AGENDA
1:30 pm, Tuesday, April 13, 2010

NOTE LOCATION THIS MONTH:
United Way, 1220 41st Avenue, Capitola

1. Call to Order
2. Introductions
3. Oral Communications
   The Committee will receive oral communications during this time on items not on today’s agenda. Presentations must be within the jurisdiction of the Committee, and may be limited in time at the discretion of the Chair. Committee members will not take action or respond immediately to any Oral Communications presented, but may choose to follow up at a later time, either individually, or on a subsequent Committee agenda.
4. Additions or deletions to consent and regular agendas

CONSENT AGENDA

All items appearing on the consent agenda are considered to be minor or non-controversial and will be acted upon in one motion if no member of the E&D TAC or public wishes an item be removed and discussed on the regular agenda. Members of the E&D TAC may raise questions, seek clarification or add directions to Consent Agenda items without removing the item from the Consent Agenda as long as no other E&D TAC member objects to the change.

5. Approve Minutes from February 9, 2010 meeting
6. Receive Transportation Development Act Revenues Report as of March 2010
7. Receive RTC Highlights from February – April 2010
8. Letter from E&D TAC to the City of Capitola regarding support of their Caltrans grant application for pedestrian, bicycle and transit planning
9. Approve renewal application for Catherine Patterson Valdez for Community Bridges/Lift Line member position
10. Approve application for Kirk Ance for Community Bridges/Lift Line alternate position
11. Information Items (may be circulated at meeting)
12. Receive Agency Updates (other than items on the regular agenda)
   a. Volunteer Center
      - FY 09-10 Second Quarter Report
   b. Community Bridges/CTSA
      - March 2010 (all) Lift Line Program Report
      - 3/10/10 Letter regarding Out of County Medical Program vehicles
c. Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (METRO)
   - ParaCruz Operations Status Report: March 2010
   - ParaCruz Taxi Subcontractor report
   - ParaCruz New Vehicle Contract report

d. Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission

e. Private Operators

REGULAR AGENDA

13. Support for 211 System – United Way Staff


14.A. METRO’s Revised Discount Fare Policy – Metro Staff

15. Approve Volunteer Center’s FY 2010-11 Transportation Development Act Claim – Volunteer Center Staff

16. Approve Community Bridges’ FY 2010-2011 Transportation Development Act Claim – Community Bridges Staff

17. Approve Metro Transit District’s FY 2010-2011 Transportation Development Act Claim – Metro Staff


20. Consider Recommendations to RTC for New E&D TAC Member/Alternate Applications Received - Chair

21. Adjourn

Next meeting: Tuesday, June 8, 2010 at 1:30 pm. RTC office, 1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz (items: Elect Chair/Vice Chair, MORE Program Presentation, Bus Stop Improvements)

HOW TO REACH US
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA 95060
Phone: (831) 460-3200 / fax (831) 460-3215
Email: info@sccrtc.org / website: www.sccrtc.org

ACCOMMODATIONS FOR PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES
The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission does not discriminate on the basis of disability and no person shall, by reason of a disability, be denied the benefits of its services, programs, or activities. This meeting location is an accessible facility. If you wish to attend this meeting and require special assistance in order to participate, please contact RTC staff at 460-3200 (CRS 800/735-2929) at least three working days in advance of this meeting to make arrangements. People with disabilities may request a copy of the agenda in an alternative format. As a courtesy to those person affected, please attend the meeting smoke and scent-free.

SERVICIOS DE TRADUCCIÓN/TRANSLATION SERVICES
Si gusta estar presente o participar en esta junta de la Comisión Regional de Transporte del condado de Santa Cruz y necesita información o servicios de traducción al español por favor llame por lo menos con tres días laborables de
anticipo al (831) 460-3200 para hacer los arreglos necesarios. (Spanish language translation is available on an as needed basis. Please make advance arrangements (at least three days in advance by calling (831) 460-3200.
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission's
Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee
Social Service Transportation Advisory Council
Paratransit Advisory Council Meeting

MINUTES-DRAFT
Thursday, February 9, 2009

1. Call to Order

John Daugherty called the meeting to order at 1:32 pm

2. Introductions

Members Present:
Hal Anjo, Social Service Provider-Seniors (County)
Lisa Berkowitz, CTSA-Community Bridges
Sharon Barbour, 5th District
John Daugherty, Metro
Veronica Elsea, 3rd District
Sally French, Social Service Provider - Disabled (Hope Services)
Clay Kempf, Seniors Council
Mike Molesky, Social Service Provider - Disabled
Catherine Patterson Valdez, Community Bridges

Excused Absences:
Debbi Brooks, Volunteer Center
Tom Crain, Potential Transit User (Disabled)

Others Present:
Charlie Dixon
Harlan Glatt, Metro
MaryLou Goeke, United Way
Theresa Rogerson, County Health Services, CTSC
Majid Yamin, City of Scotts Valley

Staff Present:
Cory Caletti
Cathy Judd
Karena Pushnik

3. Oral Communications

Cory Caletti presented the draft online version of the Hazard Report Form for both bicycle and pedestrian hazards. She requested feedback from E&D TAC members by Friday, February 12th. She pointed out the features of the form including the ability to insert a picture. Cory said that the second phase could include monitoring feedback from the local jurisdictions and informing members of the public on actions taken. She addressed the RTC’s role as a clearinghouse for the hazard reports saying that often individuals are confused about the location of the hazard... The RTC facilitates this reporting process so that the complaint is submitted to the correct department, jurisdiction or agency.

Lisa Berkowitz told members about classes presented by the Caregiver Action Group available at Cabrillo College Extension from March through May and open to family caregivers or career minded individuals. Individuals will be certified once they have completed all four of the classes.
Lisa also announced the 4th annual Meals on Wheels coin drive which is happening through the end of February. Donations can be made at any Bay Federal Bank branch in the County.

Catherine Patterson Valdez let members know that the steering committee for the Access to Health Care is a direct outcome of the Mobility Outreach and Education Project (MORE) and they are offering transportation, medication, and housing services for individuals with cancer living in the Salinas area.

John Daugherty said that a lawsuit between the California Department of Transportation and Californians with Disabilities Rights along with others has been settled with an agreement to budget more funding for access improvements throughout the state.

Charlie Dixon informed members that the Arana Gulch Master Plan including ADA trails will go before the Coastal Commission in March on the 10th, 11th or 12th. He requested that Chair John Daugherty and Vice-chair Tom Crain testify in support of elderly and disabled access before the Coastal Commission at that meeting. In light of the committee’s earlier position of support for the Master Plan, he supplied sample letters and requested members to submit them individually to the Coastal Commission in support of the Arana Gulch Master Plan by Tuesday, February 16th.

Karena Pushnik informed members that the cover story for the current Good Times is a series of articles regarding the different alternative transportation and commute solutions programs administered by the RTC and other agencies, along with a pull out section resource guide.

4. Additions and Deletions - None

CONSENT AGENDA

Action: The motion (Elsea/Patterson Valdez) to approve and accept the consent agenda carried unanimously.

5. Approved Minutes from December 8, 2009 meeting

6. Received Transportation Development Act Revenues Report as of January 2010

7. Received RTC Highlights from December 09 and January 2010

8. Approved letter from E&D TAC to Metro regarding input on the Draft Title VI Policy/Program and the Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Goals

9. Received letter from RTC to Coastal Commission dated 1/21/10 regarding support of Arana Gulch Park Master Plan

10. Received Information Items circulated at meeting:
   a. Easter Seals Project Action Mobility Planning Service
   b. Governor Schwarzenegger appointment to State Rehabilitation Council
   c. Santa Cruz Sentinel article dated 12/20/09 titled: Mayor rebuts ‘facts’ on Arana Gulch Plan
   d. Santa Cruz Sentinel article regarding women cabbies
11. Received Agency Updates
   a. Volunteer Center
   b. Community Bridges/CTSA
      - FY 09-10 First Quarter Report and January CTSA Board Report
   c. Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (METRO)
      - ParaCruz Operations Status Report: December 09 – January 10
   d. Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
   e. Private Operators

REGULAR AGENDA

12. TDA Claim from City of Scotts Valley

Majid Yamin, City of Scotts Valley Public Works Department, provided an overview of the TDA claim for the City of Scotts Valley in the amount of $93,315 to install sidewalks on Bean Creek Road along the frontage of Scotts Valley Middle School. He said that bike lanes using Bicycle Transportation Account funds had been transferred to fund this sidewalk project but there was not enough to complete the project due to the slope of the embankment. He requested that the E&D TAC recommend that the RTC approve Scotts Valley's share of TDA funds to complete the project. Any remaining money will be used to install curb ramps or other sidewalks in locations within the City of Scotts Valley to be decided by the City Council after priorities have been determined.

*Action: The motion (Molesky/Elsea) to recommend to the Commission to approve the TDA claim for the City of Scotts Valley for sidewalk installation on Bean Creek Road with the reserve to be used to implement ADA compliant sidewalk projects in Scotts Valley carried unanimously.*

13. METRO Website Update – Metro Staff

Harlan Glatt provided a detailed overview of the proposed new Metro website including a new feature which allows the viewer to toggle from English to Spanish text with the click of a button on the home page. He pointed out details on each page and showed members how to navigate to features of interest and provided the link, [http://beta.scmtd.com](http://beta.scmtd.com) to access the beta site. Members were informed that they could access the beta version of the website and view all features and provided instructions if they were interested in sending feedback (click the *Beta Testers* button on the home page and register to join the group once in the *Santa Cruz Metro Website Beta Test Community*). Harlan added that new laminated stickers showing specific routes, maps and timetables would be installed at all bus stops throughout the county and a new system map would be included in the *Headways.*
Members voiced concerns pertaining to ADA-compliant color contrast for web pages on the site, the height of the new route/timetable sticker installation at bus stops for ease of viewing by those in wheelchairs, turn-by-turn route information for sight impaired, the name of the customer service/report request form ("ticket" confusing), and problems with the captcha (anti-spam code) at the bottom of the customer support ticket submittal page for the sight impaired to report an incident.

Harian took notes on items discussed and will take the information back to see what changes, if any, could be implemented. An update will be presented at the May or July E&D TAC meeting.

14. MORE Program Report – Community Bridges

Due to the length of the Metro website update, Catherine Patterson Valdez was not able to stay and present her information but asked members to read the report and call or email her with questions or comments. Her presentation will be rescheduled for the July E&D TAC meeting.

15. Regional Transportation Plan update – RTC staff

Karena Pushnik provided an overview of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) update saying that the Draft 2010 RTP and Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (DSEIR) are scheduled for release and public review from March 1st through April 19th. The documents will be available for review on the RTC website and at most public libraries. The RTC will hold a public hearing on the draft plan at its April 1, 2010 meeting. Since the April E&D TAC meeting is a few days before the comment period closes, she wanted to give the E&D TAC advanced notice and recommend that members be prepared to review and provide comments on the document before deadline.


Karena Pushnik provided an overview of the update process for the Unmet Needs list saying that it is not necessarily project specific, but can help identify and prioritize projects to be included in RTP and/or to pursue as funds become available. Included in the list are transit needs also. The committee will have another opportunity to review/augment the list in April with the E&D TAC Annual Report. The Commission will adopt the Unmet Needs list at its May meeting to be held at the Capitol City Council Chambers. Members discussed reprioritizing specific needs and matching the high priority ranking to that used by the Transit District.

Action: Motions were taken individually on each of the following items and carry unanimously.
- Item 2 moves from H to H1 priority (Berkowitz/Molesky)
- Item 7 moves from M to H priority and Items 1, 3, 4, 8 move from H to H2 (Kempf/Molesky)
- Item 9 moves from H to H1 priority (Barbour/Anjo) with Clay Kempf abstaining.
- Items 10 and 11 move from H to H1 (Kempf/French)

Action: The motion (Barbour/Elsea) to extend the meeting for an additional 15 minutes carried unanimously.
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17. **E&D TAC Position Update — RTC Staff**

Chair John Daugherty said that Ben Morada who represents private operators will be submitting his resignation which will leave his position and his alternate position along with others vacant. RTC Staff Karen Pushnik will be doing some outreach to fill positions. Karen asked for those who opted to renew their committee membership to return their signed renewal applications.

18. **Receive oral status report about Pedestrian Safety Work Group — Work Group Chair**

Veronica Elsea reported that the Pedestrian Safety Work Group is preparing their draft report regarding sidewalk maintenance issues to present to the Commission at its May meeting. She said that it will be brought before the E&D TAC in April for input. She said that there have been 2 rounds of meetings with the all local jurisdictions within the County and that draft report lays out the status of sidewalk networks in the County with primary focus on property owner responsibility for maintenance and how the cities and county oversee the process for ensuring safe and accessible sidewalks. Karen Pushnik mentioned that local jurisdictions will have a chance to review the draft document before it becomes a public document via its inclusion in the April E&D TAC agenda.

19. **Next meeting:** Tuesday, April 13, 2010 at 1:30 pm. Note **MEETING LOCATION:** United Way, 1220 41st Avenue, Capitola (Items: TDA claims, Ped Safety Work Group Draft Report, Finalize Unmet Needs list)

20. **Adjourned at 3:50 pm**

Prepared by: Cathy Judd, SCCRTC Staff
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>FY08-09 ACTUAL REVENUE</th>
<th>FY09-10 ESTIMATE REVENUE</th>
<th>FY09-10 ACTUAL REVENUE</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE AS % OF PROJECTION</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE % OF ACTUAL TO PROJECTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JULY</td>
<td>570,200</td>
<td>454,800</td>
<td>454,800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUGUST</td>
<td>760,200</td>
<td>539,000</td>
<td>539,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPTEMBER</td>
<td>634,334</td>
<td>719,093</td>
<td>719,093</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTOBER</td>
<td>567,100</td>
<td>490,500</td>
<td>490,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOVEMBER</td>
<td>756,100</td>
<td>555,900</td>
<td>555,900</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECEMBER</td>
<td>700,859</td>
<td>625,786</td>
<td>625,785</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JANUARY</td>
<td>538,600</td>
<td>538,600</td>
<td>465,300</td>
<td>-73,300</td>
<td>-13.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEBRUARY</td>
<td>590,700</td>
<td>590,700</td>
<td>620,400</td>
<td>29,700</td>
<td>5.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARCH</td>
<td>578,624</td>
<td>578,624</td>
<td>607,400</td>
<td>28,776</td>
<td>4.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRIL</td>
<td>432,400</td>
<td>432,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY</td>
<td>464,400</td>
<td>464,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE</td>
<td>606,615</td>
<td>606,615</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>7,200,133</td>
<td>6,596,418</td>
<td>5,078,178</td>
<td>-14,825</td>
<td>-0.22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
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Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA 95060
phone (831) 460-3200 ~ fax (831) 460-3215
e-mail: info@sccrtc.org; website: www.sccrtc.org

Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC)

February 4, 2010 Meeting Highlights

Commute Solutions Program highlighted:
The RTC received a report that the Commute Solutions Program was highlighted as the cover story for the February 4, 2010 Good Times weekly magazine. In addition to giving Commute Solutions the lead article and a cover photo, the issue included a pullout Commuter Resource Guide to be used by readers in the future. All commuters can also enter a drawing for prizes by pledging to improve gas mileage, carpooling or riding the bus one day a week.

Potential Federal Jobs Bill Funds programmed:
In anticipation of the Senate approving a second economic recovery bill being called Jobs for Main Street Act, the RTC approved programming nearly $13 million for “shovel ready” projects. Included are funds that would be distributed to local jurisdictions by population formula, funding from the region’s share of State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) stimulus funds that would come through the California Transportation Commission, and the region’s unprogrammed STIP balance. Projects that would be ready to award contracts within a 90-day deadline include paving and road repair projects in each jurisdiction, Phase 2 of the Green Valley Road Rehabilitation project and the Graham Hill Road Improvement project.

Highway 1 Auxiliary Lanes Project Pre-Construction Activities proceed:
The RTC approved a $22,000 contract to conduct pre-construction activities associated with administrating the construction phase of the project. Parsons Brinckerhoff will act as a consultant to the RTC which will assume the responsibilities of construction management of the Auxiliary Lanes project.

March 4, 2010 Meeting Highlights

Draft 2010 Regional Transportation Plan and draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) released:
The RTC received a report that the draft 2010 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and the draft SEIR were released March 1st. The RTP outlines transportation challenges, funding scenarios and planned projects in Santa Cruz County through 2035. The draft SEIR assesses the potential program-level impacts of the projects for Santa Cruz, Monterey and San Benito Counties 2010 RTPs and the 2010 Monterey Bay Metropolitan Transportation Plan. A public hearing on the draft RTP will be held Thursday, April 1st at 9:30 am at the Board of Supervisors Chambers, 701 Ocean St., 5th Floor, Santa Cruz. Public comment via mail, email or at the public hearing will be taken until April 19, 2010.
Proposition 1B Transit Security Funds allocated:
The RTC allocated $212,337 in Proposition 1B Transit Security funds to the Santa Cruz Metro Transit District (Metro). These funds will allow Metro to complete security projects including facilities surveillance, radio communications, a Transit Center emergency alert system and emergency generator installation.

Transportation Development Act allocation claim approved:
The RTC approved a Transportation Development Act claim from the City of Scotts Valley for $93,315 for sidewalk construction projects and/or Americans with Disabilities Act-compliant curbs. Improvement projects are located on Bean Creek Road near the Scotts Valley Middle School, Vine Hill Rd and other locations within the city.

Local Tax Payer, Public Safety and Transportation Protection Act initiative supported:
The RTC voted to support a ballot initiative for the November 2010 ballot to protect local government, including redevelopment, transportation and transit, revenues. The measure prohibits the state from taking or borrowing local taxpayer funds dedicated to public safety, emergency response, transportation and other vital local government services. The ballot initiative is proposed by a statewide coalition of local government, transportation and public transit leaders, including the League of California Cities.

State senate bill to modernize SAFE programs introduced:
The RTC received a report that staff and RTC state legislative assistants were successful in obtaining senate sponsorship for a bill that would modernize SAFE language to expand the list of eligible motorist aid services under the program and authorize the Metropolitan Transportation Commission to place call boxes in state and federal parks. SB 1418 (Wiggins) which was introduced to the state legislature February 19, 2010 would also allow individual Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies (SAFE) to increase the SAFE fee by $1 to $2 on vehicles registered within their jurisdictions. Current RTC SAFE programs include the Freeway Service Patrol program, the Call Box program and the Safe on 17 extra CHP enforcement program.

April 1, 2010 Meeting Highlights

Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line purchase recommended and due diligence reports released:
After a comprehensive, thorough and detailed assessment of the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line, the RTC unanimously approved entering into a purchase and sale agreement with Union Pacific to acquire the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line for a total cost of $19.2 million which includes $14.2 million to the property owner and at least $5 million to fund improvements to the Branch Line. The purpose of the acquisition is to preserve the corridor for future transportation uses including freight and passenger rail service, and transit and bicycle/pedestrian trails. With the recommendation of the RTC Executive Director to pursue acquisition of the rail corridor, the RTC was permitted to release draft agreements and the remainder of the due diligence reports, with the exception of the lease analysis report and agreements still under negotiation with the short line operator, for a 30-day public review. A public hearing will be held on Wednesday, April 14, 2010 at 7:00 pm at the Board of Supervisors Chambers, 701 Ocean St., Fifth Fl., Santa Cruz, CA. Documents are available at the RTC office or on the RTC website www.sccrtc.org. The RTC will make a final decision on the purchase of the rail corridor at their May 6 meeting.
Public hearing on draft 2010 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) held:
The RTC held a public hearing on the draft RTP and draft SEIR and received input on project priorities, goals and policies. Public comment will continue to be taken until April 19, 2010 and will be brought to the RTC at its May meeting. The final documents are expected to be adopted at the June RTC meeting.
March 24, 2010

David Foster
Housing and Redevelopment Project Manager
City of Capitola
420 Capitola Avenue
Capitola, CA 95010

RE: Letter of Support for the City of Capitola’s Bicycle/Pedestrian Master Plan

Dear Mr. Foster:

I am writing on behalf of the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission’s Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee to offer our support for the City of Capitola’s Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan grant application for $100,000 to Caltrans for FY 2010-2011. We appreciate the city providing $25,000 in matching funds and an additional $25,000 in in-kind staff support.

The Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E&D TAC) advises transportation service providers and planning/public works agencies on issues related to the provision of specialized transportation and accessible pedestrian facilities for people with disabilities, seniors and persons with limited means. This includes endorsements of grant funding applications for projects within their purview.

The Caltrans grant application complements the E&D TAC’s goals by providing a defined vision, and multi-phased set of strategies/actions to improve accessibility and safety, encourage public transit ridership, improve pedestrian-oriented mixed-use neighborhoods and introduce a multi-modal transportation system in the City of Capitola and will provide a basis for the Circulation Element of their General Plan Update. The constituents represented by the E&D TAC would benefit from the implementation of safety and accessibility measures such as sidewalk completions, curb extensions, and traffic calming measures. The project will involve a community engagement process with special outreach proposed for seniors and people with disabilities.

Please feel free to contact the Regional Transportation Commission’s staff to the E&D TAC, Karena Pushnik at (831) 460-3210 or by email at kpushnik@sccrtc.org, should you have questions or comments.

Sincerely,

John Daugherty
Chair, SCCRTC Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee
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COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT APPLICATION

Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (SCCRTC)
Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E/D TAC)

Meetings are scheduled for the second Tuesday of every other month at 1:30 p.m. in the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission conference room, located at 1523 Pacific Avenue in downtown Santa Cruz. At least one meeting each year is scheduled for an alternate location. Please refer to the Committee description, bylaws and recruitment process for more information.

If you are interested in serving on this committee, please complete this application, and return it to the Regional Transportation Commission office.

PLEASE TYPE OR PRINT CLEARLY

Name:  Catherine Patterson Valdez
Home address:  225 Parnell St. Santa Cruz, CA 95062
Mailing address (if different):  PO Box 555 Aptos, CA 95001
Phone: (home) 831-688-8840  (business/message) 831-688-8840 x244
E-mail:  catherinep@cbridges.org

Length of residence in Santa Cruz County:  26 years
Position(s) I am applying for:  □ Any appropriate position
    □ LiftLine/CTSA  □ E/D TAC Member

Previous experience on a government commission or committee (please specify)

3rd Term on the LTCIC + 2nd Term on IHSS Commission + E/D TAC since 2006.

RECEIVED
MAR 09 2010
SCCRTC
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## Relevant Work or Volunteer Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Town or Address</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Bridges - Lift Lime/CTSA</td>
<td>Aptos</td>
<td>Division Director</td>
<td>7/05 - Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Bridges Admin.</td>
<td>Aptos</td>
<td>Executive Asst./CB-Board Liaison</td>
<td>6/04 - 6/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHRM - Society for Human Resources Managers</td>
<td>Palo Alto</td>
<td>Human Resources Manager</td>
<td>1995 - Present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Statement of Qualifications

Please attach a brief statement indicating why you are interested in serving on this committee and why you are qualified for the appointment. If you have served on this committee in the past, please summarize your accomplishments on the committee and indicate which of the committee’s potential future endeavors most interest you.

**Certification**: I certify that the above information is true and correct and I authorize the verification of the information in the application in the event I am a finalist for the appointment.

(Signature)  

Date: 1/12/10

**Return Application to:**  
SCCRC  
Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee  
1523 Pacific Avenue  
Santa Cruz, CA 95060  
fax: 460-3215  email: kpushnik@sccrtc.org

**Questions or Comments:**  
(831) 460-3200
COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT APPLICATION
Statement of Qualifications

Catherine Patterson Valdez

As the Lift Line / CTSA program director I feel it is my responsibility to be a member of the E/D TAC. I have been on this committee since 2006 and since that time I have received my Transit Paratransit Management Certificate through University of the Pacific (UOP) and completed through the Caltrans Department of Transportation Division of Transportation Planning Office of Professional Development’s Transportation Planning Academy, class of 2009.

Lift Line is a Social Service specialized transportation for the seniors and disabled residents program and I feel as such my role is to be a voice within this committee in advising the Santa Cruz Regional Transportation Commission on transportation issues, policies, plans, programs and projects for the Elderly, disabled (including physical and mental disabilities) and persons of limited means populations that we work with, as the CTSA.
COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT APPLICATION

Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (SCCRTC)
Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E/D TAC)

Meetings are scheduled for the second Tuesday of every other month at 1:30 p.m. in the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission conference room, located at 1523 Pacific Avenue in downtown Santa Cruz. At least one meeting each year is scheduled for an alternate location. Please refer to the Committee description, bylaws and recruitment process for more information.

If you are interested in serving on this committee, please complete this application, and return it to the Regional Transportation Commission office.

PLEASE TYPE OR PRINT CLEARLY

Name: KirkANCE
Home address: 2621 Willowbrook Lane #105 Aptos, CA 95003
Mailing address (if different):

Phone: (home) 831-210-1755 (business/message) 831-648-8840 Ext 225
E-mail: Kirk@Cbridges.org

Length of residence in Santa Cruz County: 20 years
Position(s) I am applying for: □ Any appropriate position
□ LiftLine/CTSA □ E/D TAC Alternate Member

Previous experience on a government commission or committee (please specify)
Community Bridges Workers Council Rep 6 years
Community Bridges Board of Directors Staff Member 4 years
Community Bridges Governance Committee Member 4 years
Community Bridges Fund Development Committee 4 years
Paratransit Coordination Task Force Santa Cruz 8 mo.
Relevant Work or Volunteer Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Town or Address</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Bridges - Lift Line/CTSA</td>
<td>Aptos</td>
<td>Fleet Manager/Driver Supervisor</td>
<td>5/198 Present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statement of Qualifications: Please attach a brief statement indicating why you are interested in serving on this committee and why you are qualified for the appointment. If you have served on this committee in the past, please summarize your accomplishments on the committee and indicate which of the committee’s potential future endeavors most interest you.

Certification: I certify that the above information is true and correct and I authorize the verification of the information in the application in the event I am a finalist for the appointment.

Signature: __________________________  Date: 1/12/10

Return Application to: SCCRTC
Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee
1523 Pacific Avenue
Santa Cruz, CA 95060
fax: 460-3215  email: kpushnik@scrcrtc.org

Questions or Comments: (831) 460-3200
Kirk Ance

As the Lift Line / CTSA Fleet Manager and Mechanic/Driver Supervisor I have been asked to be the alternate for Catherine Patterson Valdez, the Lift Line / CTSA Division Director as a member of the E/D TAC.

I have been on this committee since, as a alternate for 8 months. I have worked in specialize transportation services for over 12 years. And feel I can represent Lift Line/CTSA well as a committee member.
Volunteer Center of Santa Cruz County  
Transportation Program - TDA funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Santa Cruz</th>
<th>San Lorenzo Valley</th>
<th>Watsonville</th>
<th>2nd Qtr. Total</th>
<th>2nd Qtr. Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volunteers</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unduplicated Clients</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Rides</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1118</td>
<td>1307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ride Requests unable to fill</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfilled requests referred other agencies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requests cancelled by client</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Trip destinations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Santa Cruz</th>
<th>San Lorenzo Valley</th>
<th>Watsonville</th>
<th>2nd Qtr. Total</th>
<th>2nd Qtr. Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physician</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping &amp; bank</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stroke Center</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals and therapy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convalescent homes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doran Low Vision Center</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinisthore Dialysis</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>735</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Avg ride length (YTD)**

25

**Total Miles driven (YTD)**

59,060

**Total Reimbursement (YTD)**

$821
### Client Jurisdictions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>FY08-09</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz City</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotts Valley City</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Lorenzo Valley</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitola City</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watsonville City</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midcounty Unincorporated</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South County</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of County</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Clients (unduplicated)</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Origin of Ride by Jurisdiction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>FY08-09</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz City</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotts Valley City</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Lorenzo Valley</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitola City</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watsonville City</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midcounty Unincorporated</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South County</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of County</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D. Transportation:
Making a Difference:

Ann recently moved to the San Lorenzo Valley to be closer to her son. Unfortunately, one month later her son and his wife were in a car accident and have needed additional help themselves. Ann found herself in need of transportation while her son was laid up and re-cooperating. (The son and wife are doing great). Ann said “she was so happy to have found us as she had no where else to turn to.” The transportation program enables us to help all seniors who encounter difficult times.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>This Quarter</th>
<th>YTD</th>
<th>Goal For Year</th>
<th>% of Goal To Date</th>
<th>YTD Prior Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABOUT VOLUNTEERS:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Volunteers:</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz Volunteers:</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLV Volunteers:</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watsonville Vols:</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Volunteer Hours:</td>
<td>2,197</td>
<td>4,493</td>
<td>4,059</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| ABOUT CLIENTS:       |              |     |               |                   |                |
| Total Clients:       | 138          | 169 | 235           | 72%               | 188            |
| Santa Cruz Clients:  | 63           | 85  | 100           | 85%               | 83             |
| SLV Clients:         | 61           | 70  | 90            | 78%               | 87             |
| Watsonville Clients: | 14           | 14  | 45            | 31%               | 18             |

| KEY SERVICE INDICATORS |                      |     |               |                   |                |
| Total Rides:           | 1,118          | 2,302 | 5,392        | 43%               | 2,706          |
| Santa Cruz Rides:      | 790           | 1,644 | 2,800        | 59%               | 1,616          |
| SLV Rides:             | 266           | 544  | 1,592        | 34%               | 713            |
| Watsonville Rides:     | 62            | 114  | 1,000        | 11%               | 377            |

Satisfaction surveys:
Recruit and retain volunteers to provide 5,500 rides to essential destinations for 250 low income seniors and people with disabilities that have no other means of transportation.

97% of requests for rides are filled.

85% of rides are to obtain food or medical treatment essential to maintaining independent living.
B. Accomplishments:
- Mailed out over 600 quality assurance/Cultural Competency and MORE questionnaires to our clients.
- Provided specialized transportation for the AT&T Pro Am Golf Tournament.
- Completed and submitted the Mobility Outreach and Education (MORE) final Executive Summary and final report to Santa Cruz Regional Transportation Commission and Caltrans.
- Currently Division Director is in the process of finalizing the Monterey Peninsula Foundation and Agriculture Workers Transportation Program (AWTP) study Executive Summary and final reports.
- Access to Health Care Steering Committee has invited staff to this months meeting to discuss the MORE study results.
- Dominican Hospital has invited staff to meet with medical staff in service meetings to discuss Lift Line/CTSA services.
- Applied for one time only funding for a copier/fax/printer/scanner from the local AAA.
- Finalized the annual Birdies for Charity fundraiser through the Monterey Peninsula Foundation, total amount raised will be determined in April.
- Fleet Manager’s job description changed to include Drivers Supervisor allowing Division Director more time to manage grants and program management.

C. Challenges:
- Lift Line is still looking for a location to station our fleet of vehicles.
- Currently one of our contracts all but one driver from 8:00 – 10:30 and 2:15 – 4:30 every day, making it difficult to provide medical transportation for residents with early morning or late afternoon appointments. Our budget does not allow for us to pay another contractor to help with this rides which affecting local residents.
March 10, 2010

Mr. George Dondoer, Executive Director  
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission  
1523 Pacific Avenue  
Santa Cruz, CA 95060-3911

Re: Vehicles for Out of County Medical Program

Dear Mr. Dondoer:

This letter is to inform you that Lift Line, a program of Community Bridges, has officially assumed overseeing the provision of the Out-of-County Medical Transportation program, including acquiring the vehicles purchased through the Transportation Development Act (TDA) funds.

Lift Line has been coordinating this program, through volunteer drivers and a project coordinator as of October 1, 2009. We currently are in the process of taking possession of the vehicles that were purchased for this program with funding from Transportation Development Act.

On behalf of Lift Line clients and Community Bridges, I thank the Commission and staff for your continued support of our programs.

Sincerely,

Catherine Patterson Valdez  
Lift Line Division Director

cc: Karena Pushnik, Senior Transportation Planner, SCCRTC  
Jack Dilles, Director, City of Santa Cruz Finance Department  
Sam Storey, Chief Executive Officer, Community Bridges  
Michael Robins, Chief Operating Officer, Community Bridges  
David Wright, American Red Cross Executive Director
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DATE: March 26th, 2010

TO: Board of Directors

FROM: April Warnock, Paratransit Superintendent

SUBJECT: METRO PARACRUZ OPERATIONS STATUS REPORT

I. RECOMMENDED ACTION

This report is for information only - no action requested.

II. SUMMARY OF ISSUES

- METRO ParaCruz is the federally mandated ADA complementary paratransit program of the Transit District, providing shared ride, door-to-door demand-response transportation to customers certified as having disabilities that prevent them from independently using the fixed route bus.

- METRO assumed direct operation of paratransit services November 1, 2004. This service had been delivered under contract since 1992.

- Discussion of ParaCruz Operations Status Report.

- Attachment A: On-time Performance Chart displays the percentage of pick-ups within the "ready window" and a breakdown in 5-minute increments for pick-ups beyond the "ready window". The monthly Customer Service Reports summary is included.

- Attachment B: Report of ParaCruz' operating statistics. Performance Averages and Performance Goals are reflected in the Comparative Operating Statistics Table in order to establish and compare actual performance measures, as performance is a critical indicator as to ParaCruz' efficiency.

- Attachments C, D, E, F, G: ParaCruz Performance Charts display trends in rider-ship and mileage spanning a period of three years. Graph G is a graphical display reporting use of sub-contracted taxi companies for each month.

- Attachment H: Current calendar year's statistical information on the number of ParaCruz in-person eligibility assessments, including a comparison to past years, since implementation in August of 2002.
III. DISCUSSION

In the months of December 2009 and January 2010, ParaCruz rides continued to decreased from number of rides in November 2009. Trends show that ParaCruz ridership typically peaks in the month of October, drops through December, levels out through February, before rising again in March. This trend is driven primarily by attendance at the Cabrillo College Stroke and Acquired Disability Center.

The VOIP telephone system installation is completed for ParaCruz, and the reports are now available. However, fiscal ‘year to date’ statistics are not available for the remainder of this fiscal year, as the system was not in place at the beginning of this fiscal year.

The Subcontractor’s cost per ride has increased dramatically in January 2010, due to payment out of two (2) yearly five percent (5%) increases that had not been previously invoiced to METRO. The increases were paid out in addition to their regular billing cycle.

IV. FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

NONE

V. ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A: ParaCruz On-time Performance Charts
Attachment B: Comparative Operating Statistics Tables
Attachment C: Number of Rides Comparison Chart
Attachment D: Shared vs. Total Rides Chart
Attachment E: Mileage Comparison Chart
Attachment F: Year To Date Mileage Chart
Attachment G: Daily Drivers vs. Subcontractor Rides Charts
Attachment H: Eligibility Chart
Board of Directors
Board Meeting March 26th, 2010

ParaCruz On-time Performance Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>January 2009</th>
<th>January 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total pick ups</td>
<td>7172</td>
<td>6985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent in “ready window”</td>
<td>95.04%</td>
<td>95.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 5 minutes late</td>
<td>2.27%</td>
<td>1.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 10 minutes late</td>
<td>1.37%</td>
<td>1.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 to 15 minutes late</td>
<td>.70%</td>
<td>.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 to 20 minutes late</td>
<td>.35%</td>
<td>.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 to 25 minutes late</td>
<td>.14%</td>
<td>.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 to 30 minutes late</td>
<td>.07%</td>
<td>.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 to 35 minutes late</td>
<td>.01%</td>
<td>.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 to 40 minutes late</td>
<td>.01%</td>
<td>.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 or more minutes late (excessively late/missed trips)</td>
<td>.04%</td>
<td>.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total beyond “ready window”</td>
<td>4.96p%</td>
<td>4.01%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the month of January 2010, ParaCruz received twelve (12) Customer Service Reports. Six of the complaints reported were valid. Four (4) of the reported complaints were not valid. Two (2) compliments were reported.
### Comparative Operating Statistics This Fiscal Year, Last Fiscal Year through January 2010.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jan 09</th>
<th>Jan 10</th>
<th>Fiscal 08-09</th>
<th>Fiscal 09-10</th>
<th>Performance Averages</th>
<th>Performance Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requested</td>
<td>7708</td>
<td>7802</td>
<td>57696</td>
<td>58690</td>
<td>8462</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performed</td>
<td>7172</td>
<td>6985</td>
<td>46,247</td>
<td>53788</td>
<td>7805</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancels</td>
<td>18.19%</td>
<td>20.33%</td>
<td>18.19%</td>
<td>20.41%</td>
<td>18.29%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Shows</td>
<td>2.45%</td>
<td>3.97%</td>
<td>2.90%</td>
<td>1.86%</td>
<td>2.95%</td>
<td>Less than 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total miles</td>
<td>50001</td>
<td>46676</td>
<td>360287</td>
<td>349,460</td>
<td>52,356</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Av trip miles</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within ready window</td>
<td>95.04%</td>
<td>95.99%</td>
<td>95.87%</td>
<td>95.65%</td>
<td>94.71%</td>
<td>92.00% or better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excessively late/missed trips</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>Zero (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call center volume</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5644</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Avail July 2010</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call average seconds to answer</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Avail July 2010</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Less than 2 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hold times less than 2 minutes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Avail July 2010</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Greater than 90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinct riders</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>1480</td>
<td>1487</td>
<td>804</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most frequent rider</td>
<td>85 rides</td>
<td>40 rides</td>
<td>250 rides</td>
<td>218 rides</td>
<td>49 rides</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared rides</td>
<td>60.3%</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
<td>63.08%</td>
<td>Greater than 60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passengers per rev hour</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>Greater than 1.6 passengers/hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rides by supplemental providers</td>
<td>4.96%</td>
<td>12.53%</td>
<td>9.13%</td>
<td>13.28%</td>
<td>10.63%</td>
<td>No more than 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendor cost per ride</td>
<td>$22.14</td>
<td>$46.24</td>
<td>$23.20</td>
<td>$24.85</td>
<td>$22.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ParaCruz driver cost per ride (estimated)</td>
<td>$25.91</td>
<td>$24.42</td>
<td>$24.85</td>
<td>$26.12</td>
<td>$24.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rides &lt; 10 miles</td>
<td>70.59%</td>
<td>69.88%</td>
<td>70.77%</td>
<td>69.67%</td>
<td>69.82%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rides &gt; 10</td>
<td>29.41%</td>
<td>30.12%</td>
<td>29.23%</td>
<td>30.33%</td>
<td>30.18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### OUT OF DATABASE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Range</th>
<th>Unrestricted</th>
<th>Restricted</th>
<th>Restricted</th>
<th>Temporary</th>
<th>Visitor</th>
<th>DCSD</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Denied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/1/2005 to 12/31/2005</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>553</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/2006 to 12/31/2006</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>977</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/2007 to 12/31/2007</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>557</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/2008 to 12/31/2008</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>477</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### INTO DATABASE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Range</th>
<th>Unrestricted</th>
<th>Restricted</th>
<th>Restricted</th>
<th>Temporary</th>
<th>Visitor</th>
<th>DCSD</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Denied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/1/2005 to 12/31/2005</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/2006 to 12/31/2006</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/2007 to 12/31/2007</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/2008 to 12/31/2008</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MONTHLY ASSESSMENTS - 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Unrestricted</th>
<th>Restricted</th>
<th>Restricted</th>
<th>Temporary</th>
<th>Denied</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>Trip by Trip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NUMBER OF ELIGIBLE RIDERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Active</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>5336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>5315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>4820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>4895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>5291</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DATE: March 26, 2010

TO: Board of Directors

FROM: Ciro Aguirre, Operations Manager

SUBJECT: CONSIDERATION OF CONTRACT RENEWALS WITH SANTA CRUZ TRANSPORTATION, LLC AND WATSONVILLE TRANSPORTATION, INC. FOR SUPPLEMENTAL PARATRANSIT SERVICES

I. RECOMMENDED ACTION

That the Board of Directors authorizes the General Manager to enter into a one-year contract extension with Santa Cruz Transportation, LLC and Watsonville Transportation, Inc. for supplemental paratransit services.

II. SUMMARY OF ISSUES

- Santa Cruz METRO has a contract with Santa Cruz Transportation, LLC and Watsonville Transportation, Inc. for supplemental paratransit services.

- This contract was established on May 1, 2007 for a three-year period with two optional one-year extensions.

- Santa Cruz Transportation, LLC and Watsonville Transportation, Inc. have requested a one-year renewal of the contract with separately negotiated rate changes for each contractor.

III. DISCUSSION

Santa Cruz METRO has contracts with Santa Cruz Transportation, LLC and Watsonville Transportation, Inc. for supplemental paratransit services that are due to expire on April 30, 2010. Over the past three years, both firms have provided good service. Santa Cruz Transportation, LLC and Watsonville Transportation, Inc. have reviewed their contracts and have requested a one-year renewal of the contract with separately negotiated rate changes for each contractor.

Staff recommends that Santa Cruz METRO exercise the option for one-year contract extensions with Santa Cruz Transportation, LLC and Watsonville Transportation, Inc. Staff further recommends that the Board of Directors authorize the General Manager to sign a contract amendment for a one-year contract extension of each contract on behalf of Santa Cruz METRO.
IV. FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Funds to support this contract are included in the ParaCruz FY10 budget for contract transportation/Paratransit.

V. ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A: Letter received from Santa Cruz Transportation, LLC
Attachment B: Letter received from Watsonville Transportation, Inc.
Attachment C: Contract Amendment with Santa Cruz Transportation, LLC
Attachment D: Contract Amendment with Watsonville Transportation, Inc.

Prepared By: Lloyd Longnecker, Purchasing Agent
Date Prepared: March 10, 2010
Thursday, March 04, 2010

Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District  
Ciro F. Aguirre  
Operations Manager  
1200 River Street  
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Ciro F. Aguirre

This letter will confirm our ongoing commitment to the private operator and public service partnership developed between Metro Para Cruz and Santa Cruz Transportation, LLC.

Please be advised that Santa Cruz Transportation, LLC would like to renew the agreement with Santa Cruz Metro for an additional 1 (one) year term pursuant to Section 4.01 of Contract No. 06-08, beginning the first one year extension on May 1st, 2010.

1. For Metro provided vehicles: $45.85 per hour, billed as before in 4 (four) hour minimum blocks with each additional hour prorated.
2. For non Metro provided vehicles: $46.80 per hour, billed as before in 4 (four) hour minimum blocks, each additional hour prorated.
3. For SCT-100 rides: Metered rate plus $3.00; door to door.

All other terms and conditions would remain the same. The 5% per hour increase compounded annually will henceforth be eliminated. Any per hour increase or decrease will be submitted prior to commencement of the next 1 (one) year extension.

Please let me know if Metro is willing to amend the agreement in accordance with this proposal.

Yours truly,

Santa Cruz Transportation, LLC  
By, James C. Monroe

Cc, Mark Hickey and April Warnock
March 1, 2010

Dear Mr. Aguirre

Please be advised that Watsonville Transportation Inc. d.b.a. Courtesy Cab would like to renew its agreement with Santa Cruz Metro Transit District for an additional one year term, pursuant to Section 4.01 of the current agreement. Watsonville Transportation Inc. d.b.a. Courtesy Cab is willing to accept the following compensation:

1. For Metro provided vehicles: $46.92 per hour.
2. For non Metro provided vehicles: $48.00 per hour.
3. For non Metro provided vehicles single ride rate:
   $4.00 Drop
   $3.00 per Mile
   5 min wait time included at no charge.

All other terms and conditions would remain the same except that the 5% pay increase would be reduced to 2% only at the commencement of this one-year extension.

Please let me know if Santa Cruz Metro Transit District is willing to amend the agreement in accordance with this proposal.

Sincerely,

Richard Camperud, CEO
Watsonville Transportation Inc.
Courtesy Cab Co.
DATE:     March 26, 2010
TO:       Board of Directors
FROM:     Ciro Aguirre, Operations Manager
SUBJECT: CONSIDERATION OF AWARD OF CONTRACT WITH CREATIVE BUS SALES, INC. FOR PURCHASE OF TWENTY-TWO RAISED TOP PARATRANSIT VANS FOR AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED $1,150,000.

I. RECOMMENDED ACTION

That the Board of Directors authorize the General Manager to execute a contract with Creative Bus Sales, Inc. for the purchase of twenty-two raised top Paratransit vans for an amount not to exceed $1,150,000.

II. SUMMARY OF ISSUES

- A competitive procurement was conducted to solicit bids from qualified firms.

- Three firms submitted four bids for Santa Cruz METRO’s review.

- Staff has reviewed all submitted bids.

III. DISCUSSION

The fleet of mini-vans currently in operation for ParaCruz is approaching the end of its useful life and in need of replacement. Santa Cruz METRO has reviewed possible replacement vehicles and has decided to replace twenty-two (22) minivans with twenty-two (22) raised-top Paratransit vans. American Reinvestment Recovery Act (ARRA) funds will be used for this procurement.

On February 16, 2010, Santa Cruz METRO Invitation for Bid No. 10-22 was: mailed to twenty-eight (28) paratransit vehicle firms; was legally advertised; and a notice was posted on Santa Cruz METRO’s web site. On March 16, 2010, four (4) bids were received and opened from three (3) firms. A summary of the bids received are provided in Attachment A. Staff has reviewed all submitted bids. The low bid, Versa Shuttle manufactured by El Dorado National, will meet all specifications and requirements. The purchase will include options for: aluminum wheels; Q’straint slide and click tie down system with two (2) full length tracks; and a five (5) year/100,000 mile extended warranty.

Staff recommends that the Board of Directors authorize the General Manager to sign a contract with Creative Bus Sales, Inc. for the purchase of twenty-two (22) raised top Paratransit vans for an amount not to exceed $1,150,000 on behalf of Santa Cruz METRO.
IV. FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

American Reinvestment Recovery Act Funds to support this contract are included in the FY10 Capital budget under Grant Funded Projects.

V. ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A: Summary of Bids Received
Attachment B: Contract with Creative Bus Sales, Inc.

