are feasible;</p>	<p><u>Feasibility</u></p>	<p><u>Feasibility</u></p>
	<p>The proposed service can be provided with available Transportation Development Act (TDA) funding and/or other funding sources (per State law, the lack of available resources shall not be the sole reason for finding that a transit need is not reasonable to meet).</p> <p>Sufficient ridership potential exists for new, expanded, or revised transit services.</p> <p>The proposed transit service will be safe and comply with local, State and federal law.</p>	<p>The proposed service can be provided with available Transportation Development Act (TDA) funding and/or other funding sources (per State law, the lack of available resources shall not be the sole reason for finding that a transit need is not reasonable to meet per PUC § 99401.5 (c).</p> <p>Sufficient ridership potential exists for the new, expanded, or revised transit service.</p> <p>The proposed transit service complies with local, State, and federal law.</p>
<p>Have community acceptance;</p>	<p><u>Community Acceptance</u></p>	<p><u>Community Acceptance</u></p>
	<p>The proposed transit service has community support from the general public, community groups, and/or community leaders.</p>	<p>The proposed transit service has community support from the general public, community groups, and/or community leaders.</p>
<p>Serve a significant number of the population;</p>	<p><u>Benefit to Population</u></p>	<p><u>Benefit to Population</u></p>
	<p>The proposed transit service serves a significant number of residents where it is needed and would benefit the general public and/or senior and disabled persons as a whole.</p>	<p>The proposed transit service serves a significant number of residents where it is needed and would benefit the general public and/or senior and disabled persons as a whole.</p>
<p>Are economical; and</p>	<p><u>Cost-Effective</u></p>	<p><u>Cost-Effective</u></p>

<p>Can demonstrate cost effectiveness by having a ratio of fare revenues to operating costs at least equal to 10 percent.</p>	<p>The proposed transit service will not affect the ability of the overall system of the implementing agency or agencies to meet the applicable transit system performance objectives or the State farebox ratio requirement after any exemption(s) period(s) if the service is eligible for an exemption(s).</p>	<p>The proposed transit service will not affect the ability of the overall system of the implementing agency or agencies to meet applicable transit system performance objectives or the State farebox ratio requirement after any exemption(s) period(s) if the service is eligible for an exemption(s).</p>
		<p>The proposed transit service, if implemented or funded, would not cause the responsible operator to incur expenditures in excess of the maximum amount of LTF, STA, FTA funds, and fare revenues and local support.</p>
	<p><u>Consistent with Intent of Existing Transit Service(s)</u></p>	<p><u>Consistent with Intent of Existing Transit Service(s) and Plans</u></p>
	<p>Once established, the proposed transit service will not abuse or obscure the intent of existing transit service(s).</p>	<p>Once established, the proposed transit service will not abuse or obscure the intent of existing transit service(s).</p>
		<p>The proposed transit need should be in conformance with the goals included in the Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy, and consistent with the intent of the goals of the adopted Short Range Transit Plan.</p>

Note: Proposed Changes in **Bold**