Prepared By: Lloyd Longnecker, Purchasing Agent
Date Prepared: March 16, 2010

Note: The IFB along with its Exhibits and any Addendum(s) are available for review at the Administration Office of Santa Cruz METRO or online at www.scmtd.com
AGENDA: April 13, 2010

TO: Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee

FROM: Karena Pushnik, SCCRTC Staff

RE: Support for 211 Proposal from the United Way

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee:

1. Consider writing a letter of support for the United Way’s 211 social service phone system; and
2. Consider appointing a representative to the steering committee.

BACKGROUND

The United Way in Santa Cruz is the lead agency to develop the local 211 phone service, an easy to remember number that connects people to essential community information and referral services. Currently 23 counties in California have fully operational 211 systems covering over 89% of the population. Nationally, 240 million Americans in all or part of 46 states serving over 80 percent of the U.S. population have access to 211 services.

DISCUSSION

Referral and information services for the local 211 service could include information about food and housing resources; health services; resources for children and families; emergency and disaster response; mental health and crisis support; income support; and help for seniors and people with disabilities including specialized/accessible transportation resources. The call center would be located outside the county, most likely in San Francisco, so that it can maintain service should there be a local disaster. Attached are the fact sheet and presentation about the local 211 efforts (Attachments 1 and 2).

The United Way estimates that the 211 service will cost approximately $143,000 per year. The agency is seeking funding from a variety of public and private entities, as well as local donors. Attached is a budget and list of potential donors (Attachments 3 and 4). Staff recommends that the E&D TAC consider a generic letter of support for the program to help the United Way seek program funding.

In addition, the United Way has requested that a representative from the E&D TAC assist them in developing and implementing the 211 system by serving on the steering committee (Attachment 5). The next meeting will be held on Friday April 16th from 3:00 to 4:30 pm.

Staff recommends that the E&D TAC nominate a representative to serve on the 211 Steering Committee.

Mary Lou Goeke, Executive Director of the United Way will attend the E&D TAC meeting to present the materials and answer questions.
211 and 511

The RTC is simultaneously working on a feasibility analysis for 511 service which only provides transportation information and assistance. While there are some similarities between the 211 and 511 services, such as both are one-stop shops and both are a source of information during emergencies, there are also major differences. The main differences are that 211 is a personalized human to human service that serves one person at a time and that 511 is an automated service available to a large number of individuals simultaneously, and that 211 provides a broad range of social service information and 511 provides only transportation information. The 211 service may be able to help provide personalized transit help, similar to the transit district and Commute Solutions, and could be a one-stop shop or mobility management center for paratransit information. The RTC already produces the Guide for Specialized Transportation which serves as a resource for accessible transportation options in the county. The 211 service would probably use the Guide as a primary transportation resource.

SUMMARY

Staff recommends that the E/D TAC consider writing a generic letter of support for the 211 Information and Referral project and consider designating an E&D TAC member to serve on the steering committee.

Attachments:
1. 211 Fact Sheet
2. Presentation
3. 211 Proposed Budget
4. Potential Funders
5. Invitation for E&D TAC to join Steering Committee
2-1-1 Santa Cruz County: Connecting people to services and resources in their communities

2-1-1 is an easy-to-remember telephone number that connects people to essential community information and referral services. The goal of 2-1-1 is to connect our county’s residents with the services, information, resources and volunteer opportunities in their communities 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. When a person calls 2-1-1, specially trained “real people” answer the call and determine what services, information or resources are needed to help the caller. 2-1-1 now serves 240 million Americans in all or part of 46 states, serving over 80 percent of the U.S. population.

Examples of services people can access by calling 2-1-1

- Food and Housing Resources: food banks, clothing, housing and rental and mortgage assistance.
- Health Services: access to health care for the uninsured or under-insured, prenatal care, medical information lines.
- Income Support: Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) assistance, job training and education programs.
- Help for Seniors and People with Disabilities: adult day care, Meals on Wheels, respite care, home health care and transportation.

Additional benefits of a 2-1-1 system

2-1-1 PROTECTS PUBLIC SAFETY IN EMERGENCIES AND DISASTERS

- Relieves 911 call volume
  Allowing faster response to emergency calls
- Plays a major role in disaster response
  2-1-1 in Southern California handled 130,000 calls in the 5 days after the October 2007 wild fires
- 2-1-1 is in the Federal Bioterrorism Act
  Part of the infrastructure needed for disaster preparedness

2-1-1 REDUCES TAXPAYER COSTS

- Directs non-emergency calls away from the more costly 911
- Efficiently uses limited resources by streamlining the referral process, and reduces costs associated with statewide 800#s

Support 2-1-1 to help Santa Cruz County residents reach the assistance they need!

For more information contact Mary Lou Goeke at 465.2202 or mlgoeke@unitedwaysc.org
2-1-1 Santa Cruz County
Connecting Residents in Need to Vital Community Services

October, 2009

Quick Reference

2-1-1 Local Community Services
4-1-1 Directory Assistance and Information
9-1-1 Emergency Services
Imagine thousands of times a day...

Imagine a single solution...
What is 2-1-1?

- 2-1-1 is an easy to remember phone number that connects people in need with important community services.
- This free, confidential, 24-hour/seven days a week, multilingual service also serves as a vital link for individuals seeking to volunteer, provide resources and assist during times of crisis.
- 2-1-1 serves approximately 240 million Americans – over 80% of the US population;
- 212 active 2-1-1 systems covering all or part of 46 states (including 18 states with 100% coverage, plus Washington D.C. and Puerto Rico)

In California

Currently there are 21 organizations serving 23 counties reaching 89% of the population.

➢ Approximately 3 million calls will be handled annually when fully operational in all counties.
Why do we need 2-1-1?

- Many people make as many as 4-8 phone calls for help
- Many give up
- Twenty to forty percent of calls received by service providers need to be directed to another, more appropriate provider
- Professionals often try to help callers nonetheless, resulting in misspent professional and client energy

Benefits to Non-Profits and Public Agencies

- Fewer inappropriate calls
- More time and resources available to serve clients
- Easy referral source for their clients
- Complements specialized information and referral services
- Visibility for their services
- Online updating capacity – real time accuracy
United Way of the Bay Area
HELPLINK

- Selected to answer Santa Cruz County's 2-1-1 calls
- Comprehensive Information and Referral service with 30 years of experience serving the Bay Area
- Free, confidential, 24/7, multilingual service
- Professional staff, certified by Alliance of Information and Referral Systems
- Thousands of calls per year, assisting low-income parents, immigrants, laid-off workers, homeless and many others

2-1-1: Provides Assistance and Information

- Calls typically last 3-5 minutes
- Information and Referral Specialists:
  - Help the callers tell their story, understand and prioritize their needs
  - Identify and offer them appropriate resources
  - Provide advocacy for those needing extra support accessing services
  - Follow up 100% of crisis calls, such as those for shelter or housing assistance, and on 20% of non-crisis calls

The goal is individuals empowered to be their own advocates.
What types of services can people find by calling 2-1-1?

- Food and Housing Resources
- Help for Seniors and People with Disabilities
- Mental Health and Crisis Support
- Access to Income Assistance
- Health Services
- Resources for Children and Families
- Volunteer Opportunities

Resource Database

- Partnerships between 2-1-1 call center and designated agencies to provide seamless transfer of callers needing assistance
- Santa Cruz County provides original resource database
- HELPLINK provides resource management program to maintain current and accurate information about available services and add new resources as they become available
- Searchable public access provider database online
Others who use 2-1-1

**Disaster Officials**
- Have a dissemination mechanism for critical up-to-the-minute public information

**9-1-1**
- Gets fewer non-emergency calls

**Public Officials**
- Have a place to refer constituents in need of help

**General Public and Potential Donors**
- Have easy access to give or get help – donations, funds, time

---

2-1-1 also plays a Critical Role in Disasters

*San Diego Firestorm 2007*
2-1-1 Disaster & Emergency Information Communications System

In 2004 Florida was hit by five "tropical cyclones" in a single year. 2-1-1 centers across the state played a vital role throughout the major emergency.

- **Pre-storm** – information about evacuation, location and availability of shelters, inquiries from people with special needs, preparation for the storm
- **During the storm** – reassurance, crisis intervention, emergency assistance
- **Immediate aftermath** – location of essential services (water, ice, food), rescue needs, debris removal, power outages
- **Recovery** – disaster relief financial assistance, property damage, disaster-caused health issues, disaster-related transportation issues

Other disasters where 2-1-1 has proven critical

- September 11, 2001
- SARS – Toronto, 2003
- Florida Hurricanes of 2004
- Hurricanes Katrina, Rita & Wilma of 2005
- Chemical Spills – South Carolina, 2005
- Southern California Wildfires of 2007
- Mid-West Tornados of 2008
- LA Metro-Link Collision – 2008
- Hurricanes Gustav and Ike of 2008
- Floods, Extreme Heat/Cold – annually
- H1N1 Response – nationally
In California

- **October 2007**: San Diego, Los Angeles, Riverside, Orange, San Bernardino and Ventura county 2-1-1s responded to over 130,000 calls in less than a week as 20 separate wildfires broke out in Southern California causing the evacuation of over 500,000 people — and information about evacuations, shelters and road closures changed by the minute.

**2-1-1 Disaster & Emergency Information**

How many 9-1-1 calls are for non-emergency services?

- In 2004, 9-1-1 in Lee County, Florida estimated that 2-1-1 received 60,000 calls that otherwise would have gone to 9-1-1 during relief efforts for hurricane season (Trial by Wind and Water, 2004)
- A Grand Jury review of the Sacramento County Sheriff’s Department’s 9-1-1 Call Center found that 53% of the 9-1-1 calls were not emergencies
- 2-1-1 San Diego has been named by the San Diego County Office of Emergency Services to answer all non-emergency calls regarding the H1N1 virus
How 2-1-1 Santa Cruz County can be funded

As a non-profit organization 2-1-1 can receive funding from a variety of sources:

➤ State Grants such as Caltrans
➤ City and County Departments and Districts
➤ First 5 Santa Cruz County
➤ United Way of Santa Cruz County
➤ Regional and Local Foundations
➤ Corporations
➤ Individual Donors

The total annual budget is $142,000 a year.

Contacts and References

2-1-1 Information
Statewide 2-1-1:  www.211california.org
National 2-1-1:  www.211.org
CAIRS:  www.cairs.org
Bay Area:  www.211bayarea.org

2-1-1 Contacts
2-1-1 San Francisco
Ed Schoenberger
Executive Director
United Way HELPLINK
(415) 808-4304
eschoenberger@uwba.org

2-1-1 Santa Cruz County (In Planning Stage)
Mary Lou Geake
Executive Director
United Way of Santa Cruz County
(831) 485-2202
mggeake@unitedwaysc.org
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Year 1 Request</th>
<th>Year 1 In-Kind</th>
<th>Year 1 Total Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personnel</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director (.20 FTE)</td>
<td>$10,479</td>
<td>10,479</td>
<td>$20,958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Coordinator (.50 FTE)</td>
<td>$20,298</td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistant (.15 FTE)</td>
<td>$2,704</td>
<td>1,352</td>
<td>$4,056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits and Burden (30%)</td>
<td>$10,044</td>
<td>3,549</td>
<td>$13,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Personnel</strong></td>
<td><strong>$43,525</strong></td>
<td><strong>15,380</strong></td>
<td><strong>$58,905</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional and Contracted Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-1-1- San Francisco Call Center</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$65,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommunications Consultant</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>$72,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Professional and Contracted Services</strong></td>
<td><strong>$130,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,380</strong></td>
<td><strong>$142,380</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupancy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>$4,200</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>$1,080</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Equipment and Supplies</td>
<td>$5,600</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Occupancy</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,880</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$10,880</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conference, Travel and Training</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-1-1 Software Training</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIRS Conference</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings/events</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Conference, Travel and Training</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,300</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,300</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Telecommunication</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT &amp; T Conversion (7 Co Switches)</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bandwidth and Telecom</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Telecommunication</strong></td>
<td><strong>$8,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$8,500</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marketing and Outreach</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collateral Materials/Marketing</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Events (Launch,Celebration)</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Marketing and Outreach</strong></td>
<td><strong>$12,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$12,500</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Miscellaneous</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIRS Membership Dues</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td></td>
<td>$400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-1-1- Supplies (Awards, etc)</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td></td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Miscellaneous</strong></td>
<td><strong>$600</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$600</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indirect 3%</strong></td>
<td><strong>$8,047</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$8,047</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$142,472</strong></td>
<td><strong>33,260</strong></td>
<td><strong>$175,732</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
United Way of Santa Cruz County
2-1-1 Potential Funders
Year 1, FY 2010-2011

(This chart has been developed by Mary Lou Goeke and has not been discussed or approved by the organizations listed below)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans Mobility Management Funds</td>
<td>14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Capitola</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Scotts Valley</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Watsonville</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Office of Education</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Santa Cruz (HSA, HSD, Probation, Sheriff)</td>
<td>19,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Foundation of Santa Cruz County</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Hospital</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Management Council's Organizations</td>
<td>14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First 5 Santa Cruz County</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Authority of the County of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palo Alto Medical Foundation</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pajaro Valley Community Health Trust</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Harvest Food Bank</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Way of Santa Cruz County (Corporate and Individual Donors)</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL YEAR 1 REQUEST**: $143,000
17 March 2010

Karena Pushnik
SCCRTC: E&D TAC
1523 Pacific Avenue
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Dear Karena,

I invite you or your designee from the Elderly and Disabled Transit Advisory Committee to join the 2-1-1 Santa Cruz County Steering Committee.

The Steering Committee will be an advisory committee to the Board of Trustees of the United Way of Santa Cruz County. It will meet four times a year and will be the decision-making body for 2-1-1 policy decisions. The Steering Committee will be composed of one representative of each 2-1-1 funding partner as well as representatives from constituent groups such as the disabled, elders, parents of young children and other user groups. In addition there will be three representatives from non-profit health and human services agencies and three from disaster response organizations.

The Steering Committee will:
- approve the 2-1-1 annual budget,
- oversee the annual marketing plan,
- review the Call Management Software service reports and,
- review the local quality evaluation.

The first meeting of the Steering Committee will be: Friday, April 16th, 2010 from 3:00pm-4:30pm at the United Way Conference Room located at 1220 41st Avenue, Ste. C, Capitola.

The following meetings will be at the same time and location on:
- Friday, July 16th, 2010
- Friday, October 15th, 2010
- Friday, January 21st, 2011

Please email me at mlgoeke@unitedwaysc.org to let me know who your representative will be.

Many thanks for all you have done to bring 2-1-1 to the people of Santa Cruz County.

Sincerely,

Mary Lou Goeke
Executive Director
AGENDA: April 13, 2010

TO: Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee

FROM: Karena Pushnik, Senior Transportation Planner

RE: Approve Pedestrian Maintenance Report by the Pedestrian Safety Work Group

RECOMMENDATION

Staff and the Pedestrian Safety Work Group recommend that the Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee approve the E&D TAC’s subcommittee report -- titled Improving the Safety and Accessibility of Sidewalks in Santa Cruz County: A Study of Jurisdiction and Property Owner Responsibilities and Practices (attached separately) -- and forward it to the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission for their consideration, with amendments as appropriate.

BACKGROUND

The Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee appointed a subcommittee to address accessible pedestrian issues. This group, called the Pedestrian Safety Work Group, has been meeting for the last year and a half. The group has been successful in securing a Caltrans planning grant for $85,000 to analyze pedestrian issues from the perspective of seniors and people with disabilities, including safe paths to transit, and has also applied for federal New Freedom funds to construct improved facilities.

DISCUSSION

One of the first tasks of the Work Group was to identify priority origins and destinations for seniors and people with disabilities in Santa Cruz County and evaluate the pedestrian facilities leading to/from these facilities including the pathway to the nearest transit stop.

In looking at the pedestrian facilities, the Work Group realized that the responsibility for maintenance of existing sidewalks is the responsibility of adjacent property owners, however the vast majority of property owners are unaware of this requirement. The Work Group met with all five local jurisdictions in an effort to understand more about current practices, what is being done to inventory and make progress on sidewalk conditions, and efforts to promote private property involvement.

The report includes objectives, key concepts, a survey of local jurisdiction practices, components of a model program, an overview of local jurisdiction practices and a conclusion/follow up section. In addition, the Work Group researched other areas with favorable pedestrian maintenance program components and documented practices by these “benchmark” jurisdictions. The report also documents the standards used by local jurisdictions use to determine whether the hazards warrant repair and included pertinent resources in the document.

The chair of the Work Group, Veronica Elsea, and other Work Group members will present the findings of the report at the E&D TAC meeting.
Staff and the Pedestrian Safety Work Group recommend that the E/D TAC approve the Draft report -- titled Improving the Safety and Accessibility of Sidewalks in Santa Cruz County: A Study of Jurisdiction and Property Owner Responsibilities and Practices -- suggest revisions, as needed, and forward it to the Regional Transportation Commission for their consideration.

SUMMARY

The E&D TAC’s subcommittee, the Pedestrian Safety Work Group, prepared an analysis of sidewalk maintenance issues with the goal of encouraging private property owners to step up to their maintenance responsibilities and local jurisdictions to take an active role in the endeavor. This report will be presented to the RTC at their May or June meeting.

Attached separately: Pedestrian Maintenance Report
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DATE: April 13, 2010

TO: F&D TAC Members

FROM: Margaret Gallagher, District Counsel

SUBJECT: METRO'S revised Discount Fare Program

On March 22, 2010, during the Triennial Review, it was brought to METRO's attention that the Discount Fare Program needed some minor revisions to be in compliance with the Federal Transit Administration’s (FTA) regulations (49 USC 53, §5307). The FTA indicated that there are three distinct categories of eligibility for discount fares:

1. Senior Citizen;
2. Disabled Persons; and
3. Medicare Card Holder

Section 4.01 of the attached policy has been revised to create these three distinct categories. METRO had previously included Medicare Card Holders as individual’s eligible for discounted fare under Section 4.01(b) of the policy. The language in Sections 4.02 and 4.03 of the policy has been revised to reflect this change.

In addition, minor revisions have been made to the policy to include the purchase of bus passes on METRO's new website which launched on March 18, 2010 (see §§8.01 and 9.01).

Please review the Older Adult and Persons with Disabilities Fixed Route Discount Fare Program (attached), and provide your comments and suggestions at the April 13, 2010 E&D TAC Meeting.

I look forward to your meeting on April 13, 2010, when we will have an opportunity to further discuss the revisions made to METRO's Discount Fare Program.

PG/hk
Encl.
I. POLICY

1.01 It is the policy of the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (METRO) that older adult persons and persons with disabilities or an individual presenting a Medicare card, will be charged a discounted fare for transportation on METRO's fixed route service.

1.02 This policy sets forth the criteria that METRO employees must follow in order to insure that qualified individuals receive the discount that is allowed by this regulation.

II. APPLICABILITY

2.01 This policy is applicable to METRO employees and qualified individuals using the fixed route service.

III. DEFINITIONS

3.01 "Discount Fare" means one-half the regular fare.

3.02 "Older Adult" means any person who is at least 62 years old.

3.03 "Individual with a Disability" means an individual whose disability and/or medical condition meets one or more of the categories set forth in Section 4.04, or an individual who has one of the valid documents listed in Section 4.01(b) of this policy.

3.04 "Temporary Disability" means an individual whose disability and/or medical condition meets one or more of the categories set forth in Section 4.04, and that disability is not permanent.
IV. ELIGIBILITY

4.01 To qualify for a discount fare or ticket pursuant to this policy, a qualified individual must present one of the following to the bus operator, transit center ticket agent, or at a METRO Pass Outlet (See Section VIII) when paying a fixed route fare:

a. For Older adult (at least 62 years of age):
   i.) METRO Discount Photo Identification Card;
   ii.) METRO ParaCruz Identification Card;
   iii.) Paratransit Identification Card issued by another Transit Agency;
   iv.) Senior Citizen Identification Card;
   v.) Discount Photo Identification Card issued by another Transit Agency;
   vi.) Identification that displays date of birth (i.e. passport, or birth certificate);
   vii.) Current State Driver’s License, or current State Identification Card;

b. For Persons with Disabilities:
   i.) METRO Discount Photo Identification Card;
   ii.) METRO ParaCruz Identification Card;
   iii.) Paratransit Identification Card issued by another Transit Agency;
   iv.) Discount Photo Identification Card issued by another Transit Agency;
   v.) Medicare Identification Card;
   vi.) Identification Card for a California Disabled Parking Placard;
   vii.) Proof of Veterans Disability-a copy of valid Service Connected Disability Identification Card or a Veterans Administration Certification demonstrating a disability rating for aid and attendance or a service-connected disability with a rating level of 50% or higher.

e. Any individual presenting a valid Medicare Identification Card. The person presenting a Medicare ID Card may be asked for additional proof of identity (i.e., another card with a photograph) to check the validity of the Medicare Card.
4.02 To qualify for a METRO Discount Fare Card, an applicant must provide METRO Customer Service with one of the valid documents listed in Section 4.01(a) or 4.01(b) of this policy.

4.03 If an individual does not have one of the valid identification cards listed in Section 4.01(a) or 4.01(b) of this policy, he/she may still be eligible for a METRO Discount Fare Card. An additional way to qualify for a METRO Discount Fare Card is to submit a completed “Professional Verification of Disability Status” (Attachment A). Attachment A must identify the appropriate eligibility category from Section 4.04 and must be completed by one of the following licensed professionals for such category:

a. Licensed physicians with a Doctor of Medicine (M.D.) or Doctor of Osteopathic Medicine (D.O.) degree, licensed physician’s assistants and nurse practitioners may certify in all categories in which they are licensed to diagnose;

b. Licensed chiropractors, may certify in categories 1, 2, 3 and 4;

c. Licensed podiatrists, may certify disabilities involving the feet under categories 1, 2, 3 and 4;

d. Licensed optometrists, may certify in category 9;

e. Licensed audiologists, may certify in category 10;

f. Licensed clinical psychologists and licensed educational psychologists, may certify in categories 12, 15, 16 and 17;

g. Licensed marriage and family counselors (MFCC) and licensed clinical social workers (LCSW) may certify in Category 17.

4.04 To qualify for METRO Discount Fare Card based on a disability, the individual must meet one of the following categories as determined by a qualified individual identified in Section 4.03:

1. **Non-ambulatory Disabilities**—Impairments that, regardless of cause, require individuals to use a wheelchair for mobility;

2. **Mobility Aids**—Impairments that cause individuals to walk with significant difficulty, including individuals using a leg brace, cane walker, or crutches to achieve mobility;

3. **Musculo-Skeletal Impairment (Including Arthritis)**—Musculo-skeletal impairment such as muscular dystrophy, osteogenesis imperfecta or any type of arthritis; such as functional Class III or anatomical Stage III;

4. **Amputation**—Persons who suffer amputation of, or anatomical deformity of (i.e. loss of major function due to degenerative changes associated with vascular or neurological deficits, traumatic loss of muscle mass or tendons and x-ray evidence of bony or fibrous ankylosis...
at an unfavorable angle, joint subluxation or instability): (a) both hands; or (b) one hand and one foot; or (c) amputation of lower extremity at or above the tarsal region (one or both legs);

5. **Cerebrovascular Accident (Stroke)**—With one of the following: (a) pseudobulbar palsy; or (b) functional motor deficit in any of two extremities; or (c) ataxia affecting two extremities substantiated by appropriate cerebellar signs or proprioceptive loss post 4 months.

6. **Pulmonary Ills**—Respiratory Impairments of Class 3 and 4. Class 3: FVC between 51 percent and 59 percent of predicted; or FEV between 41 percent and 59 percent of predicted. Class 4: FVC less than or equal to 50 percent of predicted; or FEV less than or equal to 40 percent of predicted.

7. **Cardiac Ills**—Cardiovascular impairments of functional Class III or IV. Functional Classification: Class III: Individuals with cardiac disease resulting in marked limitation of physical activity. They are comfortable at rest. Less than ordinary physical activity causes fatigue, palpitation, dyspnea or anginal pain. For instance, inability to walk one or more level blocks or climbing a flight of ordinary stairs. Class IV: Individuals with cardiac disease resulting in inability to carry out any physical activity without discomfort. Symptoms of cardiac insufficiency or of the anginal syndrome may be present even at rest. If physical activity is undertaken, discomfort is increased.

8. **Dialysis**—Individuals whose disability requires the use of a kidney dialysis machine.

9. **Sight Disabilities**—Those individuals whose vision in the better eye, after best correction, is 20/200 or less; or those individuals whose visual field is contracted (commonly known as tunnel vision): (a) to 10 degrees or less from a point of fixation; or (b) so the widest diameter subtends an angle no greater than 20 degrees; and (c) individuals who are unable to read information signs or symbols for other than language reasons.

10. **Hearing Disabilities**—Deafness or hearing incapacity that makes an individual unable to communicate or hear warning signals, including only those persons whose hearing loss is 70 dba or greater in the 500, 1000, 2000 Hz. Ranges.

11. **Disabilities of Incoordination**—Individuals suffering faulty coordination or palsy from brain, spinal or peripheral nerve injury and any person with a functional nerve injury and any person with a functional motor deficit in any two limbs or who suffers manifestations which significantly reduce mobility, coordination or perceptiveness not accounted for in previous categories;
12. **Intellectual Disability**—Individuals characterized by significant limitations both in intellectual functioning and in adaptive behavior as expressed in conceptual, social, and practical adaptive skills. This disability generally originates during the developmental period before the age of 18 or as the result of illness or accident later in life and is associated with impairment in adaptive behavior (a general guideline is an IQ which is more than two standard deviations below the norm).

13. **Cerebral Palsy**—A disorder dating from birth or early infancy or as the result of illness or accident later in life, non-progressive, although if not treated there is marked regression in functioning characterized by examples of aberrations of motor functions (paralysis, weakness, incoordination) and often other manifestations of organic brain damage such as sensory disorders, seizures, mental retardation, learning difficulty and behavioral disorders.

14. **Epilepsy (Convulsive Disorder)**—A clinical disorder involving impairment of consciousness, characterized by seizures (e.g., generalized, complex partial, major motor, grand mal, petit mal or psychomotor), occurring more frequently than once a month in spite of prescribed treatment, with (a) diurnal episodes (loss of consciousness and convulsive seizure); (b) nocturnal episodes which show residual interfering with activity during the day; or (c) a disorder involving absence (petit mal) or mild partial (psychomotor) seizures occurring more frequently than once per week in spite of prescribed treatment with 1) Alteration of awareness or loss of consciousness; and 2) Transient postictal manifestations of conventional or antisocial behavior. Person exhibiting seizure-free control for a continuous period of more than six (6) months duration are not included in the statement of Epilepsy defined in this category.

15. **Infantile Autism**—A syndrome described as consisting of withdrawal, very inadequate social relationships, language disturbance and monotonously repetitive motor behavior. Many children with autism will also be seriously impaired in general intellectual functioning. This syndrome usually appears before the age of six and is characterized by severe withdrawal and inappropriate response to external stimuli.

16. **Neurological Impairment**—A syndrome characterized by learning, perception and/or behavioral disorders of an individual who’s IQ is not less than two standard deviations below the norm. These characteristics exist as a result of brain dysfunctions (any disorder in learning using the senses), neurologic disorder or any damage to the central nervous system, whether due to genetic, hereditary, accident or illness factors. This section includes people with severe gait problems who are restricted in mobility.
17. **Mental Disorders**—Individuals whose mental impairment substantially limits one or more of their major life activities. This includes inability to learn, work or care for oneself. A principal diagnosis from the SSM IV classification in one of the following areas is required for eligibility: Organic Mental Disorders, Schizophrenic Disorders, Paranoid Disorders, Psychotic Disorders not elsewhere classified, Affective Disorders, Somat Form Disorders, Dissociative Disorders, Adjustment Disorders, Psychological Factors Affecting Physical Condition, and Post Traumatic Stress Syndrome. These diagnoses must be at Class 3 to 5 levels:

- Class 3-Moderate Impairment. Levels compatible with some, but not all, useful functions.
- Class 4-Marked Impairment. Levels significantly impede useful functioning.
- Class 5-Extreme Impairment. Levels preclude useful functioning.

(Note: If a person’s disorder is in remission or primary incapacity is acute or chronic alcoholism or drug addiction, they are specifically excluded from discount fare eligibility.)

18. **Chronic Progressive Debilitating Disorders**—Individuals who experience chronic and progressive debilitating diseases that are characterized by constitutional symptoms such as fatigue, weakness, weight loss, pain and changes in mental status that, taken together, interfere in the activities of daily living and significantly impair mobility. Examples of such disorders include: (a) Progressive, uncontrollable malignancies (i.e., terminal malignancies or malignancies being treated with aggressive radiation or chemotherapy); (b) Advanced connective tissue diseases (i.e., advance stages of disseminated lupus erythematosus, scleroderma or polyarteritis nodosa); (c) Symptomatic HIV infection (i.e., AIDS or ARC) in CDC defined clinical categories B and C.

19. **Multiple Impairments**—This category may include, but not be limited to, persons disabled by the combined effects of more than one impairment, including those related to age. The individual impairments themselves may not be severe enough to qualify as a Transit Dysfunction; however, the combined effects of the disabilities may qualify the individual for the program.

V. **PURCHASING METRO DISCOUNT ID CARDS**

5.01 An eligible individual may purchase a METRO Discount Fare Card at either of the following locations at the times indicated:

a. Santa Cruz Metro Center (Pacific Station) Information Booth on weekdays. Please contact (831-425-8600) METRO for specific times.
b. Watsonville Transit Center at West Lake and Rodriguez Streets every Tuesday
generally. Please contact (831-425-8600) METRO for specific times.

5.02 An eligible individual must present one of the forms of Identification listed in Section
4.01 or other acceptable proof of age in order to qualify for a METRO Discount Fare
Card based on being 62 years of age or older.

5.03 a. To purchase a METRO Discount Fare Card based on disability without proof of
disability set forth in Section 4.01(b), the individual must provide a completed
“Professional Verification of Disability Status” (Attachment A). Attachment A must
be certified by a licensed medical practitioner or other licensed professional verifying
that the individual has a disability (see Section IV), which may qualify the individual
for a discounted fare.

* Verification of Disability Status Forms can be picked up at:

Santa Cruz Metro Center (Pacific Station) Information Booth, or
requested by phone at (831) 425-860;

METRO’s Accessible Services Coordinator at (831) 423-3868 or the
California Relay System at 800-735-2929.

The forms are also available on-line at METRO’s website:

www.scmtd.com

b. COST OF DISCOUNT ID CARD: Those eligible individuals will pay $2.00 for the
Card, $2.00 for the first replacement of a lost card, and $5.00 for the replacement of a
lost card thereafter.

5.04 Children (under the age of 18) of METRO passengers using Metro Discount Photo ID
Cards can ride at the discounted rate when accompanying their qualifying parent. Parents
must complete a registration form (Attachment B), available at the Santa Cruz Metro
Center (Pacific Station) and Watsonville Transit Centers to qualify for this extended
coverage. The registration form is also available on METRO’s website
(www.scmtd.com).

VI. PERSONAL CARE ATTENDANTS

5.01 Persons with Disabilities are eligible to have one personal care attendant travel with
him/her without paying a second fare. To qualify, the Verification of Disability Status
Form must indicate a need for a Personal Care Attendant, which is certified by a licensed
medical practitioner or other licensed professional. Upon acceptance by METRO, the
eligible individual will be provided with specific identification that authorizes
transportation with one Personal Care Attendant.

6.02 An individual who has a METRO Discount Fare Card or Paratransit Card issued by
another Transit Agency, or a METRO ParaCruz Eligibility Card, which indicates the need
for one Personal Care Attendant, may ride on METRO’s fixed route with one Personal
Care Attendant without paying a second fare.
VII. TEMPORARY DISABILITIES

7.01 Persons with temporary disabilities, who meet one or more of the Categories listed in Section 4.04 of this Policy, may qualify for a Temporary (non-permanent) METRO Discount Fare Card (Peach colored Discount Card).

7.02 This Temporary Discount Fare Card will reflect an expiration date, which corresponds with the individual’s “Certification of Disability Status” Form. Once expired, the person would be required to receive a new “Certification of Disability Status” Form from a licensed professional in Section 4.03 in order to extend his/her METRO Discount Fare Card.

VIII. METRO PASS OUTLETS

8.01 METRO Bus Passes can be purchased starting five working days prior to the beginning of the month at the following locations:

APTOS
*Community Bridges/Lifeline, 236 Santa Cruz Avenue

BOULDER CREEK
Boulder Creek Pharmacy, 13081 Highway 9

CAPITOLA
SaveMar: Supermarket, 1475 – 41st Avenue

FELTON
Felton Pharmacy (inside New Leaf Market), 6240 Highway 9

LIVE OAK
*Live Oak Family Resource Center, 1438 Capitola Road

SANTA CRUZ
*Metro Center, 920 Pacific Avenue
*Emily’s Bakery, 1129 Mission Street (Mission & Laurel)
*Walgreen’s Pharmacy, 1718 Soquel Avenue

SCOTT’S VALLEY
*Epic Adventure Games, 222 Mt. Hermon Road, Suite A

WATSONVILLE
SaveMart Supermarket, 1465 Main Street
Watsonville Transit Center, 475 Rodriguez Street

*Highway 17 Monthly Pass sold only at these locations. All bus passes, including the Highway 17 Monthly Pass, may also be purchased by mail using the order form provided
inside the *Headways* bus schedule, and are available for purchase on METRO’s website [www.scmtd.com](http://www.scmtd.com).

**IX. ORDER PASSES BY MAIL**

9.01 Individuals who currently hold a valid METRO *Discount Fare Card*, or have previously purchased Discounted Passes and are on file with Santa Cruz METRO, can order bus passes by mail and on METRO’s website. The form is available in the *METRO Headways*, or at the METRO Information Booth (Pacific Station), and on METRO’s website [www.scmtd.com](http://www.scmtd.com). Mail the completed form along with a self-addressed, stamped envelope to:

Santa Cruz Metro  
920 Pacific Avenue, Suite 21  
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

9.02 Please allow 7 business days from the date the order is received by METRO. If you have any questions regarding orders for discount passes, call (831) 425-3822.

**X. ADMINISTRATION OF REGULATION**

10.01 The Operations Manager or designee is responsible for the following:

a. Ensuring that this regulation is disseminated to all existing fixed route drivers, customer service agents and transit center ticket agents.

b. Ensuring that this regulation is disseminated to all new and future fixed route drivers, customer service agents and transit center ticket agents.

c. Providing guidance, training and assistance to all employees, customer service agents and transit center ticket agents who are responsible for issuing METRO Discount ID Cards and passes.

10.02 METRO will integrate the METRO Discount Fare Card Program into its Policies and Procedures.
Attachment A

PROFESSIONAL VERIFICATION OF DISABILITY STATUS

I, __________________________ agree to the release of the medical information disclosed on this form to the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District for the purpose of METRO Discount Fare eligibility.

INDIVIDUAL'S SIGNATURE: ___________________________ Date: ____________

Date of Birth: ____________________________

*This portion of form to be completed by a Licensed Professional as described in Regulation #AR-1028, Section 4.03 (i.e.: licensed physician, chiropractor, podiatrist, optometrist, audiologist, clinical psychologist, marriage & family counselor, as appropriate, based on disability category).

PROFESSIONAL VERIFICATION:

The above named individual has requested a Discounted Fare from Santa Cruz METRO Transit District. By my signature, I certify that the information below is true and correct. I have reviewed the eligibility criteria as outlined in Regulation #AR-1028 - Section IV re: Eligibility and determined that my client is eligible for this program.

The individual identified above is eligible for a discounted fare, due to his/her illness, injury, or incapacity, as listed below: (Check all that apply)

☐ The above named individual is a person who by reason of illness, injury, age, congenital malfunction, or other permanent or temporary incapacity or disability (including, any individual who is a wheelchair user or has semi-ambulatory capabilities), is unable, without special facilities, planning, or design, to utilize public transportation facilities and services as effectively as a person who is not so affected. (*See Section 4.04 for Category descriptions). Please list the Category disability that this individual has ________________.

☐ The Disability is permanent.

☐ The disability is not permanent and will expire on ________________.

☐ The above named individual requires the use of a Personal Care Attendant (PCA).

How long do you anticipate the need for a PCA?

☐ Permanent; or ☐ Temporary

(Specify expiration date)

Signature of Licensed Professional: ___________________________ Date: ____________

Print Name of Licensed Professional: ___________________________

Professional Title: ___________________________ License Number: ___________________________

Address: ___________________________

Telephone: (____) _______
Attachment B

REQUEST FOR REDUCED CHILDREN’S FARE
WITH DISABILITY I.D. CARD

I wish to request certification to allow my children, under the age of 18, (listed below) to travel with me when I use my Disability ID Card and pay the Disability Reduced Fare while traveling on METRO Fixed Route service.

CHILDREN:

Name: __________________________

Name: __________________________

Name: __________________________

Name: __________________________

Name: __________________________

Disability ID Card Holder:

Print Name: __________________________

Address: __________________________

Signature: __________________________ Date: ________________

After completing the top portion of this form, please submit the completed form to the Customer Service Agent at Santa Cruz Metro Center (Pacific Station), or Watsonville Transit Center. The Customer Service Agent will then place a sticker on your Discount ID Card, which allows you to pay Discount Fare for your children when they accompany you on METRO Fixed Route bus service.
AGENDA: April 13, 2010

TO: Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee

FROM: Karena Pushnik, SCCRTC Staff

RE: Recommend that the RTC approve FY 2010-11 Transportation Development Act Funds for the Volunteer Center

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee recommend that the Regional Transportation Commission:

Approve the FY 2010-11 Transportation Development Act funding request from the City of Santa Cruz on behalf of the Volunteer Center for $51,754, which consists of the FY 2010-11 allocation of $58,181, minus the overpayment in FY 2009-10 of $6,427.

BACKGROUND

The Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) allocates Transportation Development Act funds from the region’s share of the ¼ cent sales tax according to established formulas in the Commission’s Rules and Regulations.

DISCUSSION

At the Regional Transportation Commission’s (RTC) March meeting, the FY 2010-11 budget was approved including Transportation Development Act (TDA) allocations for both the Volunteer Center and Community Bridges. The allocation to the Volunteer Center was $58,181. However, last fiscal year TDA funds came in less than the anticipated amount due to the depressed economy. Because the Volunteer Center receives one lump sum at the beginning of the fiscal year, rather than refund part of their last year’s allocation, they opted to subtract the loss in revenue from this fiscal year’s allocation. Thus, $6,427 was deducted from the total amount budgeted.

The Volunteer Center’s goal is to provide 4,600 one-way trips to eligible clients over FY 2010-11 (Attachment 1). Because this program uses volunteer drivers, it is a highly cost effective method of providing rides to many in the county who are ineligible for ParaCruz services.

The City of Santa Cruz, as a local jurisdiction, has agreed to act as the claimant for both agencies, as it has historically, concurrent with the E/D TAC action.

SUMMARY

Staff recommends that the E/D TAC recommend that the Regional Transportation Commission approve the claim from the City of Santa Cruz on behalf of the Volunteer Center.

Attachment 1: Volunteer Center Claim and Background Information.
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Transportation Development Act (TDA) – Local Transportation Funds
CLAIM FORM

This form has been developed in an effort to standardize information required from TDA recipients, based on TDA Statute, RTC Rules and Regulations, and/or RTC board requests. If you have any questions about this claim form or would like an electronic copy of the form, please contact the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission at 460-3200.

Project Information

1. Project Title: Transportation Program

2. Implementing Agency: Volunteer Center of Santa Cruz

3. Sponsoring Agency (if different) – must be a TDA Eligible Claimant: City of Santa Cruz

4. TDA funding requested this claim: $ 51,754 (10/11 allocation of $58.181 minus $6,427 overpayment 09/10)

5. Fiscal Year (FY) for which funds are claimed: FY 10 / 11

6. General purpose for which the claim is made, identified by the article and section of the Act which authorizes such claims:

☐ Article 8 Bicycle and/or Pedestrian Facility

☐ Article 4 Public Transportation

☐ Article 8 Specialized Transportation

☐ Article 3 & 8 TDA Admin or Planning

7. Contact Person/Project Manager

Name: Debra Brooks
Telephone Number: 831-427-5070  E-mail: RSVP@scvolunteercenter.org
Secondary Contact (in event primary not available): Lois Connell
Telephone Number: 831-427-5070  E-mail: lois@scvolunteercenter.org

8. Project/Program Description/Scope (use additional pages, if needed, to provide details such as work elements/tasks): Please see attached scope of work.

9. Project Location/Limits (attach a map and/or photos if available/applicable, include street names): All of Santa Cruz County

10. Justification for the project. (Why is this project needed? Primary goal/purpose of the project; problem to be addressed; project benefits; importance to the community)

We know from needs assessments that low or free transportation to elderly and disabled persons out side of the fixed route are in desperate need. The Volunteer Centers Transportation Program is a vital link in providing this service. Volunteer drivers provide the service free of charge to clients through out the county.

11. Project Goals:

a. Measures of performance, success or completion to be used to evaluate project/program: The number of rides provided and the number of clients served will measure performance. This will be evaluated through ride reports compiled on each ride that details client, date and time of ride, destination of ride and driver providing ride. These records are entered into a computerized data file.
b. Number of people to be served/anticipated number of users of project/program (ex. number of new or maintained bike miles; number of people served/rides provided): Our goal is to provide 4,600 one-way trips to eligible clients. Clients will be limited to a maximum of two rides per week. Our priority for filling requests is as follows:

- 1st Priority: Medical trips for low-income persons
- 2nd Priority: Medical trips for other persons
- 3rd Priority: Shopping for low-income persons
- 4th Priority: Shopping for other persons
- 5th Priority: Other eligible destinations

These trips will be targeted for geographic distribution as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Rides</th>
<th>% of Rides</th>
<th>#Clients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz/Mid-County/Aptos/Capitola</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Lorenzo/Scotts Valley</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watsonville/Freedom</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures are based on population data derived from the latest census and available transit services for each area of operations. In considering geographic distribution of services, our goal is to provide extra support in those areas which are outside the boundaries of Lifeline services, or which receive limited Lifeline service and have limited public transit services.

12. Consistency and relationship with the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) - Is program/project listed in the RTP and/or consistent with a specific RTP Goal/Policy? The Volunteer Center's of Santa Cruz have been receiving TDA funds for over 35 years and was been a member of the Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee. The program is listed in the Specialized Transportation Guide and is included in the March 12, 2008 draft Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan providing all services listed in the plan.

13. Impact(s) of project on other modes of travel, if any (ex. parking to be removed): This project will have little or no impact on other modes of travel.

14. Estimated Project Cost/Budget, including other funding sources, and Schedule: (attach project budget)

What is the total project cost? $  

Is project fully funded? Yes

What will TDA funds be used on (ex. administration, brochures, engineering, construction)? Funds are used for personnel Cost, Audit fees, Supplies, Telephone, Occupancy, Printing, Postage, Volunteer mileage, Administration.

15. Preferred Method and Schedule for TDA fund distribution (see RTC Rules and Regulations for details):

a. Bike/Ped: ☐ Up to 90% upon initiation of work OR ☐ 100% upon project completion

b. CTSA: ☐ Quarterly disbursement, with up to 35% in first quarter, and the remaining quarterly payments being one-third of the remaining claim amount; OR ☐ Quarterly disbursement

c. Volunteer Center: ☐ Full approved claim amount in the first quarter
d. SCMTD: □ Quarterly disbursement

16. TDA Eligibility:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES?/NO?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Has the project/program been approved by the claimant's governing body? Attach resolution to claim. (If &quot;NO,&quot; provide the approximate date approval is anticipated.)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Has this project previously received TDA funding?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. For capital projects, have provisions been made by the claimant to maintain the project or facility, or has the claimant arranged for such maintenance by another agency? (If an agency other than the Claimant is to maintain the facility provide its name: __________________________ )</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Has the project already been reviewed by the RTC Bicycle Committee and/or Elderly/Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee? (If &quot;NO,&quot; project will be reviewed prior to RTC approval).</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SCMTD, CTSA, Bike to Work, CTSC Only – PLEASE KEEP ANSWERS BRIEF

17. Improving Program Efficiency

- Describe any areas where special efforts have been made in the last fiscal year to reduce operating cost and/or increase ridership/program usage. Note any important trends.

- Goals for next fiscal year (ex. identify opportunities to maximize economies of scale). Describe any areas where special efforts will be made to improve efficiency and increase program usage/ridership:

18. What is different from last year’s program/claim.

19. Schedule of regular progress reports including an evaluation at the end of the year:

CTSA and Volunteer Center (Article 8) Only

20. Are these transportation services responding to a transportation need not otherwise being met within the community or jurisdiction of the claimant? Describe. The Volunteer Center's Transportation Program is a volunteer program providing rides and serves to people who, through age, physical limitations or geographic location, are unable to use other public or private transportation resources. Our goal is to provide extra support in those areas which are outside the boundaries of Liftline services, or which receive limited Liftline service and have limited public transit services. The service is provided free of charge to clients. There are no other providers of this service in the community.

21. Where appropriate, are these specialized transportation services coordinated with other transportation services? Describe When possible, the Volunteer Center will refer those callers whose requests cannot be accommodated through our program to other transportation programs.

SCMTD & RTC Only

22. List the recommendations provided in your last Triennial Performance Audit and your progress toward meeting them.

- Describe the work your agency has undertaken to implement each performance audit recommendation and the steps it will take to fully implement the recommendation.

- For any recommendations that have not been implemented, explain why the recommendation has not been implemented and describe the work your agency will undertake to implement each performance audit recommendation.

- Describe any problems encountered in implementing individual recommendations.

SCMTD Only

15-4
23. Farebox Recovery Ratio: (split out = urbanized service vs. non-urban service farebox ratios for prior year and year-to-date)
   - Fare Revenue: $
   - Local Support Revenues: $
   - Operating Cost: $
   - Ratio Fare Rev/Op Cost: ____% (minimum required=15%)
   - Cost per ride being subsidized for different services/funds:

Note: Exemptions for calculating operating costs – spell out in your operating budget summary.
- Service extensions are exempt until two years after the end of the fiscal year during which they were established (PUC Sec. 99268.8). This exemption applies only if the new service was not provided nor was funded by LTF/STA during any of the prior three fiscal years.
- The additional operating costs to a transit operator of providing comparable complementary paratransit services, pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act, that exceed operator’s prior year costs as adjusted by the CPI are excluded from operating cost.
- The costs of providing ridesharing services are also excluded from operating costs.

24. Current fare & local support revenue to operating cost ratio versus FY1978-79 ratio (for services to the general public).
   - Current ratio ((sum of fare revenues + local support)/operating cost): ______________
   - FY1978-79 Ratio: ______________

25. Did the SCMTD operating budget increase over 15% from the prior fiscal year?
   If the answer is yes, please provide a statement identifying and substantiating the reason or need for the increase in the transit operating budget in excess of 15% above the preceding year, and identify substantial increases or decreases in the scope of operations or capital provisions for major new service - (transit claimants only, if applicable).

26. Operating statistics (compare current fiscal year to date to last three full fiscal years; *TDA required performance indicators), submit items from the following list.
   - Annual passengers
     - Rides/passenger trips provided by type (student, senior, adult, pass holders, etc, or however stat’s kept) and amount of TDA $ used for each type of ride
   - Annual service hours
   - Passengers per vehicle service hour*
   - Annual service miles
   - # of fixed-route miles
   - Service Area – square miles
   - Service Area Population
   - Passengers per vehicle service mile*
   - Average passengers per weekday
   - Total operating costs in budget
   - Operating cost per vehicle service hour*
   - Total operating cost per passenger*
   - Average Farebox Revenue per passenger (describe what is included)
   - # of FTE employees (all employees, not just drivers)
   - Vehicle Service hours/Employee*
   - # of routes
   - Average route length
• Average travel times/rider
• # of bus stops
• # of vehicles in operation
• # of monthly bus passes in circulation
• Max vehicles in service at any time:
• Hours of service:
• Approximate # of unduplicated passengers
• Cost per unit of service plus text about long range plans to make/keep this low
• Funds and percentage spent on administration/overhead/grantee allocation/etc
• Actual financials compared with budget
• Actual number of rides provided compared with goal and text about whether goal was met and why/why not

Documentation to Include with Your Claim:

All Claims
• A letter of transmittal to SCCRTC addressed to the Executive Director that attests to the accuracy of the claim and all its accompanying documentation.
• Resolution

All Transit and Specialized Transportation Claims (SCMTD, CTSA, and Volunteer Center)
• A copy of the operating and capital budgets for the coming fiscal year
• Description of capital projects, including time frame over which project will be funded and implemented
• Operating Plan for current and upcoming activities – can be within project description

Article 4 Transit Claims
• A certification completed within the last 13 months from the California Highway Patrol indicating that the operator is in compliance with Section 1808.1 of the Vehicle Code
• Certifications

Article 3 & 8 Bicycle/Pedestrian Claims
• Evidence of environmental review for capital projects
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A. TARGET POPULATION

The Volunteer Center's Transportation Program is a volunteer program providing rides and serves to people whom, through age, physical limitations or geographic location, are unable to use other public or private transportation resources. Volunteer drivers using their own vehicles provide rides. Our program is limited to ambulatory persons. Our service area is all of Santa Cruz County.

B. SERVICE GOALS

Our goal is to provide 4,600 one-way trips to eligible clients. Clients will be limited to a maximum of two rides per week. Our priority for filling requests is as follows:

1st Priority - Medical trips for low-income persons
2nd Priority - Medical trips for other persons
3rd Priority - Shopping for low-income persons
4th Priority - Shopping for other persons
5th Priority - Other eligible destinations

These trips will be targeted for geographic distribution as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rides</th>
<th>% of Rides</th>
<th>Client</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz/Mid-County/Aptos/Capitola</td>
<td>2600</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Lorenzo/Scotts Valley</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watsonville/ Freedom</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures are based on population data derived from the latest census and available transit services for each area of operations. In considering geographic distribution of services, our goal is to provide extra support in those areas which are outside the boundaries of Liftline services, or which receive limited Liftline service and have limited public transit services.

C. PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

1. The Volunteer Center will maintain volunteer dispatchers five days per week from 10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. in Santa Cruz, and from 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. in the Watsonville and Valley centers.

2. When possible, the Volunteer Center will refer those callers whose requests cannot be accommodated through our program to other transportation programs.

3. The Volunteer Center will continue its intensive campaign to recruit new drivers and dispatchers for all three offices.
4. Volunteer Center staff will attend all meetings of the Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee of the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission.

D. QUARTERLY REPORTS

Quarterly Reports and a Final Activities Report are due to the Transportation Commission and the City of Santa Cruz according to this schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior Year Annual Report</td>
<td>September 3, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly Activities Report 1</td>
<td>October 29, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly Activities Report 2</td>
<td>February 1, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly Activities Report 3</td>
<td>April 29, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly Activities Report 4</td>
<td>August 1, 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reports will contain the following information for each center and total:

1. Number of rides provided
2. Trip destinations
3. Mileage claimed
4. Estimated mileage donated
5. Estimated total mileage
6. Average length of trip
7. Number of unduplicated passengers
8. Number of requests for service
9. Number of turndowns
10. Reason for turndowns
11. Number of active volunteers
12. Geographic distribution of clients

E. INSURANCE

Comprehensive auto and general liability insurance over and above that held by the driver will be maintained by the Volunteer Center in the amount of $1,000,000 per occurrence.

F. CLAIMS

One claim will be submitted for advance payment for the year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual Advance - July 1, 2010</td>
<td>$58,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Overpayment 2009/2010</td>
<td>$6,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment Amount</td>
<td>$51,754</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Program Name:** Transportation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acct No.</th>
<th>Accounts, Sub Account(s)</th>
<th>FY 10-11 Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4007</td>
<td>Public Support: Donations, Unrestricted Donations</td>
<td>$ 5,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4285</td>
<td>Grants and Contract: Transportation Commission</td>
<td>$ 51,754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Program Revenues</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 56,929</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXPENSES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acct No.</th>
<th>Accounts, Sub Account(s)</th>
<th>FY 10-11 Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5001</td>
<td>Salaries and Wages: Hourly Wages</td>
<td>$ 30,437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5012</td>
<td>Benefits: Medical/Dental Insurance</td>
<td>$ 1,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5025</td>
<td>Benefits: Workers Compensation</td>
<td>$ 375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5016</td>
<td>Payroll Taxes: Social Security/Medicare</td>
<td>$ 2,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5018</td>
<td>Payroll Taxes: State UI Taxes</td>
<td>$ 475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6012</td>
<td>Auditing Expense</td>
<td>$ 600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6040</td>
<td>Insurance, General</td>
<td>$ 686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6042</td>
<td>Insurance, Volunteer</td>
<td>$ 723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6050</td>
<td>Postage Expense</td>
<td>$ 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6059</td>
<td>Printing</td>
<td>$ 150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6060</td>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>$ 240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6061</td>
<td>Rent, Watsonville</td>
<td>$ 3,937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6088</td>
<td>Supplies, Program: Program Supplies</td>
<td>$ 250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6098</td>
<td>Mileage, Volunteers</td>
<td>$ 6,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6100</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>$ 1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6160</td>
<td>Admin Fees</td>
<td>$ 7,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Program Revenues</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 56,929</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AGENDA: April 13, 2010

TO: Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee

FROM: Karena Pushnik, SCCRTC Staff

RE: FY 2010-11 Transportation Development Act Funds for Community Bridges

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee recommend that the Regional Transportation Commission approve the Transportation Development Act funding request from the City of Santa Cruz on behalf of Community Bridges for $488,721.

BACKGROUND

The Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) allocates Transportation Development Act funds from the region's share of the ¼ cent sales tax according to established formulas in the Commission's Rules and Regulations.

DISCUSSION

At the Regional Transportation Commission's (RTC) March meeting, the FY 2010-11 budget was approved including Transportation Development Act (TDA) allocations for both Community Bridges and the Volunteer Center. The City of Santa Cruz, as a local jurisdiction, has agreed to act as the claimant for both agencies, as it has historically, concurrent with the E/D TAC action.

The budget and program information from the Community Bridges is attached (Attachment 1). Community Bridges serves low income and disabled individuals, many of which are unable to use traditional public transit or the complementary paratransit. The TDA funds are projected to provide a total of 65,000 rides to approximately 500 people in FY 2010-11.

SUMMARY

Staff recommends that the E/D TAC recommend that the Regional Transportation Commission approve the claim from the City of Santa Cruz on behalf of Community Bridges.

Attachment 1: Community Bridges Claim and Background Information
Transportation Development Act (TDA) – Local Transportation Funds
CLAIM FORM
Submit a separate form for each agency.

This form has been developed in an effort to standardize information required from TDA recipients, based on TDA Statute, RTC Rules and Regulations, and/or RTC board requests.
If you have any questions about this claim form or would like an electronic copy of the form, please contact the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission at 460-3200.

Project Information

1. Project Title: Lift Line / CTSA for Santa Cruz County

2. Implementing Agency: Community Bridges

3. Sponsoring Agency (if different) – must be a TDA Eligible Claimant:
The City of Santa Cruz acts as the eligible TDA claimant for Lift Line. Lift Line receives the TDA funds through a contract with the City of Santa Cruz.

4. TDA funding requested this claim: $488,721

5. Fiscal Year (FY) for which funds are claimed: FY 10 / 11

6. General purpose for which the claim is made, identified by the article and section of the Act which authorizes such claims:
☐ Article 8 Bicycle and/or Pedestrian Facility ☑ Article 8 Specialized Transportation
☐ Article 4 Public Transportation ☐ Article 3 & 8 TDA Admin or Planning

7. Contact Person/Project Manager
Name: Catherine Patterson Valdez
Telephone Number: 831-688-8840 ext. 244 E-mail: catherinep@cbridges.org
Secondary Contact (in event primary not available) : Michael Robins
Telephone Number: 831-688-8840 ext. 204 E-mail: michaelr@cbridges.org

8. Project/Program Description/Scope (use additional pages, if needed, to provide details such as work elements/tasks): Please see Exhibit C-1 and C-2 attached.

9. Project Location/Limits (attach a map and/or photos if available/applicable, include street names): All of Santa Cruz County.

10. Justification for the project. (Why is this project needed? Primary goal/purpose of the project; problem to be addressed; project benefits; importance to the community).
Community Bridges has been the designated Consolidated Transportation Services Agency (CTSA) since 1982. CTSA's are authorized under California Government Code Sections 15975 and 15950-15952 which were enacted pursuant to the Social Service Transportation Improvement Act. The purpose of the CTSA is to improve transportation required by social service recipients by promoting the consolidation of social service transportation. As the Coordinated Transportation Service Agency, Lift Line is coordinating transportation services with other transportation and human service agencies in order to provide the most efficient transportation possible. We are also working with County School Districts, Family and Children's Services of the County of Santa Cruz, County office of Education, Veterans Service Offices, and other Hospitals and Medical facilities. Lift Line is also working closely with several other non-profit organizations and other Counties to help define and create an effective mobility management center to help mobilize resident with various disabilities, low income and senior populations to travel easily throughout our County as well as to travel seamlessly throughout our tri-county region.
The benefit of CTSA coordination is to improve and identify the need for specialized transportation equipment, provide adequate training to ensure that not only Lift Line staff operates in a safe and sensitive manner but to provide expertise and training for other transportation providers in the County. Lift Line is currently providing access to the tools and training to ensure local transportation programs are also providing safe transportation service. This also allows all of us to obtain cost savings from centralized scheduling, dispatching, and maintenance and administrative efficiencies.

Pursuant to the CTSA designation for Santa Cruz County, Community Bridges operates the Lift Line transportation program, which works in identifying unmet transportation needs, coordinates and provides social service transportation services to low-income seniors, disabled residents, underserved populations and other persons in Santa Cruz County. Lift Line can directly address the issues identified through the unmet needs process by providing rides to medical appointments (including dialysis), alternative care, mental health and various therapy appointments.

11. Project Goals:
   a. Measures of performance, success or completion to be used to evaluate project/program:
      Lift Line uses the Trapeze Pass Scheduling program (Trapeze Software Group On-Line Data Products, Inc.) for scheduling and dispatching all directly performed and brokered rides. This includes rides sub-contracted to our local taxi companies. Regular updates are made to this system to ensure the continued functionality and sophistication of the system. Lift Line Dispatch System is completely automated with Mobil Data Computers (MDC) and Automatic Vehicle Locaters (AVL) that integrate with Trapeze, making it easy to make changes if needed and track rides as they occur. As rides are completed, the MDCs tag completed rides with real pickup and drop-off times and highlight these times in blue, making it easier for our dispatchers to monitor all rides. Likewise, uncompleted or unassigned rides (such as will-call returns) are highlighted in red to inform the dispatcher of the priority of pending trips. The addition of the AVLs in the fleet allows Lift Line to monitor and track vehicles at any moment. These systems allow Lift Line to provide accurate monthly encounter data to satisfy data requirements. We will continue to provide our quarterly TDA reports, with the RTC reporting requirements, which are generated directly from the actual rides performed and documented through these systems.

Performance Measures to be included in Quarterly Reports

The quarterly reports are to include the following:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Unduplicated passengers per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Total passenger trips (units of service) per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Incidents per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Accidents per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Mechanical failures* (including lift failure) per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>No-shows per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Turndowns or referrals per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Cansels per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Donations per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Total operating cost per passenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Total operating cost per vehicle service hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Total passengers per vehicle service hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Total passengers per vehicle service mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Fare box recovery level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Van mileage per program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>% of Rides performed by subcontractors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>% of shared trips/ Average vehicle occupancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>% of cancelations of total rides</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mechanical failure means any problem which results in a delay of one hour or longer, or cancellation of service.
b. Number of people to be served/anticipated number of users of project/program (ex. number of new or maintained bike miles; number of people served/rides provided):
Lift Line’s is projecting to provide service to 500 Santa Cruz residents who will need specialized wheel-chair accessible vans and is projecting to provide and coordinate over 65,000 rides in the 2010/2011 fiscal year. Due to the economy’s impact on sales taxes resulting in reduced revenue, our ride estimates have decreased from our current year. Please see Exhibit C-1 and C-2 Operating Plan for details. Lift Line will continue to provide responsive, non-emergency health and medical paratransportation for seniors and disabled residents of Santa Cruz County, all of which are low-income. Trips are provided to health and medical destinations such as medical centers, doctor's offices, pharmacies, dialysis centers, and various medical therapy appointments. In partnership with Central Coast Alliance for Health, rides to medical destinations will be provided for qualified members Lift Line works closely with Watsonville Dialysis and Santa Cruz Satellite Dialysis to provide flexible services for its clients who are unable to use transit or ParaCruz services.

12. Consistency and relationship with the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) - Is program/project listed in the RTP and/or consistent with a specific RTP Goal/Policy?
Community Bridges Lift Line works closely with the Regional Transportation Commission and the members of the Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee, Long Term Care Interagency Commission, In Home Support Service Commission, Commission on Disabilities, Human Care Alliance, and the local Senior Network Agency to identify specialized transportation needs for Santa Cruz County. This year Lift Line has created a new alliance with the Access to Health Care steering Committee to address some of the out of county transportation issues. Lift Line as a program of Community Bridges works closely with local human service and transportation programs on local and regional coordinated plan projects, as required by Federal and State Transportation Agencies. These are included in both the RTP, which is updated every 3-5 years, and the Coordinated Human Services Transportation Plan. Projects/programs in the 2005 RTP within Projected Funds list include: continued non-ADA mandated paratransit services including medical service rides, Elderday, senior meal sites, non-emergency same day transportation for medically fragile individuals, and expanding the non-ADA mandated paratransit system to meet the growing specialized transportation needs of seniors and people with disabilities.

13. Impact(s) of project on other modes of travel, if any (ex. parking to be removed):
Lift Line is a complimentary service to the ADA- mandated METRO ParaCruz service. In addition, Lift Line provides a more flexible specialized transportation service for ongoing identified unmet immediate service needs. Due to the diverse nature of our services, Lift Line is able to group riders in various service categories, which ultimately reduces the number of vehicles needed to perform rides and in turn cuts down on traffic and emissions. In the fiscal year 2009/2010 Lift Line was able to optimize service by scheduling ride in the most efficient manner and ultimately reducing the cost of each ride by grouping ride types for long distance, cross county rides.

14. Estimated Project Cost/Budget, including other funding sources, and Schedule: (attach project - budget)

What is the total project cost? Total CTSA Transportation Budget = $1,728,224 (TDA only = $488,721)

Is project fully funded? YES

What will TDA funds be used on (ex. administration, brochures, engineering, construction)?
These funds will be used for administration, all cost related to provision of paratransit rides, and vehicle/communications acquisition. See TDA budget, Exhibit A.

15. Preferred Method and Schedule for TDA fund distribution (see RTC Rules and Regulations for details):
a. Bike/Ped: ☐ Up to 90% upon initiation of work OR ☐ 100% upon project completion

b. CTSA: ☑ Quarterly disbursement, with up to 35% in first quarter, and the remaining quarterly payments being one-third of the remaining claim amount;
   OR ☐ Quarterly disbursement

c. Volunteer Center: ☐ Full approved claim amount in the first quarter

d. SCMTD: ☐ Quarterly disbursement

16. TDA Eligibility:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES?/NO?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Has the project/program been approved by the claimant's governing body? Attach resolution to claim. (If &quot;NO,&quot; provide the approximate date approval is anticipated.)</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Has this project previously received TDA funding?</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. For capital projects, have provisions been made by the claimant to maintain the project or facility, or has the claimant arranged for such maintenance by another agency? (If an agency other than the Claimant is to maintain the facility provide its name: )</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Has the project already been reviewed by the RTC Bicycle Committee and/or Elderly/Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee? (If &quot;NO,&quot; project will be reviewed prior to RTC approval).</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SCMTD, CTSA, Bike to Work, CTSC Only – PLEASE KEEP ANSWERS BRIEF

17. Improving Program Efficiency

- Describe any areas where special efforts have been made in the last fiscal year to reduce operating cost and/or increase ridership/program usage. Note any important trends.

To reduce personnel down time and overtime, split shift schedules were implemented. Routes were also re-structured to increase productivity by grouping rides so that the vehicles are serving at capacity as much as possible. The current cost per service unit has gone up this year due primarily from the increase in Lift Line providing more rides to residents outside the METRO service area. Also, subcontractors continued to be used however, the rates to assist with longer rides to and from North and South County are much higher than previous years. Due to our ability to efficiently group riders, the overall cost of the other 09/10 TDA programs went down.

We continue to work on state wide workers comp pool to reduce our premiums. Lift Line also maintained optimum fleet size for services provided.

Taking into consideration the National, State and local government financial unbalance, as well as the International fuel issues, which has caused the cost of fuel to fluctuate at a rate that is incredibly hard to forecast, we continue to receive phone calls from concerned residents about available transportation options. Our local residents call Lift Line on a daily basis to voice their concern, and our focus has been on helping these residents identify the most cost effective way for them to move around the County, as well as to Out-of-County medical appointments. Through the MORE grant, Lift Line conducted outreach forums and gathered information from underserved residents and identified their transportation needs. With this information, Lift Line is actively addressing new ways of providing transportation for the special needs community, including the 211 calling service option. The MORE data will provide a look at creative approaches to resolving these fragmented systems to a more seamless network with a customer-focused mindset. The information and graphs developed for this study can be used to help implement Mobility Management Centers. This new approach will improve efficiency in County transportation services to this study’s targeted population. Clearly, the need for transportation for target special groups will be an on-going issue, especially while needs will continue to grow due
to our aging population and funding remains constrained. Lift Line is analyzing this information, which is helping us define the need for a local mobility management center.

Community Bridges Lift Line recently received funds to support transportation for our local Veterans to the out-patient clinic in Monterey. Coordinating this effort has also identified the need for CTSA to help coordinate the rides to the bay area hospitals locations, which in the past was coordinated by our local Red Cross. Having this “Out-of-County” volunteer medical ride service in house has allowed us to better identify the residents who need this service and we were able to consolidating rides for Veterans going to the Monterey Outpatient Clinic. By analysis use patters and destinations as well as working in partnership with other out of county health care providers we are able to consolidate our destination and scheduling processes.

- Goals for next fiscal year (ex. identify opportunities to maximize economies of scale). Describe any areas where special efforts will be made to improve efficiency and increase program usage/ridership:

The Mobility OutReach and Education (MORE) project grant analysis has supported the need for a mobility management center and identified unmet transportation issues and needs for Lift Line as the CTSA to address. We will continue working to develop solutions around transportation needs of some of the most disenfranchised populations in our community. The outcomes of this project has enabled us to more effectively carry out our mission to broaden mobility opportunities for all individuals by providing and coordinating the most accessible transportation possible.

18. What is different from last year’s program/claim?
Less funding is driving the changes we are all facing, we are working strategically to maintain the same quality door to door service with less funding.

19. Schedule of regular progress reports including an evaluation at the end of the year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting Period</th>
<th>Due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Fiscal Year: 2009/2010</td>
<td>11/15/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 1st Quarter, 7/1/10 through 9/30/10</td>
<td>01/15/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 2nd Quarter, 10/1/10 through 12/31/10</td>
<td>04/15/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 3rd Quarter, 1/1/11 through 3/31/11</td>
<td>07/15/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 4th Quarter, 4/1/11 through 6/30/11</td>
<td>11/15/11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CTSA and Volunteer Center (Article 8) Only

20. Are these transportation services responding to transportation need not otherwise being met within the community or jurisdiction of the claimant? Describe. Yes. For our target population we provide transporation that is otherwise not available. Services are provided to seniors and people with disabilities that can’t drive, are not able to use our METRO or ParaCruz services (do not have the financial resources, have origins/destinations out side the service area or have wheelchairs that do not meet the size criteria).

21. Where appropriate, are these specialized transportation services coordinated with other transportation services? Describe.
Lift Line, as the CTSA, acts as the safety net transportation service for seniors and disabled individuals unable to secure mobility through other programs. In addition, Lift Line coordinates and refers people daily to other services more suited to their specialized transportation requirements such as: METRO bus or ParaCruz; local taxi services through the taxi scrip program; the Volunteer Center, Veterans Services and our in house “Out of County” volunteer medical ride service. We help identify an individual’s specific need for specialized transportation service and coordinate not only services in our County, but also for rides to neighboring counties of San Benito, Monterey and Santa
Clara. In addition, Lift Line assists those who call from other parts California as well as callers from out of the state looking for health services as well as public and specialized transportation. Lift Line’s Division Director will continue to participate with local and statewide transportation groups to develop coordinated processes and keep updated on current and new transportation system for our seniors and disabled residents.

**SCMTD & RTC Only (CTSA will be required to include this after the next audit in 2010)**

22. List the recommendations provided in your last Triennial Performance Audit and your progress toward meeting them.
   - Describe the work your agency has undertaken to implement each performance audit recommendation and the steps it will take to fully implement the recommendation.
   - For any recommendations that have not been implemented, explain why the recommendation has not been implemented and describe the work your agency will undertake to implement each performance audit recommendation.
   - Describe any problems encountered in implementing individual recommendations.

**Documentation to Include with All Claims:**

**All Claims**
- A letter of transmittal to SCCRTC addressed to the Executive Director that attests to the accuracy of the claim and all its accompanying documentation.
- Resolution

**All Transit and Specialized Transportation Claims (SCMTD, CTSA, and Volunteer Center)**
- A copy of the operating and capital budgets for the coming fiscal year
- Description of capital projects, including time frame over which project will be funded and implemented
- Operating Plan for current and upcoming activities – can be within project description

**Article 4 Transit Claims**
- A certification completed within the last 13 months from the California Highway Patrol indicating that the operator is in compliance with Section 1808.1 of the Vehicle Code
- Certifications

**Article 3 & 8 Bicycle/Pedestrian Claims**
- Evidence of environmental review for capital projects
## COMMUNITY BRIDGES - LIFT LINE / CTSA
### TDA 2010-11 BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACCOUNT TITLE</th>
<th>TDA 2010-11</th>
<th>TDA &amp; MATCH 2010-11</th>
<th>CTSA 2010-11</th>
<th>EXHIBIT A, Page 1 of 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERSONNEL:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALARIES &amp; WAGES</td>
<td>150,201</td>
<td>294,227</td>
<td>420,748</td>
<td>171,626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRINGE BENEFITS: UNEMPLOYMENT</td>
<td>2,253</td>
<td>4,413</td>
<td>6,311</td>
<td>3,873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORKERS COMP</td>
<td>9,162</td>
<td>17,948</td>
<td>30,097</td>
<td>8,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEALTH INSUR.</td>
<td>45,060</td>
<td>88,268</td>
<td>146,484</td>
<td>49,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FICA</td>
<td>11,400</td>
<td>22,332</td>
<td>37,832</td>
<td>10,754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401K PLAN</td>
<td>1,202</td>
<td>2,354</td>
<td>3,894</td>
<td>1,549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PERSONNEL COSTS:</strong></td>
<td>219,278</td>
<td>429,542</td>
<td>645,366</td>
<td>244,692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICES &amp; SUPPLIES:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPERATING:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEHICLE OPERATIONS-GAS</td>
<td>14,850</td>
<td>61,468</td>
<td>81,957</td>
<td>14,631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEHICLE LICENSES</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>1,625</td>
<td>2,167</td>
<td>513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEHICLE MAINTENANCE</td>
<td>5,980</td>
<td>14,936</td>
<td>19,915</td>
<td>5,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEHICLE INSURANCE</td>
<td>22,267</td>
<td>64,655</td>
<td>86,207</td>
<td>21,937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNICATIONS-RADIO</td>
<td>5,456</td>
<td>8,955</td>
<td>11,940</td>
<td>5,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL VEH. OPERATING COSTS:</strong></td>
<td>49,073</td>
<td>151,639</td>
<td>202,186</td>
<td>48,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMINISTRATION:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTRACTED SERVICES</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSIONAL SERVICES</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>3,253</td>
<td>4,776</td>
<td>1,316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JANITORIAL SERVICES</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>958</td>
<td>1,423</td>
<td>496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUNDRAISING COMM RELATIONS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,292</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAFF TRAVEL</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINOR EQUIPMENT</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQUIPMENT MAINT &amp; REPAIR-MENTOR</td>
<td>12,460</td>
<td>23,460</td>
<td>23,460</td>
<td>18,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFFICE SUPPLIES</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAM SUPPLIES</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>2,797</td>
<td>3,729</td>
<td>533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEHICLE MAINT SUPPLIES</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>2,423</td>
<td>3,231</td>
<td>647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPUTER SUPPLIES/RELATED</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSTAGE</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>2,574</td>
<td>3,432</td>
<td>515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPACE RENTAL</td>
<td>11,415</td>
<td>44,527</td>
<td>59,369</td>
<td>11,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTILITIES</td>
<td>2,457</td>
<td>5,733</td>
<td>7,644</td>
<td>2,421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPACE MAINTENANCE</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>1,490</td>
<td>1,986</td>
<td>555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELEPHONE</td>
<td>3,433</td>
<td>3,406</td>
<td>4,541</td>
<td>3,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISCELLANEOUS FEES</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>1,337</td>
<td>1,782</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAFF TRAINING</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSURANCE-GENL LIABILITY &amp; FIDELITY</td>
<td>3,237</td>
<td>3,237</td>
<td>3,237</td>
<td>3,174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBERSHIPS/SUBSCRIPTIONS</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRINTING &amp; COPYING</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>1,713</td>
<td>2,284</td>
<td>1,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVERTISING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAXI - ELDERDAY RIDES</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20,492</td>
<td>20,492</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAXI - MOW RIDES</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>28,264</td>
<td>28,264</td>
<td>18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBSIDIZED TAXI - LL RIDES</td>
<td>22,500</td>
<td>31,884</td>
<td>31,884</td>
<td>13,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBSIDIZED TAXI - SCRIP</td>
<td>26,260</td>
<td>26,260</td>
<td>26,260</td>
<td>27,504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSSP SERVICE EXPENSE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,640</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUS PASSES</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQUIP FINANCING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,419</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSF TO EQUIP RESERVE</td>
<td>24,375</td>
<td>24,375</td>
<td>24,375</td>
<td>27,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSF FROM EQUIP RESERVE</td>
<td>(27,774)</td>
<td>(27,774)</td>
<td>(27,774)</td>
<td>(3,873)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR EQUIPMENT</td>
<td>55,488</td>
<td>483,776</td>
<td>485,295</td>
<td>38,776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGENCY OVERHEAD</td>
<td>65,312</td>
<td>125,512</td>
<td>178,615</td>
<td>67,936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ADMINISTRATION COSTS:</strong></td>
<td>220,369</td>
<td>815,269</td>
<td>877,170</td>
<td>238,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td>488,721</td>
<td>1,396,471</td>
<td>1,724,722</td>
<td>531,399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUES</strong></td>
<td>488,721</td>
<td>1,396,471</td>
<td>1,724,722</td>
<td>531,399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET GAIN (LOSS)</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## COMMUNITY BRIDGES - LIFT LINE / CTSA
### TDA 2010-11 BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACCOUNT TITLE</th>
<th>TDA 2010-11</th>
<th>TDA &amp; MATCH 2010-11</th>
<th>CTSA 2010-11</th>
<th>TDA 2009-10</th>
<th>TDA &amp; MATCH 2009-10</th>
<th>CTSA 2009-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BUDGET</td>
<td>BUDGET</td>
<td>BUDGET</td>
<td>BUDGET</td>
<td>BUDGET</td>
<td>BUDGET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDA</td>
<td>488,721</td>
<td>488,721</td>
<td>488,721</td>
<td>531,399</td>
<td>531,399</td>
<td>531,399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA Section 5310</td>
<td>401,553</td>
<td>401,553</td>
<td>401,553</td>
<td>34,328</td>
<td>34,328</td>
<td>34,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>12,539</td>
<td>12,539</td>
<td>12,539</td>
<td>15,674</td>
<td>15,674</td>
<td>15,674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Capitola</td>
<td>40,320</td>
<td>40,320</td>
<td>40,320</td>
<td>44,800</td>
<td>44,800</td>
<td>44,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Scotts Valley</td>
<td>2,820</td>
<td>2,820</td>
<td>2,820</td>
<td>2,820</td>
<td>2,820</td>
<td>2,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Watsonville</td>
<td>2,342</td>
<td>2,342</td>
<td>2,342</td>
<td>2,755</td>
<td>2,755</td>
<td>2,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>7,574</td>
<td>7,574</td>
<td>7,574</td>
<td>9,548</td>
<td>9,548</td>
<td>9,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Agency on Aging-Title IIB</td>
<td>38,798</td>
<td>38,798</td>
<td>38,798</td>
<td>38,798</td>
<td>38,798</td>
<td>38,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.O.R.E.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24,023</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWTP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA Section 5317</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey Penin Fdn</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Hospital</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,344</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,264</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medi-Cal (CAAH)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15,643</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15,643</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Contracts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>107,299</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>78,619</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Contracts- ISSP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Contract - Elderday</td>
<td>361,804</td>
<td>361,804</td>
<td>382,296</td>
<td>382,296</td>
<td>382,296</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scrip - Taxi</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>7,412</td>
<td>7,412</td>
<td>7,412</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scrip - MSSP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15,140</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15,140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mow Inter-Program Charges</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Income</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundraising</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,451</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,451</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,374</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,374</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Income - Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>185</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Inter-Program</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interprog-Outside Contracts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Sales</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Kind Revenue-Van Parking</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad Debt Allowance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>488,721</td>
<td>1,396,471</td>
<td>1,724,722</td>
<td>531,399</td>
<td>1,099,830</td>
<td>1,429,330</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## COMMUNITY BRIDGES - LIFT LINE / CTSA
### TDA 2010-11 BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPERATING FUND SOURCES</th>
<th>CTSA FINAL FY 08-09</th>
<th>CTSA BUDGET FY 09-10</th>
<th>CTSA BUDGET FY 10-11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TDA</td>
<td>559,631</td>
<td>531,399</td>
<td>488,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF SANTA CRUZ</td>
<td>26,992</td>
<td>15,674</td>
<td>12,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF CAPITOLÀ</td>
<td>44,800</td>
<td>44,800</td>
<td>40,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF SCOTTS VALLEY</td>
<td>2,820</td>
<td>2,820</td>
<td>2,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF WATSONVILLE</td>
<td>3,241</td>
<td>2,755</td>
<td>2,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY OF SANTA CRUZ</td>
<td>12,515</td>
<td>9,548</td>
<td>7,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AREA AGENCY ON AGING-TITLE IIIB</td>
<td>38,885</td>
<td>38,798</td>
<td>38,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.O.R.E.</td>
<td>53,361</td>
<td>24,023</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWTP</td>
<td>50,448</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA SECTION 5317</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONTEREY PENIN FDN</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOMINICAN HOSPITAL</td>
<td>4,481</td>
<td>2,264</td>
<td>2,344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDI-CAL (CCAA)</td>
<td>16,635</td>
<td>15,643</td>
<td>15,643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTSIDE CONTRACTS</td>
<td>37,733</td>
<td>78,619</td>
<td>107,299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTSIDE CONTRACT - ISSP</td>
<td>29,446</td>
<td>43,500</td>
<td>45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTSIDE CONTRACT - ELDERDAY</td>
<td>378,232</td>
<td>382,296</td>
<td>361,804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAXI SCRIP SALES</td>
<td>7,829</td>
<td>7,412</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSSP SCRIP</td>
<td>28,194</td>
<td>15,140</td>
<td>15,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOW INTERPROGRAM CHGS.</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTEREST INCOME</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUNDRAISING</td>
<td>3,451</td>
<td>3,451</td>
<td>3,451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONATIONS</td>
<td>2,374</td>
<td>2,374</td>
<td>2,374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAM INCOME - OTHER</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEHICLE INTERPROGRAM</td>
<td>12,404</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTRAPROG. OUTSIDE CONTRACTS</td>
<td>4,154</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEHICLE SALES</td>
<td>15,800</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN-KIND REVENUE</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAD DEBT ALLOWANCES</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL REVENUES</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,408,038</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,395,002</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,323,169</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECTION 5310 - PASS THRU</td>
<td>34,333</td>
<td>34,328</td>
<td>401,553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONTEREY BAY AIR POLLUTION DIST.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUES</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,442,371</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,429,330</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,724,722</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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EXHIBIT B

CTSA FIVE YEAR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN 0910
FISCAL YEARS: 09/10 THROUGH 13/14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fund Balance</td>
<td>$3,673</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>$22,046</td>
<td>$27,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA Section 5310</td>
<td>$34,328</td>
<td>$401,553</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$165,000</td>
<td>$57,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition to Fund</td>
<td>$27,774</td>
<td>$55,223</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Interest</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>$3</td>
<td>$2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$65,776</td>
<td>$483,791</td>
<td>$50,016</td>
<td>$212,049</td>
<td>$109,649</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Purchase</td>
<td>$38,776</td>
<td>$483,776</td>
<td>$27,970</td>
<td>$184,602</td>
<td>$63,995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Maintenance</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$38,776</td>
<td>$483,776</td>
<td>$27,970</td>
<td>$184,602</td>
<td>$63,995</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Year-End Balance $27,000 $15 $22,046 $27,447 $45,654

Notes:

1. As Capital Grants are indefinite, and as capital equipment arrival dates vary, projected figures may require adjustment.
2. "FTA Section 5310" includes computer hardware and software, new maintenance equipment, and new paratransit vehicles.
3. "Equipment Purchase" in 09/10 includes 3 MDC's, Training Projector, 2 laptop computers and vehicle security cameras.
4. "Equipment Purchase" in 10/11 and 11/12 includes replacement vehicles, new trapeze mapping & vehicle locator and an upgrade on the communication system.
5. "Equipment Purchase" in 12/13 includes an air compressor and piping air compressor dispenser.
EXHIBIT C-1
Lift Line / CTSA
10/11 OPERATING PLAN

1. Operating Plan

Lift Line operates a fleet of 22 wheelchair accessible vans, providing responsive, non-emergency health and medical transportation for low-income seniors and disabled residents of Santa Cruz County. At no cost to users, transport is provided to destinations such as doctor’s offices, pharmacies, Elderday, Senior Dining Centers, Dialysis Sites and various medical therapy appointments. As of September 2009 we also took in house the coordination of the volunteer out-of-county transportation program that provides medical rides to Monterey, Alameda, Santa Mateo and Santa Clara Counties.

Transportations services are available weekdays and weekends, 5:30 a.m. to 10:30 p.m., with the exception of state holidays, Cesar Chavez Day, and Martin Luther King Jr. Day, although special needs on these holidays may be addressed. Due to the current demand for service during our peak hours we have been asking our TDA medical clients to work with us and try to book their medical rides between 10:30am and 1:45 pm. Lift Line has been working closely with local medical facilities to optimize this preferred window of service for this select group of Santa Cruz residents.

Community Bridges maintains comprehensive auto and general liability coverage, including the City of Santa Cruz and SCCRTC as additional insured parties. A copy of each insurance certificate shall be filed with the City and with SCCRTC.

Lift Line is seeking to both continue the TDA Medical Rides service and to ensure that this service includes participants that have no other transportation options from the Cabrillo Stoke Center, Central Coast Alliance for Health Medi-Cal program, the Dragon Slayer physical and mental health rehabilitation center, and clients with multiple sclerosis, as well as other low-income seniors and disabled residents with specialized medical transportation needs. Rides would be available to participants outside the METRO service area, those who do not have the means to pay $6.00 round trip METRO/ParaCruz fee, those who do not meet or go beyond the ADA parameters and individuals who need door-to-door assistance.

Our eligibility process is to send an application to residents who are requesting Lift Line specialized transportation service. The TDA application asks residents for proof of age, and/or disability and income; they return, to Lift Line, a completed and signed application with the appropriate attachments as proof. At that point we determine if they meet the criteria for service then send them a letter of eligibility for rides.

Lift Line also coordinates with the local taxi companies to offer the very popular Taxi Scrip (TS) program This program serves as a safety net service for non-medical rides and rides needed outside the ADA-mandated METRO paratransit service areas. Individuals may purchase subsidized taxi scrip so that they can directly schedule taxi rides, and the majority of taxi vehicles are fully accessible for mobility devices. Currently 100% of residents that receive the Taxi Scrip at a discount are low income and below the federal 200% poverty level. Lift Line staff recently updated the TDA applications to reflect the new Federal Government poverty level guidelines. Area taxi service contractors include: San Lorenzo Valley Taxi, Deluxe Taxi, Courtesy Cab, and Santa Cruz Yellow
Lift Line provides ongoing monitoring and assessment of the program to ensure that eligibility criteria are met, subcontractors meet safety criteria, and there is no abuse of the program. The demand for both Taxi Scrip and medical rides has increased substantially for the third fiscal year in a row, the current average cost per trip has almost doubled since the tax rate increase in 2007 and the average cost per ride is now $12 to $14, thereby diminishing the amount of rides that can be taken with the scrip. Currently clients can purchase three $10.00 books, for a total of $30.00 worth of scrip, for $8.00 which would give them approximately 1 or 2 rides per book. There is currently a limit to purchase three books each quarter, per person. Tracking the actual ride count and identifying who is using the scrip is virtually impossible. We would like to eliminate these books and replace them with coupons with their name and expiration dates, by quarter, clearly marked on the coupon. Lift Line would like to emulate the process currently being used by the Health Project Center for the multipurpose senior service programs MSSP. Tips are not prohibited, but the population who uses the taxi scrip program essentially doesn’t have the means to provide a tip.

Lift Line began coordinating and provides out-of-county medical transportation this fiscal year. This program is currently running as a volunteer program with four (4) drivers and one (1) transportation coordinator. Through Lift Line we have been providing trips to destinations such as the Veterans Administration Hospital in Palo Alto, Kaiser Hospital in San Jose, Cancer Clinic in San Francisco, and Stanford University Medical Center to name a just a few. Lift Line is able to provide low cost services due to the use of volunteer drivers and low overhead of this program. We are tracking these rides through a Microsoft access data system and are looking into incorporating these clients into our Trapeze software.

Lift Line staff will continue to work with the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission’s Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E/D TAC) in identifying and addressing unmet needs. In addition, Lift Line continues to work with the E/D TAC in meeting the Unmet Transit and Paratransit Needs as well as the recommendations of the Paratransit Coordination Task Force. Through our daily outreach and annual client survey we have been able to determine the overall consensus that a Mobility Management Center (MMC) would benefit not only seniors and disabled residents, but also general public transit users. It has already been determined by our Coordinated Regional Plan that a mobility management center would benefit our community. The Mobility Management Center will be a one-stop shop and provide transportation services to customers, including older adults, people with disabilities, and individuals with lower incomes. It would also serve the general public by responding to and influencing the demands of the market by undertaking actions and supportive strategies in collaboration with others to provide a full range of options for travel. The center would computerize, plan, develop, and operate travel options as well as provide a variety of training classes, to help residents address the increasing costs of individual travel. Transit coordination training would be beneficial to the community to help determine what specific characteristics of travel experiences are of the greatest importance; collect data regularly on those factors through a combination of customer surveys and independent evaluations; utilize information systems that can continuously track changes in performances at a level that allows meaningful change to occur and most effectively coordinate human service and transportation needs. As the CTSA, it is a roll of Lift Line to coordinate the implementation of a MMC. Lift Line is moving forward by identifying funding sources for a 2011 implementation of this local area Mobility
Management Center; it will be parallel in service coordination to the new Monterey Mobility Center.

For those who don’t qualify for ParaCruz or Medi-Cal assistance, we will continue to help them complete the required paperwork to make it easier for them to use the current TDA programs that meet their specific needs. In our role as the Coordinated Transportation Service Agency, Lift Line will continue working with other transportation providers to ensure maximum efficiency and coordination.

Lift Line will continue to focus its resources on transportation needs that are not being met by other paratransit services, such as ADA-mandated ParaCruz. Through TDA funding, Lift Line will continue to serve those not eligible for ParaCruz service, specifically low-income individuals who cannot afford the $6.00 round-trip ParaCruz co-pay, those that don't meet the ADA parameters, and those with origins/destinations outside of the METRO ParaCruz service area. Also, because Lift Line provides safety net services to those ineligible or unable to use other services, its goal is to provide flexible programs, scheduling, and dispatching that can respond to the changing needs of medical providers and their clients. Examples include same-day medical services and medical services on weekends.

Lift Line continues to meet with the Meals on Wheels Program Director and site managers of the county’s senior meal sites to review unmet transportation service needs. After assessing this past year’s average daily attendance we can report a significant increase in ridership for the Watsonville Senior Center dining site and a decrease in the ridership for the Highland Senior Dining Center. With the decreased FY 2010-11 County funding for transportation and meal services, we are anticipating less nutritional rides for next fiscal year. Lift Line has been using a large 24 passenger vehicle which eliminates the need for two vehicles and helping to cuts operational ride costs. Lift Line will continue to coordinate with the Meals on Wheels program to increase attendance at all of the senior dining centers.

We are requesting to continue providing service to participants attending the Elderday Adult Day Health Center Program. This program is a Federally Qualified Health Center that provides day health care to seniors and community residents who need constant care, and/or are diagnosed with dementia or Alzheimer’s type of dementia. Almost all of these participants use wheelchairs or walkers, and require vans with lifts. Generally, these clients are very frail, and need personal, door-to-door assistance, reflecting the specialized training that our Lift Line drivers receive. This level of client service is time consuming and labor intensive. For the fiscal year 09/10 we anticipated providing at least 35,000 rides, including rides funded by Elderday. As of February 2009, we have provided 23,667 rides. Elderday continues to increase their client participation from the current average of almost 80 per day to 90 participants a day. This year, Elderday faces possible cuts in the FQHC reimbursement that is currently being driven by the State of California. The State has proposed a five million dollar reduction in reimbursements for service to all FQHC Adult Day Health Centers. Acknowledgment is due to the support of TDA transportation funding, that the Elderday’s increased participation has become a more stable service in our community because of the transportation available from South County to the North County location. TDA funds will again be used to partially subsidize funds for these Elderday rides.
# TABLE 1 - TDA PROPOSED SERVICE UNITS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TAXI SCRIP(1)</th>
<th>Out of County Medical</th>
<th>MEDICAL TDA</th>
<th>MEALS ON WHEELS</th>
<th>ELDERDAY</th>
<th>TOTAL UNITS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FUNDS ALLOCATED</td>
<td>$43,306</td>
<td>$13,662</td>
<td>$241,157</td>
<td>$72,761</td>
<td>$62,393</td>
<td>$433,279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPERATING COST</td>
<td>$11.48</td>
<td>$11.47</td>
<td>$31.61</td>
<td>$6.39</td>
<td>$5.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. PROGRAM MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>$4.58</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$12.26</td>
<td>$3.26</td>
<td>$2.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.e., Mgmt Personnel, Fleet Mgr, Info. Mgr, Rent, Liability Insur., Phone, Supplies, etc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. ADMINISTRATION</td>
<td>$2.72</td>
<td>$1.95</td>
<td>$7.44</td>
<td>$1.98</td>
<td>$1.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.5% of total cost per unit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL COST PER SERVICE UNIT</td>
<td>$18.78</td>
<td>$13.42</td>
<td>$51.31</td>
<td>$13.63</td>
<td>$9.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/11 PROJECTED TDA UNITS OF SERVICE</td>
<td>2,306</td>
<td>1,018</td>
<td>4,700</td>
<td>5,340</td>
<td>6,673</td>
<td>20,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison Only 09/10 Projected TDA Units of Service</td>
<td>3,538</td>
<td>1,018</td>
<td>5,451</td>
<td>4,997</td>
<td>6,673</td>
<td>21,677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQUIPMENT PURCHASE MATCH</td>
<td>$55,442</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL TDA CLAIM REQUEST</td>
<td>$488,721</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## OPERATION PLAN SERVICE OF UNITS

### EXHIBIT C - 2

#### 2010 / 2011

### NON-TDA SUPPORTED

#### TABLE 2 - OTHER CTSA SERVICE UNITS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Vets/Dialysis Section 5317</th>
<th>Meals on Wheels</th>
<th>Elderday Services</th>
<th>MSSP</th>
<th>Outside Contracts (1)</th>
<th>Total Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funds Allocated</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$104,393</td>
<td>$361,804</td>
<td>$15,140</td>
<td>$107,299</td>
<td>$713,636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue per Service Unit</td>
<td>$49.52</td>
<td>$13.63</td>
<td>$9.55</td>
<td>$16.99</td>
<td>$13.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/10 Projection Units of Service</td>
<td>2,524</td>
<td>7,661</td>
<td>38,716</td>
<td>891</td>
<td>7,875</td>
<td>57,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operating Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$120,812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA Section 5310</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$834,448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDA Claim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,724,722</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note 1)**

**San Andreas Regional Center (SARC) and other outside contracts include higher capacity trips (group rides) which create larger productivity.**

#### TABLE 3 - ALL SERVICE UNITS TOTALED (Total tables 1 and 2, units of service, to equal table 3 totals)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Vets/Dialysis Section 5317</th>
<th>Taxi Scrip</th>
<th>Red Cross</th>
<th>Medical TDA</th>
<th>Meals on Wheels</th>
<th>MSSP Taxi Scrip</th>
<th>Elderday</th>
<th>Contract Services</th>
<th>Total Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011 Ride Projections</td>
<td>2,524</td>
<td>2,306</td>
<td>1,018</td>
<td>4,700</td>
<td>13,001</td>
<td>891</td>
<td>45,389</td>
<td>7,875</td>
<td>77,704</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Exhibit D

#### Schedule of Payments
**FY: 2010-2011 TDA Claim**
**CTSA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 15, 2010</td>
<td>$ 122,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 15, 2010</td>
<td>$ 122,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 15, 2011</td>
<td>$ 122,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15, 2011</td>
<td>$ 121,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 487,721</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AGENDA: April 13, 2010

TO: Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee

FROM: Karena Pushnik, SCCRTC Staff

RE: FY 2010-11 Transportation Development Act Funds for the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee recommend that the Regional Transportation Commission:

Approve the Transportation Development Act funding request from the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District for $4,974,478.

BACKGROUND

The Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) allocates Transportation Development Act (TDA) funds from the region’s share of the ¼ cent sales tax according to established formulas in the Commission’s Rules and Regulations.

DISCUSSION

At the Regional Transportation Commission’s (RTC) March meeting, the FY 2010-11 budget was approved including Transportation Development Act (TDA) allocations for the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (Metro) in the amount of $4,974,478.

The Metro’s TDA Claim Form and summary pages from Metro’s preliminary budget are attached (Attachment 1). Metro will use the TDA funds to assist with operating the fixed route bus services and the American’s with Disabilities-mandated paratransit service, ParaCruz. Based on their claim form, Metro provided 6,026,920 bus rides and 93,279 ParaCruz rides last fiscal year. Of the bus rides, approximately 146,830 used senior/disabled passes and 22,650 were wheelchair users.

As reported to the Metro board on March 26, 2010, Metro is anticipating a continued drop in revenues in FY10/11, especially from the local transit half-cent sales tax, Transportation Development Act (TDA), and rider fares. In order to balance the budget, Highway 17 fares are being increased, funds are being shifted from capital projects to operations, staff reductions have been proposed, and reserve funds are being used.

SUMMARY

Staff recommends that the E/D TAC recommend that the Regional Transportation Commission approve the FY 2010-11 claim from the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District.

Attachment 1: Metro TDA Claim and budget pages
March 31, 2010

George Dondero, Executive Director
Santa Cruz County Regional
Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Avenue
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

RE: SANTA CRUZ METRO’S FY11 TDA CLAIM

Dear Mr. Dondero:

Enclosed is the FY11 Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 4 claim for the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (Santa Cruz METRO). These funds will be used for FY11 transit and paratransit operations.

Santa Cruz METRO requests a total of $4,974,478 in FY11 TDA funds allocated by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (SCCRTC) to be paid on a quarterly basis as indicated in the accompanying claim form.

Santa Cruz METRO recognizes that TDA funding levels may change with actual tax revenue accrual in Santa Cruz County during FY11 and that funding amounts and disbursements will be adjusted in accordance with the amended amount of TDA funds adopted by the SCCRTC for its annual work program.

The FY11 TDA claim is being submitted as requested with an authorizing resolution from the Santa Cruz METRO Board of Directors, the FY11 and FY12 Preliminary Line Item Operating Budget, the FY11 Capital Budget and a transit operator compliance certificate from the California Highway Patrol.

Thank you for your consideration. Please call Angela Aitken, Finance Manager and Acting Assistant General Manager, at (831) 426-6080 if you need additional information.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Leslie R. White,
General Manager

Enclosure

cc: John Doughty, AMBAG
Transportation Development Act (TDA) – Local Transportation Funds
CLAIM FORM
Submit a separate form for each project.

This form has been developed in an effort to standardize information required from TDA recipients, based on TDA Statute, RTC Rules and Regulations, and/or RTC board requests.
If you have any questions about this claim form or would like an electronic copy of the form, please contact the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission at 460-3200.

Project Information

1. Project Title: Public Transit Operations Santa Cruz County

2. Implementing Agency: Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District

3. Sponsoring Agency (if different) – must be a TDA Eligible Claimant:

4. TDA funding requested this claim: $4,974,478

5. Fiscal Year (FY) for which funds are claimed: FY 2011

6. General purpose for which the claim is made, identified by the article and section of the Act which authorizes such claims:
   - [ ] Article 8 Bicycle and/or Pedestrian Facility
   - [X] Article 4 Public Transportation
   - [ ] Article 8 Specialized Transportation
   - [ ] Article 3 & 8 TDA Admin or Planning

7. Contact Person/Project Manager
   Name: Angela Aitken, Finance Manager and Acting Assistant General Manager
   Telephone Number: (831) 426-6080
   E-mail: aaitken@scmtd.com

   Secondary Contact (in event primary not available): Tove Beatty
   Telephone Number: (831) 426-6080
   E-mail: tbeatty@scmtd.com

8. Project/Program Description/Scope (use additional pages, if needed, to provide details such as work elements/tasks.

   This project provides operating assistance for fixed-route public transit and ADA complementary paratransit operations in Santa Cruz County. Fixed-route public transit operations require a maximum fleet of 87 vehicles to serve 40 routes throughout Santa Cruz County. ParaCruz, Santa Cruz METRO’s complementary paratransit service, operates 38 accessible vans in demand-response service for persons who, due to disability, cannot access the fixed-route system.
9. Project Location/Limits (attach a map and/or photos if available/applicable, include street names):

Santa Cruz METRO Service Area

10. Justification for the project. (Why is this project needed? Primary goal/purpose of the project; problem to be addressed; project benefits; importance to the community)

This project supports public fixed-route transit and paratransit service in Santa Cruz County. Public transit serves as an alternative transportation mode of choice and as essential lifeline transportation for residents who do not have access to a privately owned vehicle.

11. Project Goals:

Measures of performance, success or completion to be used to evaluate project/program (ex. increase use of facility/service, decrease collisions, etc.):

a. Total Annual passenger trips

b. Number of people to be served/anticipated number of users of project/program (ex. number of new or maintained bike miles; number of people served/rides provided): For FY11, Santa Cruz METRO will carry an estimated 4,997,047 trips on its fixed-route and paratransit services.
12. Consistency and relationship with the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) - Is program/project listed in the RTP and/or consistent with a specific RTP Goal/Policy?  
   Yes 
   • Goal 1. Preserve and Maintain the Existing Transportation System Emphasizing Safety and Efficiency 
   • Goal 2. Increase Mobility by Providing an Improved and Integrated Multi-Modal Transportation System 

13. Impact(s) of project on other modes of travel, if any (ex. parking to be removed): 
   • Reduce congestion on local streets and roads by providing alternatives to private automobile. 
   • Increase range of travel for bicycles by accommodating bikes on buses. 
   • Provide feeder service to intercity bus, rail and airline network at San Jose. 

14. Estimated Project Cost/Budget, including other funding sources, and Schedule: (attach project budget). Specialized Transportation Claims require 10% local match. Local match can take the form of fares, donations, agency charges, grants, revenue sharing and other non-restricted sources. In kind services many NOT apply toward the local match. 

   What is the total project cost? $37,896,043 (FY11) 
   Is project fully funded? Yes 

   What will TDA funds be used on (ex. administration, brochures, engineering, construction)? 
   • Administration 
   • Operations 

15. Preferred Method and Schedule for TDA fund distribution (see RTC Rules and Regulations for details): 
   a. Bike/Ped: □ Up to 90% upon initiation of work OR □ 100% upon project completion 
   b. CTSA: □ Quarterly disbursement, with up to 35% in first quarter, and the remaining quarterly payments being one-third of the remaining claim amount; OR □ Quarterly disbursement 
   c. Volunteer Center: □ Full approved claim amount in the first quarter 
   d. SCMTD: ☑ Quarterly disbursement 
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16. TDA Eligibility:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Has the project/program been approved by the claimant's governing body? Attach resolution to claim. (If &quot;NO,&quot; provide the approximate date approval is anticipated.)</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Has this project previously received TDA funding?</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. For capital projects, have provisions been made by the claimant to maintain the project or facility, or has the claimant arranged for such maintenance by another agency? (If an agency other than the claimant is to maintain the facility provide its name: ________________________)</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Bike, Ped, and Specialized Transportation Claims: Has the project already been reviewed by the RTC Bicycle Committee and/or Elderly/Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee? (If &quot;NO,&quot; project will be reviewed prior to RTC approval).</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SCMTD, CTSA, Bike to Work, CTSC Only – PLEASE KEEP ANSWERS BRIEF**

17. Improving Program Efficiency

- Describe any areas where special efforts have been made in the last fiscal year to reduce operating cost and/or increase ridership/program usage. Note any important trends.
  1. Continued service planning efforts to recalibrate trip run times by collecting and analyzing vehicle location data using GPS-enabled cell phones and Xora tracking software.
  2. Extended customer service hours at Santa Cruz Metro Center.
  3. Coordinated Highway 17 Express schedule with Amtrak schedule to meet more trains at San Jose Diridon Station.
  4. Reduced travel time on Route 54 with service adjustment.

- Goals for next fiscal year (ex. identify opportunities to maximize economies of scale). Describe any areas where special efforts will be made to improve efficiency and increase program usage/ridership:
  1. Use new ParaCruz Automated Callback System to increase efficiency by reducing “no-show” trips.
  2. Reduce maintenance costs and improve quality of service with 27 new paratransit replacement vans.
  3. Improve system access through updated internet site.
  4. Improve scheduling, dispatch, planning and customer service efficiency with software upgrades.
  5. Improve fare collection with new fareboxes.

18. What is different from last year's program/claim? Santa Cruz METRO operations are unchanged. New vans, fareboxes and information technology systems will be operational in FY11. TDA Claim is less than FY10.

19. Schedule of regular progress reports including an evaluation at the end of the year:

- SCMD – April each year
- Specialized Transportation: Quarterly to E/D TAC, RTC ___________ (Months/Year)
- CTSA: Bicycle Committee ___________ (Month, year); RTC ___________ (Month, year)
- B2W: Bicycle Committee ___________ (Month, year); RTC ___________ (Month, year)
CTSA and Volunteer Center (Article 8) Only

20. Are these transportation services responding to transportation needs not otherwise being met within the community or jurisdiction of the claimant? Describe.

21. Where appropriate, are these specialized transportation services coordinated with other transportation services? Describe.

SCMTD & RTC Only

22. List the recommendations provided in your last Triennial Performance Audit and your progress toward meeting them.

- Describe the work your agency has undertaken to implement each performance audit recommendation and the steps it will take to fully implement the recommendation.
- For any recommendations that have not been implemented, explain why the recommendation has not been implemented and describe the work your agency will undertake to implement each performance audit recommendation.
- Describe any problems encountered in implementing individual recommendations.

June, 2007 Performance Audit Recommendations to the Transit District:

1. Public Utilities Code Section 99244 requires the RTC to establish a process to review SCMTD’s operation for possible implementation of changes making the operation more efficient. We recommend the SCMTD actively participate in the process set up by the RTC.

- Santa Cruz METRO and SCCRTC staff defined new performance reporting measures (see page 8) which have been used with submission of the TDA Claims in FY09, FY10 and FY11.

2. Participate in the Human Service Coordination Planning Process which the SCCRTC will begin in 2007.

- Santa Cruz METRO participated with AMBAG and SCCRTC to develop the Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan. AMBAG adopted the Final CPTHSTP in May, 2008.
- Santa Cruz METRO participated with UCSC and SCCRTC staff in selection of projects to receive JARC/NF funding in FY2008.
- Santa Cruz METRO participates in the Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee to facilitate coordination of specialized transportation services.

3. The SCMTD should consider implementing a strategic marketing plan aimed at increasing ridership. This effort could focus on the community TDM realm by participating in region-wide mobility plans.

- Santa Cruz METRO upgraded its internet site to add new trip planning features, ticket sales and improved route maps. These enhanced features will improve transit system access to retain patrons and attract new riders.
- Santa Cruz METRO continues to participate in the regional blueprint planning process to improve mobility through application of “smart growth” practices.
- Santa Cruz METRO is an active participant in the development of the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Plan 2010.
Santa Cruz METRO seeks to increase ridership by maintaining safe, efficient transit service and by offering passenger amenities such as free internet service on the Highway 17 Express. Santa Cruz METRO has applied for several grants that include comprehensive public outreach performance measures targeted at underserved groups.

**SCMTD Only**

23. Farebox Recovery Ratio: (split out=urbanized service vs. non-urban service farebox ratios for prior year and year-to-date) NOTE: Due to interlining of rural/urbanized area service and the comparatively small amount of rural service operated in Santa Cruz, Santa Cruz METRO does not separately track revenue attributable to rural ridership. FY10 Budget:

- Fare Revenue: $8,927,444
- Local Support Revenues: $37,103,973
- Operating Cost: $40,935,309
- Ratio Fare Rev/Op Cost: 21.8% (minimum required=15%)
- Cost per ride being subsidized for different services/funds: NA

Note: Exemptions for calculating operating costs — spell out in your operating budget summary.

- Service extensions are exempt until two years after the end of the fiscal year during which they were established (PUC Sec. 99268.8). This exemption applies only if the new service was not provided nor was funded by LTF/STA during any of the prior three fiscal years.
- The additional operating costs to a transit operator of providing comparable complementary paratransit services, pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act, that exceed operator’s prior year costs as adjusted by the CPI are excluded from operating cost.
- The costs of providing ridesharing services are also excluded from operating costs.

24. Current operating cost ratio versus FY1978-79 ratio (for services to the general public).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCMTD REVENUE RATIO FY79</th>
<th>SCMTD REVENUE RATIO FY10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FARES:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Fares</td>
<td>$657,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Transit Fares</td>
<td>$220,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Trans. Rev.</td>
<td>$795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Fares</strong></td>
<td>$878,391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TAXES</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax</td>
<td>$11,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax</td>
<td>$1,036,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Taxes</strong></td>
<td>$1,047,994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUE</strong></td>
<td>$1,926,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPERATING EXPENSE</strong></td>
<td>$3,384,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUE RATIO FY79</strong></td>
<td>56.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FARES:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Fares</td>
<td>$3,416,931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Transit Fares</td>
<td>$3,682,013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paratransit Fares</td>
<td>$327,254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 17 Fares</td>
<td>$1,501,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Fares</strong></td>
<td>$8,927,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TAXES</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax</td>
<td>$16,201,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUE</strong></td>
<td>$25,129,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPERATING EXPENSE</strong></td>
<td>$40,935,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUE RATIO FY10</strong></td>
<td>61.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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25. Did the SCMTD operating budget increase over 15% from the prior fiscal year?  No.  METRO's FY11 operating budget decreased to $37,389,043 from $40,935,309 in FY10, a decrease 7.4% from the prior fiscal year. If the answer is yes, please provide a statement identifying and substantiating the reason or need for the increase in the transit operating budget in excess of 15% above the preceding year, and identify substantial increases or decreases in the scope of operations or capital provisions for major new service - (transit claimants only, if applicable).

26. Operating statistics (compare current fiscal year to date to last three full fiscal years; *TDA required performance indicators), submit items from the following list.
- **Annual passengers**
  - Rides/passenger trips provided by type (student, senior, adult, pass holders, etc, or however stat's kept) and amount of TDA $ used for each type of ride.  **TDA amount not calculated by ride type.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY09</th>
<th>UCSC Student</th>
<th>UCSC Staff</th>
<th>Total UC</th>
<th>Cabrillo</th>
<th>Cash</th>
<th>Tickets</th>
<th>S/D</th>
<th>Day Pass</th>
<th>S/D Day Pass</th>
<th>Pre-Paid Fares</th>
<th>Pacific Shores</th>
<th>W/C</th>
<th>Bike</th>
<th>RIDERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2,374,357</td>
<td>212,771</td>
<td>2,587,128</td>
<td>277,899</td>
<td>1,350,205</td>
<td>114,894</td>
<td>146,830</td>
<td>22,694</td>
<td>15,454</td>
<td>1,504,543</td>
<td>7,272</td>
<td>22,650</td>
<td>206,425</td>
<td>6,026,920</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Annual service hours**: Performance Indicators, page 8
- **Passengers per vehicle service hour**: Performance Indicators, page 8
- **Annual service miles**: Performance Indicators, page 8
- **# of fixed-route miles**: 499 (directional route miles)
- **Service Area – square miles**: 450 (Santa Cruz County)
- **Service Area Population**: 268,637 (State of California, Dept. of Finance, May 2009)
- **Passengers per vehicle service mile**: Performance Indicators, page 8
- **Average passengers per weekday**: 20,035 (FY09)
- **Total operating costs in budget**: included with Budget
- **Operating cost per vehicle service hour**: Performance Indicators, page 8
- **Total operating cost per passenger**: Performance Indicators, page 8
- **Average Farebox Revenue per passenger (describe what is included)** Performance Indicators, page 8. Average farebox revenue includes annual fares collected on board, contract fares, ridership-based payments and commissions divided by annual passengers.
- **Vehicle Service hours/Employee**: Performance Indicators, page 8
- # of routes: 40
- # of bus stops: 999
- # of vehicles in operation: 87
- # of monthly bus passes in circulation: 2,030 (avg. FY09)
- Max vehicles in service at any time: 87
- Hours of service: 04:15 – 02:00 weekday; 06:05-03:00 weekend
- Actual financials compared with budget: included with budget
- Actual number of rides provided compared with goal and text about whether goal was met and why/why not. See Performance Indicators, page 8. Santa Cruz METRO does not establish specific ridership goals.
### Performance Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operating Expenses</th>
<th>FY07</th>
<th>FY08</th>
<th>FY09</th>
<th>FY10 YTD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Fixed-Route Expenses</td>
<td>$27,766,768</td>
<td>$29,605,178</td>
<td>$29,106,813</td>
<td>$16,945,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 17</td>
<td>$1,620,992</td>
<td>$1,722,320</td>
<td>$1,786,045</td>
<td>$1,185,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paratransit</td>
<td>$3,169,853</td>
<td>$3,602,134</td>
<td>$3,626,157</td>
<td>$2,228,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL Operating Expenses</strong></td>
<td><strong>$32,557,513</strong></td>
<td><strong>$34,929,632</strong></td>
<td><strong>$34,429,035</strong></td>
<td><strong>$20,355,627</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System Information</th>
<th>FY07</th>
<th>FY08</th>
<th>FY09</th>
<th>FY10 YTD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directional Route Miles</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Bus Stops</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Routes</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Active Fleet</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Bus in svc. (WD)</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total METRO Employees</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Hour Per Employee</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers Comp/100 employees/mo.</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Fixed-Route Performance</strong></td>
<td><strong>FY07</strong></td>
<td><strong>FY08</strong></td>
<td><strong>FY09</strong></td>
<td><strong>FY10 YTD</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridership</td>
<td>5,360,699</td>
<td>5,522,943</td>
<td>5,708,338</td>
<td>2,954,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Hours</td>
<td>200,130</td>
<td>202,108.2</td>
<td>202,148.72</td>
<td>115,928.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Miles</td>
<td>2,728,654</td>
<td>2,733,823.8</td>
<td>2,740,218.24</td>
<td>1,577,968.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passengers Per Hour</td>
<td>26.79</td>
<td>27.33</td>
<td>28.24</td>
<td>25.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passengers Per Mile</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost Per Passenger</td>
<td>$5.48</td>
<td>$5.67</td>
<td>$5.41</td>
<td>$6.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Per Passenger</td>
<td>$1.16</td>
<td>$1.21</td>
<td>$1.22</td>
<td>$1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farebox Recovery</td>
<td>22.49%</td>
<td>22.49%</td>
<td>23.97%</td>
<td>21.37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highway 17 Performance</th>
<th>FY07</th>
<th>FY08</th>
<th>FY09</th>
<th>FY10 YTD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ridership</td>
<td>244,618</td>
<td>270,044</td>
<td>318,582</td>
<td>197,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Hours</td>
<td>21,057</td>
<td>21,760.9</td>
<td>21,705.1</td>
<td>12,660.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Miles</td>
<td>520,407</td>
<td>532,247.6</td>
<td>569,084.7</td>
<td>339,658.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passengers Per Hour</td>
<td>11.62</td>
<td>12.41</td>
<td>14.68</td>
<td>15.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passengers Per Mile</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost Per Passenger</td>
<td>$6.63</td>
<td>$6.38</td>
<td>$5.61</td>
<td>$6.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Per Passenger</td>
<td>$3.35</td>
<td>$3.32</td>
<td>$3.25</td>
<td>$3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farebox Recovery</td>
<td>50.52%</td>
<td>52.12%</td>
<td>57.90%</td>
<td>51.71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fixed-Route Totals</th>
<th>FY07</th>
<th>FY08</th>
<th>FY09</th>
<th>FY10 YTD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ridership</td>
<td>5,605,317</td>
<td>5,792,987</td>
<td>6,026,920</td>
<td>3,151,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Hours</td>
<td>221,188</td>
<td>223,869</td>
<td>223,854</td>
<td>128,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Miles</td>
<td>3,249,061</td>
<td>3,266,071</td>
<td>3,309,303</td>
<td>1,917,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Per Revenue Hour</td>
<td>$132.86</td>
<td>$139.94</td>
<td>$138.00</td>
<td>$141.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passengers Per Hour</td>
<td>25.34</td>
<td>25.88</td>
<td>26.92</td>
<td>24.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passengers Per Mile</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Per Passenger</td>
<td>$1.38</td>
<td>$1.43</td>
<td>$1.46</td>
<td>$1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Per Passenger</td>
<td>$5.24</td>
<td>$5.41</td>
<td>$5.13</td>
<td>$5.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidy Per Passenger</td>
<td>$3.86</td>
<td>$3.98</td>
<td>$3.67</td>
<td>$4.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Accidents/100k miles</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Collisions/100k miles</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ParaCruz Performance</th>
<th>FY07</th>
<th>FY08</th>
<th>FY09</th>
<th>FY10 YTD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ridership</td>
<td>85,367</td>
<td>87,713</td>
<td>93,279</td>
<td>46,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Hours</td>
<td>38,401</td>
<td>39,333.0</td>
<td>44,631.1</td>
<td>21,557.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Miles</td>
<td>428,758</td>
<td>572,750.0</td>
<td>636,901.0</td>
<td>366,052.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passengers Per Hour</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passengers Per Mile</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Per Passenger</td>
<td>$2.68</td>
<td>$2.62</td>
<td>3.45*</td>
<td>$2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farebox Recovery</td>
<td>7.23%</td>
<td>6.38%</td>
<td>8.88%</td>
<td>6.16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Exceeds the $3.00 trip fare due to contracted prepayments.
Description

FY11 TDA funds requested in this claim will provide operating assistance to the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (Santa Cruz METRO). FY11 TDA funds will support fixed route and paratransit operating and administrative costs. Santa Cruz METRO will operate the maximum level of public transit service possible within the limits of available operating revenue.

Santa Cruz METRO currently operates 40 fixed routes and ADA Complementary Paratransit service throughout Santa Cruz County, a 450-square-mile region with an estimated 2009 population of 268,637 (State of California, Department of Finance, May 2009). Santa Cruz METRO serves 999 bus stops and four transit centers in the County: Pacific Station (Metro Center) in downtown Santa Cruz; Watsonville Transit Center; Capitola Mall; and the Scotts Valley Transit Center. The Highway 17 Express route links Santa Cruz bus service to intercity bus, rail and air networks in San Jose. Service operates from approximately 4:15am until 2:00am weekdays with reduced service levels on weekends and holidays. A demand-response route provides extended late-night service to the University.

Santa Cruz METRO has a peak pullout of 87 buses. All buses are accessible to persons with disabilities, including persons who use wheelchairs. Front-mounted bicycle racks on each bus can carry up to three bicycles. Santa Cruz METRO currently operates 65 CNG buses. The remaining 37 diesel buses in its active fleet will be retired or replaced with CNG buses at the end of their useful life.

Santa Cruz METRO provides ADA Complementary Paratransit service as mandated by the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. Santa Cruz METRO employees operate ParaCruz, its branded ADA paratransit service, to deliver a comparable level of service to persons unable to use the fixed-route system during the hours and days that fixed-route public transit operates. Santa Cruz METRO operates 38 paratransit vans and delivered 93,279 paratransit trips in FY09. Eligible passengers within ¼ mile of the fixed-route service can request next-day trips using ParaCruz.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>ACTUAL FY09</th>
<th>BUDGET FY10</th>
<th>$ CHANGE ACT FY09 BUDG FY10</th>
<th>% CHANGE ACT FY09 BUDG FY10</th>
<th>PRELIMINARY BUDGET FY11</th>
<th>$ CHANGE BUDG FY10 BUDG FY11</th>
<th>% CHANGE BUDG FY10 BUDG FY11</th>
<th>PRELIMINARY BUDGET FY12</th>
<th>$ CHANGE BUDG FY11 BUDG FY12</th>
<th>% CHANGE BUDG FY11 BUDG FY12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1100 Administration</td>
<td>977,524</td>
<td>1,116,801</td>
<td>139,277</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>955,205</td>
<td>(161,597)</td>
<td>-14.5%</td>
<td>991,159</td>
<td>35,955</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200 Finance</td>
<td>1,788,447</td>
<td>2,153,007</td>
<td>364,560</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>2,259,481</td>
<td>106,474</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>2,224,942</td>
<td>(34,539)</td>
<td>-1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300 Customer Service</td>
<td>496,068</td>
<td>572,736</td>
<td>75,667</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>474,615</td>
<td>(98,121)</td>
<td>-17.1%</td>
<td>475,796</td>
<td>1,162</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400 Human Resources</td>
<td>607,666</td>
<td>800,140</td>
<td>192,474</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>625,359</td>
<td>(174,761)</td>
<td>-21.8%</td>
<td>701,991</td>
<td>76,832</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 Information Technology</td>
<td>628,672</td>
<td>716,342</td>
<td>87,671</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>730,352</td>
<td>14,010</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>758,969</td>
<td>28,817</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700 District Counsel</td>
<td>468,429</td>
<td>490,759</td>
<td>22,330</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>507,023</td>
<td>16,263</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>529,159</td>
<td>22,137</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800 Risk Management</td>
<td>168,925</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>81,075</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2200 Facilities Maintenance</td>
<td>2,581,391</td>
<td>2,568,539</td>
<td>(12,853)</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
<td>2,289,975</td>
<td>(278,563)</td>
<td>-10.8%</td>
<td>2,320,746</td>
<td>30,771</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3100 Paratransit Program</td>
<td>3,626,158</td>
<td>4,579,272</td>
<td>953,114</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>4,672,312</td>
<td>93,040</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>4,952,474</td>
<td>280,162</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3200 Operations</td>
<td>2,505,237</td>
<td>2,530,509</td>
<td>95,272</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>2,684,588</td>
<td>81,079</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>2,789,496</td>
<td>104,908</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3300 Bus Operators</td>
<td>13,209,215</td>
<td>14,348,318</td>
<td>1,139,103</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>13,559,235</td>
<td>(789,083)</td>
<td>-5.5%</td>
<td>13,855,388</td>
<td>396,154</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4100 Fleet Maintenance</td>
<td>5,899,119</td>
<td>6,575,136</td>
<td>2,676,017</td>
<td>45.4%</td>
<td>7,133,456</td>
<td>(1,441,880)</td>
<td>-10.5%</td>
<td>7,287,165</td>
<td>153,738</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9001 Cobra Benefits</td>
<td>2,718</td>
<td>(2,716)</td>
<td>-100.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9005 Retired Employee Benefits</td>
<td>1,557,328</td>
<td>2,160,449</td>
<td>603,123</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>1,754,441</td>
<td>(406,008)</td>
<td>-10.8%</td>
<td>1,807,075</td>
<td>52,633</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700 SCCIC/COPS</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(300)</td>
<td>-100.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL OPERATING EXPENSES</td>
<td>34,519,085</td>
<td>40,935,309</td>
<td>6,416,246</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>37,896,043</td>
<td>(3,039,267)</td>
<td>-7.4%</td>
<td>39,544,392</td>
<td>1,146,340</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Balancing Actions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5,173,833)</td>
<td>(6,348,323)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL OPERATING EXPENSES</td>
<td>32,722,210</td>
<td>32,686,069</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3/17/2010 Department Expenses
### SANTA CRUZ METROPOLITAN TRANSIT DISTRICT

**FY11 & FY12 PRELIMINARY OPERATING BUDGET**

#### REVENUE SOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REVENUE SOURCE</th>
<th>ACTUAL FY09</th>
<th>BUDGET FY11</th>
<th>CHANGE ACT FY09</th>
<th>BUDGET FY10</th>
<th>% CHANGE ACT FY09</th>
<th>% CHANGE BUDGET FY11</th>
<th>PRELIMINARY BUDGET FY11</th>
<th>% CHANGE BUDGET FY10</th>
<th>PRELIMINARY BUDGET FY11</th>
<th>% CHANGE BUDGET FY10</th>
<th>PRELIMINARY BUDGET FY11</th>
<th>% CHANGE BUDGET FY10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Passenger Fares</td>
<td>3,386,262</td>
<td>3,416,931</td>
<td>9,679</td>
<td>3,240,064</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>-5.0%</td>
<td>3,278,546</td>
<td>32,461</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Special Transit Fares</td>
<td>3,590,053</td>
<td>3,682,013</td>
<td>91,980</td>
<td>3,534,732</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>-4.0%</td>
<td>3,711,449</td>
<td>176,737</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Personnel Fares</td>
<td>322,124</td>
<td>327,254</td>
<td>5,130</td>
<td>341,250</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>358,313</td>
<td>17,053</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Highway 17 Fares</td>
<td>1,034,204</td>
<td>1,070,046</td>
<td>35,842</td>
<td>1,230,748</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>1,423,054</td>
<td>12,308</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Highway 17 Payments</td>
<td>436,551</td>
<td>431,200</td>
<td>(5,351)</td>
<td>436,512</td>
<td>-1.2%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>436,867</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Commissions</td>
<td>5,677</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>(177)</td>
<td>6,012</td>
<td>-3.1%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>6,012</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Advertising Income</td>
<td>187,312</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>(37,312)</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>-19.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Rent Income - S.C. Pacific Station</td>
<td>90,384</td>
<td>91,774</td>
<td>1,390</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>-1.9%</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Rent Income - Watsonville TC</td>
<td>36,718</td>
<td>34,399</td>
<td>(2,317)</td>
<td>34,490</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>34,490</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Rent Income - General</td>
<td>12,859</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(12,859)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Interest Income</td>
<td>391,808</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>(341,808)</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>-87.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Other Non-Transp Revenue</td>
<td>(5,244)</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>11,007</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>-211.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Sales Tax (1/2 cent)</td>
<td>14,923,142</td>
<td>16,201,999</td>
<td>1,278,857</td>
<td>13,130,000</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>-19.0%</td>
<td>13,392,800</td>
<td>292,000</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Transp Dev Act (TDA) Fund</td>
<td>5,086,249</td>
<td>5,651,220</td>
<td>(45,026)</td>
<td>4,974,478</td>
<td>-2.5%</td>
<td>-10.4%</td>
<td>4,767,478</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 FTA Sec 5307 - Op Assistance</td>
<td>3,460,203</td>
<td>3,715,442</td>
<td>(25,242)</td>
<td>3,445,442</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>-1.6%</td>
<td>3,645,442</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Misc. Operating</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Hwy 2 Project Advance (#4 and #5 of 5)</td>
<td>(70,000)</td>
<td>(70,000)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>-100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 FTA Sec 5311 - Rural Op Asst</td>
<td>161,515</td>
<td>170,894</td>
<td>9,279</td>
<td>170,894</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>170,894</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBTOTAL REVENUE:**

|            | 33,859,765 | 34,834,495 | 1,198,730 | 3.4% | 31,056,240 | 33,778,655 | -10.0% | 31,767,764 | 520,524 |

**ONE-TIME REVENUES**

|            |            |            |            |      |            |            |      |            |        |
|            |            |            |            |      |            |            |      |            |        |
|            |            |            |            |      |            |            |      |            |        |
|            |            |            |            |      |            |            |      |            |        |

**SUBTOTAL ONE-TIME REVENUES:**

|            | 27,799     | 15,000     | (12,799)   | 46.0% | 1,065,000  | 1,080,200  | 200.0% | 850,000     | (245,000) |

**TRANSFERS**

|            | 795,471    | 3,288,589  | 2,473,118  | 310.9% | 301,063    | (2,986,928) | -80.6% | (301,663)   | -100.0%  |

**SUBTOTAL TRANSFERS:**

|            | 795,471    | 6,086,814  | 5,290,343  | 655.1% | 570,996    | (5,144,846) | -90.9% | 269,302     | (301,663) |

**TOTAL REVENUE:**

|            | 33,859,765 | 40,930,309 | 6,448,444  | 18.0% | 32,722,210 | (8,213,101) | -20.1% | 32,866,069  | (25,139)  |

**% CHANGE BUDGET FY11:**

<p>|            | 0.0%        | -5.0%      | 1.0%       |      |            | -5.0%      |      |            | -5.0%    |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACCOUNT</th>
<th>ACTUAL FY09</th>
<th>ACTUAL FY10</th>
<th>$ CHANGE</th>
<th>% CHANGE</th>
<th>ACTUAL FY09</th>
<th>ACTUAL FY10</th>
<th>$ CHANGE</th>
<th>% CHANGE</th>
<th>PRELIMINARY BUDGET FY11</th>
<th>BUDGET FY10</th>
<th>$ CHANGE</th>
<th>% CHANGE</th>
<th>PRELIMINARY BUDGET FY11</th>
<th>BUDGET FY10</th>
<th>$ CHANGE</th>
<th>% CHANGE</th>
<th>PRELIMINARY BUDGET FY11</th>
<th>BUDGET FY10</th>
<th>$ CHANGE</th>
<th>% CHANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LABOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501011 Bus Operator Pay</td>
<td>963,412</td>
<td>927,092</td>
<td>(36,321)</td>
<td>-3.8%</td>
<td>986,195</td>
<td>59,103</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>1,048,099</td>
<td>61,905</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>12,381</td>
<td>12,381</td>
<td>12,381</td>
<td>12,381</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501013 Bus Operator OT</td>
<td>171,312</td>
<td>124,250</td>
<td>(46,962)</td>
<td>-27.4%</td>
<td>197,239</td>
<td>72,889</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>209,620</td>
<td>12,381</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>12,381</td>
<td>12,381</td>
<td>12,381</td>
<td>12,381</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501021 Other Salaries</td>
<td>451,484</td>
<td>812,774</td>
<td>361,290</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>779,396</td>
<td>(33,376)</td>
<td>-4.1%</td>
<td>821,106</td>
<td>41,710</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>12,381</td>
<td>12,381</td>
<td>12,381</td>
<td>12,381</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501023 Other OT</td>
<td>35,936</td>
<td>74,200</td>
<td>38,264</td>
<td>106.5%</td>
<td>74,978</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>76,990</td>
<td>4,012</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>12,381</td>
<td>12,381</td>
<td>12,381</td>
<td>12,381</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>1,622,144</td>
<td>1,938,416</td>
<td>318,272</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>2,037,807</td>
<td>99,392</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>2,157,815</td>
<td>120,008</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>12,381</td>
<td>12,381</td>
<td>12,381</td>
<td>12,381</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FRINGE BENEFITS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACCOUNT</th>
<th>ACTUAL FY09</th>
<th>ACTUAL FY10</th>
<th>$ CHANGE</th>
<th>% CHANGE</th>
<th>ACTUAL FY09</th>
<th>ACTUAL FY10</th>
<th>$ CHANGE</th>
<th>% CHANGE</th>
<th>ACTUAL FY09</th>
<th>ACTUAL FY10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>502011 Medicare/Soc. Sec.</td>
<td>27,333</td>
<td>29,221</td>
<td>1,888</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>29,853</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>31,394</td>
<td>1,741</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502021 Retirement</td>
<td>224,069</td>
<td>269,697</td>
<td>45,578</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>275,751</td>
<td>6,115</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>281,866</td>
<td>53,344</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502031 Medical Ins</td>
<td>813,338</td>
<td>798,613</td>
<td>18,725</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>837,338</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>844,682</td>
<td>6,356</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502041 Dental Ins</td>
<td>56,563</td>
<td>67,798</td>
<td>11,235</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>65,892</td>
<td>(1,906)</td>
<td>-2.8%</td>
<td>67,586</td>
<td>1,977</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502045 Vision Ins</td>
<td>16,728</td>
<td>18,755</td>
<td>2,027</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>18,015</td>
<td>(740)</td>
<td>-3.9%</td>
<td>18,555</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502051 Life Ins/AD&amp;D</td>
<td>5,759</td>
<td>6,738</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>6,893</td>
<td>(845)</td>
<td>-12.5%</td>
<td>6,070</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502060 State Disability Ins (SDI)</td>
<td>18,085</td>
<td>35,755</td>
<td>17,670</td>
<td>99.8%</td>
<td>22,495</td>
<td>31,356</td>
<td>-68.2%</td>
<td>23,166</td>
<td>1,321</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502061 Long Term Disability Ins</td>
<td>21,518</td>
<td>12,243</td>
<td>9,275</td>
<td>75.7%</td>
<td>20,440</td>
<td>(11,721)</td>
<td>-54.7%</td>
<td>23,554</td>
<td>1,314</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502071 State Unemployment Ins (SUI)</td>
<td>9,052</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>(669)</td>
<td>-25.0%</td>
<td>8,383</td>
<td>(483)</td>
<td>-5.4%</td>
<td>8,833</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502081 Worker's Comp Ins</td>
<td>120,842</td>
<td>53,857</td>
<td>66,985</td>
<td>126.4%</td>
<td>55,892</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>60,562</td>
<td>3,385</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502101 Holiday Pay</td>
<td>38,901</td>
<td>56,230</td>
<td>17,329</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>56,892</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>60,562</td>
<td>3,385</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502103 Floating Holiday</td>
<td>5,514</td>
<td>5,805</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>6,967</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502109 Sick Leave</td>
<td>56,308</td>
<td>95,491</td>
<td>39,183</td>
<td>69.6%</td>
<td>96,928</td>
<td>1,438</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>102,694</td>
<td>5,768</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502111 Annual Leave</td>
<td>157,951</td>
<td>103,470</td>
<td>(54,481)</td>
<td>-34.5%</td>
<td>104,563</td>
<td>1,113</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>110,603</td>
<td>5,920</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502121 Other Paid Absence</td>
<td>15,148</td>
<td>14,360</td>
<td>(789)</td>
<td>-5.2%</td>
<td>14,575</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>15,440</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502251 Phys. Exams</td>
<td>1,060</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>1,940</td>
<td>130.3%</td>
<td>3,900</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>4,380</td>
<td>3,860</td>
<td>95.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502253 Driver Lic Renewal</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>168.7%</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>1,060</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>95.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502999 Other Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>4,104</td>
<td>6,363</td>
<td>2,260</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
<td>5,603</td>
<td>(760)</td>
<td>-11.9%</td>
<td>5,843</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals                       | 1,390,140   | 1,747,608   | 357,465  | 25.7%    | 1,579,854   | (167,751)   | -9.6%    | 1,862,009 | 102,155      | 6.5%        |

3/17/2010 Paratransit - 3100
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACCOUNT</th>
<th>ACTUAL FY09</th>
<th>ACTUAL FY10</th>
<th>BUDGET FY10</th>
<th>% CHANGE</th>
<th>ACT FY09</th>
<th>BUDGET FY10</th>
<th>% CHANGE</th>
<th>PRELIMINARY FY11</th>
<th>BUDGET FY11</th>
<th>% CHANGE</th>
<th>PRELIMINARY FY11</th>
<th>BUDGET FY11</th>
<th>PRELIMINARY FY12</th>
<th>BUDGET FY12</th>
<th>% CHANGE</th>
<th>BUDGET FY12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SERVICES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503011 Accting/Audit Fees</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503012 Admin/Bank Fees</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503031 Prof/Technical Fees</td>
<td>16,867</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>(8,867)</td>
<td>-92.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503032 Legislative Services</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503033 Legal Services</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503034 Pre-Employment Exams</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503041 Temp Help</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503042 Custodial Services</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503042 Custodial Services</td>
<td>2,394</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>1,206</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503043 Security Services</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503044 Classified/Legal Ads</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503045 Legal Ads</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503046 Legal Services</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503047 Graphical Services</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503051 Repair - Bldg &amp; Impr</td>
<td>2,963</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>5,037</td>
<td>170.0%</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>(3,000)</td>
<td>-47.5%</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503052 Repair - Equipment</td>
<td>168,852</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>11,148</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>(30,000)</td>
<td>-16.7%</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503053 Repair - Rev Vehicle</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503054 Repair - Non Rev Vehicle</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503055 Haz Mat Disposal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>190,876</td>
<td>199,600</td>
<td>8,724</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>186,860</td>
<td>(33,000)</td>
<td>-16.5%</td>
<td>166,800</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>166,800</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOBILE MATERIALS &amp; SUPPLIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504011 Fuels &amp; Lubricants - Non Rev Veh</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504012 Fuels &amp; Lubricants - Rev Veh</td>
<td>149,746</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>100,254</td>
<td>68.9%</td>
<td>320,000</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>380,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504013 Tires &amp; Tubes</td>
<td>21,078</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>4,922</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504161 Other Mobile Supplies</td>
<td>48,596</td>
<td>95,000</td>
<td>46,404</td>
<td>95.5%</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>(45,000)</td>
<td>-47.4%</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504191 Rev Vehicle Parts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>219,420</td>
<td>372,100</td>
<td>162,680</td>
<td>69.6%</td>
<td>397,100</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>451,100</td>
<td>54,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>54,000</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCOUNT</td>
<td>ACTUAL FY09</td>
<td>BUDGET FY10</td>
<td>$ CHANGE ACT FY09</td>
<td>% CHANGE ACT FY09</td>
<td>PRELIMINARY BUDGET FY11</td>
<td>$ CHANGE BUDGET FY10</td>
<td>% CHANGE BUDGET FY10</td>
<td>PRELIMINARY BUDGET FY12</td>
<td>$ CHANGE BUDGET FY11</td>
<td>% CHANGE BUDGET FY11</td>
<td>PRELIMINARY BUDGET FY12</td>
<td>$ CHANGE BUDGET FY11</td>
<td>% CHANGE BUDGET FY11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER MATERIALS &amp; SUPPLIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504205 Freight Out</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504211 Postage &amp; Mailing</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>5,188</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504214 Promotional Items</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504215 Printing</td>
<td>1,607</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>5,393</td>
<td>335.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504217 Photo Supp/Process</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>1,331</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504311 Office Supplies</td>
<td>3,215</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>9,285</td>
<td>288.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504315 Safety Supplies</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>861</td>
<td>196.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504317 Cleaning Supplies</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>1,070</td>
<td>368.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504409 Repair/Maint Supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504421 Non-inventory Parts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504511 Small Tools</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>73.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504515 Employee Tool Replacement</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>81.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>7,393</td>
<td>32,800</td>
<td>25,407</td>
<td>343.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTILITIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>505011 Gas &amp; Electric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>505021 Water &amp; Garbage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>505031 Telecommunications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>19,383</td>
<td>37,000</td>
<td>17,617</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASUALTY &amp; LIABILITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>506011 Insurance - Property</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>506015 Insurance - PL/PD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>506021 Insurance - Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>506123 Settlement Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>506127 Repairs - District Prop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/17/2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SANTA CRUZ METROPOLITAN TRANSIT DISTRICT
### FY11 & FY12 PRELIMINARY OPERATING BUDGET

Paratransit - 3100

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACCOUNT</th>
<th>ACTUAL FY09</th>
<th>BUDGET FY10</th>
<th>$ CHANGE FY09</th>
<th>% CHANGE FY09</th>
<th>PRELIMINARY BUDGET FY11</th>
<th>$ CHANGE FY12</th>
<th>% CHANGE FY12</th>
<th>PRELIMINARY BUDGET FY12</th>
<th>$ CHANGE FY12</th>
<th>% CHANGE FY12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TAXES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>507051 Fuel Tax</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>507201 Licenses &amp; Permits</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>(300)</td>
<td>-37.5%</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>507999 Other Taxes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>(300)</td>
<td>-37.5%</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PURCHASED TRANS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503400 Contract/Paratransit</td>
<td>176,002</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISC EXPENSE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>509011 Dues/Subscriptions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>508085 Advertising - Rev Prod</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>509101 Employee Incentive Program</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>509121 Employee Training</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>509123 Travel</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>509125 Local Meeting Expense</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>509127 Board Director Fees</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>509150 Contributions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>509198 Cash Over/Short</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEASES &amp; RENTALS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>512011 Facility Lease</td>
<td>799</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>154,000</td>
<td>154,000</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>158,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>512061 Equipment Rental</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>799</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>159,200</td>
<td>158,400</td>
<td>19800.0%</td>
<td>163,200</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONNEL TOTAL</td>
<td>3,012,285</td>
<td>3,866,022</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>3,617,862</td>
<td>(68,360)</td>
<td>-1.9%</td>
<td>3,839,824</td>
<td>222,162</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-PERSONNEL TOTAL</td>
<td>613,873</td>
<td>893,250</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>1,054,650</td>
<td>161,400</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>1,112,650</td>
<td>58,000</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPARTMENT TOTALS</td>
<td>3,626,158</td>
<td>4,759,272</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>4,672,312</td>
<td>93,040</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>4,852,474</td>
<td>260,162</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3/17/2010
# SANTA CRUZ METROPOLITAN TRANSIT DISTRICT
## FY11 PRELIMINARY CAPITAL BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT/ACTIVITY</th>
<th>FEDERAL FUNDS</th>
<th>STATE FUNDS</th>
<th>STATE TRANSIT ASSIST. (STA)</th>
<th>LOCAL FUNDS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grant-Funded Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MetroBase Maintenance Facility</td>
<td>$1,108,062</td>
<td>$891,938</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MetroBase Operations Facility</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase Smartcard Farebox System (ARRA)</td>
<td>$2,267,000</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$2,267,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase of 425 Front Street (TCRP)</td>
<td>$1,457,667</td>
<td>$617,333</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$2,075,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase 27 ParaCruz Vehicles (ARRA)</td>
<td>$1,750,000</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1,750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Mgmt. Info. Technology (ARRA)</td>
<td>$1,213,108</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1,213,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Video Surveillance Project (OHS-1B)</td>
<td>$47,678</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$47,678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleet - Land Mobile Radio Project (OHS-1B)</td>
<td>$59,798</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$59,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trapeze Pass Interactive Voice Response System</td>
<td>$46,000</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$46,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$7,841,837</td>
<td>$1,616,747</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$9,458,584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IT Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace Fleet &amp; Facilities Maintenance Software</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$415,000</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$415,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR Software Upgrade</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$230,000</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$230,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade District Phone System</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$41,000</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$41,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trapeze Pass Customer Certification Software</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automated Purchasing System Software</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$806,000</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$806,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3/18/2010
## SANTA CRUZ METROPOLITAN TRANSIT DISTRICT
### FY11 PRELIMINARY CAPITAL BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT ACTIVITY</th>
<th>FEDERAL FUNDS</th>
<th>STATE FUNDS</th>
<th>STATE TRANSIT ASSIST. (STA)</th>
<th>LOCAL FUNDS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facilities Repair &amp; Improvements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTC Lane Four Shelter Replacement</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 75,000</td>
<td>$ 75,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair, Reseal, Restripe (Sinkholes) - Operations</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 4,000</td>
<td>$ 4,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 79,000</td>
<td>$ 79,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue Vehicle Replacement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 17 Buses (4) - VTA - (Measure A)</td>
<td>$ 2,500,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 2,500,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$ 2,500,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 2,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Revenue Vehicle Replacement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maint Equipment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Office Equipment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Misc.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL CAPITAL PROJECTS</strong></td>
<td>$ 7,841,837</td>
<td>$ 4,116,747</td>
<td>$ 885,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 12,843,584</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AGENDA: April 13, 2010

TO: Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee
FROM: Karena Pushnik, Senior Transportation Planner
RE: 2009 Annual Report for the Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee review the 2009 Annual Report and forward it to the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission with amendments, as appropriate.

BACKGROUND

The Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee regularly prepares an Annual Report (Attachment 1) outlining the Committee’s accomplishments, as well as current and anticipated unmet transportation needs. No annual report was prepared last year.

DISCUSSION

Over the last year, the E/D TAC met its regular responsibilities, which consisted of monitoring specialized transportation needs in Santa Cruz County, providing input and advocacy for specialized transportation projects, funding oversight, developing the preliminary list of unmet needs, and maintaining the committee.

Summary of E/D TAC 2009 Annual Report

(1) Transportation-Related Projects
   a. Supported Arana Gulch Master Plan accessible trails
   b. Supported City of Santa Cruz TDA claim for Branciforte Creek plan
   c. Supported County of Santa Cruz TDA claim for 4 pedestrian projects
   d. Supported City of Santa Cruz TDA claim for Ocean St pedestrian project

(2) Funding Oversight
   a. Input on Regional Transportation Improvement Plan funding
   b. Reviewed Section 5310 funding recommendations
   c. Letters of support for 4 New Freedom/Jobs Access Reverse Commute grants
   d. Advised RTC on Volunteer Center, Community Bridges and Metro TDA claims
   e. Reviewed and made recommendations on federal stimulus funding projects
(3) Monitoring Specialized Transportation Needs in Santa Cruz County
   a. Tracked all specialized transportation service providers
   b. Provided policy input on the following with respect to the needs of seniors and people with disabilities:
      i. Metro’s Non-Discrimination Program/Policy
      ii. Metro’s Disadvantaged Business Goals
      iii. Metro’s Service Animal Policy
      iv. Metro’s Discount Fare Policy
      v. Federal funding priorities for pedestrian improvements
      vi. RTC’s state and federal legislative agenda

(4) Regional Issues and Concerns
   a. Made recommendations about rides to dialysis and veterans facilities
   b. Provided input to City of Santa Cruz regarding roundabouts
   c. Recommended changes to Metro’s revised maps and website
   d. Reviewed draft interactive Hazard Reporting Form for ped and bike issues
   e. Analyzed transition plan for Out-of-County rides from Red Cross to Community Bridges
   f. Reviewed process for including pedestrian and transit input at environmental document phase of projects
   g. Received presentation from Monterey County’s Mobility Management Center
   h. Received Highway 1 Auxiliary Lane environmental document status report

(5) Planning Processes
   a. Reviewed draft 2010 RTP for E&D projects
   b. Reviewed the Metro’s Short Range Transit Plsn

(6) Internal Committee Issues
   a. Elected a Chair and Vice Chair

(7) List of Unmet Specialized Transportation/Transit Needs
   a. Reassessment of priorities relative to recognized unmet transportation needs of elderly and disabled individuals
   b. Ongoing articulation of unmet needs

Staff recommends that the E/D TAC review the draft 2009 Annual Report (including the list of unmet needs), suggest revisions, as needed, and forward both to the Regional Transportation Commission for their consideration.

SUMMARY

Following committee review of the 2009 Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee Annual Report, an amended (if necessary) report will be forwarded to the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission for review at their May or June meeting.

Attachment:
   1. 2009 Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee Annual Report
The Santa Cruz County Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee

2009 Annual Report

Presented to the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
May 2010
An Annual Review of the Work and Accomplishments of the Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee
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The Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee’s Regional Role

The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission's Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee -- also serving as the state-designated Social Services Advisory Committee -- is a group of transportation providers, social service agencies, and members of the public who meet every two months to determine planning, funding, and policy for specialized transportation to serve Santa Cruz County's seniors and people with physical, mental and/or economic disabilities.

One of the essential functions of this advisory committee is to provide broad and significant insight to the Regional Transportation Commission on countywide transportation issues and policies that are likely to affect the growing population of older and disabled residents of Santa Cruz County. Members of this committee have direct and personal experience with quality-of-life concerns related to maintaining full and independent lives through access to mobility assistance. As this population group continues to grow, planning activities for specialized transportation services throughout the region will become even more important.
(1) Transportation-Related Projects

The Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E&D TAC) supported the multi-purpose trails in the Arana Gulch Master Plan, expressing enthusiasm to have access to the county’s greenbelts for wheelchairs and other mobility devices.

The Committee supported the City of Santa Cruz’s Transportation Development Act (TDA) funding request to develop a plan for a pedestrian and bicycle bridge over the Branciforte Creek to connect the levee path.

The E&D TAC supported the County of Santa Cruz’s TDA claim for pedestrian improvements on Calabasas Road, State Park Drive, Green Valley Road and at Boulder Creek Elementary.

The E&D TAC supported the City of Santa Cruz’s TDA claim to improve the pedestrian crossing of Ocean Street at Leonard to provide better access to the County Building.

(2) Funding Oversight

Members advised the Regional Transportation Commission on prioritizing projects funded by the Regional transportation Improvement Plan (RTIP) and other funding sources. Four specific projects were endorsed by the E/D TAC: the Arana Gulch Master Plan multi-use trails, Highway 1 High Occupancy Vehicle Lane project, Soquel-Morrissey Auxiliary Lane project, and transferring funding from Metro’s transit planning project (unnecessary with Google Transit) to bus stop improvements.
Members endorsed Section 5310 funding recommendations for five vehicles and maintenance equipment for Community Bridges.

The Committee wrote four letters of support for New Freedom and Jobs Access/Reverse Commute grants for the Seniors Council, Community Bridges, the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District and the Regional Transportation Commission.

Members approved Transportation Development Act claims for the Volunteer Center, Community Bridges and the Transit District. The claims were analyzed in detail, including targeted ride category goals, the degree to which unmet needs were addressed, and overall administration costs for the agency.

The E&D TAC made recommendations on projects to receive two potential rounds of federal stimulus funding.

(3) Monitoring Policies Related to Specialized Transportation in Santa Cruz County

Meeting the specialized transportation needs of diverse populations in a mixed rural and urban county can be extremely challenging, and the Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee is actively engaged in monitoring existing services, from public and non-profit to
private, for-profit services. Committee members share much expertise over this broad spectrum of services.

Among the specialized transportation service providers in Santa Cruz County are: the Americans With Disabilities Act Mandated ParaTransit program, ParaCruz, operated by Metro; the countywide Lift Line transportation by Community Bridges, the designated Consolidated Transportation Services Agency; various private operators, including taxi companies and for-profit medical transport service; a collection of informal and volunteer efforts to provide vital and personal transportation services to individuals whose mobility needs would otherwise be unmet.

Members reviewed and provided input on Metro’s Title VI Non-Discrimination Program/Policy.

Committee members analyzed and approved the Metro’s Disadvantaged Business Goals.

The E&D TAC provided input to the Metro regarding proposed changes to their Service Animal policy.

The Committee reviewed the Metro’s Discount Fare Policy and provided recommendations.

Changes in the policy dictating federal funding priority for pedestrian improvements near transit, were discussed. The committee sent a letter supporting a wider radius of pedestrian and bicycle facilities around transit stops be eligible for priority funding status.

The E&D TAC reviewed the RTC’s federal and state legislative agenda and made recommendations regarding issues affecting specialized transportation for seniors and people with disabilities.
(4) Regional Issues & Concerns

The Committee heard a report about the current status of rides to veterans facilities and to dialysis centers.

Members requested a presentation from City of Santa Cruz public works staff regarding the proposed roundabouts and specifically requested that staff address potential conflicts for pedestrians.

The Metro solicited the committee’s input on their revised maps, and website update. Committee members were able to comment on accessibility issues for sight impaired individuals and other readability issues.

Committee members participated in reviewing the interactive countywide Hazard Report for both pedestrian and bicycle hazards. The online Hazard Report will have the potential for wider distribution and use.

The Committee reviewed the transition plan for out-of-county medical rides from the Red Cross to Community Bridges. The use of RTC-purchased vehicles was discussed as were other cost saving measures.

The E&D TAC requested RTC staff to provide a report outlining the procedure for reviewing environmental documents in an effort to understand whether there was more of an opportunity to request that projects include improved transit and pedestrian access features.

An overview of Monterey County’s Mobility Management Center was presented to the E&D TAC by staff from Monterey-Salinas Transit.

The committee received a status report about the draft environmental document prepared for the Highway 1 Morrissey-Soquel Auxiliary Lanes project.
Community Bridges staff provided an update about both the Agricultural Worker Transportation Project and the Mobility Outreach and Education Project.

The E&D TAC heard from Metro staff about the sensitivity component of their driver training program.

(5) Planning Processes

Committee members reviewed components of the 2010 Regional Transportation Plan including the Goals and Policies, funding estimates and proposed projects.

The E&D TAC provided input to the Metro regarding the update of the Short Range Transit Plan.

(6) Internal Committee Issues

Members elected a Chairman and Vice-Chairman, John Daugherty (representative from Metro), and Tom Crain (Potential Transit User-Disabled). Officers are elected annually.

(7) List of Unmet Specialized Transportation/Transit Needs

In cooperation with the Metro Board, the Elderly and Disabled Advisory Committee evaluated, amended and prioritized the draft list of Unmet Specialized Transportation and Public Transit Needs, acknowledging the importance of this list in establishing funding priorities for transportation spending. A copy of the list is attached.
2010 DRAFT – April 2, 2010
Unmet Specialized Transportation/Transit Needs List

Comments should be submitted in person at the Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee meeting on April 13 or the May 6 RTC public hearing (call 460-3200 for location of both meetings). Transit comments may be submitted directly to the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (info@scmtd.com or 110 Vernon St, Santa Cruz, 95060).

Questions? Please call 460-3200.

Comments received since last draft to E& DTAC in Feb 2010 shown in underline/strikeout.

Prioritization:
- **H** - High priority items are those items that fill a gap or absence of service. There are three levels of High priority with H1 being the top priority.
- **M** - Medium priority items are items that supplement existing service.
- **L** - Low priority items should become more specific and then be planned for, as funds are available.

General

1. **H1** - Lack of fully accessible transit stops and safe travel paths between senior and/or disabled living areas, medical facilities, educational facilities, employment locations, retail centers, entertainment venues and/or bus stops (examples: Capitola Road and side streets, trailer park at Antionelli, Santa Cruz County Nursing facility)

2. **H2** - Expanded publicity necessary about existing specialized transportation services including ADA paratransit, non-ADA paratransit, Medi-Cal rides and mobility training for people to use regular fixed route buses

3. **H2** - Shortage of transportation services for low-income children and their families, including a lack of transportation for people transitioning from welfare to work

4. **H2** – Availability of accessible local taxi services for seniors and disabled persons

5. **H2** - Lack of direct paratransit and accessible transit connections with neighboring counties — including Monterey (Pajaro), San Benito, Santa Clara and other points north

6. **M** – Expansion of the program currently in place in some jurisdictions to all jurisdictions in the county that requires homeowners to make improvements to sidewalks adjacent to their property when the property is sold

7. **M** - Amend local taxi ordinances to facilitate improved service to seniors and individuals with disabilities

Paratransit/Specialized Transportation

8. **H1** - Lack of specialized transportation for all areas outside the ADA Paratransit service area, with special emphasis on priority destinations
9. **H1** - Need for coordinated and seamless-to-the-public system of specialized transportation with a Mobility Management Center (central information point, one stop shop)

10. **H1** - Lack of transportation for dialysis and other medical appointments

11. **H2** - Shortage of projected funding for all specialized transportation (including fixed route, ADA and non-ADA Paratransit) to meet the needs of the senior population expected to increase over the next 15 to 30 years

12. **M** - Shortage of programs and operating funds for 'same day' medical trips on paratransit

13. **M** - Shortage of programs and operating funds for ‘same day’ non-medical trips

14. **M** - Shortage of volunteer drivers in Santa Cruz County including for the Volunteer Center Transportation Program and the American Red Cross out-of-county medical ride program, particularly in south county

15. **M** - Shortage of affordable special care trips and gurney vehicles for medically fragile individuals and those needing “bed to bed” transportation

16. **M** - Provide transportation for all senior meal sites in the county to meet unmet needs

17. **M** - Assure the availability of taxi scrip to meet need for “safety net” services

18. **L** - Need for the Consolidated Transportation Services Agency to acquire an improved operations and maintenance facility

19. **L** - Need for Ongoing provision of ADA Paratransit certification, provided by Metro, at group facilities

**Transit**

20. **H1** – Restore transit service to 2009 levels.

21. **H1** - Complete MetroBase Facility Phase 1 and Phase 2 including Operations Building and Parking Structure.

22. **H1** - Restore service to Gault Street and La Posada, Blackburn Street (Santa Cruz), Independence Square (Watsonville), simultaneously with the restoration of service to senior residences and centers and areas of high density concentrations of mobility-challenged individuals.

23. **H1** - Need to prioritize bus stop improvement and shelter replacement based on high usage by seniors and people with disabilities

24. **H2** - Redevelop Santa Cruz Metro Center as mixed use facility incorporating local transit service, regional transit service, paratransit service, intercity bus service, commercial office functions, passenger service facilities, parking facilities, and both market rate and affordable housing and potentially for child-care facilities.

25. **H12** - Funding to maintain existing services and facilities.

26. **H2** - Complete conversion of vehicles (revenue and non-revenue) to alternate fuels.

27. **H2** - Four (4) small fixed route replacement buses for rural service.
28. **H2** - Fourteen (14) full sized fixed route replacement buses. *(new vans purchased, funded by the American Reinvestment and Recovery Act)*

29. **H2** - Replace thirty-four (34) paratransit vans with larger capacity minibuses.

30. **H2** - Identify and obtain funding to support the future levels of paratransit service that will be required.

31. **H2** - Revise and improve web site to enhance effectiveness and visibility. *(new website launched March 2010)*

32. **H2** - Increased frequencies for Route 71 evening service: 2x an hour until 9PM vs. 7PM.

33. **H2** - Acquire and develop permanent operation and maintenance facility for ParaCruz to accommodate increased fleet size and growth in future service.

34. **H2** - Replace thirty (30) 1998 fixed route buses.

35. **H3** - Implement “yield to bus” program to improve travel times.

36. **H3** - Extend highway 17 service to Watsonville.

37. **H3** - Add AM/PM and weekend Route 79 service.

38. **H3** - Purchase Automated Vehicle Location/Pasenger (AVL) Counting System.

39. **H3** - Installation of Transponders on all buses for Preemptive Signal Control on major corridors improving traffic flow, reducing travel time, and improving on-time performance.

40. **H3** - Increase weekend Hwy 17 service frequencies.

41. **H3** - Add early morning Route 70 service to Cabrillo College.

42. **H3** - Additional night UCSC service, including Route 20.

43. **H3** - Extension of Highway 17/Amtrak service to UCSC at key times.

44. **H3** - East/West Express service to UCSC and Cabrillo and from Watsonville on 69W.

45. **H3** - Express service between San Lorenzo Valley and both UCSC and Cabrillo College.

46. **H3** - Expanded service between UCSC and Westside University activity centers such as Long Marine Lab, Wrigley building offices, Texas Instruments building offices.

47. **H3** - Service from the UC Inn to UCSC.

48. **H3** - Expanded service to new residential and commercial areas in Watsonville.

49. **H3** - Continue to improve bus stops to be ADA accessible.

50. **H3** - Purchase Smart Card Fare Collection System, coordinated with Monterey Salinas Transit, to allow persons with lower incomes to take advantage of multi-ride purchase discounts. *(funded by grants and the American Reinvestment and Recovery Act, activation expected in FY 10/11)*

51. **H3** - Route 66 using 7th Avenue inbound and outbound (between Capitola Road and Soquel Avenue).
52. **H3** - Add early morning Route 35 service.

53. **H3** - Implement circulator service in Santa Cruz, Watsonville, Capitola, and Scotts Valley.

54. **H3** - Service from Santa Cruz County to Los Gatos.

55. **H3** - Expanded bicycle capacity and access on the fixed route system by promoting the Folding Bikes in Buses Program to complement the recently-installed 3-position bike racks on all fixed route service.

56. **H3** - Increase window of service on Route 4.

57. **H3** - Equip ParaCruz Vehicles with Mobile Data Terminals (MDT) for improved manifest display, immediate additions/deletions/confirmations to trips, improved communication and tracking.

58. **H** - Continued need for transit to unserved low income and senior housing areas in south county (examples: Stonecreek Apartments in Watsonville and the San Andreas Migrant Labor Camp)

59. **H/M** – Bus and ParaCruz service on all holidays

60. **M** - Expanded evening and late night service on major fixed routes to improve service accessibility.

61. **M** – Implement automated "Reminder" phone call system for ParaCruz to remind riders of scheduled trip in advance, reducing "missed trips" and improve efficiency. *(funded by New Freedom funds and currently operating)*

62. **M** – Web based Trip Planner for fixed route bus service to improve customer trip planning capability via computer. *(currently in operation on Metro website via Google Transit)*

63. **M** - Automated phone-based trip planning providing Metro route information and or trip planning coordination via telephone and voice activated menu.

64. **M** - Install bus shelters at high usage stops.

65. **M** - 30-minute peak frequencies on collector and arterial routes.

66. **M** - Braille and raised numbers on bus signage at bus stops indicating which bus routes are being offered at each stop.

67. **L** - Install audio and video surveillance system for all buses.

68. **L** - Bi-directional service on local Watsonville and Aptos/Rio Del Mar routes.

69. **L** - Fare free service to students under the age of 13.
TO: Elderly/Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee
FROM: Karena Pushnik, Senior Transportation Planner
RE: Draft 2010 Regional Transportation Plan and Environmental Impact Report

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission’s Advisory Committees review the *Draft Regional Transportation Plan* and *Supplemental Environmental Impact Report* and recommend any changes for the final documents.

BACKGROUND

The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) is currently in the process of updating the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The RTP is a state-mandated, long-range plan which is intended to provide a vision of regional transportation goals, policies, objectives and strategies, providing a basis for transportation infrastructure and operation/maintenance decisions for both the short and longer (25-year) term. The document covers all modes of transportation to, from, and within the county.

The 2010 RTP is a minor update to the 2005 RTP. Program-level environmental analysis of changes since 2005 is provided in the Draft *Supplemental Environmental Impact Report*.

DISCUSSION

On March 1, 2010, the Commission released the *Draft 2010 Regional Transportation Plan* and *Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (DEIR)* for public review. The documents are available for review on the Commission’s website, www.sccrtc.org/rtp.html, and at local libraries. A public hearing on the draft plan was held on April 1, 2010.

**Commission staff recommends that committee members review and provide input on the draft documents at this meeting. Comments on the draft documents are due April 19, 2010.**

While we recognize that the Committee has reviewed the project lists and policies in the past, we wanted to give you an additional opportunity to provide input on the document as a whole. Certification of the EIR and adoption of the 2010 RTP are currently scheduled for the RTC’s June 3, 2010 meeting.

SUMMARY

The draft *2010 Regional Transportation Plan* and *Supplemental Environmental Impact Report* have been released for review. Staff requests that committee members review the draft documents and submit comments before the April 19, 2010 deadline.

Attachment 1: Draft RTP Executive Summary
Attachment 2: Supplemental DEIR Executive Summary
RTP 2010
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2010 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (herein referred to as the "RTC" or "Commission") periodically completes a Regional Transportation Plan to guide short- and long-range transportation planning and project implementation for the county.

This 2010 Regional Transportation Plan (called the "2010 RTP") is a minor update of the last version, completed in 2005, and provides guidance for transportation policy and projects through the year 2035. The 2010 RTP is the RTC's comprehensive planning document, which identifies the goals, projects, and programs that will improve and maintain our transportation system over the next twenty-five years. Individual projects listed in the 2010 RTP must still undergo separate design and environmental processes, and can only be implemented as local, state and federal funds become available.

2010 PLAN ORGANIZATION

The 2010 RTP is organized into the following chapters:

- Chapter One  Introduction
- Chapter Two  Our Transportation System
- Chapter Three  Goals and Policies
- Chapter Four  The Investment Program
- Chapter Five  Environmental and Air Quality Review of the 2010 RTP
- Chapter Six  Greenhouse Gas Emissions- Meeting the Challenge

DEVELOPING THE 2010 RTP

The 2010 RTP is a minor update of the 2005 Plan which addresses the existing transportation system and transportation needs of the entire county. Such a comprehensive plan necessarily involves the cooperation of many local, regional and state agencies. Public input is also critical to the RTC's planning and decision-making process. Comments from a wide range of individuals, public interest groups, and local agencies have been solicited over the past five years, most notably during extensive Transportation Funding Task Force workshops in 2006 and 2007. During development of the 2010 RTP, public input was sought through public meetings on key elements of the RTP. Additionally, in submitting projects for consideration, project sponsors took into consideration input they receive directly from the public.
INCREASED TRAFFIC CONGESTION AND COMPETING DEMANDS FOR LIMITED TRANSPORTATION DOLLARS

Public sentiment on policy and funding decisions can be strong in Santa Cruz County, and transportation issues are no exception. Traffic congestion in the county continues to be a source of frustration and the community has expressed many ideas about how the limited funds available for highway, transit, road, and alternative transportation projects should be spent. A number of factors are clear:

➤ Santa Cruz County has a rich multi-modal transportation network. The county’s existing transportation network comprises a broad range of transportation facilities and modes, including: state highways, local roads and streets, an extensive bus system and specialized transport system for seniors and people with disabilities, bikeways, sidewalks, a rail line, an airport, and traffic management systems such as carpool programs, Park and Ride lots, Intelligent Transportation System technology, and signal synchronization. This “multi-modal” transportation network is crucial to meeting the travel needs of all county residents, including drivers, non-drivers and commercial traffic. Notably, approximately one-third of county residents do not drive, and an aging population is likely to increase the demand for transit, safe pedestrian routes, and specialized transport services.

➤ Traffic congestion exists in Santa Cruz County and will not go away in the foreseeable future. Population growth and region-wide jobs to housing imbalances that encourage driving as the mode of choice result in more drivers making more automobile trips. The daily traffic jams on Highway 1 and local streets are only the most obvious example of increasing congestion on county roadways.

➤ Transit service is limited by available revenues. In response to reduced revenues from the half-cent local transit sales tax and state cuts to transit funding, bus service reductions will be considered.

➤ Maintenance needs for the existing transportation network are increasing. Roadway, bikeway, sidewalk, bridge and other repairs must be addressed in parallel with capacity and operational enhancements. If ongoing routine maintenance needs are not addressed, the cost of deferred maintenance will grow exponentially, leaving little funding for major improvements.

➤ The complexity of transportation solutions is increasing as communities find that new projects must be shoe-horned into existing urban areas. Adding new highway lanes, widening city streets, building new roads, adding passenger rail service, or building new bus facilities are neither simple nor inexpensive propositions. Project delays, environmental concerns, neighborhood opposition, and right-of-way needs can increase cost, and, in some cases, may cause a funded project to be withdrawn.

➤ All transportation modes and facilities are subsidized with public funding generated from tax revenues—including freeways, local roads, bus and rail transit, and transportation for people with special needs. Many of the subsidies are indirect and
are not covered in the 2010 RTP or administered by the RTC. Examples of indirect transportation subsidies include pollution clean-up costs, law enforcement, emergency response costs and parking subsidies.

➢ The RTC has discretion over less than 10% of the transportation funds typically available to the region. The vast majority of transportation funding is dedicated to specific uses—such as airport improvements, highway safety and transit operations.

➢ The ebb and flow of federal, state, regional, and local funding affects project timing. Many needed projects with already identified funding have been delayed several years as the result of downturns in the economy that affect the availability of those funds.

➢ Existing funds are insufficient to finance major transportation improvements and ongoing maintenance. Additionally, the competition for limited state and federal funds favors large urban areas with local sources of revenues, such as local transportation sales taxes. New revenue sources will be needed to make major modifications to our transportation system and to eliminate the backlog of maintenance needs.

➢ Reaching consensus on transportation improvements is difficult, especially in light of limited funds, competing interests, and the inevitable impacts of major projects. In an attempt to generate sufficient funds for local transportation projects, the RTC proposed a new half-cent sales tax on the November 2004 ballot. Though voters rejected this first attempt, efforts continue to generate consensus and the 2010 RTP assumes that voters will approve a new tax in the next few years.

GOALS AND POLICIES

The 2010 RTP carries forward goals from the 2001 and 2005 RTP, which are to:

➢ Preserve and maintain the existing transportation system, emphasizing safety and efficiency.

➢ Increase mobility by providing an improved and integrated multi-modal transportation system.

➢ Coordinate land use and transportation decisions to ensure that the region's social, cultural, and economic vitality are sustained for current and future generations.

➢ Ensure that the transportation system complements and enhances the natural environment of the Monterey Bay region and minimizes greenhouse gas emissions.

➢ Make the most efficient use of limited transportation financial resources.

➢ Solicit broad public input on all aspects of regional and local transportation plans, projects, and funding.
THE INVESTMENT PROGRAM

The Goals and Policies — along with local priorities, potential environmental impacts, safety, economic and transportation equity considerations, funding constraints, and identified gaps in the existing transportation network — provided the basis for the identification of over 450 transportation improvement projects and programs that are needed to address the region’s mobility, accessibility, and economic and environmental sustainability needs over the next 25 years. Together with a discussion of how they will be funded, these projects and programs constitute the 2010 RTP’s “Investment Program,” described in Chapter 4.

FUNDING PROJECTION

During the next 25 years, approximately $2.6 billion from federal, state, and local funding sources is projected to be available to finance transportation projects in Santa Cruz County.

Of the $2.6 billion projected to be available, over 75 percent is dedicated to specific types of projects. Approximately $1 billion of that dedicated funding is slated for transit service and capital improvements. A large proportion of transit revenues come from our county’s dedicated half-cent local sales tax for transit.

As noted earlier, the RTP also assumes that the region’s voters will approve a new half-cent transportation sales tax measure in the next few years. Approximately 14 percent of the $2.6 billion is anticipated from that new sales tax, and it would be up to the discretion of the voters which projects receive those funds, though this RTP assumes that those funds will be dedicated to the projects and programs listed in the 2010 RTP.

Less than 10% of the $2.6 billion, $200 million over the coming 25 years, are discretionary funds under the direct control of the RTC.

It is important to note that transportation funding can be incredibly unpredictable. State and federal actions can result in elimination of certain funding programs or diversion of transportation funds to the State General Fund, as has happened regularly to transit funds over the past several years. Inevitably, some of the funding sources assumed within the financial projections for this plan will not actually be realized, depending on decisions made by voters and the state and federal governments. In addition, the RTC is constantly working with other transportation planning agencies to develop new transportation revenue sources, but it is always very challenging to do so.

Even if all of the revenues assumed in this document are realized these projected funds are insufficient to keep up with maintenance, operational, safety, and major improvement needs of the region. As such, this document identifies additional sources for new funds that could be made available for “unconstrained” projects. These could include new local or state gas taxes, vehicle registration fees, statewide transportation bonds, special federal funding programs (such as American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA), Jobs for Main Street Act, special state legislative budget requests, and new grant or transportation impact fee programs.
FUNDING PROJECTS

The costs of individual projects and programs listed in the Investment Program are divided in two categories based on priority, funding availability, and potential environmental effects. Transportation improvements that can be funded with foreseeable transportation revenues between 2010 and 2035 are shown as “Constrained”. This group includes already funded projects to be constructed in the short term, and planned projects that could be constructed anytime within the 2010 RTP’s 25-year time-line as projected funds become available. Transportation improvements to be implemented if new revenues are generated or become available show their funding as “Unconstrained”. Some projects are identified with both constrained and unconstrained funds, indicating a need for additional funds to complete the entire project, though portions of those projects may be completed using anticipated funding.

The 2010 RTP assigns future transportation funds to a range of projects and programs designed to maintain the current transportation system, provide traffic congestion relief and broaden transportation options. Key proposals include:

- Maintenance of the existing transportation network including roads, highways, bike lanes, sidewalks, and transit
- Safety and operational improvements to Highways 1, 9, 17, 129 and 152
- Adding High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes on Highway 1 between Aptos and Santa Cruz to facilitate increased carpool, vanpool and transit use
- Improvements to major arterial roads -- including bus, pedestrian and bicycle facilities -- to better accommodate local and commute traffic
- Expanded bus service, with additional Highway 17 Express buses and more Park and Ride lots to serve Silicon Valley, UCSC, and south county commuters
- Construction of the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network along the coast
- Local bicycle and pedestrian projects designed to improve the feasibility of bicycle commuting, and provide safe bicycle and pedestrian routes to schools
- Expansion of specialized transport services to meet the projected increases in senior and disabled populations
- Increased availability of accurate and timely information about road conditions, transit operations, and other transportation options
- Landscaping and lighting improvements to make transportation corridors part of livable communities
IMPLEMENTING THE INVESTMENT PROGRAM

Development of the RTP project list is only the first step towards actual implementation of the projects identified in the 2010 RTP. Prior to the beginning of construction for each project, a number of steps must be taken to secure funds and satisfy environmental and funding requirements, requiring from 6 months to 20 years, depending on the particular project's complexity, impacts, level of public interest, and availability of funds. These steps include: developing a detailed project cost estimate; obtaining local, state and/or federal grants; designing the project; determining the project's environmental impacts according to state and federal laws; securing right-of-way, if necessary; and throughout the process, incorporating public input.

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS STRATEGIES

New for the 2010 RTP, the RTC has included a discussion on greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) in relation to transportation planning. In the absence of tools to measure the effectiveness of specific RTC policies towards reducing GHGs and without having the specific GHG reduction targets from the state, the new chapter introduces some of the best practices which could be included in a portfolio of strategies to meet future emission reduction goals in Santa Cruz County. The discussion suggests that a combination of strategies is essential to bending the curve of future emissions downward. While technological developments in vehicle design and clean fuels are outside the purview of the RTC, the RTP can focus on strategies that transform mobility as a way to affect GHG trends. The RTP includes many projects that pro-actively implement GHG reduction strategies such as: operating a Commute Solutions program to encourage ridesharing; funding freeway service patrols to remove incidents and improve traffic flow; adding high occupancy vehicle lanes in the Highway 1 corridor to encourage carpools, vanpools and transit use; acquiring the rail corridor for goods movement, bicycle and pedestrian access and possible passenger service; and supporting bicycle, pedestrian and transit projects.

ENVIRONMENTAL AND AIR QUALITY REVIEW OF THE 2010 RTP

The California Environmental Quality Act of 1970 (CEQA) requires that the environmental effects of the 2010 RTP be fully analyzed. This analysis was prepared as a separate program level Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) to the 2005 RTP EIR, released along with the 2010 RTP. The SEIR was prepared in coordination with the Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC), the San Benito Council of Governments (SBCOG), and the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG). The SEIR supplements the certified 2005 RTP EIR by adding to the information provided in the 2005 EIR based on minor changes to the project lists and policies and addressing new information not previously available. The SEIR analyzes the potential environmental impacts of the 2010 RTP, including alternative investment scenarios, and identifies potential mitigation measures for impacts of the transportation program for the whole region. The SEIR does not analyze impacts of, or mitigations for, individual projects, as each project will undergo a separate environmental review process. The respective agency sponsors will conduct this project-specific review once funding is received and the project development process is initiated.
Together Santa Cruz, Monterey, and San Benito Counties comprise the North Central Coast Air basin (NCCAB). The three county region (or NCCAB) is an attainment area for ozone precursors and therefore exempt from conformity analysis. However, several projects in the plan implement the Air District's approved Transportation Control Measures for the region, which are developed to reduce transportation-related emissions by reducing vehicle use or improving traffic flow.
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2010 MONTEREY BAY AREA
METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN
ASSOCIATION OF MONTEREY BAY AREA GOVERNMENTS

CONSISTING OF:

2010 MONTEREY COUNTY
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN
TRANSPORTATION AGENCY FOR MONTEREY COUNTY

2010 SANTA CRUZ COUNTY
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN
SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

2010 SAN BENITO COUNTY
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN
SAN BENITO COUNTY COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

State Clearinghouse #2004061013

Prepared for:
AMBAG
P.O. Box 809
MARINA, CALIFORNIA 93933

Prepared by:
PMC
585 CANNERY ROW, SUITE 304
MONTEREY, CA 93940

PMC®

FEBRUARY 2010
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (REPLACED IN ENTIRETY)

This Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) represents the environmental review for
the 2010 Monterey Bay Area Metropolitan Transportation Plan ("2010 MTP"), which is the
"project" under review. This document supplements the certified 2005 Monterey Bay Area MTP
EIR, which is incorporated by reference. The information contained in this SEIR is intended to
provide AMBAG with the environmental information necessary to consider approval and adoption
of the project. The 2010 MTP, collectively, consists of the 2010 Monterey County Regional
Transportation Plan (2010 MC-RTP), the 2010 Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Plan
(2010 SCC-RTP) and the 2010 San Benito County Regional Transportation Plan (2010 SBC-RTP).

2010 MTP Project Overview

A series of transportation projects and programs as proposed, evaluated and selected at the county-
wide level, serve as the basis for the 2010 MTP. In receipt of each county’s project list, AMBAG has
been assured by the Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPAs) of each county that their
RTP was developed taking into account transportation need, an evaluation of alternatives to meet
that need, and the resultant plan and/or program selection to satisfy transportation needs. Most
importantly, the RTPs reflect an extensive public involvement and participation process, as outlined
in AMBAG’s Monterey Bay Region Public Participation Plan (June 11, 2008). The end product is a vision
for a transportation system to serve the three-county region, based on public input, which embraces
various modes of transportation to efficiently maximize the movement of people and goods, and to
reduce energy consumption and air pollution through the year 2035.

The 2010 MTP does not provide project designs or construction schedules, and adoption of this
comprehensive planning document does not represent an approval action for any of the individual
transportation programs or projects. Details relating to the site-specific alignment, location, design
and scheduling of the transportation improvement projects identified in the 2010 MTP are not fixed
in, or defined by, this document. The adoption of the 2010 MTP represents an essential first step in
qualifying for the receipt of the funding necessary to permit the implementation of programs and
projects in the financially constrained Action Element of the 2010 MTP.

AMBAG as Lead Agency under CEQA

The Lead Agency in the development of the 2010 MTP and in the preparation of this Supplemental
Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) is the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments
(AMBAG). The 2010 MTP expresses the priorities of AMBAG, TAMC, SCCRTC, SBCOG and
their partner planning/programming agencies, for transportation system improvements and programs within the Monterey Bay region. This Program SEIR describes, in general terms, the probable environmental effects which may be associated with those expressed priorities on a regional, system-wide basis, rather than on a project-by-project basis.

The SEIR updates information provided in the previous EIRs prepared on earlier MTPs and RTPs. These changes include slight revisions to policy statements; the deletion of some projects which appeared on previous financially constrained Action Element lists (but which have since been completed or have been dropped from consideration); the addition of new projects to the financially constrained Action Element and the Financially Unconstrained Project Lists; revisions of the Financial Element to reflect changes in anticipated revenues; a standalone Consistency Analysis to evaluate 2010 MTP consistency with other plans and programs currently in force within the region; a programmatic Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions Analysis; and new population and housing forecasts released by AMBAG in 2008.

This SEIR identifies measures which appear to be available for, and effective in, mitigating the significant environmental effects associated with the implementation of the programs and projects identified in the financially constrained Action Element of the 2010 MTP. These mitigation measures, as identified, are recommendations to the appropriate agency responsible for the actual implementation of the projects. The identified mitigation measures may be subject to change based on comments received on the SEIR during the review period, and on the determination made by the respective governing boards in reviewing the SEIR.

What the 2010 MTP SEIR Is

This SEIR identifies the long-term environmental impacts of the components of the 2010 MTP and provides the basis for further project-level CEQA (and National Environmental Policy Act [NEPA]) compliance for implementation of future transportation projects. There are only a few chapters from the certified 2005 MTP EIR that have been updated in their entirety to contain “new information of substantial importance” based on updates from the 2010 MTP.

What this SEIR is Not

This SEIR is not a ‘comprehensive’ update to every chapter of the certified 2005 MTP EIR. As discussed above, several chapters have been updated in their entirety. Several other chapters, however, have been updated with minor additions or clarifying information. In those cases, chapters are identified with the label “Errata Changes Only”, and only the pages with text changes are reproduced.

The remaining chapters of the 2005 MTP EIR, requiring only temporal edits that do not include new information of substantial importance, remain valid, and are not reproduced within this SEIR. Those chapters are labeled with the heading “No Changes”.
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The full text of the 2005 MTP EIR is available for reference at: www.ambag.org.

Alternatives Evaluated

The SEIR evaluates four alternatives to the adoption of the 2010 MTP. In this document, the “No Build” alternative represents a scenario in which no new construction on transportation system improvement projects would take place in the absence of the 2010 MTP, although maintenance of the existing transportation infrastructure would continue. The “Financially Unconstrained” alternative represents a more extensive range of transportation system improvements than anticipated under the 2010 MTP, since it would encompass all of the transportation system improvement programs and projects identified in the financially constrained Action Element of the 2010 MTP, as well as all of the transportation system improvement programs and projects identified in the Financially Unconstrained Project Lists of the 2010 MTP. The “Financially Constrained – No New Revenues” evaluates a scenario where some major projects may be postponed or jeopardized in the absence of new funding sources. Finally, the “GHG-Reduction” alternative assumes long-term changes in land use and circulation patterns (consistent with Senate Bill (SB) 375 and the AMBAG Draft Blueprint Plan), resulting in enhanced coordination between land use and transportation systems, with the ultimate goal of further reducing greenhouse gases and other environmental benefits.

For the purposes of CEQA analysis, the “GHG Reduction” alternative is identified as the environmentally superior alternative. Such an alternative, however, will rely upon the long term coordination of regional land use and transportation planning efforts, and is not considered a viable “option” to the 2010 MTP at this time.

Impact and Mitigation Summary Table

A “program-level” summary of the potentially significant adverse environmental impacts of the project is identified in the table on the following pages, along with corresponding mitigation measures and strategies. Although the impact analysis and resulting mitigation changed very little from 2005, the entire table has been produced here so that the public and reviewing agencies will have a complete summary of all impact and mitigation statements in one place.

In reviewing this analysis summary, it is important to remember that these potential impacts are not directly related to the adoption of the 2010 MTP. By itself, the adoption of the 2010 MTP would not be sufficient to enable any of the projects identified in the financially constrained Action Element of the 2010 MTP to proceed, and would not directly result in any adverse environmental impacts. Under CEQA, each of the appropriate agencies responsible for the actual implementation of projects identified in the financially constrained Action Element of the 2010 MTP will be required to provide some level of project-specific environmental review for each of the projects listed once such projects have been designed and formally proposed for approval.

As a result, several impacts are identified as “significant and unavoidable” until such time that they are reviewed, analyzed and mitigated at the project specific level.
AGENDA: April 13, 2010

TO: Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee

FROM: Karena Pushnik, SCCRTC Staff

RE: New Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee Applications

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee consider all applications received at the meeting for new member/alternate positions, and make recommendations to the Regional Transportation Commission for their approval.

556,721

BACKGROUND

The E&D TAC has 16 positions representing roughly half of citizens and half of agencies/organizations that either work with seniors and people with disabilities or provide transportation services to these populations. The committee functions best when, at a minimum, all positions are filled. Attached is a current roster (Attachment 1).

DISCUSSION

At the last meeting, the E&D TAC directed RTC staff to make a effort to fill the vacant positions. Staff has completed the following:

- Submitted Public Service Announcements to radio and television
- Placed paid ads in local newspapers
- Communicated with Commissioners representing Supervisory Districts with vacancies

Attached is one application received at the time when the packet was prepared from Michael Lewis representing the 1st Supervisory District (Attachment 2). Due to the outreach efforts listed above, staff anticipates that the committee will receive additional applications for the E&D TAC’s consideration.

SUMMARY

Staff recommends that the E/D TAC consider applications received for vacant member and alternate positions on the committee and make recommendations to the Regional Transportation Commission for their approval.

Attachments:

1. Current Roster
2. Application from Michael Lewis for 1st District Representative
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Representing</th>
<th>Alternate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clay Kempf (2011)</td>
<td>Social Service Provider - Seniors</td>
<td>Patty Talbot (2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hal Anjo (2013)</td>
<td>Social Service Provider - Seniors (County)</td>
<td>vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally French (2012)</td>
<td>Social Service Provider - Disabled</td>
<td>vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Molesky (2014)</td>
<td>Social Service Provider - Disabled (County)</td>
<td>vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Berkowitz (2011)</td>
<td>CTSA (Community Bridges)</td>
<td>Bonnie McDonald (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Patterson Valdez (2014 pending approval)</td>
<td>CTSA (Lift Line)</td>
<td>Kirk Ance (2014 pending approval)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Daugherty, Chair (2012)</td>
<td>SCMTD (Metro)</td>
<td>April Warnock (2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donella Bloebaum (2012)</td>
<td>Potential Transit User (60+)</td>
<td>vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Crain, Vice Chair (2009)</td>
<td>Potential Transit User (Disabled)</td>
<td>vacant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Year in Parentheses) = Membership Expiration Date
### Membership Roster (March 2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisory District Representatives</th>
<th>Representing</th>
<th>Alternate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vacant</td>
<td>1st District</td>
<td>vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Leopold)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>2nd District</td>
<td>vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Pirie)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veronica Elsea (2012)</td>
<td>3rd District</td>
<td>Thom Onan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Coonerty)</td>
<td>(2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vacant</td>
<td>4th District</td>
<td>Sandra Coley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Campos)</td>
<td>(2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Barbour (2009)</td>
<td>5th District</td>
<td>vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Stone)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Staff

Karena Pushnik, Transportation Planner, RTC, 460-3210, kpushnik@sccrtc.org
COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT APPLICATION

Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (SCCRTC)
Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E/D TAC)

Meetings are scheduled for the second Tuesday of every other month at 1:30 p.m. in the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission conference room, located at 1523 Pacific Avenue in downtown Santa Cruz. At least one meeting each year is scheduled for an alternate location. Please refer to the Committee description, bylaws and recruitment process for more information.

If you are interested in serving on this committee, please complete this application, and return it to the Regional Transportation Commission office.

PLEASE TYPE OR PRINT CLEARLY

Name: ______Michael A. Lewis________________________
Home address: __1190 7th Avenue #5, SC. 95062________________________
Mailing address (if different): ______________________________

__________________________________________________________
Phone: (home) ___462-4919_______ (business/message) ___________________
E-mail: ___malewis@calcentral.com________________________________________

Length of residence in Santa Cruz County: ___8 years_____________________
Position(s) I am applying for: Any appropriate position
X 1st District Representative________________________

Previous experience on a government commission or committee (please specify)
RTC Bicycle Committee 2005 to 2010

20-4
Relevant Work or Volunteer Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Town or Address</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yacht Harbor Manor Homeowners</td>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>11/03 to 11/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUNM Board of Directors</td>
<td>Albuquerque, New</td>
<td>Staff Council Liaison</td>
<td>8/2000 to 9/2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Alaska Fairbanks Staff</td>
<td>Fairbanks, Alaska</td>
<td>Research Staff</td>
<td>8/1995 to 5/2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Statement of Qualifications:** Please attach a brief statement indicating why you are interested in serving on this committee and why you are qualified for the appointment. If you have served on this committee in the past, please summarize your accomplishments on the committee and indicate which of the committee’s potential future endeavors most interest you.

**Certification:** I certify that the above information is true and correct and I authorize the verification of the information in the application in the event I am a finalist for the appointment.

__________________________  ____________________________
Signature                  Date

**Return Application to:** SCCRTC
Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee
1523 Pacific Avenue
Santa Cruz, CA 95060
fax: 460-3215  email: kpushnik@sccrtc.org

**Questions or Comments:** (831) 460-3200
Statement of Qualifications:

I am sixty years old, approaching elderly status, and I walk or bicycle wherever I go in Santa Cruz. When traveling outside of Santa Cruz, I use public transportation, including AMTRAK out of San Jose or Salinas. I've traveled from coast to coast across the United States by train and bus and have traveled extensively in the UK by public surface transportation.

I have been a daily bicycle commuter for the past 35 years, in Nebraska, Wyoming, Alaska, New Mexico and Santa Cruz. I regularly walk from Live Oak to Santa Cruz and back on existing sidewalks and paths.
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I. Introduction

The Pedestrian Safety Work Group is a subcommittee of the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission’s Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee. Its mission is to ensure safe and accessible pedestrian travel and access throughout the county for the benefit of all residents.

The Work Group has initiated a study to determine the status of local jurisdiction sidewalks, and of the practices employed in managing the property owner component of maintenance programs.

For the purposes of this study, sidewalks are defined as that portion of the public right-of-way which is primarily devoted to pedestrian use. Pedestrians are defined as anyone using the sidewalk network, including individuals walking, using a wheelchair or other mobility device, and pushing a stroller or cart.

The work group was interested in validating and responding to the following perceptions which were brought to our attention by members of the public:

- That, in several jurisdictions, a significant percentage of sidewalks do not meet basic safety and access standards
- That the majority of those sidewalks are located adjacent to private property
- That many property owners are unaware of their responsibility, under California law, for maintaining sidewalks adjacent to their properties
- That jurisdiction programs which address safety and access issues are not visible to, or understood by, many of their residents
- That most jurisdiction programs are not targeted to achieve a high rate of compliance within a defined period of time.

II. Objectives of this study:

Based on these perceptions, the work group developed the following objectives for this study:

- Clarify property owner and jurisdiction responsibilities for maintaining safe and accessible sidewalks
- Clarify program objectives that will bring sidewalk networks into compliance with regulatory standards
- Encourage local jurisdictions to develop a commonly understood set of standards for sidewalk maintenance
- Determine the current status of local jurisdiction sidewalk networks
• Document the current practices of local jurisdiction sidewalk maintenance programs
• Build a program model for managing to the objective of a compliant sidewalk network using advanced components of surveyed programs
• Request that local jurisdictions conduct program assessments, and consider upgrades as appropriate
• Assist local jurisdictions in developing processes for outreach that build a greater awareness and support for a community value of safe and accessible sidewalks
• Request that local jurisdiction programs report status of sidewalk networks to their governing bodies annually; and coordinate in an annual reporting of status to the Regional Transportation Commission

In meeting these objectives, this report focuses mainly on Jurisdiction oversight of property owner sidewalk maintenance.

III. Presentation to the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission:

The Work Group is presenting this report to the RTC for the following reasons:

• Sidewalks are a critical component of the county’s overall transportation network
• Sidewalk maintenance policies and practices are matters of concern to the Commission’s member jurisdictions
• There are several program challenges shared across jurisdictions
• Coordination in addressing common challenges has the potential to leverage limited resources

IV. Presentation of Key Concepts

Unsafe sidewalk conditions:

Conditions arise in sidewalk networks that pose risks to pedestrians seeking to use them. These include broken and raised pavement, slopes with potential to tip wheelchairs and related mobility devices, vegetation that intrudes into the walkway, holes around trees, vehicles parked across sidewalks, and signs, poles, stands or benches that obstruct or narrow the path of travel.

Trip and fall hazards are a danger to all residents. The elderly, and others with impairments that affect vision and balance, are more susceptible to such hazards. Devices such as wheelchairs, motorized scooters, strollers, walkers, skates and
skateboards can dislodge passengers when significant pavement uplifts or angles of slope are encountered.

When hazards constitute barriers to sidewalk use, they may cause pedestrians, on foot or using mobility devices, to make detours into roadways, or other paths, to reach destinations.

The importance of sidewalks to population segments:

In addition to residents who use sidewalks for enjoyment and exercise, many find such use to be a necessary affordable and accessible option for traveling to a destination. Seniors, no longer able or choosing not to drive, people unable to purchase and maintain automobiles due to low income, and those with disabilities find the use of sidewalks to be essential for their travel in the community and for connecting with public transit.

When sidewalk networks are not consistently safe and accessible, residents may avoid use of the system. For the elderly and persons with disabilities, this may greatly restrict opportunities for involvement in neighborhood and community activities or may force reliance on the use of more costly transportation services such as paratransit.

The objective of sidewalk maintenance:

For a sidewalk system to function properly it must connect to popular destination points within a community and provide ease of movement for pedestrians traveling into and around a community.

Sidewalks that are major paths of travel make important connections within the jurisdiction and with networks of neighboring jurisdictions. These sidewalks tend to be located along major road corridors and connect to key community destinations.

Neighborhood sidewalks systems normally serve local residents. They link to neighborhood parks, schools, shops, transit stops and the jurisdiction-wide pedestrian network.

The objective of sidewalk maintenance is to have a seamless system, free of obstructions or missing segments, on which pedestrians feel safe and comfortable.

Standards for sidewalk maintenance:

Standards typically include tolerances for gaps, broken, raised, and settled sidewalks as well as delineation of which can be addressed by grinding and which require replacement.

Standards communicate the jurisdiction’s requirements for sidewalk pavement condition and unobstructed pathways. They allow property owners, and other members of the public, to identify and address safety and access issues. Standards
also provide a basis for the jurisdiction to initiate notification and compliance processes with property owners.

Enlisting residents in the identification and reporting of sidewalk issues is critical to the success of jurisdiction sidewalk maintenance programs. The following is a list of items generally included in sidewalk maintenance standards:

- Uplifts
- Gaps
- Surface condition
- Pathway obstructions
- Cross-Slopes
- Curb ramps

The challenge is to express these standards in non-technical terms so that they can be understood and applied by residents. Federal and State standards tend to be expressed as technical specifications so jurisdictions have had to develop their own versions that are more readily communicated and understood. The work group's research failed to identify standards language that this report could recommend.

If common maintenance standards language could be developed for the five local jurisdictions it would provide an opportunity to leverage resources in communicating a consistent message.

Property owner responsibility:

A high percentage of the sidewalk networks of most jurisdictions are adjacent to private properties. The California Streets and Highways Code Section 5610 requires the following:

“Owners of lots or portions of lots fronting on any portion of a public street to maintain the sidewalk in such a condition that it will not endanger persons or property, and will not interfere with the public use of the sidewalk.”

It appears that many property owners in local jurisdictions are unaware of their responsibility for maintaining sidewalks adjacent to their properties or of their liability in the event of injury resulting from unsafe conditions.

Local jurisdiction responsibility:

The regulatory environment regarding sidewalk accessibility has evolved to give additional focus to a jurisdiction’s responsibility for ensuring that its sidewalk network complies with Americans with Disabilities Act guidelines.
The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, in *Barden v. City of Sacramento*, held that local jurisdictions are responsible for ensuring that programs achieve compliance with ADA-based standards for sidewalk accessibility.

While, under California law, property owners are responsible for maintaining sidewalks adjacent to their properties, jurisdiction processes and controls largely determine the rate at which safety and access issues are identified and addressed.

Jurisdictions are encouraged to consult with their legal staffs to track any changes in program oversight requirements.

**Measurements of program status:**

Without formal processes for measuring the percentage of sidewalks that are in compliance, it is difficult for local jurisdictions, and the community at large, to determine current status and rates of year-to-year improvement. This information is the foundation for establishing goals and timetables that achieve jurisdiction objectives.

Each local jurisdiction faces unique challenges in efforts to achieve and maintain an integrated and conforming sidewalk network and help residents understand their role in the maintenance of pedestrian facilities.

The manner in which jurisdictions assess their networks, report status, and monitor rates of progress may vary but certain measurements seem essential for determining the effectiveness of sidewalk maintenance programs:

- The current percentage of jurisdiction sidewalks that are in compliance with jurisdiction standards
- The year-to-year progress toward the jurisdiction’s compliance goal, expressed as a percentage of sidewalks that meet jurisdiction standards
- The average interval from identification of a significant unsafe condition to its resolution

**Setting objectives and timetables:**

Objectives and timetables demonstrate a commitment to address and resolve sidewalk exposures within a defined period of time. They can be developed to reflect rates of progress exhibited by current program practices or on the expectation that a high level of compliance with jurisdiction objectives should be achieved within a defined time period.

A jurisdiction must weigh a number of factors in setting program goals. Among these are the extent to which its sidewalks are currently in compliance, the rate at which non-complying sidewalks are being replaced, the priority given to pedestrian safety and access, concerns regarding legal actions on behalf of those injured or denied access, and resources available to address safety and access exposures.
Methods for the identification of safety and access issues:

There are three primary sources for identification of safety and access issues:

- **Property owners** with knowledge of safety and access standards can identify issues regarding sidewalks adjacent to their own properties
- **Citizens** with knowledge of sidewalk maintenance standards and the process for reporting issues can notify the jurisdiction concerning safety and access exposures on the properties of others
- **Jurisdictions** can conduct periodic safety and access audits of their sidewalk networks

Effectiveness of methods:

The methods vary in effectiveness. No single system is capable of promptly identifying all safety and access exposures. The following describes the strengths and limitations of each:

The jurisdiction audit is the most comprehensive and effective approach to obtaining detailed and reliable data needed for the reporting of current status and rate of improvement. Safety and access issues that emerge between audits must be identified and addressed through the citizen reporting process.

The citizen reporting process relies on public knowledge of standards, an awareness of the reporting process, and a motivating community value that safe and accessible sidewalks are important. Without a sustained and effective public education campaign, citizens will not have the information needed to report exposures. Even under ideal conditions, sole reliance on this process would be expected to identify a limited subset of existing safety and access exposures.

When property owners identify and address issues that emerge on sidewalks adjacent to their properties, it is an indication that standards are understood and that there is community support for safe and accessible sidewalks. Property owner initiated repairs occur with greater frequency in jurisdictions where a community value has been established through sustained public education.

V. Survey of Jurisdiction Practices

The Work Group surveyed local jurisdictions to determine the status of their sidewalk networks and to understand the practices employed in managing property owner compliance with jurisdiction safety and access standards. Three additional jurisdictions, identified as having advanced program components, were also surveyed.
Methodology

Prior to its initial meeting with each of the five local jurisdictions, the Work Group requested background information regarding current sidewalk maintenance practices. An initial round of meetings was held with jurisdiction staffs to clarify questionnaire responses and discuss current practices for each of the program components addressed in this report. A second round of meetings was held to verify accuracy of information reported in the notes of the first meeting. Jurisdictions were encouraged to provide additional information and describe any changes implemented since the first meeting. Following the second round of meetings, drafts of the report and jurisdiction profiles were provided to public works directors and their staffs for final review and input.

(Profiles of local jurisdiction program components are presented in Appendix A.)

Work group research identified three additional jurisdictions, outside of Santa Cruz County, with programs that include advanced components. The three non-local jurisdictions were administered the questionnaire by phone and asked to describe the background and rationale for current practices.

(Information regarding program components of the three additional jurisdictions is presented in Appendix B.)

The Work Group gathered process documentation and educational materials describing advanced practices of all surveyed programs. Survey findings are intended as resources for local jurisdictions in assessing current program practices and in understanding alternative approaches that may improve outcomes or utilization of resources. The information addresses shared program challenges and is adaptable to a variety of environments.

In addition to program practices identified in this report, the staffs of local jurisdictions are encouraged to make inquiries within their professional networks regarding advanced practices in areas of interest. The advanced program components described in this report may suggest additional topics for discussion with those contacts.

VI. Format of a Program Model

The Work Group’s survey of jurisdiction practices and government standards identified seven important components of a sidewalk network management program. In this section each component of the program model is identified and described, followed by a list of practices that have helped jurisdictions accomplish the objectives of that component. Jurisdictions having an advanced version of that program component are acknowledged.

To facilitate comparisons between local jurisdiction practices and components of the program model, both listings are numbered and labeled in identical sequences (see
Appendix A).

Components of a program model:

(1) **Conduct network-wide audits to identify sidewalks that do not comply with jurisdiction standards.**

A full assessment of a jurisdiction’s overall sidewalk network requires some form of audit process. Regular and comprehensive audits can generate data that is sufficiently reliable for determining status, setting goals, and tracking program performance.

Some jurisdictions that conduct audits divide their sidewalk networks into sectors and audit one sector per year, or other specified interval.

Few jurisdictions have made explicit commitments to bring sidewalks into full compliance within specific periods of time. In the absence of a specific commitment, a jurisdiction’s percentage of non-complying sidewalks, and year-to-year rate at which that percentage is being reduced, serve as operational indicators of a timetable.

Practices identified in the programs of surveyed jurisdictions:

Types of Audits:

- Proactive, cyclical audits by the jurisdiction
- Audits that respond to citizen reports of unsafe or inaccessible sidewalks
- Ad hoc audits by DPW employees attendant to other activities

Scope of Audits:

- Audit subsections of a jurisdiction so that the full area is assessed over the course of a defined number of years
- Focus on areas where there is a pattern of citizen reported issues
- Expand the scope of audits that respond to reports of individual sidewalk issues
  - Check both sides of street on an entire block
  - Assess multiple blocks if the sidewalk issue is on a busy pedestrian corridor
  - Assess links from the citizen-reported sidewalk hazard to key origins, destinations or transit stops

Jurisdictions meeting the following criterion:

*The full sidewalk network is audited within a defined number of years.*
(2) **Report status of the sidewalk network at a regularly defined interval.**

Public perception of the level of emphasis a jurisdiction places on its maintenance program is determined by the condition of its sidewalk network and its responsiveness to issues.

If the network has a high percentage of sidewalks that conform to the jurisdiction standards, or if there is a strong indication of year to year improvement, then a clear message is sent that safe and accessible sidewalks are an important community value.

Evidence that the jurisdiction governing body is committed to the program is apparent when there is an annual reporting of network status. An annual reporting sustains focus on progress being made toward objectives.

Practices identified in the programs of surveyed jurisdictions:

- A statement of standards for accessibility and safety
- The percentage of network sidewalks currently in compliance
- Year-to-year improvement in percentage of compliant sidewalks
- Average interval from identification of an exposure to resolution

Jurisdictions meeting the following criterion:

*The status of the full network, or of major segments, is reported at defined intervals.*

- City of Capitola
- City of Corvallis Oregon
- City of Fairfield Ohio

(3) **Implement administrative processes that ensure prompt resolution of safety and access issues.**

Achieving objectives and timetables will depend on implementing administrative processes that ensure they will be met. Processes should be evaluated to determine their capacity to promptly identify safety and access issues, notify property owners of violations, track actions to repair or replace, initiate sidewalk repair or replacement when property owners do not take required actions, and inspect completed work to ensure compliance with standards.
Practices identified in the programs of surveyed jurisdictions:

- On-line and print forms for residents to report sidewalk conditions
- A database for tracking the sequence of steps from report of condition to its resolution
- On-site inspections to reported safety or access issues
- Photographs to document issues
- Letters, with support information, sent to property owners
- A time limit for making repairs or replacements
- Follow-up to determine if work has been completed
- A final enforcement step for those not complying

Jurisdictions meeting the following criterion:

The administrative processes that are in place have resulted in the prompt resolution of safety and access issues identified in the jurisdiction’s sidewalk network.

- City of Capitola
- City of Santa Cruz
- City of Scotts Valley
- City of Watsonville
- City of Corvallis Oregon
- City of Fairfield Ohio

(4) **Promote the community value of property owners maintaining safe and accessible sidewalks**

The positive promotion of sidewalk maintenance programs makes the difference in whether or not program standards, requirements and processes are viewed as in the interest of property owners and the community. Jurisdictions will secure greater support if property owners are able to recognize that they gain substantially from program provisions.

There is a mutual interest of property owners and the community in maintaining safe and accessible sidewalks. Walkable, safe and accessible sidewalks enhance the appearance and value of individual properties and neighborhoods. They encourage walking for recreation and exercise, increasing resident interaction and strengthening of neighborhood and community social networks.

Safe and accessible sidewalks also help property owners and jurisdictions avoid liability claims that may originate from injuries caused by sidewalk hazards.
Practices identified in the programs of surveyed jurisdictions:

- Promotion campaigns that achieve high visibility for residents
- Program content that is interesting, persuasive and clear
- Information that is routed through channels that reach a high percentage of jurisdiction residents
- The message is reinforced at least annually to sustain community awareness

Jurisdictions meeting the following criterion:

*An on-going, coordinated and highly-visible campaign is in place to build support for the value of property owners maintaining adjacent sidewalks*

- City of Corvallis Oregon
- City of Fairfield Ohio

**5) Inform residents of the jurisdiction’s program for ensuring the maintenance of safe and accessible sidewalks.**

Public education has the potential to address sidewalk maintenance program requirements in several ways:

- It can alert citizens to safety and access issues that apply to themselves and their neighbors
- It may prompt property owners to initiate corrective action without the need for jurisdiction involvement
- It alerts citizens to processes for reporting hazards and barriers on the properties of others
- It can make citizens aware of jurisdiction information and services that will assist them in taking corrective action
- It will help build a community value for addressing issues concerning safe and accessible sidewalks

An educational initiative needs to have the capability of sustaining awareness of the program, its safety and access standards, the process for reporting issues, and support resources for corrective action.

Sidewalk maintenance initiatives can be presented as partnerships between property owners and jurisdictions:

- Property owners have responsibility for maintaining the sidewalks adjacent to their properties
• Jurisdictions can support these efforts with information, services, and monitoring
• On behalf of all residents, jurisdictions have responsibility for oversight of the sidewalk networks and for ensuring that sidewalks are safe and accessible

Conversations with jurisdiction staff confirmed that many property owners are not aware that sidewalk maintenance is their responsibility. They are also unaware of standards for determining if sidewalks are safe and accessible.

With property owner awareness, the early identification of unsafe conditions may allow issues to be addressed with less costly solutions. Property owners will more readily address major repairs if they understand that technical, and perhaps financial, assistance, is available from the jurisdiction.

Jurisdiction web pages and lobby brochures are passive outreach media that have limited ability to achieve the necessary level of awareness. Jurisdiction mailings, and publications that include program descriptions, may address the need. In the absence of jurisdiction mailings and publications, periodic placement of information in local news media may be a good alternative.

Practices identified in the programs of surveyed jurisdictions:

• A public information strategy that sustains resident focus on key aspects of the program
• Property owners are periodically reminded of their responsibility for maintenance of adjacent sidewalks and of the avenues for identifying and addressing issues
• Citizen initiative to identify and address hazards is encouraged
• A brochure/pamphlet is available that contains information about sidewalk maintenance standards and resources for addressing issues
• Residents are informed that sidewalk conditions will be audited periodically

Jurisdictions meeting the following criterion:

A high percentage of residents are aware of standards for safe and accessible sidewalks, property owner responsibility for their maintenance, and sources of information for addressing issues.

• City of Capitola
• City of Corvallis Oregon
• City of Fairfield Ohio
(6) Create highly visible process for reporting sidewalk safety and access issues

Processes that encourage citizens to identify and report unsafe and inaccessible sidewalks are important supplements to jurisdiction audits.

Citizen reports can alert jurisdiction staff to serious issues that emerge between audits. They are particularly important if the jurisdiction’s audit cycle extends over a number of years.

Standards and reporting processes must be well understood by a high percentage of residents to serve effectively as a stand-alone identification process.

The citizen report form should include instructions for the immediate contact of an official when the sidewalk hazard poses a serious and imminent danger to the public.

Sidewalks are often blocked by objects whose removal is beyond the scope of public works departments’ authority. It is recommended that contact information be included in program literature for the addressing of issues such as vehicles or objects repeatedly placed on sidewalks by residents or businesses.

The citizen reporting process is an important tool in building a community value of safe and accessible sidewalks.

Practices identified in the programs of surveyed jurisdictions:

- Make copies of the citizen reporting forms available online and in locations where residents would expect to find them.
- Create a process for notifying the person submitting the report of which jurisdiction will be responding to the hazard along with any pertinent follow-up information.
- Coordinate public education regarding the citizen reporting process with the broader program information initiative described in (5) above.
- Consider coordination with other jurisdictions in a public education campaign to alert residents to the process.
- Sustain public awareness by periodically renewing the public information campaign.

Jurisdictions meeting the following criterion:

A well-documented issue reporting process is in place and a high percentage of existing sidewalk safety and access issues are being reported.

- City of Corvallis Oregon
- City of Fairfield Ohio
(7) **Develop information and support resources for property owners seeking to address unsafe or inaccessible sidewalk conditions**

Property owners, when advised that their sidewalks have unsafe conditions, will be able to effectively, and promptly, address the problems when they are provided with guidance and support from local jurisdictions.

Jurisdictions vary widely in the level of information and support they provide to property owners.

Practices identified in the programs of surveyed jurisdictions:

- Describe repair and replacement options that address specific situations
- Describe permit and inspection requirements and fees
- Offer jurisdiction services that reduce property owner effort and expense in completing sidewalk repairs
- Identify resources to which property owners can be referred in order to obtain services on their own

Potential services to be offered by a jurisdiction:

- Vegetation removal
- Grinding of sidewalk uplifts
- No-fee permits
- Providing a list of qualified contractors
- Referral to contractors with whom the jurisdiction has negotiated a favorable rate
- Low-interest loans
- Property liens that are repaid through property taxes

Jurisdictions meeting the following criterion:

*Current information offers effective guidance for addressing a range of potential conditions and offers services, or identifies contacts, for making the necessary repairs.*

- City of Santa Cruz
- City of Watsonville
- City of Belmont
- City of Corvallis Oregon
- City of Fairfield Ohio
VII. Overview of Local Jurisdiction Practices:

The following are general observations regarding current practices of the five local jurisdictions as they relate to the program model:

(1) Conduct network-wide audits to identify sidewalks that do not comply with jurisdiction standards

Four of the five local jurisdictions rely on citizen reports as the primary method for identifying sidewalk safety and access issues. This approach can be expected to identify only a limited percent of the existing issues.

(2) Report status of the sidewalk network at a regularly defined interval

Local jurisdictions do not currently have the capability to report the overall status of their sidewalk networks. Incomplete data generated by current citizen reporting processes has limited value in the reliable tracking of overall network status and rate of improvement.

(3) Implement administrative processes that ensure prompt resolution of safety and access issues

Program staffs in all five local jurisdictions adequately notify property owners of reported incidents that come to their attention. Follow-up and managing the resolution of sidewalk safety and access issues is less effective. All jurisdictions have been creative in developing responsive processes and leveraging limited resources.

(4) Promote the community value of property owners maintaining safe and accessible sidewalks

Currently, many property owners give little thought to their sidewalks until they are notified of a problem, and do not understand their responsibility for maintaining adjacent sidewalks. The significant percentages of non-complying sidewalks indicate that a community value has yet to be established. All jurisdictions acknowledged that more promotion could be done and were receptive to the idea of creating a coordinated public service campaign to help build this shared community value.

(5) Inform residents of the jurisdiction’s program for ensuring the maintenance of safe and accessible sidewalks

A significant percentage of residents are unclear about jurisdiction responsibility for maintaining sidewalks. Many are unaware of property owner responsibility for maintenance and their jurisdiction’s processes for identification, notification, support and enforcement of safety and access standards. Public education initiatives to increase resident awareness have been limited. All jurisdictions requested the work group’s assistance in creating and publicizing documents which explain their programs.
Create highly visible process for the identification and reporting of sidewalk safety and access issues

Most jurisdictions have this information posted on their public works department website and available, as a brochure, in department lobbies. More proactive public education measures are needed to achieve and sustain awareness of this process. All jurisdictions have expressed an interest in creating a commonly understood set of sidewalk maintenance standards, making it easier for residents to identify hazards. Input from the work group was also welcomed regarding publicity of the reporting process and increasing the availability of hazard report forms.

Develop information and support resources for property owners seeking to address unsafe or inaccessible sidewalk conditions

Some jurisdictions are able to offer services or referrals which can reduce property owner effort and expense. If more jurisdictions could offer such assistance, Program support and compliance would likely be increased.

VIII. Conclusion and Follow-up

The goal of this report is to improve the condition of sidewalks throughout all jurisdictions in Santa Cruz County by evaluating current sidewalk maintenance program practices, identifying important potential program components and offering additional resources. The objective is to support jurisdictions in their efforts to achieve, within defined periods of time, sidewalk networks that are in compliance with jurisdiction standards for maintenance. The Work Group wishes to acknowledge the conscientious efforts of local jurisdiction program staff in the current climate of reduced staffing and financial resources. Current practices provide a sound foundation for upgrades needed to achieve network compliance. Local jurisdictions are encouraged to assess the objectives of their programs, the current status of their networks, the ability of current processes to achieve program objectives, and the comparative merits of program components of other jurisdictions.

While the five jurisdictions differ significantly in their needs and circumstances, there are many areas which can benefit from collaboration and adoption of common approaches. It is hoped that this report will support efforts by jurisdictions to work together to meet their common challenges and to enlist property owners as partners in creating a safe, pedestrian-friendly community.

The local jurisdictions have expressed an interest in collaborating in the following categories:

Program Management

- Defining common standards for sidewalk maintenance
Exploring efficient methods for conducting sidewalk audits
- Evaluating the effectiveness of administrative processes
- Securing resources for program upgrades

Public Education / Outreach
- Developing content and media outlets to promote a community value of safe and accessible sidewalks
- Making property owners aware of their responsibility for maintaining sidewalks adjacent to their properties
- Educating residents about jurisdiction programs, processes and resources available to assist them in addressing sidewalk issues

Reporting Sidewalk Network Status
- Determining content, schedules, and methods for reporting the sidewalk network status to the Regional Transportation Commission

The work group, based on first hand experience and research/completion of this report, is prepared to supplement jurisdiction-based efforts by offering the following specific services:

- Creating and editing documents, publicity and public education materials
- Making or assisting with presentations to community groups
- Facilitating jurisdiction interaction with individuals or groups who have interest in sidewalk maintenance program design and status
- Facilitating networking among local jurisdictions
- Initiating a collaborative effort among the five local jurisdictions to develop sidewalk maintenance standards language which residents can easily understand
- Identifying and supporting grants to fund upgrades of program components
- Assisting with research, as resources allow

In one year, the Work Group will conduct a follow-up survey of the five local jurisdictions to assess changes in sidewalk network status and maintenance programs, and will submit a follow-up status report to the Regional Transportation Commission.
Appendix A

Current Practice Profiles of Local Jurisdictions

City of Capitola
City of Santa Cruz
City of Scotts Valley
City of Watsonville
County of Santa Cruz
Jurisdiction Profile: City of Capitola

Information provided by: Steve Jesberg, Department of Public Works (DPW) Director and Ed Morrison, Assistant Public Works Director

Baseline Information:
- 26 road miles (centerline)
- Approximately 50% of roads have sidewalks
- Sidewalks in downtown area maintained by the property owner.

1) Conduct jurisdiction-wide audits to identify sidewalks that do not meet standards.
- One-fifth of the city’s residential areas, and all of the commercial areas, will be inventoried each year with the goal of bringing all sidewalks into compliance.
- An inventory has been done informally since early 1990’s, but became formal and planned in 2008. During 2009 the second fifth was inventoried.
- The City’s Capital Improvement Program identifies new sidewalk improvements planned by the city.
- In response to the objective of understanding the total percentage of compliant sidewalks in a jurisdiction, DPW staff indicated that this would be possible for each fifth of the city audited that year and would be based on the status of individual properties, as a unit of measurement.
- The City Council of Capitola directed staff to implement sidewalk improvement programs in 2006 and 2008.
- The 2006 initiative was in response to the need to remove vegetative obstructions; the 2008 initiative sought to more fully assess and address hazardous conditions.
- DPW has data from the inventory of the first two neighborhood “fifths” (Attachment A-1)
- DPW will review materials from other jurisdictions to beef up tracking of property improvements.
- DPW would like to map their entire sidewalk network including identification of deficiencies.

2) Report status of the entire jurisdiction’s sidewalk network annually
- Information is currently gathered and reported for 1/5 of the city each year.

3) Implement administrative processes that ensure prompt resolution of safety and access issues.
- DPW staff will go look at a location within 24 hours of a complaint being filed.
- If the uplift hazard is minor, the city will use their crew to grind the walkway. If not, DPW will notify the property owner of their responsibility to fix the problem. DPW staff will advise property owners of contractors who have
insurance on file with the City and have done similar work. Property owners are required to complete repairs within 30 days of notification.

- Approximately 90% of the property owners comply with notices to correct hazards and understand that it is in their best interest to reduce their liability exposure.
- Action toward property owners that don’t comply requires a public hearing per the city’s municipal code. This process is unique among jurisdictions surveyed and seems to represent an onerous requirement and unnecessary hurdle to prompt resolution.
- Right-of-way work requires an encroachment permit, typically provided at no cost by the City

(4) **Promote the community value of property owners maintaining safe and accessible sidewalks**

- A marketing/outreach plan to promote a community value of safe and accessible sidewalks has not been developed.
- DPW staff informally discusses a shared community value when inspecting neighborhoods and interacting with residents.

(5) **Inform residents of the jurisdiction’s program for ensuring the maintenance of safe and accessible sidewalks.**

- The City Council established sidewalk maintenance program goals in a public meeting
- Information regarding the program has been included in one city newsletter
- The Pedestrian Safety Work Group requests that outreach emphasize the broad value and benefit of safe and accessible sidewalks to all community residents.
- DPW will include more information about their sidewalk program on the City’s website
- DPW will write an article for an upcoming City Newsletter about the sidewalk improvement program emphasizing the community value of having a great pedestrian network.
- The Pedestrian Safety Work Group offers to assist the DPW with the article (draft and/or review it)

(6) **Create highly visible process for reporting sidewalk safety and access issues**

- Public education regarding the reporting process is limited. There is no program brochure or posting on the department’s website.
- Sidewalk safety and access exposures may be reported using the Regional Transportation Commission’s Pedestrian Access Report form.

(7) **Develop information and support resources for property owners seeking to address unsafe or inaccessible sidewalk conditions**
• Trip hazards of less than ½ inch will be ground down by the City typically within a targeted time line of one week.
• The City may remove minor vegetation barriers encountered in the course of daily work activities.
• Trees:
  o The property owner is responsible for sidewalk tree maintenance/repair, regardless of who planted the adjacent tree(s)
  o The City planning department decides whether or not a property owner can replace a tree.
  o The City has list of currently acceptable trees to plant (changes over time)
  o The City uses root barriers for their tree plantings and is planning on developing standards for barriers in order to encourage and insure their proper use by property owners.

Notable practices

• The City conducts a rotating five year sidewalk audit of sectors of the city.
• There is a 24 hour response to reports of hazards which includes an inspection.
• The City grinds sidewalks trip hazards of less than ½ inch typically within one week.
• The City will advise property owners of contractors who have insurance on file with the City and have done similar work. The City sustains focus on prompt resolution by property owners.
• City waives permit fees for sidewalk repair work.
• The City’s enforcement process includes a public hearing as a final step. This is unique among jurisdictions surveyed. The hearing delays resolution and is probably not a necessary step.
Capitola’s Sidewalks
Guidelines for Inspection and Clearing

Vegetative Obstructions

Objective: To keep Capitola’s sidewalks clear of vegetative obstructions for safer pedestrian access.

1) All sidewalks will be inspected for vegetative obstructions, on an on-going basis.
2) Public Works crew will prune any minor growth that is observed during their daily work routine. Any major amount of growth will be reported to their Public Works Supervisor.
3) The Public Works Supervisor will inspect any reported obstructions and will determine a course of action. If work is minor in scope, the Public Works crew will be assigned to cut the growth clear from the sidewalk.
4) If the Supervisor determines there is a major amount of work to be done, the Supervisor will contact the property owner and inform of the work that is needed. After 1-2 weeks, if the needed work is not performed, the Public Works crew will be assigned to trim back the reported obstruction.
4.5) If the supervisor determines the work is too sensitive in nature or to large to be completed by Public Works crews, the Public Works office will be notified to initiate abatement procedures.
5) The amount of work needed per site will be determined using the following general descriptions as criteria. When in doubt, contact the Supervisor.
6) Vegetative obstructions will be classified as follows:
   No action needed: If vegetative growth brushes against the body but does not cause you to change course.
   Minor work: If vegetative growth forces you to change course but does not exceed one wheelbarrows worth of debris.
   Major work: Vegetative growth exceeds one wheelbarrows worth of debris or will significantly alter the aesthetics of the plant/tree.
7) Monthly reports will be provided to the Public Works Director stating the following: number of sites identified, number of sites addressed, and the number of abatement notices needed.

Sidewalk Offsets

Objective: To keep Capitola’s sidewalks free of trip hazards

1) All sidewalks will be inspected for offsets, on an on-going basis.
2) Offsets are any concrete sidewalks that have been lifted by \( \frac{1}{2} \)" or more and create a trip hazard.
3) The Public Works Supervisor will inspect all commercial corridor sidewalks annually. The commercial corridor will include Capitola Village, Capitola Avenue, Capitola Road, Clares Street, Bay Avenue, Monterey Street, 41st Avenue, and 38th Avenue.
4) The Public Works Supervisor will inspect all neighborhood sidewalks on a rotating five-year inspection program. The neighborhoods will be identified and prioritized in the following order: the Cliffwood Heights Neighborhood, the Depot Hill & Capitola Village Neighborhood, the Riverview/Pilgrim/Rosedale Neighborhood, the Jewel Box/Southern Neighborhood, and the Avenues/North of Capitola Road Neighborhood. (see attached maps)
5) The Supervisor will determine and mark which offsets can be repaired by the Public Works crew. The Public Works Office will be notified of any site that will need an abatement notice.
6) Monthly reports will be provided to the Public Works Director stating the following: number of sites identified, number of sites addressed, and the number of abatement notices needed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Address/Block</th>
<th>Trims</th>
<th>Sidewalk Grinds</th>
<th>Repairs</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eay Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilroy Drive</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Drive</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverview Drive</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunset Drive</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# CAPITOLA SIDEWALK MAINTENANCE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

**2009**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Address/Block</th>
<th>Crew Vegetation Trims</th>
<th>Owners Notified of Trimming Need</th>
<th>Owners Vegetation Trims</th>
<th>Sidewalk Grinds</th>
<th>Sidewalk Offsets Set for Owner Repairs</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>01/13/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>01/13/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>01/13/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>01/13/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>01/13/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitola Ave.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>01/13/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitola Ave.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>01/13/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitola Ave.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>01/28/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>01/28/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41st</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>01/29/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41st</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41st</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41st</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41st</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41st</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41st</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Locations:**
- Capitola Diner
- Del Mar Cleaners
- Citibank
- BOA
- WFB
- Wachovia
- PG&E substation
Jurisdiction Profile: City of Santa Cruz

Information provided by: Cheryl Schmitt and Jim Burr

Baseline Information:
- 140 road miles (centerline miles)
- The percentage of roads with sidewalks is unknown. An audit is underway
- Sidewalks in downtown area maintained by the property owners, sometimes through association fees.

(1) Conduct jurisdiction-wide audits to identify sidewalks that do not meet standards.
- The City’s sidewalk maintenance program is complaint driven, rather than a systematic audit.
- DPW staff also try to assess the condition of additional sidewalks near the specific complaint (so residents don’t feel singled out), sometimes along both sides of the block, and may also assess links to high traffic pedestrian corridors such as safe routes to schools
- The City is currently updating their map showing missing sidewalks and ramps. This map does not address maintenance issues.
- The Capital Improvement Program will include missing facilities as unfunded
- DPW will consider ideas for taking an inventory of the city’s sidewalk conditions or the response rate of private property owners to repair notices, such as use interns or complying with community service hour conditions

(2) Report status of the entire jurisdiction’s sidewalk network annually.
- Available information about the status of the sidewalk network reflects only the complaints received and is not currently gathered or reported in a comprehensive format. A City-wide base map of sidewalk status is underway.

(3) Implement administrative processes that ensure prompt resolution of safety and access issues.
- City staff inspects complaints and photographs the hazardous area.
- A $275 fee permit is required for all repair work (fee was waived up to July 2009, but reinstated due to the budget situation).
- The City sends a letter requesting that the property owner make the repair and notes that their home owners insurance may cover the cost.
- City provides a list of potential contractors.
- The property owner is not given a deadline for completion of the repair.
- The City has sent over 700 letters since 2007.
- Although City staff does not re-inspect to determine if the work has been completed, they now are able to match the incidents with the finalized permits to determine the follow-up rate.
A follow-up study conducted by an intern in February of 2008 found that 66% of those sent notices had completed the repairs. The City no longer does any grinding or vegetation removal, it is all the responsibility of the property owner.

(4) **Promote the community value of property owners maintaining safe and accessible sidewalks**

- A marketing/outreach plan to promote a community value of safe and accessible sidewalks consists of a brochure available in print and on the City’s website.
- The City is open to additional outreach.

(5) **Inform residents of the jurisdiction’s program for ensuring the maintenance of safe and accessible sidewalks.**

- A brochure describing the program is available on the DPW webpage and a copy is included in the notice of needed repair sent to property owners.
- DPW will work on getting more information about the program placed on the City website.
- DPW will work on getting an article about private property owner maintenance responsibilities in the SCMU Review, the utility newsletter.
- Other outreach ideas: Presentations to Santa Cruz Neighbors and to the City Council.
- The Pedestrian Safety Work Group volunteered to help with outreach materials (draft, review, etc.)

(6) **Create highly visible process for reporting sidewalk safety and access issues**

- Information regarding the process for reporting hazards is posted on the DPW webpage and in program brochures. Outreach public education regarding the process is limited.
- The City also uses the RTC’s Pedestrian Access Report form.

(7) **Develop information and support resources for property owners seeking to address unsafe or inaccessible sidewalk conditions**

- Trees:
  - City Arborist must perform an inspection if sidewalk work may impact an adjacent tree
  - Parks and Recreation Department and the Public Works department are occasionally at odds about whether to encourage trees in the strip between the sidewalk and the street.
  - If a sidewalk uplift due to a tree, the city charges $125 for the tree inspection by the city arborist in addition to the $275 for the city sidewalk inspection/permit
Root barriers encouraged if planting in strip between sidewalk and street. Root barrier detail on City’s website. City encouraged to include information in their brochure.

Notable practices

- The City has a program brochure that is well-conceived and written.
- There is a well-defined process for inspection and documentation of hazards. Responses to individual hazard reports are expanded to include assessments of adjacent sidewalks.
- The property owner notification package is well-conceived and written.
- The process for addressing tree related sidewalk issues considers and resolves a range of challenging issues. The fee structure is an item of interest.
- The City uses Geographic Information Systems (GIS) to map where sidewalks exist as a way to identify deficiencies in the network.
NOTICE TO REPAIR SIDEWALK AREA

The City of Santa Cruz Municipal Code requires property owners to maintain in a safe condition sidewalk areas, which include, but are not limited to, the sidewalk, driveway, curb, gutter and street trees adjoining their property. I inspected the sidewalk condition adjoining your property at Address and observed uneven pavement creating potentially unsafe conditions on the sidewalk.

I request that you promptly repair the damaged sidewalk area, as required by law. A City of Santa Cruz concrete construction permit will be required of a General-A Engineering or C-8 Concrete licensed contractor for this repair work. The charge for this permit is $275. Sidewalks requiring arborist inspection will be charged an additional $125.

Please note that under Santa Cruz Municipal Code §15.20.220, a landowner is liable to members of the public who are injured due to the property owner’s failure to maintain the sidewalk areas. Since the sidewalk condition appears to pose a risk of injury to the public, its prompt repair will eliminate a significant liability exposure for you. I recommend that you contact your property owner’s insurance company to see if this is covered in your policy.

Please refer to the enclosed documents for more information.

Sincerely,

Cheryl Schmitt
Bicycle/Pedestrian Coordinator

Cc:  Risk Manager
         940-15.50
Enc:  Codes
         Brochure
         Photograph
         List of Contractors

D:\data\docs\bikes&peds\sidewalks\Address.doc
5610. The owners of lots or portions of lots fronting on any portion of a public street or place when that street or place is improved or if and when the area between the property line of the adjacent property and the street line is maintained as a park or parking strip, shall maintain any sidewalk in such condition that the sidewalk will not endanger persons or property and maintain it in a condition which will not interfere with the public convenience in the use of those works or areas save and except as to those conditions created or maintained in, upon, along, or in connection with such sidewalk by any person other than the owner, under and by virtue of any permit or right granted to him by law or by the city authorities in charge thereof, and such persons shall be under a like duty in relation thereto.

5611. When any portion of the sidewalk is out of repair or pending reconstruction and in condition to endanger persons or property or in condition to interfere with the public convenience in the use of such sidewalk, the superintendent of streets shall notify the owner or person in possession of the property fronting on that portion of such sidewalk so out of repair, to repair the sidewalk.

5612. Notice to repair may be given by delivering a written notice personally to the owner or to the person in possession of the property facing upon the sidewalk so out of repair, or by mailing a postal card, postage prepaid, to the person in possession of such property, or to the owner thereof at his last known address as the same appears on the last equalized assessment rolls of such city or to the name and address of the person owning such property as shown in the records of the office of the clerk.

5613. The postal card shall contain a notice to repair the sidewalk so out of repair, and the superintendent of streets shall, immediately upon the mailing of the notice, cause a copy thereof printed on a card of not less than 8 inches by 10 inches in size, to be posted in a conspicuous place on the property. In lieu of posting a copy of the mailed notice on the property as provided in this section, the superintendent of streets may, not less than seven days nor more than 10 days after the mailing of the first postal card notice, mail an additional postal card, postage prepaid, marked "Second Notice," to the person to whom the first postal card notice was addressed. The second notice shall otherwise contain the material required by this article, but shall not extend the time for commencing repairs specified in Section 5614.
5614. The notice shall particularly specify what work is required to be done, and how it is to be done, and what materials shall be used in the repair and shall further specify that if the repair is not commenced within two weeks after notice is given and diligently and without interruption prosecuted to completion, the superintendent of streets shall make such repair, and the cost of the same shall be a lien on the property.

5614.1. The legislative body may adopt a resolution determining that bonds shall be issued and assessments collected and enforced pursuant to Part 5 of this division. In such event, the notice to repair shall specify that bonds shall be issued to represent the security of the unpaid assessments, payable over a period of not to exceed six years, and shall further recite a maximum rate of interest to be paid on the indebtedness, which shall not exceed 7 percent a year, payable semiannually.

5615. If the repair is not commenced and prosecuted to completion with due diligence, as required by the notice, the superintendent of streets shall forthwith repair the sidewalk. Upon the written request of the owner of the property facing the sidewalk so out of repair, as ascertained from the last equalized assessment roll of the city, or as shown in the records of the office of the clerk, the superintendent may repair any other portion of the sidewalk fronting on the property that is designated by the owner. The superintendent shall have power to prescribe the form of the written request. The cost of repair work done by request pursuant to this section shall be a part of the cost of repairs for which, pursuant to this chapter, subsequent notices are given, hearings held and assessment and collection procedures are conducted.

5616. Upon the completion of the repair, the superintendent of streets shall cause notice of the cost of the repair to be given in the manner specified in this article for the giving of notice to repair, which notice shall specify the day, hour and place when the legislative body will hear and pass upon a report by the superintendent of streets of the cost of the repair together with any objections or protests, if any, which may be raised by any property owner liable to be assessed for the cost of such repair and any other interested persons. If bonds are to be issued, the notice shall also contain the information required by Section 5614.1.

5617. Upon the completion of the repair, the superintendent of streets shall prepare and file with the legislative body a report specifying the repairs which have been made, the cost of the repairs, a description of the real property in front of which the repairs have been made and the assessment against each lot or parcel of land
15.20.210 PROPERTY OWNER’S DUTY TO THE PUBLIC TO MAINTAIN AND REPAIR SIDEWALK AREAS.

(a) The maintenance and repair of sidewalk areas, including the sidewalk, curb and planting strip, and the making, confirming and collecting of assessments for the cost and expenses of said maintenance and repair, may be done, and the proceedings therefor may be had and taken, in accordance with this section and the procedure therefore provided in Chapter 22 of Division 7, Part 3, of the Streets and Highways Code as the same is now in effect or may hereafter be amended. In the event of any conflict between the provisions of said Chapter 22 of Division 7, Part 3, of the Streets and Highways Code and this section, the provisions of this section shall control.

(b) The owners of lots or portions of lots adjacent to or fronting on any portion of a sidewalk area, including planting strips, sidewalks, curbs and gutters, shall repair and maintain such sidewalk areas and pay the costs and expenses therefor, including a charge for the city of Santa Cruz’s costs of inspection and administration whenever the city awards a contract for such maintenance and repair, and including the costs of collection of assessments for the costs of maintenance and repair under subsection (a) of this section, or the handling of any lien placed on the property due to failure of the property owner to promptly pay such assessments.

(c) For purposes of this section, “maintenance and repair of sidewalk area” shall include, but not be limited to, maintenance and repair of surfaces, including grading, removal and replacement of sidewalks, repair and maintenance of curbs and gutters, removal of weeds and debris, tree root pruning and installing root barriers, and other maintenance, including pruning and trimming of trees, shrubs, ground cover and other landscaping within the sidewalk area, including planting strips and curbs, so that the sidewalk area will remain in a condition that is not dangerous to property or to persons and will not interfere with the convenience of the public using the area in a reasonable manner.

(d) All maintenance activities performed under this section shall conform with the guidelines and recommendations of the public works and parks and recreation departments. Tree and plant maintenance shall comply with the requirements stated in Section 13.30.060 of this code.

Maintenance of the sidewalk area shall include maintenance of trees and other vegetation contained in planters and other structures located above ground level within the sidewalk area.

(e) Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 5614 of the Streets and Highways Code, the director of public works may, in his or her discretion and for sufficient cause, extend the period within which required maintenance and repair of sidewalk areas must commence by a period of not to exceed seventy-four days from the time the notice referred to in said Section 5614 is given.

(f) Prior to performing any curb or sidewalk repairs or replacement, a permit shall be obtained from the director of public works as required by this chapter. Before any tree is pruned, trimmed, root pruned or removed under this section, all permits required by Section 13.30.100 of this code must first be obtained from the director of parks and recreation. No fees shall be charged for these permits. All permits shall be displayed at the worksite.

(Ord. 94-62 § 5, 1995: prior code § 7236).

15.20.220 LIABILITY FOR INJURIES TO PUBLIC.

The property owner required by Section 15.20.210 to maintain and repair the sidewalk area shall owe a duty to members of the public to keep and maintain the sidewalk area in a safe and non-dangerous condition. If, as a result of the failure of any property owner to
maintain the sidewalk area in a nondangerous condition as required by Section 15.20.210, any person suffers injury or damage to person or property, the property owner shall be liable to such person for the resulting damages or injury. The city of Santa Cruz shall have a cause of action for indemnity against such property owner for any damages the city may be required to pay in satisfaction of any judgment or settlement of any claim that results from injury to persons or property as a legal result of the failure of the owner to maintain the sidewalks and sidewalk areas in accordance with this section. No liability shall arise under this section where an application for a permit to correct a dangerous condition is denied and said condition subsequently causes injury to a member of the public, provided that the scope and purpose of the application is limited to the correction of unsafe conditions as specified by Sections 13.30.060(b), 15.20.070(a), and 15.20.210(c) of this code. (Ord. 94-62 § 6, 1995: prior code § 7237).

15.20.230  Repealed by Ord. 94-62 § 7.

15.20.240  NOTICE TO PROPERTY OWNERS TO INSTALL UTILITY CONNECTIONS.

When any portion of any public street in the city is about to be macadamized or remacadamized, paved or repaved, whether by private contract or by contract with the city engineer, it shall be the duty of the city engineer to require, by notice in writing, to be delivered to them or left on the premises, the owners or occupants of the lots fronting on any portion of the public street, to lay forthwith gas, sewer, and water pipes, when the same have not been previously laid, connecting said lots with the gas, sewer and water mains under the streets, in front of said property. Such owners must, within three days after notice given as aforesaid, commence the work specified therein, and diligently and without interruption proceed the same to completion to the satisfaction of the city engineer. (Prior code § 7239).

15.20.250  SETBACK LINES ON OCEAN STREET.

The setback lines on Ocean Street between Water Street and Pryce Street are hereby set and fixed as follows: A line on each side of the centerline of Ocean Street hereinafter described, parallel thereto and distant fifty feet at right angles therefrom. The centerline is described as follows:

BEGINNING at a point at Station 852-00, as said station is of record in the office of the Department of Public Works, Division of Highways, San Francisco, as the same is established for the widening of Ocean Street, from Pryce Street to Water Street and as the same is shown on a map filed in the office of the city engineer, prepared by the Division of Highways, May, 1935, for said widening. The point is in the centerline of the State Highway, Route 5, Section A, District IV, and the easterly termination of Pryce Street thence South 17 degrees 14 minutes East to the centerline of Water Street. (Prior code § 7240).

15.20.260  STREET PURPOSE DECLARED.

The lands included within the setback lines herein described will be occupied by a public street when same is constructed under a program now adopted by the city and State Division of Highways, and the provisions of Chapters 15.04, 15.08, 15.20, 15.28, 15.32, 15.44 and 15.48, are notice to property owners affected hereby not to place structures or improvements within said setback lines; that no structures or improvements will be permitted therein; and that any such placed therein will
8. Is the property owner responsible for repairs if the concrete damage is caused by a tree?

In an effort to beautify our City’s neighborhoods, street trees are encouraged in front of each residence. The property owner is responsible for the maintenance of the street tree and for the cost of concrete repair, even though the concrete may have been raised by the street tree. Certain species of trees may raise concrete if preventative maintenance is not performed.

In extreme cases, street trees cannot be saved and must be removed before the sidewalk and/or curb and gutter can be replaced. City standards require replacement of the tree, to be selected from a list of approved street trees. Proper tree selection is critical and is reviewed by the City Arborist. The tree permit process in these cases must be pursued before a concrete permit can be issued. Tree permits are issued by the Parks and Recreation Department. Tree work permitting is governed by Chapter 13 of the Santa Cruz Municipal Code.

9. What measures should be taken to minimize concrete displacement by tree roots?

To reduce the chance of future concrete displacement, trees can be root-pruned and a root barrier installed. Care must be taken when root pruning to avoid damaging underground utilities.

Also, deep-watering the tree, that is, applying a slow trickle of water over a 24-hour period, encourages deeper root growth which reduces the chance of sidewalk damage.
The sidewalk, park strip, and curb and gutter are located next to the street on the front and/or side portion of your property. The curb and gutter are located at the edge of the street pavement. The sidewalk is either separated from the curb by a parkway strip area, or is located adjacent to the curb.

Who is responsible for maintaining the sidewalk, park strip area, and curb gutters?
The property owner is responsible for properly maintaining this area (see Santa Cruz Municipal Code Section 15.20.210). This responsibility includes maintenance of damaged or displaced concrete, abatement of weeds or debris, and the maintenance of trees and shrubs whether on private or public property. Replacement and trimming of street trees and shrubs is further governed by Chapter 13 of the Santa Cruz Municipal Code.

Who is liable for injuries caused by defective sidewalks?
The owner of property adjoining a sidewalk area is liable for injuries caused by that owner’s failure to maintain the sidewalk area in a safe condition (see Santa Cruz Municipal Code Section 15.20.220).

How is the need for correction of landscape-related problems determined?
- Visibility – When parkway strip shrubbery interferes with vehicle operator visibility, trimming to a maximum height of thirty inches is required. (30 inches maximum height, 25 feet minimum sight distance at corners).
- Walkway and Gutter Clearance – Trimming of ground cover or shrubs is required when there is an encroachment onto the sidewalk or gutter.
- Obstacles in the Parkway Strip – Elimination of tree stumps, large rocks, trash, holes, and some built-up planters is required. When the parkway strip is unimproved or landscaped and there is a drop, the parkway strip must be filled with dirt or other material (no asphalt) to eliminate tripping hazards.

When is concrete repair needed?
Repair of the sidewalk concrete is required in the following circumstances:
- A vertical separation of more than one-half inch in sidewalk or concrete parkway strip.
- Ramping, where there is a rise or depression of more than one inch within a horizontal distance of eight inches in conjunction with a vertical separation.
- A separation or opening in a break or construction joint of 3/8 inch or more (Americans with Disabilities Act Standard).
- The breaking apart or spalling of concrete with a minimum depth of more than one-half inch.

Curb and gutter repair is required in the following circumstances:
- Where a defect interferes with the safe and reasonable use by pedestrians and bicyclists, such as vertical or horizontal separations of more than one-half inch or there are broken away sections adjacent to a margin walk or driveway approach.
- It is part of a driveway approach replacement.

What are the options available for completing the work?
Construction of curbs, gutters, and sidewalks in City streets may be performed by a properly licensed and insured contractor. A permit is required for concrete repair, and may be issued to contractors for free by the Department of Public Works. Permits for street tree and shrub trimming may be obtained from the Department of Parks and Recreation. Permits are valid for 45 days; call (831)420-5270.

How does one go about finding a contractor?
The yellow pages or the classified section of the newspaper are good places to start. The contractor selected must secure a concrete construction permit from the Department of Public Works.

Are there inspections and standards for concrete repair work?
Yes, all work and materials must be in conformance with the City of Santa Cruz Standard Specifications for Public Works Construction and Parks and Recreation ISA Standards.
Before placing any concrete you must have the forms, base, tree root removal, and saw cuts inspected. After approval, a City-approved concrete mix must be used. Finish must be a light broom finish with score marks to match the existing sidewalk. After the work is completed, you must call for a final inspection. A permit is required for all concrete work in the public right-of-way. To obtain a permit or arrange an inspection, call (831)420-5160.

For further information about sidewalks and street trees please call:
Department of Parks & Recreation at (831)420-5270 or Public Works Department at (831)420-5160
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Owner Name</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Employee Count</th>
<th>Business Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOCATELLI CONCRETE FINISHING</td>
<td>255 CASSELY RD</td>
<td>PETE LOCATELLI</td>
<td>20/01/1976</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1605 : CEMENT CONTRACTOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOMBARDO DIAMOND CORE DRILLING</td>
<td>2225 DE LA CRUZ BLVD</td>
<td>RICHARD D LONG</td>
<td>01/07/1989</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1605 : CEMENT CONTRACTOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TNT CONCRETE #673425</td>
<td>1311 DELAWARE AVE</td>
<td>WILLIAM THREEWITT</td>
<td>30/05/1980</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1605 : CEMENT CONTRACTOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RALSTON CONCRETE, TOM #736486</td>
<td>241 FERN ST</td>
<td>TOM RALSTON</td>
<td>28/08/1990</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1605 : CEMENT CONTRACTOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALBANESE INC, JOS J #299880</td>
<td>840 PARKER ST</td>
<td>JOHN ALBANESE</td>
<td>05/11/1992</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1605 : CEMENT CONTRACTOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BERNKEITS CONCRETE, KATHLEEN</td>
<td>2337 BRANCIFORTE DR</td>
<td>KATHLEEN BERNKEITS</td>
<td>10/11/1992</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Business License Database

**Your search for:**
- Employee Count=Select:
- Business Class Code=1605

**Found 22 matches (displaying 11 to 20)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Owner Name</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Employee Count</th>
<th>Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BARTLETT, DAMEON CONCRETE 758374</td>
<td>725 30TH AVE</td>
<td>DAMEON BARTLETT</td>
<td>17/05/2003</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1605 : CEMENT CONTRACTOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITLOW CONCRETE INC #750243</td>
<td>4148 CLARES ST</td>
<td>W J WHITLOW</td>
<td>29/05/1961</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1605 : CEMENT CONTRACTOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APARICIO CEMENT CONTRACTOR INC, C</td>
<td>506 PHELAN AVE</td>
<td>CARLOS APARICIO</td>
<td>06/05/2007</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1605 : CEMENT CONTRACTOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CELL CRETE CORPORATION 243404</td>
<td>995 ZEPHYR AVE</td>
<td>LOU FISHER</td>
<td>18/07/2007</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1605 : CEMENT CONTRACTOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAL WEST CONCRETE CUTTING INC</td>
<td>3000 TARA CT</td>
<td>CONCRETE CAL-WEST</td>
<td>18/06/2008</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1605 : CEMENT CONTRACTOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRUM CONCRETE, MICHAEL L #379912</td>
<td>2642 MONTEREY AVE</td>
<td>MICHAEL L CRUM</td>
<td>18/07/1996</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Business Phone:  
Employee Count: 5  
Business Classification: 1605 : CEMENT CONTRACTOR

Business Name: MELO CONCRETE CONSTRUCTION 76768  
Business Address: 5820 OBATA WAY C  
Owner Name: MANUEL M MELO  
Start Date: 01/07/2008  
Business Phone:  
Employee Count: 12  
Business Classification: 1605 : CEMENT CONTRACTOR

Business Name: US CONCRETE CONSTRUCTION  
Business Address: 30634 HASLEY CANYON RD  
Owner Name: ULISES SALAZAR  
Start Date: 17/11/2008  
Business Phone:  
Employee Count: 15  
Business Classification: 1605 : CEMENT CONTRACTOR

Business Name: BERKELEY CEMENT INC 290755  
Business Address: 1200 SIXTH ST  
Owner Name: SCOTT FADELLI  
Start Date: 12/12/2008  
Business Phone:  
Employee Count: 3  
Business Classification: 1605 : CEMENT CONTRACTOR

Business Name: SANDERS CONCRETE, DOUG 775440  
Business Address: 1313 PROSPECT ST  
Owner Name: DOUG SANDERS  
Start Date: 12/01/2007  
Business Phone:  
Employee Count: 2  
Business Classification: 1605 : CEMENT CONTRACTOR

« Back  Next »

New Search

Report Website Problems (Broken Links, Page Not Found, etc.)  
To:  
webmaster@ci.santa-cruz.ca.us
Business License Database

Your search for:

- Employee Count=Select:
- Business Class Code=1605

Found 22 matches (displaying 21 to 22)

Business Name: CYPRESS HILL CONCRETE INC.
Business Address: 200 BURNETT AVE 43
Owner Name: JOHN CABALLERO
Start Date: 25/03/2008
Business Phone:
Employee Count: 2
Business Classification: 1605 : CEMENT CONTRACTOR

Business Name: BAY AREA ASPHALT & CEMENT
Business Address: 545 NIPPER AVE
Owner Name: SCOTT KOLANDER
Start Date: 07/07/2009
Business Phone:
Employee Count: 5
Business Classification: 1605 : CEMENT CONTRACTOR

New Search

Report Website Problems (Broken Links, Page Not Found, etc.)
To:
webmaster@ci.santa-cruz.ca.us
Jurisdiction Profile: City of Scotts Valley

Information provided by Ken Anderson (Public Works Director)

Baseline Information:
- 35 miles of streets (centerline)
- Approximately 15-30% have sidewalks, mostly in commercial areas
- City maintains Scotts Valley Drive and Mt. Hermon Road
- All other business districts maintained by the district

(1) Conduct jurisdiction-wide audits to identify sidewalks that do not meet standards.
- The sidewalk improvement program is complaint driven, no formal sidewalk audit is performed
- Approximately 2 complaints were received in 2009
- There is currently no process for measuring and reporting the percent of sidewalks that are in compliance.
- Currently there are no goals or timetables for compliance.
- Most of the sidewalks are new and don’t yet need much maintenance
- Much of the city is on slopes which would not meet ADA standards
- The City’s Capital Improvement Program includes new sidewalk projects and sidewalk repairs such as curb cuts, which are prioritized based on funding projections
- The City has a Sidewalk Master Plan, but it is ten years old
- The City has an ADA Committee comprised of two caregivers (1 for an adult, 1 for a child), two disabled individuals (both use power chairs), 1 City Council member, 1 staff each from DPW, planning and police.
- The Capital Improvement Program will include missing facilities as unfunded

(2) Report status of the entire jurisdiction’s sidewalk network annually.
- Information is not currently gathered or reported in this format.

(3) Implement administrative processes that ensure prompt resolution of safety and access issues.
- City staff inspects complaints and knocks on door/explains program to property owner.
- No fee is charged the property owner for an encroachment or repair permit
- The City does not provide pavement grinding, but may take care of vegetation immediately, especially if it pushes people out into the street. Residents are notified that city crews may use chainsaw or other rough tools to trim vegetation
- Property owners are required to use a licensed contractor in making repairs.
- The City stays in touch with the property owner until the problem is resolved. It uses a “tickler” system to monitor completion of the work.
• If property owners do not make repairs, the City would do so with the option of placing a lien on the property if payment was not made.
• The City aims for 100% of the conditions prompting complaints to be corrected.
• The City adds new sidewalks primarily when it is a condition of a new subdivision or other improvement.

(4) **Promote the community value of property owners maintaining safe and accessible sidewalks**

• A marketing/outreach plan to promote a community value of safe and accessible sidewalks has not been developed.

(5) **Inform residents of the jurisdiction’s program for ensuring the maintenance of safe and accessible sidewalks.**

• Outreach public education regarding the program is limited.
• The City feels that businesses are aware of their responsibilities for sidewalk maintenance.
• Residential property owners are not as aware, but there are fewer sidewalks in these areas.
• The City does not have brochure for property owners on its website or in its lobby.
• Requirements are communicated when the property owner is notified of sidewalk hazards/exposures.
• The City does not have a newsletter for publicizing the program.
• More program information could be placed on the City website.
• Other Outreach Ideas:
  o Work with homeowner associations
  o Place articles in the Scotts Valley Press Banner newspaper
  o Make presentations to televised City Council meetings
  o Solicit leadership from the mayor
• DPW staff is receptive to coordinating with the other local jurisdictions to develop a common set of standards for property owner sidewalk maintenance and repairs.
• The Pedestrian Safety Work Group volunteered to help with outreach materials (draft, review, etc.)

(6) **Create highly visible process for reporting sidewalk safety and access issues**

• Information regarding the process for reporting exposures is posted on the DPW webpage.
• Either the generic city complaint form or the RTC’s Pedestrian Access Report can be used to report hazards.
• Public education regarding the process is limited.
(7) **Develop information and support resources for property owners seeking to address unsafe or inaccessible sidewalk conditions**

- Few trees in strip between sidewalk and street, so few tree issues on sidewalks
COMPLAINT FORM

Complaint No.

Address/Location of Complaint:

Description of Complaint (print clearly):

Your Name (complainant): ________________________________ Date: ________________________________

Address: _____________________________________________ Phone: ________________________________

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY


☐ Fire District ☐ Other ________________________________

Assessor’s Parcel No.____________________________________

Property Owner’s Name:__________________________________

Property Owner’s Address:_______________________________
April 5, 2002

Bluebonnet Lane
Scotts Valley, CA 95066

The Police Department has notified me that they have received several complaints regarding limited site distance on Bean Creek Rd. due to your landscaping located in the city right-of-way adjacent to Bean Creek Rd. I visited the site and observed that your shrubbery is overgrown and is impairing people’s ability to see cars traveling Scotts Valley Drive bound on Bean Creek Road. The bushes need to be trimmed and maintained at a height of three feet. If you would like to have the bushes professionally trimmed in a manner to your liking, please do so by April 15, 2002. If the bushes are not trimmed by this time, a city work crew will trim the bushes in a manner that may not be to your liking. If you have any questions, please contact me at 438-8689.

Sincerely,

Dave Leuty
Maintenance Division Manager

cr
Jurisdiction Profile: City of Watsonville

Information provided by Maria Esther Rodriguez (Principal Engineer) and Rosemarie Martinez Dow (Assistant Engineer)

Baseline Information:
- 92 miles of streets (centerline)
- Approximately 75% have sidewalks on both sides

(1) Conduct jurisdiction-wide audits to identify sidewalks that do not meet standards.
- The sidewalk maintenance program is complaint driven.
- There is no formal sidewalk audit process to determine the percent of sidewalks adjacent to private property that are in compliance.
- The City is making progress toward compliance with each new project that is proposed and approved. A plan is not currently in place to achieve full compliance within a defined period of time.
- The City has a goal of installing curb cuts at all intersections. The curb cuts are mapped on the city’s Geographic Information System (GIS).
- The City pays for the installation of curb ramps at intersections but adjacent property owners are responsible for maintenance of the sidewalks.

(2) Report status of the entire jurisdiction’s sidewalk network annually.
- Information is not currently gathered or reported in this format.

(3) Implement administrative processes that ensure prompt resolution of safety and access issues.
- City staff inspects complaint and photographs problem
- For complaints about vegetation, the City takes photo and sends letter to the property owner with request for immediate attention.
- The City may do free concrete grinding if the problem is ¼ to ½ inch uplift.
- If there is a significant safety or access exposure, a letter/photo is posted at the site.
- The City bids a contract every two years that includes rates, specifications, and procedures. The contractor awarded the bid then performs the pedestrian facility repairs as directed by City staff. (Referred in this document as “City contractor”)
- A letter with a cost quote is sent to property owner requiring them to either:
  - Fix the problem using their own contractor within 30 days or
  - Enter into an agreement with the City to have the City contractor make the repair.
- Upon request, Property owners are given a list of licensed contractors with whom they can negotiate their own terms. The list of contractors is compiled
from all contractors requesting to be included on the City’s list. (City contractor is usually less expensive.)

- A permit is needed for repair work done by private citizens. A licensed contractor pulls the permit. No permit required if the work is performed under the City contract.
- The permit includes a 10% fee to cover inspection costs.
- The City aims for 100% of complaints to be corrected.
- An asphalt overlay of the streets triggers ramp and ADA improvements, but chip seal does not.

(4) **Promote the community value of property owners maintaining safe and accessible sidewalks**

- A marketing/outreach plan to promote a community value of safe and accessible sidewalks has not been developed.

(5) **Inform residents of the jurisdiction’s program for ensuring the maintenance of safe and accessible sidewalks.**

- The City publishes a brochure describing the program for property owners to maintain their sidewalks.
- The City acknowledges it could place more program information on its website.
- City Staff has presented information on Sidewalk repair to Realtor’s board.
- Other Outreach Ideas:
  - Insert program information in utility and/or property tax billings mailed to city residents.
  - Create a sticker that could be used on all trash cans.
- The South County Bike and Pedestrian Safety Work Group is also working on promoting pedestrian safety and has a goal to increase community awareness and promote use of hazard reporting.
- DPW supports a countywide mandate for property owners to repair sidewalks at the time of sale.

(6) **Create highly visible process for reporting sidewalk safety and access issues**

- Public education regarding the process is limited.

(7) **Develop information and support resources for property owners seeking to address unsafe or inaccessible sidewalk conditions**

- The City may do free concrete grinding if the problem is ¼ to ½ inch uplift.
- City gives property owners two weeks to take care of vegetation issues, if not done the City will take care of it and bill property owners or add costs to property tax.
- The City Finance Department offers the option of setting up an agreement/account for property owners who opt to use the city’s contractor,
and pay back the cost of repairs with a zero interest loan over one year (in hardship cases, may go up to two years).

- Cost of curb cuts subtracted out of the repair cost estimate.
- The agreement is notarized. If property owner defaults on the loan, then added to their property tax bill.
- The City repairs sidewalks damaged due to street trees if the city planted the tree. Sometimes the city will replace the tree and add root barriers.
- The City has a list of approved trees
- Landscaping in strip between sidewalk and street occurs primarily in commercial and industrial areas

**Notable practices**

- The City offers property owners the option of having the city's contractor, with who they have negotiated rates, perform the work.
- The City Finance Department sets up an agreement/account, for property owners who opt to use the City contractor, to pay back the cost of repairs with a zero interest loan over one year (In hardship cases, it may be extended to two years).
- The agreement is notarized. If property owner defaults on the loan, then added to their property tax bill.
- The City has an aggressive curb cut program that is prioritized based on community requests primarily addressing the needs of seniors, people with disabilities and children.
Property Posted: Date, 20##
By: Rosemarie Dow

Property Location: ### Street
Parcel No. ##-###-##

NOTICE TO REPAIR

Date: Date, 20##

To: Owner
Street Address
City, State ZIP

As the owner in possession if that certain property in the City of Watsonville described above, you are hereby notified that a portion of the sidewalk/curb and gutter/driveway is in need of repair and is in such condition as to interfere with the public safety and use thereof. The specific deficiency is described as follows:

Approximately (# of) square feet of concrete sidewalk and (# of) linear feet of curb constituting a pedestrian tripping hazard. The location will be marked for your information (see attached photograph).

Would you please cause the repairs to be made by a contractor of your choice within 30 days. The repair must be made in accordance with the city standards and by a licensed, bonded contractor. A C-8 or A license is required and a Public Works permit is to be issued to the contractor.

This Notice to Repair may be discussed with a member of the Engineering Department staff by calling Rosemarie Dow at (831) 768-3110.

If, after discussion, the property owner still disagrees with the staff decision, it may be appealed to the City Council by filing a Notice to Appeal with the City Clerk within fourteen (14) days of the above date. If appealed, you will be advised in writing of the City Council meeting at which your matter will be heard.
If the appeal is denied by the City Council, you may cause the repairs to be made by a contractor of your choice or the City's concrete contractor will make the required repairs and you will be billed for the cost of the work. A City administrative cost of 10% will be added to the bill. The Engineer's Estimate for the repairs is $###(including the 10% admin. cost). This quotation is good until Month DD, YYYY. After completion, the total cost may be paid in cash to the City or it may be placed upon the property tax roll for collection.

For more information please call Ms. Dow at 768-3110.

Very truly yours,

Rosemarie M. Dow  
Assistant Engineer for

David A. Koch  
Public Works/Utilities Director

Attachments
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CITY OF WATSONVILLE

"Opportunity through diversity; unity through cooperation"

SIDEWALK, DRIVEWAYS, CURBS, AND GUTTERS

Within the City of Watsonville, a property owner is responsible to maintain the sidewalk, driveway, curb, and gutter adjacent to their property in good condition so as to not interfere with the public safety and use. If any of these areas become deficient (or a tripping hazard), repair is the responsibility of the property owner.

Once the City becomes aware of a deficiency, the property owner is sent a “Notice to Repair” and given 30 days in which to complete it. This notice identifies the deficiency and includes a cost estimate for the needed repairs. The repair must be made in accordance with City standards and performed by a bonded contractor with an “A” or “C-8” license. A City permit is also required for this work.

The property owner has the option to hire their own contractor, or enter into an agreement with the City for the repairs. With the latter option, a City hired contractor would perform the repairs at competitive prices. The City offers various payment options: 1) the repair cost could be paid in full by owner or lessee; 2) owners can enter into a pay back agreement for the cost of repairs plus a 10% administrative fee with a 12 month (interest free) payment plan that the City’s Finance Department would bill monthly; or 3) the repair cost could be added to the property tax bill (including County administrative fees and interest) for collection by the County of Santa Cruz.

A property owner can appeal the repair notice to the City Council by filing a Notice to Appeal with the City Clerks office. The appeal process is outlined in the Watsonville Municipal Code under Title 1, Chapter 4. For more information on the appeal process, please contact the City Clerks office at (831) 728-6005.

For additional information or any questions regarding maintenance of sidewalks, driveways curbs and gutters, please contact Ms. Rosemarie Dow of the Public Works and Utilities Department at (831) 728-6175.

Sincerely,

David A. Koch
Public Works and Utilities Department Director

Attachment A: Watsonville Municipal Code (Chapter 2) and page 292 of the Improvement Act of 1911
Jurisdiction Profile: County of Santa Cruz

Information provided by Jack Sohriakoff

Baseline Information:
- 640 road miles (centerline)
- Approximately 25% of roads have sidewalks
- In general, sidewalks in urbanized areas (Aptos, Soquel, Felton, etc.) are maintained by the adjacent property owners or business association.

(1) **Conduct jurisdiction-wide audits to identify sidewalks that do not meet standards.**
- The County has a complaint-driven sidewalk maintenance program
- No formal inventory of sidewalk conditions is performed
- There is no current process for determining the percent of sidewalks that are in compliance, nor are there goals for achieving a level of compliance for safe and accessible sidewalks.
- DPW will check in with other counties or professional organizations to identify processes used in performing sidewalk audits.
- Ideas discussed for conducting sidewalk audits include:
  - Include sidewalk assessments with annual inspections of signs by county staff beginning with the urbanized areas in villages and towns
  - Consider alternative staff to perform audits (interns, volunteers, etc.)
  - Seek a new funding source to cover project costs
- Measure C requires County to send an annual report to the County about the status of bicycle and pedestrian facility construction. Although the measure primarily relates to new construction, rather than maintenance of existing facilities, it is an example of regular reporting practices.
- DPW will request that sidewalks be included on the GIS mapping system

(2) **Report status of the entire jurisdiction’s sidewalk network annually.**
- This information is not currently gathered or reported.

(3) **Implement administrative processes that ensure prompt resolution of safety and access issues**
- County staff inspects complaints
- If the sidewalk issue is related to a County-maintained drainage system, curb inlets, culverts, etc, then County fixes problem
- DPW sends a letter to property owner requiring them to fix the problem using a licensed contractor (no list provided)
- DPW requests that the property owner address vegetation hazards within 2 weeks. There is a 30-day time requirement for property owners to address other types of hazards/exposures. If property owners do not fix the problem within a specified time limit we may elect to have our crews perform the work and charge the property owner accordingly.
• If improvements are minor or considered basic maintenance, then no permits are needed. Otherwise if the work is considered major and requires inspections, the property owner will need to secure permits and pay fees.
• DPW assumes that property owners comply with notices to correct sidewalk conditions so a formal enforcement process has not been developed.
• DPW plans to develop a “tickler” file to determine whether or not the work is done.
• The County aims for 100% of complaints to be corrected.

(4) **Promote the community value of property owners maintaining safe and accessible sidewalks**

• A marketing/outreach plan to promote a community value of safe and accessible sidewalks has not been developed.

(5) **Inform residents of the jurisdiction’s program for ensuring the maintenance of safe and accessible sidewalks.**

• The County has no brochure or newsletter
• The County acknowledges it could put more program information, including sidewalk maintenance standards, on its website
• Other Outreach Ideas:
  o Insert program information in a waste management or property tax bill
  o Work with Traffic Safety Coalition, particularly on safe routes to school
  o Encourage Board members to solicit input from their constituents
  o Work with chambers of commerce to publicize sidewalk maintenance responsibilities
  o County road crews could inspect sidewalks adjacent to road and sign work
  o DPW would provide sidewalk maintenance brochures (if developed) at the many community meetings that county staff attend (schools, neighborhoods, etc.)
• The Pedestrian Safety Work Group volunteered to help develop outreach materials (draft, review, etc.)

(6) **Create highly visible process for reporting sidewalk safety and access issues**

• Information regarding the process for reporting hazards/exposures is posted on the DPW webpage. Outreach public education regarding the process is limited.
• DPW receives the RTC’s Pedestrian Access Report forms.

(7) **Develop information and support resources for property owners seeking to address unsafe or inaccessible sidewalk conditions**

• A description of the basic process for addressing sidewalk exposures is included in notices to property owners with noncompliant sidewalks.
• The information does not include a description of repair options or resources available for making repairs.

• Trees:
  o Root barrier design criteria included in notice to property owners. Barrier required if county does inspection.
  o Redevelopment Agency has a program to encourage property owners to plant trees provided by agency. How property owner plants trees is not monitored.
Appendix B

Current Practices of Other Benchmark Jurisdictions

City of Corvallis, OR
City of Fairfield, OH
City of San Jose, CA
City of Corvallis, OR
Jurisdictional Programs to Facilitate Sidewalk Maintenance
By Adjacent Property Owners

Survey Questions

Benchmark Jurisdiction: Corvallis, OR
Person Interviewed: Bruce Moser, Public Works, City of Corvallis
bruce.moser@ci.corvallis.or.us
(541) 754-1779
Website: http://www.ci.corvallis.or.us/index.php?option=content&task=view&id=519&Itemid=457

Brief Summary The City of Corvallis, OR started their program to ensure property owners maintained their sidewalks about 20 years ago. The city currently inspects 1/10 of the jurisdiction every year (all of the jurisdiction every 10 years). Property owners of non-compliant sidewalks are notified that they are responsible to repair their sidewalks within 90 days of notification. The city offers to repair the sidewalks by the city contractor for typically a less expensive cost to the property owner. If the property owner does not make the repairs, the city takes them to court with the potential of a $2500 fine and the property owners have always made the repairs. Typically the city contractor repairs 95% of the sidewalks and property owners repair 5% of the sidewalks through their own contractors. The city has a commitment to 100% compliance of the areas inspected per year.

Demographics

1. What is the population of your jurisdiction?
   54,000

2. What percentage of the population lives in urban versus rural settings?
   90% Urban
   10% Rural

Standards

3. Does your jurisdiction have defined standards for sidewalk pavement condition and accessibility? If so, what are the sources of the standards?

   x Defined standards in which document: Newsletter
   ____ Basis – Explain ADA standards on Federal Register - maximum 2% cross slope, maximum ½” lip, maximum 1” gap. Note: Standards do not address poor quality cement where aggregate can pop out. This type of sidewalk condition is hard to measure.
It is written in the code that the city engineer or agent can make determination that the sidewalks are out of compliance due to being too rough.

**Outreach**

4. How are property owners informed of their responsibility to maintain their sidewalks in safe and accessible condition?

___ Brochure
___ Website
x Newsletter Yearly
___ Real estate agent at time of house purchase
x Other – Explain

1- It is written in the city municipal code.
2- Letters are sent out every year to all property owners who will have their sidewalks inspected that year. (1000’s of letters/year).

**Objectives**

5. Has your jurisdiction made a commitment to having a certain percentage of sidewalks comply with safety and access standards within a specified timeframe? If so, what are the commitments?

___ No
___ Yes _____% of sidewalks will conform to standards within_____years
x Other – Explain

City is committed to 100% compliance every year for the inspected portion (1/10) of the city.

6. Are the commitments for compliance different for sidewalks maintained by your jurisdiction and those for which property owners are responsible?

___ No
___ Yes - Explain

7. Does the jurisdiction have a method for measuring and reporting year to year improvement in the percentage of sidewalks that are in compliance?

___ No
x Yes - Explain

City gets 100% compliance every year for the inspected portion (1/10th) of the city.
Identification of Sidewalks in Need of Repair

8. Does the jurisdiction regularly perform jurisdiction-wide audits of sidewalk safety and accessibility? If so, how often are these audits conducted?

   x Yes, every _10_ years the sidewalks throughout the jurisdiction are inspected.
   ____ No

9. Can you provide an estimate of staff time and resources required to perform these audits?

   ____ Staff hours per year
   ____ Other resources

10. What methods are available for citizens to report hazards or barriers to accessibility?

   x Jurisdiction website online/downloadable form
   x Phone calls taken to report hazard/barrier 90%
   x Emails taken to report hazard/barrier
   ____ Paper form provided at jurisdiction
   x Other - Explain
      Advocates raise issues to committees.

11. Does your jurisdiction coordinate with neighboring jurisdictions to ensure consistency of programs? If yes, please explain. Corvallis’s program is a model program. Other jurisdictions call wanting information of how they run their program (6 to 10 calls per year).

12. On a yearly basis, approximately what ratio of non-conforming sidewalks is identified by jurisdiction inspections versus citizen complaints?

   Majority ____ Jurisdiction Inspections
   20-30/year ____ Citizen Complaints

Methods for Enforcement of Property Owner’s Responsibility to Maintain Sidewalks to Standards
13. Are there ordinances or codes requiring property owners to maintain sidewalks to jurisdictional standards? Yes, municipal code.

14. Does the ordinance or code require the property owners to bring sidewalks into compliance within a specified timeframe? If so, what is the timeframe? Yes, 90 days.

15. What is the process for notifying property owners of their responsibility to maintain their sidewalk to standards?

- Property inspected prior to notification to verify non-compliance
- Notification by letter
- Notification by phone
- Other - Explain

The city sends the first letter telling all property owners in the area to be inspected, that they are coming out to inspect the sidewalks. Inspection takes place and any sidewalks out of compliance are marked. A letter is sent to notify the property owners that their sidewalk is not in compliance and they need to have it repaired within 90 days. In this letter, the city offers to have the sidewalk be repaired by the city contractor and provides an estimate of the cost. Typically 90-95% of the people have the city do the work. The property owners need to tell the city within 30 days if they want to be in the contract. City opens the job up for a bid and then City sends another letter (certified mail) to property owners telling them the exact cost. The property owners have 2 weeks to send in a check (but they really give them more time). The property owners inspect to see if sidewalk is fixed. If not they send them a terse letter that they are in violation of the city code. At this point, the City may get a few more people who want to have their sidewalks repaired by the city contractor and they are charged a slightly higher cost ($300/panel). If people do not repair, the city takes them to court and then they make repair so they do not have to pay $2500 fine. 95% of people willing to make the repairs, 4% wait until the last minute, 1% do not make repairs and they are taken to court.

If a complaint is made about a sidewalk, process is similar but may not be the right timeframe for the city contractor to be able to make the repairs.

16. How and when do you follow up after notifying a property owner of a noncompliant sidewalk to assess whether a repair is being initiated? See above.

17. Are licensed contractors, inspections and standards for concrete repair required? Licensed contractors and inspections are required for both the city contractor and by the property owners contractor.
18. In practice, will the jurisdiction initiate repairs if property owner does not make repairs within specified timeframe?

Yes!

Financing

19. If your jurisdiction makes repairs, following property owner failure to make the repairs within the specified timeframe, do you bill the property owner?
City takes the property owners to court and property owners then make repairs.

20. Will the cost of repair be added to the property tax, a lien put on house, or addressed by some other method? Please explain.
City never had to do this as once the property owner is taken to court, they are motivated to make the repair.

21. If a lien is used, where does the funding come from to cover the costs until the house is sold?
Not applicable. See 19 and 20 above.

22. Does your jurisdiction pay for any sidewalk repair on property adjacent to private property such as vegetation removal, grinding of sidewalks, or repair due to street tree damage?  
   No

   ___ Vegetation removal
   ___ Grinding of sidewalks < ___ inches
   ___ Repair due to street tree damage

City puts in ADA ramps and is on track for 100% compliance for ADA ramps in 2012.

23. Does your jurisdiction offer any programs to assist property owners who cannot afford repairs?

   ___ No
   x ___ Yes – Explain The City provides hardship loans to be paid monthly over a year.

Resources

24. Approximately, how much staff time in your agency is devoted to working on sidewalk programs/projects and in particular programs that facilitate private property owner maintenance of their sidewalks?

   ___ FTE or Staff hours per week on sidewalk programs
   ____ FTE or Staff hours per week on property owner sidewalk maintenance
25. Have you received grants to assist with any of the above sidewalk-related activities?

___ No
___ If yes, what activities are funded and what was the source of funds?
City has received grants to put in ADA ramps and pads and landings at transit stops.

26. Can your agency share any forms, tools or efficiency tips? (public education, property owner notification, tracking of property owner repairs, notices of non-compliance, documents relating to jurisdiction initiated repairs)

City uses a computer program that tracks permits and it has a sidewalk component. It can access homeowners’ information.

27. What major challenges did you encounter in the design and implementation of your program? How were these issues addressed?

Sweetgum trees are destroying sidewalks at a rapid pace. Sometimes even as quick as 5 months after a repair! About 70% of the sidewalk repairs are due to street tree damage that the property owners have to pay for even though the trees were put in as part of a street tree program many years ago. There is a street tree ordinance which makes it challenging for property owners to take out their street trees. He has looked into all sorts of different ideas to deal with the problem such as rubber sidewalks, alternate types of concrete installation such as interlock and wiring that will lift 2 or more panels together. There is a list of street trees that are not a problem on their website.

28. Do you have other comments or suggestions?

The inspectors and contractors making the repairs are the city’s representatives out in the community. They are taking a hard message out to the community. It is important that they have the skill to interface with the public in a positive, informed manner.

The street tree program should be communicating with the sidewalk program.

The November city council meeting will have an item to propose that the city charge additional property tax fees so that the city will have funds to repair the sidewalks instead of the property owners.
The goal of the Sidewalk Safety Program is to repair and replace hazardous sidewalks and to construct incomplete sections of the sidewalk system over time. The City has a responsibility to ensure that sidewalks are maintained for the community as a whole, including upgrading corners to provide wheelchair ramps, maintaining new public alley approaches, and repairing sidewalks adjacent to City-owned property.

The effort to ensure sidewalks are maintained in safe condition is shared by property owners. Property owners are responsible for the construction and maintenance of sidewalks and driveway approaches next to their property's frontage. Chapter 2.15 of the City's Municipal Code establishes the property owners' responsibility for repair and their liability in case of an accident. Any time a sidewalk's condition is noted as presenting a safety hazard to pedestrians, the City notifies the property owner that repairs are required and then follows up to ensure the repairs are completed.

In addition to notifying property owners of unsafe sidewalks as they are noted by City staff or are reported by pedestrians, the City also conducts an annual Sidewalk Safety Program. Each year, one of eleven sidewalk districts is surveyed for sidewalks in need of repairs. The repair criteria are specific (see below). The property owners are notified of the need for repairs, and they are offered the opportunity to participate in the City's repair contract. The City puts the total work out to bid, with the bid going to the lowest responsive, responsible bidder, in accordance with State of Oregon purchasing and contracting guidelines. Property owners are then notified of the actual costs to perform their repairs based on the low bid, and they must make payment in full to the City before the contractor performs the work.

Related Links

- Guidelines for Public Sidewalk and Driveway Repairs
- Sidewalk Marking Code & Conditions
  - Requiring Grind or Replacement
- Required Qualifications for the Installation or Repair of Sidewalks, Curbs, or Driveways in the Public Right-of-Way
- Corvallis Municipal Code, Chapter 2.15, Sidewalk Improvements
- Council Policy 91-7.08 Sidewalk Policy
- Frequently Asked Questions about the Sidewalk Safety Program

  Why have I received notice from the City to repair my sidewalk?

The City has established safety criteria for our sidewalks that are being applied uniformly throughout the community. The criteria are specific in what constitutes a needed sidewalk repair. There are two reasons you may be notified of sidewalk repairs that need to be made:
1.

All year-round, property owners are notified of unsafe sidewalks as they are noted by City staff or are reported by pedestrians.

2.

Each year, one of eleven sidewalk districts is surveyed for sidewalks in need of repairs. Property owners are notified and given an opportunity to participate in a large, City-coordinated contract. Notices for the Annual Sidewalk Safety Program are usually mailed in November or December.

What options do I have to repair my sidewalk?

If the case number in the subject line of your letter starts with VIO, your notification was not part of the City's Annual Sidewalk Safety Program, and you will be responsible for coordinating the repairs yourself (see the next question, "How do I arrange for sidewalk repair?").

If the case number in the subject line of your letter starts with SWD, you have been notified during the City's Annual Sidewalk Safety Program which focused on your sidewalk district, and you will have two options each with different advantages. Choose the option that's best for you:

1. You can arrange for the work to be done yourself.

   Work gets done faster.

   You choose your own contractor.
   You have direct control over the work.
   You coordinate bids, permits and inspections.

2. You can have the City coordinate the repair work.

   Bidding and contract award process may slow completion of the work.

   Actual cost will not be known until the City's bid process is complete.
   The City may be able to obtain a lower price due to quantity of work contracted.
   The City will administer the repair contract, including coordinating bids, permits and inspections.

How do I arrange for sidewalk repair?

A permit must be obtained from the City's Development Services Division at 501 SW Madison Avenue for all sidewalk repairs except grinding.
The permit fee is $10. The work needs to be done to City construction standards by a licensed concrete finisher. Property owners who apply for permits to do sidewalk repairs themselves (but do not plan to have the work done by a licensed concrete finisher) must sign a statement of understanding of current applicable City standards and submit proof of insurance (including a clause showing the City as an additional insured party) in the following amounts:

- Each occurrence: $1,000,000
- Personal & Adv Injury: $1,000,000
- General Aggregate: $1,000,000
- Comp/Op Aggregate: $1,000,000

For more information, contact the Development Services Division at 541-766-6929.

After receiving notice about the specific repairs needed, you will have 60 days from the notice date to complete the work.

If I decide to let the City do the work, what do I need to do?

You will need to submit the request form included with the sidewalk repair notification letter sent by the City. The City will then bid your repairs as part of a larger sidewalk repair project and notify you of actual costs once bids are received. Actual costs will include an administrative fee equal to the current permit fee for such work.

What are typical sidewalk repair costs for repairs coordinated by the City?

Sidewalk removal and replacement can range from $8.00 and $10.00 per square foot. Sidewalk grinding is estimated at $10.00 to $12.00 per linear foot.

For more information or to report a sidewalk hazard, call the Public Works Department at (541) 766-6916.

For more information on obtaining a construction permit for a sidewalk repair, contact The City of Corvallis, Community Development Department, Development Services Division, (541) 766-6929.
CITY OF CORVALLIS, OREGON

GUIDELINES FOR PUBLIC SIDEWALK AND DRIVEWAY REPAIRS

These guidelines shall be used to determine when and to what extent public sidewalk driveway approach and alley approach repairs shall be required.

Removal and replacement or repairs shall be required whenever a public sidewalk or driveway approach is in a hazardous or unsafe condition. A hazardous or unsafe condition shall be determined by the limits as set forth in these guidelines in conjunction with the judgement of the City Engineer or designated representative.

DEFINITIONS

Panel: A panel is any section defined by joints, or score marks or an approximate square when joints do not exist.

Driveway Approach: A driveway approach is that portion of the driveway between the curb and the property line.

Alley Approach: An alley approach is that portion of an alley between the curb and property line side of the sidewalk or right-of-way.

Public: Any facility within the public right-of-way between the property line and street curb or surfacing.

CONDITIONS REQUIRING REPAIR OR CONSTRUCTION

The following is a listing of the criteria by which a sidewalk is considered hazardous or unsafe and therefore may require removal and replacement or repairs. Removal and replacement or repairs may be required based on any one of the items individually or a combination of the items. These criteria should be used as guidelines with judgement and discretion used in their application.

Removal and Replacement

Removal and replacement of complete panels is required when any of the following conditions exist:

- A vertical separation of more than 1-inch at either a joint or crack.
- A horizontal separation of 1 inch or more at either a joint or crack.
- The cross slope of sidewalks is greater than 3/4” per foot (1:16).
- Water ponds due to insufficient cross slope or misalignment. Removal and replacement shall not be required if the problem is corrected by modifications to
adjacent landscaping or obstructions.

- Severely rough, uneven surface due to scaling or spalling that would cause a tripping hazard.
- Severe cracking resulting in multiple loose or unstable individual pieces within a panel.

**Grinding**

Grinding is required when any of the following conditions exist:

- A vertical separation between 1/2-inch and 1-inch at the joint. Ground surfaces shall have a maximum slope of 1.5 inches per foot (1:8). Ground surfaces 4 inches or more in width shall be roughened.

**OTHER CONDITIONS**

**Tree Roots**

The following alternatives may be used to repair sidewalks affected by adjacent tree roots. Please consult a licensed arborist regarding these options.

- The sidewalk may be rerouted around the offending roots. Rerouting of the sidewalk may require dedication of an easement to the City for the sidewalk.
- The sidewalk may be ramped over the tree roots, provided the longitudinal slope does not exceed 1 inch per foot (1:12).
- The sidewalk may be removed and replaced after the tree roots have been pruned by a licensed arborist.
- Remove tree (permit required from the Parks and Recreation Department) and replace sidewalk. This option should be considered only if other remedies are impractical.

**General**

- Gravel or asphaltic concrete driveway and alley approaches shall be replaced with concrete where street curb and sidewalk exist.
- Abandoned or vacated driveway and alley approaches shall be removed and curb and sidewalk constructed across the abandoned section.
- Ambulatory ramps will be installed at all intersections in conjunction with the Safety Sidewalk Program annual repair districts as City funds allow.
Sidewalks shall be installed to complete gaps and missing sections when other segments of adjacent sidewalks exist between intersections in accordance with Council Policy 7.08.022.

**Standard Construction Specifications**

- All public sidewalk, driveway approach, alley approach, and ambulatory ramps shall be constructed in accordance with the City’s Standard Construction Specifications, latest edition.

**Sidewalk Marking Codes**

| G | R/R | SIDEWALK |

- Grind panel edge

Remove and replace sidewalk panels between “tee” marks

Updated 11/7/05
REQUIRED QUALIFICATIONS FOR THE INSTALLATION OR REPAIR OF SIDEWALKS, CURBS, OR DRIVEWAYS IN THE PUBLIC RIGHT-OF WAY

Policy Summary:

Specifies the qualifications for individuals who apply for permits to install or repair any accessible concrete, including sidewalks, driveway/alley approaches, bike lanes, or curbs/gutters in the public right-of-way as outlined in Section 2.15.080 of the City Municipal Code.

Background:

Until January of 1995, the City Municipal Code had required City "cement finisher's licenses" for anyone engaged "in the business of constructing or repairing any sidewalk, curb, or driveway in the public right-of way..." Because of a conflict with ORS 701.055, the cement finisher's licensing requirement was deleted; however, the City continued its desire to ensure these individuals were aware of City standards, had appropriate experience, and maintained appropriate levels of insurance. This policy provides a summary of the required qualifications.

Discussion:

Section 2.15.080 of the Municipal Code states as follows:

No person shall accept remuneration for constructing or repairing any sidewalk, driveway approach, or curb in the public right-of-way unless the person is registered with the Construction Contractors Board, and has demonstrated to the satisfaction of the City Manager the ability to perform the work in a workmanlike fashion according to the City’s specifications.

In order to demonstrate the ability to perform work as stated above, an individual must possess knowledge of the current applicable City standards. A person who accepts remuneration for this type of work must be registered with the CCB; consequently the City has some assurance the
individual is bonded and has some experience. Additionally, these individuals are required to sign a statement indicating that he/she understands the applicable City standards.

This policy also applies to those who are not accepting remuneration as described in Section 2.15.080 cited above. These individuals are not required to possess a CCB registration; however, he/she must also sign a statement indicating that he/she understands the applicable City standards and must submit proof of insurance.

Some sidewalk repairs are accomplished by grinding panels to alleviate trip hazards. A sidewalk repair permit is required for grinding but the individual making a repair by grinding does not need to meet these qualification requirements.

Policy:

Individuals who apply for permits to install or repair sidewalks, bike paths, driveway/alley approaches, or curbs in the public right-of-way as outlined in Section 2.15.080 of the City Municipal Code and who are accepting remuneration for these services must meet the following criteria:

- Pay the one-time $25.00 registration fee, and,
- Sign a statement indicating that he/she has reviewed and understands the current applicable City of Corvallis standards, and
- Show a current registration with the CCB, maintain this registration and submit proof of and maintain insurance in the following amount (including a clause showing the City as an additional insured party-example: The City of Corvallis, its officers, agents, and employees shall be additionally insured with respect to operations performed within the City of Corvallis):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liability Type</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Each Occurrence</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal and Adv Injury</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Aggregate</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp/Op Aggregate</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If at any time the CCB registration or insurance lapses, the individual must reapply using the same steps outlined above.

Property owners who apply for permits to install or repair sidewalks, bike paths, driveway/alley approaches, or curbs/gutters in the public right-of-way adjacent to their property and who are not accepting remuneration for these services must meet the following criteria:
• Sign a statement indicating that he/she has reviewed and understands the current applicable City of Corvallis standards, and

• Submit proof of and maintain insurance for the duration of the project in the following amount (including a clause showing the City as an additional insured party - example: *The City of Corvallis, its officers, agents, and employees shall be additionally insured with respect to operations performed within the City of Corvallis*):

  Personal Liability:

  Each Occurrence $1,000,000

NEXT SCHEDULED REVIEW: December 2011
CP 91-7.08 Sidewalk Policy

Adopted September 18, 1961 & Revised September 8, 1970 (91-7.08.020)
Adopted May 21, 1973 (91-7.08.030)
Combined and Affirmed October 7, 1991
Revised June 20, 1994
Reviewed November 6, 1995
Revised November 3, 1997
Revised November 15, 1999
Affirmed October 16, 2000
Revised December 17, 2001
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7.08.010 Purpose

To establish a policy regarding sidewalk construction and repair.

7.08.020 Policy - Sidewalk Construction

7.08.021 Sidewalk construction shall be as per Municipal Code Chapter 2.15 Sidewalk Improvements, as amended.

7.08.022 The criteria used to base an order to construct a missing sidewalk in an area that generally has sidewalks will be as follows:

*Undeveloped Lot* - Where the plat was recorded after November 1997 and has been recorded three years or longer, or when the missing sidewalk creates a threat to public safety and health as determined by the Public Works Director, and there is no sidewalk on the opposite side of the street unless there is no reasonably safe means for a person to cross the street.
Developed Lot - The City has received a compliant and review by City staff determines that the missing sidewalk presents a threat to public safety and health, and there is no sidewalk on the opposite side of the street unless there is no reasonably safe means to cross the street.

7.08.030 Policy - Sidewalk Repair

7.08.031 The owners of land adjoining any street in the City are responsible for the repair and maintenance of sidewalks in front of, along, or abutting their property as established by Municipal Code Chapter 2.15.

7.08.032 It is the responsibility of the City to construct and repair sidewalk wheelchair access ramps at intersections, repair and maintain sidewalks at public alley approaches, and repair and maintain sidewalks in front of, along, or abutting City owned property.

7.08.033 The City will maintain an ongoing annual program to identify hazardous sidewalk conditions, notify those responsible of necessary repairs, and ensure that repairs are completed.

7.08.034 The City will provide year round inspections of sidewalk hazards identified by citizen complaints in all areas of the City.

7.08.035 As per Municipal Code Section 2.15.160, as amended, the City will establish an optional program as per 7.08.040 Annual Program - Sidewalk Safety Program to assist property owners with repairs to hazardous sidewalks as well as the financing of those repairs as per 7.08.060 - Optional Financing of Repair Costs.

7.08.036 The City will attempt to accommodate trees and planting strips by considering sidewalk relocation options, including easements on private property.

7.08.040 Annual Program - Sidewalk Safety Program

7.08.041 Annually, the City will identify a district within the city limits containing public sidewalks to be inspected based on the Sidewalk Safety Districts map maintained by Public Works. The City will provide notification to all residents and owners of property within that year's district describing the program.

7.08.042 Sidewalk hazards will be identified and marked following guidelines prepared by the City Public Works Department.
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7.08.043 In conjunction with the annual sidewalk inspection, City Staff will identify locations in need of wheelchair access ramps as well as sidewalk repairs designated as City responsibility.

7.08.044 Property owners will be notified by letter of repairs to sidewalks abutting their property as per Municipal Code Section 2.15.090, as amended. An estimate of repair costs will be provided with the notification. For owners of property outside the Central Business District who participate in the annual program by utilizing the City’s contract, if the sidewalk is wider than five (5) feet, the property owner shall be responsible for the costs related to a width of five (5) feet; the City shall be responsible for the cost of the additional width calculated on a proportional basis. Property owners who choose to arrange for the repairs themselves, regardless of sidewalk width, shall bear the entire cost of repairs.

7.08.045 Property owners will be given the option of insuring completion of the repairs themselves or notify their intent that the City coordinate repairs and will indicate their choice to the City. If a property owner chooses to insure the completion of the repairs, a permit must be obtained from the Development Services Division as per Municipal Code Section 2.15.070.

7.08.046 Property owners who choose to arrange for the repair work themselves will be required to complete all repairs by City permit, as per Municipal Code Section 2.15.070, as amended, and within 60 days of the initial notification of repairs. Property owners who fail to respond within 30 days from the date of the notice issued as per 7.08.044 will be issued an order as per Municipal Code Section 2.15.090. Copies of sidewalk construction standards and specifications are available from the Development Services Division.

7.08.047 Property owners who choose to complete the work themselves will be required to sign a statement that they have reviewed and understand the adopted City sidewalk standards and provide proof of liability insurance in order to receive a permit. Property owners may also contract directly with a qualified contractor.

7.08.048 The City will advertise all other work for bids according to City purchasing code and State law requirements in conjunction with its annual program to construct wheelchair access ramps and repair sidewalks designated as City responsibility.

7.08.049 Once bids are received, the City will provide a notification of the actual repair costs to the property owners who indicated their intent that the City coordinate the repairs. Repair costs will include the actual cost of construction plus administrative.
7.08.050 Once actual repair costs are made available to them, property owners will be given an additional opportunity to decide whether to arrange for the repairs themselves or commit to an agreement that the City coordinate repairs.

7.08.051 Property owners who were notified as per 7.08.049 and choose to arrange for repairs themselves or fail to respond to the notification within 30 days from the date of that notification, will be given 60 days from the date of the notice in which to complete repairs.

7.08.052 Property owners who request that the City coordinate repairs must, within 30 days of the notification issued as per 7.08.049, either pre-pay the entire cost of repairs or apply for optional financing with the City.

7.08.053 Should the City coordinate repairs for the property owner and additional work that should have been identified by the City during the initial inspection be required during the course of construction, the additional cost to complete that work will not be passed on to the property owner.

7.08.060 Optional Financing of Repair Costs

7.08.061 An optional fixed rate loan will be made available to all property owners who request coordination of repairs by the City. The loan duration will be equal to one year for every $250 borrowed up to a maximum of five years and will be secured by property liens. Loan applications will be distributed and collected by Public Works staff.

7.08.062 The Finance Department will set loan rates by April 1 of each year for the following fiscal year. It is the intent of this policy to set loan rates lower than those currently offered for unsecured loans, yet high enough to discourage those who can afford to pay the full cost of repairs from tying up available loan funds.

7.08.063 Financing will be offered within loan funding levels at no interest to those property owners who qualify for low income assistance. Low income is defined as income at or below 80% of Benton County median income based on family size.

7.08.070 Enforcement

7.08.071 Property owners who fail to construct new sidewalks or complete the required repairs within the time frames established in this document and by Municipal Code will be subject to fines as established in the Municipal Code Chapter 2.15, as amended.
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7.08.072. To ensure that property owners who are noticed as a part of the annual sidewalk safety program as per 7.08.040 are given every opportunity to comply, a follow-up letter will be sent after the 60-day repair period has expired, reminding them of their responsibility, and requesting that repairs be made within 30 days.

7.08.073 Those cases that do not respond to the follow-up letter sent as per 7.08.072 will be referred to the City Attorney's Office (CAO). The CAO will issue a new letter, requiring repairs to be made immediately.

7.08.074 Cases that are referred to the CAO will be evaluated individually to determine the reason for non-compliance. In each case, an effort to work out voluntary compliance will be exhausted before legal enforcement procedures are implemented. Legal action will seek compliance and recovery of legal costs incurred by the City.

7.08.080 Review and Update

This Community Improvement Policy shall be reviewed by the Public Works Director triennially in October and updated as appropriate.
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Sidewalk improvements.
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Section 2.15.010 Definitions.

1) Curb - A raised concrete edging on the side of a street, forming a gutter.
2) Driveway approach - The portion of a driveway in the public right-of-way, including, if applicable, the adjacent curb and gutter.
3) Sidewalk - A paved pedestrian pathway located in the public right-of-way.
4) Owner - A person who holds title to real property or a contract purchaser of real property of record according to the latest assessment roll in the office of the Benton County Assessor.

(Ord. 94-20 § 3, 1994)

Section 2.15.020 Improvements required.

1) All owners of land adjoining any public street in the City shall construct, reconstruct, repair, and maintain in good condition the sidewalks and driveway approaches within the public right-of-way in front of, along, or abutting their land in accordance with the provisions of this Chapter. Construction, reconstruction, repair, and maintenance of sidewalks and driveway approaches is declared to be a routine obligation of the adjacent property owner and deemed necessary to protect the health and safety of persons in the City.

2) The City Manager shall, at such times as he or she determines appropriate, survey or inspect the condition of sidewalks in all or any part of the City. When a survey or inspection reveals sidewalk conditions that may pose a threat to the health and safety of persons in the City, the City Manager shall issue an order to repair the sidewalk pursuant to Section 2.15.090.

(Ord. 94-20 § 3, 1994)

Section 2.15.030 Compliance with standards/guidelines.
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No person shall construct, reconstruct, or repair any sidewalk, driveway approach, or curb in a public right-of-way within the City except in compliance with the specifications and guidelines of this Chapter, or exceptions thereto approved as provided in this Chapter.
(Ord. 94-20 § 3, 1994)

Section 2.15.040 Standard specifications/guidelines.

1) The City Manager shall adopt and, from time to time, may amend standard specifications for sidewalks, driveway approaches, and curbs to be built within the City. The specifications may include provisions relating to the kind, type, width, length, location, materials, elevation, and grade of sidewalks, driveway approaches, and curbs. The specifications shall be regarded as the minimum standards reasonably necessary for the health and safety of the public.

2) The City Manager shall adopt and, from time to time, may amend guidelines for the repair of sidewalks and driveway approaches within the City. The guidelines may establish conditions requiring repair provisions relating to the manner of repair, including materials and method, and standards for repair, including the kind, type width, length, location, elevation, and grade of sidewalks and driveway approaches. The guidelines shall be regarded as the minimum standards reasonably necessary for the health and safety of the public.

3) The City Manager may approve exceptions to the standard specifications or guidelines if the circumstances, including but not limited to topography, right-of-way width, pedestrian usage, landscaping, and other aesthetic considerations, reasonably require an exception and the public health and safety will not be unreasonably affected. When granting an exception to the specifications or guidelines, the City Manager may attach conditions which the Manager finds reasonably necessary to protect or enhance the public welfare.
(Ord. 94-20 § 3, 1994)

Section 2.15.050 When improvements required.

1) Newly developed property.

a) The owner of property which abuts any public street improved with hard surface paving and curbs but lacking a sidewalk shall construct a sidewalk within the public right-of-way along the entire frontage of the property when any building on the property, other than an accessory structure as defined in the Land Development Code is constructed, renovated added on to, or remodeled or within three (3) years from final recording of the plat, whichever comes first.

b) No building permit shall be issued for construction, renovation, or remodeling of any building on such property unless the construction plans filed to support the application for the building permit provide for construction of sidewalks and driveway approaches in accordance with this Chapter.

c) Construction of the required sidewalk must be complete and approved by the City within thirty (30) days of completion of the work described in the building permit or occupancy of the building, whichever is sooner.

2) Other property.

The City Manager may determine that the public health and safety require construction of sidewalks or driveway approaches adjacent to property other than that described in subsection (1) above. In that event, the City Manager shall issue an order as provided in Section 2.15.090.
(Ord. 2003-39 §1, 11/17/2003; Ord. 94-20 §3, 1994)

Section 2.15.060 Abandoned driveway approach.

When the City Manager determines that an owner or occupant of a property has discontinued the
use of a driveway approach, the City Manager may issue an order, as provided in Section 2.15.090, requiring the owner to remove the driveway approach and restore or construct a curb and sidewalk in accordance with the provisions of this Chapter.

(Ord. 94-20 § 3, 1994)

Section 2.15.070 Permit requirements.

   No person shall construct or repair any sidewalk, driveway approach, or curb within the public right-of-way unless the person holds a valid City permit to perform the specific work. Applications for the permit shall be made on forms provided by the City and shall specify the name and address of the owner of the property, the location of the property, and the name of the person who will perform the work. A person contracted to perform the work must be registered with the Construction Contractors Board, and must demonstrate to the satisfaction of the City Manager the ability to perform the work in accordance with the City's specifications. A permit fee for the construction of a sidewalk or driveway approach or the cutting or altering of a curb as provided in the fees code (Chapter 8.03) shall be paid to the City at the time the application is filed.

(Ord. 2003-39 §2, 11/17/03; Ord. 95-17 §2, 1995; Ord. 94-20 §3, 1994)

Section 2.15.080 Concrete finisher's qualifications.

   No person shall accept remuneration for constructing or repairing any sidewalk, driveway approach, or curb in the public right-of-way unless the person is registered with the Construction Contractors Board, and has demonstrated to the satisfaction of the City Manager the ability to perform the work in a workmanlike fashion according to the City's specifications.

(Ord. 94-20 § 3, 1994)

Section 2.15.090 Order; notice to owner.

   1) When the City Manager determines that construction, restoration, or repair of a sidewalk is necessary to protect public health and safety, she or he shall issue an order requiring the property owner to perform the required work.

   2) Notice of the City Manager's order shall be served upon the owner by personal service or by certified mail, return receipt requested, directed to the owner at the address on the County assessor's most recent property tax assessment roll. The notice shall be deemed served at the time of personal service, or three days after mailing.

   3) The notice shall state:

      a) The work required to be performed;

      b) That the City has determined the work is necessary for public health and safety;

      c) That the work must be completed in accordance with City standards within sixty (60) days of service of the notice;

      d) That, if the owner fails to complete the work within the required time, the owner may be subject to a fine of $250 per day, the City may perform the work at the owner expense, and the cost of the work performed by the City may become a lien against the property;

      e) That the owner may appeal the order by filing an appeal within ten (10) days of service of the notice.

(Ord. 99-20 § 1, 11/15/1999; Ord. 94-20 § 3, 1994)

(99-20, Amended, 11/15/1999)
Section 2.15.100 Performance of required work by City.

If the owner fails to complete the required work within the time prescribed by a final order, the City may complete the work at the owner's expense. Upon completion of the work, the City Manager shall compile a report containing an itemized statement of costs, including actual administrative costs. (Ord. 94-20 § 3, 1994)

Section 2.15.110 Notice of cost; lien.

1) Upon completion of the report required by Section 2.15.100, the owner shall be served with a notice of costs. The notice of costs shall be served in the manner prescribed by Section 2.15.090.

2) The notice of costs shall state:
   a) The total cost, including administrative costs, of the work performed by the City;
   b) That the costs will accrue interest at the rate of ten (10) per cent per annum, beginning 30 days from service of the notice, and that the costs will become a lien against the property unless paid within 30 days of service of the notice;
   c) That the owner may appeal the cost determination by filing an appeal within ten (10) days of service of the notice.

3) If the costs are not paid within 30 days of a final notice of cost determination, the costs as determined shall be entered in the docket of City liens, and from that time the City shall have a lien upon that described property for the total amount of the charge. That lien shall have priority over all other liens and encumbrances of any character, and may be enforced in any manner permitted by law.

4) Any lien imposed under this Chapter is hereby declared to be an incurred charge imposed on property by reason of the owner failure to meet routine obligations of ownership necessary to protect health and safety. (Ord. 94-20 § 3, 1994)

Section 2.15.120 Appeal.

An owner may appeal the City Manager's order to construct, alter, or repair or the City Manager's determination of costs to a hearings officer. If an appeal is not filed within 10 days from service of the notice, the owner shall be deemed to have waived the right to appeal and the order or determination of costs shall become final. (Ord. 94-20 § 3, 1994)

Section 2.15.130 Appeal procedures.

1) An appeal shall be filed in writing with the City Manager within 10 days of service of notice of an order or cost determination.

2) The appeal shall include a copy of the notice, and shall state the specific reasons for the owner's objection to the order or cost determination.

3) The appeal shall be accompanied by a $50.00, nonrefundable appeal fee. (Ord. 94-20 § 3, 1994)

Section 2.15.140 Hearing.

1) If an appeal is properly filed, a hearing shall be held in accordance with this Section.

2) The hearing shall be held before a hearings officer appointed by the City Manager. The hearing shall be set and conducted within 96 hours of receipt of the request, holidays, Saturdays and
Sundays not to be included. The hearings officer may adopt rules and procedures for the conduct of the hearing. The hearing may be continued to a later date upon the request of the owner. Except as this Chapter or rules adopted by the City Manager prior to the hearing provide otherwise, the hearing shall be conducted in accordance with the Attorney General's Model Rules of Administrative Procedure, 1993 edition.

3) If the appeal is from an order to construct, restore, or repair a sidewalk, curb, or driveway approach, the issue before the hearings officer shall be limited to whether the work ordered is necessary for the health and safety of the public. If the hearings officer determines that it is necessary, the hearings officer shall issue an order requiring that the work be completed within sixty (60) days. If the hearings officer finds that the work is not necessary for the health and safety of the public, the hearings officer shall issue an order so stating.

4) If the appeal is from a cost determination, the issue before the hearings officer shall be limited to the accuracy of the costs assessed. The hearings officer shall issue an order affirming or modifying the costs assessed, and requiring payment within thirty (30) days.

5) The order of the hearings officer shall be made in writing, and shall include a statement of findings supporting the decision.

6) If the owner fails to appear at the scheduled hearing, the hearings officer shall issue an order affirming the City Manager's order or cost determination.

7) The order of the hearings officer shall be served on the City Manager and the owner, by personal service or first-class mail. The notice to the owner, if served by mail, shall be sent to the address provided in the notice of appeal.

8) The decision of the hearings officer shall be final, except that it may be appealed to the City Council as provided in Chapter 1.11. Any appeal to Council must be filed within 10 days of the decision of the hearings officer. If such an appeal is filed, no fines shall be levied, work performed by the City, or liens filed until after resolution of the appeal.

(99-20, Amended, 11/15/1999)

Section 2.15.150 Improvement district.

Nothing in this ordinance shall prevent the City Council from forming a sidewalk improvement district or from improving a sidewalk as a part of any other improvement district.

(Ord. 94-20 § 3, 1994)

Section 2.15.160 Sidewalk repair implementation policy.

The City Manager will develop and maintain an administrative policy for sidewalk repairs abutting private property that provides for City financial and administrative assistance to property owners with the repair of sidewalks and driveways.

(Ord. 94-20 § 3, 1994)

Section 2.15.170 Liability of property owner.

It is not only the duty of all owners of land within the City to keep in repair all sidewalks and driveway approaches existing in front of, along, or abutting upon their respective lots or parcels of land or parts thereof, but the owners are hereby declared to be solely liable for all damages to whomsoever resulting or arising from their fault or negligence in failing to keep any sidewalk or driveway approach in repair.

(Ord. 94-20 § 3, 1994)
Section 2.15.180 Penalties.

Any person who violates any provision of this ordinance shall, upon conviction, be subject to a fine of not more than $250.00. Each day's violation constitutes a separate offense.
(Ord. 94-20 § 3, 1994)

Section 2.15.190 Captions.

The Section captions and headings in this Chapter are for convenience and reference purposes only and shall not affect in any way the meaning or interpretation of this Chapter.
(Ord. 94-20 § 3, 1994)
Jurisdictional Programs to Facilitate Sidewalk Maintenance
By Adjacent Property Owners

Survey Questions

Benchmark Jurisdiction: Fairfield, OH
Person Interviewed: Don Brill, Public Works Department, City of Fairfield
dbrill@fairfield-city.org
(513) 867-4218
Website: http://www.fairfield-city.org/publicworks/sidewalks.cfm

Brief Summary  The city of Fairfield, OH started their program to ensure property owners maintained their sidewalks about 15 years ago due to a couple of lawsuits and the city’s insurance rates going up. The city currently inspects ¼ of the jurisdiction every year (all of the jurisdiction every 4 years). Property owners of non-compliant sidewalks are notified that they are responsible to repair their sidewalks within 60 days of notification. The city offers to repair the sidewalks by the city contractor for typically a less expensive cost to the property owner than if they were to do it through their own contractor. Typically the city repairs 95% of the sidewalks and property owners repair 5% of the sidewalks through their own contractors. If the sidewalk is not repaired within 60 days of notification, the city will make the repair. The property owners are billed by the city for the repair. At the property owners request or if they do not pay the bill, the cost is added to the property tax to be paid over a 5 year period. The city has a commitment to 100% compliance of the areas inspected per year.

Demographics

1. What is your jurisdiction – a city, county?  Incorporated city (no downtown)
   What is the population of your jurisdiction? 42,000

2. What percentage of the population lives in urban versus rural settings?
   99% Urban
   1% Rural

Standards
3. Does your jurisdiction have defined standards for sidewalk pavement condition and accessibility? If so, what are the sources of the standards?

**Yes** Defined standards in which document: **Brochure**

 Basis - Explain

 Don said the standards were defined by their city or possibly other neighboring cities with similar programs. [No crack > 0.5”, no lip > 0.5”, no concrete spalling (surficial breakdown of concrete due to salting for snow and ice)]

**Outreach**

4. How are property owners informed of their responsibility to maintain their sidewalks in safe and accessible condition?

**x** Brochure

 Public Works sends out brochure to property owners who need to make repairs after city-wide inspections determine what sidewalks need replacement.

 **__** Website

 **__** Newsletter

 **__** Real estate agent at time of house purchase

 **__** Other - Explain

 City Council passes ordinance each year requiring property owners to maintain their sidewalks.

**Objectives**

5. Has your jurisdiction made a commitment to having a certain percentage of sidewalks comply with safety and access standards within a specified timeframe? If so, what are the commitments?

 **__** No

 **__** Yes ______% of sidewalks will conform to standards within _____years

 **x** Other – Explain

 100% of sidewalks inspected every year will conform to standards by the end of the year (if not sooner!). The 12 square mile jurisdiction is broken into 4 areas and 1 area is inspected every year, all 4 areas are inspected every 4 years. Last year, the number of sidewalk repairs was 546.

6. Are the commitments for compliance different for sidewalks maintained by your jurisdiction and those for which property owners are responsible?

 **x** No

 **__** Yes - Explain
7. Does the jurisdiction have a method for measuring and reporting year to year improvement in the percentage of sidewalks that are in compliance?

___ No
___ Yes - Explain

They have 100% compliance from year to year for the area inspected.

Identification of Sidewalks in Need of Repair

8. Does the jurisdiction regularly perform jurisdiction-wide audits of sidewalk safety and accessibility? If so, how often are these audits conducted?

x__ Yes, every 4 years the sidewalks throughout the jurisdiction are inspected.
___ No

9. Can you provide an estimate of staff time and resources required to perform these audits? He did not give this estimate separate from the total estimate of time for whole program.

___ Staff hours per year
___ Other resources

10. What methods are available for citizens to report hazards or barriers to accessibility?

___ Jurisdiction website online/downloadable form
___ Phone calls taken to report hazard/barrier Most common method
___ Emails taken to report hazard/barrier
___ Paper form provided at jurisdiction
___ Other - Explain

Call city councilman

11. Does your jurisdiction coordinate with neighboring jurisdictions to ensure consistency of programs? If yes, please explain. Not really, they all have their own programs with similar philosophy. Initially, they borrowed ideas from the neighboring jurisdictions of Hamilton and Middletown, OH.

12. On a yearly basis, approximately what ratio of non-conforming sidewalks is identified by jurisdiction inspections versus citizen complaints?
Methods for Enforcement of Property Owner’s Responsibility to Maintain Sidewalks to Standards

13. Are there ordinances or codes requiring property owners to maintain sidewalks to jurisdictional standards? Yes, he will send.

14. Does the ordinance or code require the property owners to bring sidewalks into compliance within a specified timeframe? If so, what is the timeframe? Yes, 60 days.

15. What is the process for notifying property owners of their responsibility to maintain their sidewalk to standards?

- Property inspected prior to notification to verify non-compliance
- Notification by letter Certified
- Notification by phone
- Other - Explain

If they do not get back the receipt of a certified letter, they will hand deliver the letter.

Property owners are notified from their address on the tax form.

16. How and when do you follow up after notifying a property owner of a noncompliant sidewalk to assess whether a repair is being initiated? City follows up by making repairs after 60 day period and billing the property owner. People are supposed to call if they initiate repair. If there is no response to the notification, city contractor goes there to repair and if repair is already complete they move onto the next repair.

17. Are licensed contractors, inspections and standards for concrete repair required?

Licensed contractors are not required but he wishes they were. Inspections (prior to pouring concrete) and standards for concrete are required. If city contractor is used, no inspections required. City contractor will guarantee their work for 1 year or will replace.
18. In practice, will the jurisdiction initiate repairs if property owner does not make repairs within specified timeframe? Yes – Don did not have an estimate of how many repairs were made by city due to property owner not responding to notification.

**Financing**

19. If your jurisdiction makes repairs, following property owner failure to make the repairs within the specified timeframe, do you bill the property owner? Yes

20. Will the cost of repair be added to the property tax, a lien put on house, or addressed by some other method? Please explain. The cost of repair will first be billed to the property owner and if they do not pay then the city will add cost to their property taxes to be paid over a 5 year period.

21. If a lien is used, where does the funding come from to cover the costs until the house is sold? The cost comes out of the General Fund to pay the contractor until the money is paid back by the property owner.

22. Does your jurisdiction pay for any sidewalk repair on property adjacent to private property such as vegetation removal, grinding of sidewalks, or repair due to street tree damage? No. City will not plant street trees unless property owner wants them.

___ Vegetation removal
___ Grinding of sidewalks < ___ inches
___ Repair due to street tree damage

23. Does your jurisdiction offer any programs to assist property owners who cannot afford repairs?

___ No
x Yes – Explain The property owner can pay off the repair through their property taxes over a 5 year period

**Resources**
24. Approximately, how much staff time in your agency is devoted to working on sidewalk programs/projects and in particular programs that facilitate private property owner maintenance of their sidewalks?

___ FTE or Staff hours per week on sidewalk programs
___ FTE or Staff hours per week on property owner sidewalk maintenance programs

They have 2 part-time inspectors each working 21 hours/week on property owner sidewalk maintenance programs for 10 months out of the year. 42 hours/week total for 10 months

25. Have you received grants to assist with any of the above sidewalk-related activities?

___ No
___ If yes, what activities are funded and what was the source of funds?

26. Can your agency share any forms, tools or efficiency tips? (public education, property owner notification, tracking of property owner repairs, notices of non-compliance, documents relating to jurisdiction initiated repairs) Don will send a package of information about their program, forms they use, and computer programs and spreadsheets. They use a computer program generated in their office (database?) for office information and excel spreadsheet for information to bring in the field.

27. What major challenges did you encounter in the design and implementation of your program? How were these issues addressed? Initially it was challenging to get the citizens to understand the importance of the program and why it was so important but now everyone understands the expectations.

28. Do you have other comments or suggestions? Important to have trained inspectors in the field that have some PR skills in order to help property owners buy in to the importance of the program.

Other information:

The costs of sidewalk repair by the city contractor for one block 4’ x 4’ is $112 and for 5’ x 4’ is $140.

City pays for wheel chair ramps.
March 2009

Dear Resident:

The sidewalk areas in front of your property were recently inspected by the City of Fairfield as part of its sidewalk replacement program. This program is designed to identify cracks and structural deficiencies on sidewalks, driveway aprons, and other such structures along the street in front of your property and to provide an efficient mechanism for the replacement of such problems.

The City of Fairfield apologizes for any inconvenience resulting from this notice. However, sidewalk replacement is an important method of reducing the potential for injury to citizens as well as the liability to you as a property owner and to the City.

As a result of the inspection on your property, the enclosed Exhibit "A" identifies the items in need of replacement which have been marked with paint.

You may arrange to complete this replacement yourself or hire a contractor of your choice. If you choose one of these options, we ask that the replacement be completed no later than sixty (60) days from the date you received this letter, and that you notify the City of your intentions to have the work performed by you or your own contractor. Please remember that replacement must be made in accordance with construction standards of the City of Fairfield. In order to ensure that these standards are met, please contact the City's Construction Services Sidewalk Inspector at 867-4218 for an inspection when the forms are in place and twenty-four (24) hours in advance of the new concrete being poured. By not notifying this office prior to the work being completed, there is no way of knowing if the work meets City standards. If the City is not properly notified, you may be required to remove the work and have it replaced again in order for the proper inspection procedures to occur.

As stated above, you have sixty (60) days to complete the work. After sixty (60) days, the City will contract for any replacement that has not been completed. The City's contractor will perform the work and you will receive a bill. The cost for the City's contractor to replace your sidewalk is $6.40 per square foot of sidewalk and $6.90 per square foot for the apron and the sidewalk area between the apron and your driveway. The City requests you not send payment until you receive an invoice from the City.

Should you choose to defer payment, the City will arrange for the cost of the replacement to be added to your property tax bill as an assessment. Such assessments are collected over a period of five (5) years and include an interest charge and a service charge of 7% on the unpaid balance.

If the City's contractor performs the work, please notify the City of any privately installed underground lines located near the marked sidewalk replacement area. Such lines might include invisible fences, sprinkler systems, cable television, and sump pump drain pipes. Every effort will be made by the City's contractor to avoid damaging these lines. However, the City will not be responsible for damage to any privately installed underground services located within the public right-of-way.

If there are any questions, or if you need additional information, please do not hesitate to contact the Construction Services Sidewalk Inspector at 867-4218.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

David Butsch
Public Works Director

DB:hap

AVAILABLE IN ALTERNATIVE FORMAT
5350 Pleasant Avenue, Fairfield, Ohio 45014  513-867-5300 (TDD-867-5392)
LEGAL NOTICE

To: CITY OF FAIRFIELD PROPERTY OWNERS
IDENTIFIED IN THE ATTACHED EXHIBIT "A"

Please Take Notice That:

(1) On the 12th day of January, 2009, the Council of the City of Fairfield, Ohio, duly passed Resolution No. __1-09__.

(2) Said Resolution No. __1-09__ declared the necessity of replacing certain sidewalks (including aprons, if applicable).

(3) Under the provision of said Resolution you are required to replace the sidewalks (including aprons, if applicable) abutting your property as described in the attached Exhibit "A", in accordance with the plans and specifications heretofore prepared and now on file in the office of the Clerk of Council of said City of Fairfield.

(4) In the event said sidewalks (including aprons, if applicable) are not replaced within sixty (60) days from the date of service of this notice, the Council of said City will cause the replacement to be done and the cost of such replacement will be assessed against your property in the manner provided by law. You may pay the cost of the replacement directly to the City of Fairfield and not be assessed. **Do not remit payment until you receive a bill from the City of Fairfield.**

(5) If you have any questions, please contact the Construction Services Division at 867-4218.

By order of the Council of the City of Fairfield, Ohio.

Dena C. Morsch
Clerk of Council
City of Fairfield, Ohio
City of Fairfield, Ohio
Sidewalk Apron Inspection Report

Reference Number: 510
Inspection Year: 2010

Name: FALCOM PROPERTIES

Street Address
5380 CAMELOT DR
FAIRFIELD OH 45014

Inspected By
Don Brill

Inspection Date:
9/22/2009

Lot # Auditor #
9496 A0700-174-000-163

Estimated Cost of Repairs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of 4&quot; Blocks</th>
<th>Square Feet (4&quot; concrete)</th>
<th>Cost per Ft:</th>
<th>Amounts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$7.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of 7&quot; Blocks</th>
<th>Square Feet (7&quot; concrete)</th>
<th>Cost per Ft:</th>
<th>Amounts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>230.00</td>
<td>$7.50</td>
<td>$1,725.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curbs</th>
<th>Linear Feet (Curbs)</th>
<th>Cost per Ft:</th>
<th>Amounts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$39.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: 2.7" BLOCKS 4X5=40
APRON 10X19=190

Total Estimated Cost: $1,725.00

Tuesday, September 29, 2009
## Invoice Listing for Sidewalks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Auditor No.</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>N-R Owner</th>
<th>Sidewalk</th>
<th>Apron</th>
<th>Curb</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>MIKE/RONDA CORBIN</td>
<td>A0700-069-000-059</td>
<td>5765 CRESTVIES DR,</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>140.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>MARCUS CRAWFORD</td>
<td>A0700-068-000-065</td>
<td>1 GILMORE COURT</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>112.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>TODD/LISA MILLER</td>
<td>A0700-068-000-064</td>
<td>3 GILMORE CT.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>224.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>MIKE/DEBBY OLDING</td>
<td>A0700-068-000-058</td>
<td>4 GILMORE CT.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>112.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>DONALD/LENA NIESON</td>
<td>A0700-068-000-063</td>
<td>5 GILMORE CT.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>140.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>JAMES FELTNER</td>
<td>A0700-068-000-059</td>
<td>6 GILMORE CT.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>120.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>PHILLIP/TERESSA CHERRY</td>
<td>A0700-068-000-062</td>
<td>7 GILMORE CT.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>140.00</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>525.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>BERNARD/KATHY VASKE</td>
<td>A0700-146-000-103</td>
<td>5655 GILMORE DR.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>112.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>GEORGE/E. SAYAF</td>
<td>A0700-146-000-107</td>
<td>5656 GILMORE DR.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>112.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>BRIANA MILLER</td>
<td>A0700-146-000-102</td>
<td>5663 GILMORE DR.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>140.00</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>120.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>TERRY/GLORIA PARKER</td>
<td>A0700-146-000-109</td>
<td>5672 GILMORE DR.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>112.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>TOM/DEBRE PETERS</td>
<td>A0700-130-000-011</td>
<td>5679 GILMORE DR.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>140.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>MORRIS/GLORIA SCHNIEKE</td>
<td>A0700-068-000-076</td>
<td>5680 GILMORE DR.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>140.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>JOHN/MELISSA HAYS</td>
<td>A0700-068-000-077</td>
<td>5690 GILMORE DR.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>495.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>CITY OF FAIRFIELD</td>
<td>A0700-068-000-079</td>
<td>5720 GILMORE DR.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>K/JENNIFER TANAKA</td>
<td>A0700-068-000-009</td>
<td>5728 GILMORE DR.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>405.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>MIKE/JENNIE NUNNELLEY</td>
<td>A0700-068-000-055</td>
<td>5765 GILMORE DR.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>392.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>KELLY CATT</td>
<td>A0700-068-000-051</td>
<td>5774 GILMORE DR.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>LORI HARRINGTON</td>
<td>A0700-069-000-052</td>
<td>2752 RESOR ROAD</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>1,095.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>ROXANN/RUSTON STORER</td>
<td>A0700-069-000-051</td>
<td>2760 RESOR ROAD</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>168.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Tuesday, September 29, 2009*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>STREET</th>
<th>BLOCKS</th>
<th>SQ FT</th>
<th>$</th>
<th>SQ FT</th>
<th>$</th>
<th>PRUSE</th>
<th>FF</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>CRESTVIEW DR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$140.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$140.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>GILMORE CT.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$112.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$112.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>GILMORE CT.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>$224.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$224.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>GILMORE CT.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$112.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$112.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>GILMORE CT.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$140.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$140.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>GILMORE CT.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$120.00</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$120.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>GILMORE CT.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$140.00</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>$525.00</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$665.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>GILMORE DR.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$112.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$112.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>GILMORE DR.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$112.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$112.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>GILMORE DR.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$140.00</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$120.00</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$260.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>GILMORE DR.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$112.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$112.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>GILMORE DR.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$140.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$140.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>GILMORE DR.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$140.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$140.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>GILMORE DR.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>$495.00</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$495.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>GILMORE DR.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td>WATER CAP MISNG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>GILMORE DR.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>$405.00</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$405.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>GILMORE DR.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>$392.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$392.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>GILMORE DR.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>$450.00</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$450.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>PLANET DR.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$120.00</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$120.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>PLANET DR.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>$1,080.00</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$1,080.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>PLANET DR.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$112.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$112.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>RESOR RD.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>$1,095.00</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$1,095.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>RESOR RD.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$168.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$168.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>RESOR RD.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>RESOR RD.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>RESOR RD.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>$975.00</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$975.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>RESOR RD.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>$2,145.00</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$2,145.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                |                |        |        | $      | $      | $      | $      |        |    |              |
|                |                |        |        | $      | $      | $      | $      |        |    |              |

| ORIGINAL TOTAL | 326 | $2,296.00 | 1144 | $8,580.00 | $      | $      | $10,876.00 |    |              |
| LESS CBO       | 0   | $      | 0     | $      | $      | $      | $        |    |              |
| CURRENT TOTAL  | 326 | $2,296.00 | 1144 | $8,580.00 | $      | $      | $10,876.00 |    |              |
## 2010 WARD 1

### AS OF SEPTEMBER 30, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>4''</th>
<th>7''</th>
<th>PRUSE</th>
<th>FF</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># NO.</td>
<td>STREET</td>
<td>BLOCKS</td>
<td>SQ FT</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>SQ FT</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BASED UPON PRUS 2010 BID PRICES

- **4''**: $/SQ. FT | $7.00
- **7''**: $/SQ.FT. | $7.50
- **CURB**: $/LN FT. | $39.00

### # cbo's

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4''</th>
<th>7''</th>
<th>1ST WARD</th>
<th>4F</th>
<th>4H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>REF 6-15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>REF 16-25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>REF 26-35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>REF 36-49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>REF 50-59</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Will the City’s contractor restore my lawn area?

The sidewalk replacement contract includes the provision that the contractor repair or replace any landscaping that may be disturbed by removal and replacement of the sidewalk.

Is the City’s contractor insured?

Yes, the successful bidder for the concrete contract is insured and bonded.

What are the guidelines for replacement?

1. Any block having a crack more than 1/2" wide. Cracked surfaces that are level and solid can be patched. However, if there is a differential, heaved or uneven settlement, then the sidewalk block cannot be patched, but must be replaced as marked.

2. Adjoining blocks or portions thereof whose edges differ vertically by more than 1/2".

3. Blocks that have holes in them 1/2" or larger in diameter or are cracked and broken so that pieces are missing or loose.

4. Blocks having depressions, reverse cross-slope (sloping away from the street).

5. Blocks having a cross-slope in excess of 3/4" vertical per one foot horizontal.

6. Blocks that cause a change in longitudinal grade of the sidewalk of more than 3" in five feet.

7. Blocks where the surface has broken away exposing a very rough surface of coarse stone. (This condition is known as “spalling.”)

8. Brick, stone or sandstone sidewalks are prohibited.

9. Water stop boxes, gas stop boxes, etc., that are not to proper grade will be replaced.

A note of caution:

One of the problems with sidewalk replacement is spalling. This damage can occur on newly poured sidewalks due to the use of salt. The City’s contractor utilizes air entrained concrete and sprays a curing compound on the walk to help prevent spalling from occurring; however, it is a good idea not to use salt on your new walk for the first year. Sand or cinders can be used, as well as a number of non-salt de-icing products.

If someone other than the City’s contractor does the work:

- Use Class C concrete with air entrainment.
- Broom or swirl finish must be used.
- Landscape must be replaced if disturbed during installation.
- Curing compound must be applied the same day the concrete is placed.
- Expansion joints must be placed every 40 feet of newly placed, continuous concrete sidewalk.
- Work must be performed according to City of Fairfield standards: Sidewalks are to be 4 inches thick. Sidewalks between driveways and aprons are to be 7 inches thick. Aprons also are to be 7 inches thick.
- The Construction Services Division must be notified to perform the necessary inspections twenty-four hours prior to placing new concrete by calling 867-4218.

For additional information, please visit the City’s website at http://www.fairfield-city.org/pubworks/pwsidewalk.cfm

Since you have received this brochure, areas of sidewalk on your property have been identified as in need of replacement. Information in this brochure will help explain the program to you.

Should you have questions not answered by the enclosed information, please feel free to call the Fairfield Public Works Department at 867-4218. The office is open Monday - Friday from 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.
From the Department of Public Works

A vital service and responsibility of the City of Fairfield is to address the needs and safety of our neighborhoods. To ensure this safety, Laws and Ordinances are necessary to guarantee and help limit liabilities of not only the City but property owners as well. One such law is Chapter 909 of the City of Fairfield Codified Ordinances which states that it is the property owner’s responsibility to maintain and keep in good repair sidewalks, driveway aprons and the curb lawn area between sidewalks and curb on the edge of the roadway. The Public Works Department presents the information here to summarize the procedures of the City’s Sidewalk Replacement Program. We hope that you find the information useful and understandable.

Why is a sidewalk replacement program necessary?

Fairfield requires developers to provide sidewalks, curbs, paved streets and driveway aprons for the use by pedestrians as well as the motoring public. These improvements were constructed in accordance with specifications in order to assure a long, useful life. However, the strongest pavement materials wear out in time and need to be replaced. There are three major concerns which necessitate a replacement program.

First, the potential of injury due to falling on uneven or broken sidewalks. Our first concern should be the safety of residents and a Sidewalk Replacement Program addresses this issue.

Second, the national rise in liability lawsuits against property owners. A Sidewalk Replacement Program will significantly reduce the possibility of legal action being taken against residents.

Third, by assuring that sidewalks are replaced when necessary, the City keeps its insurance rates down, resulting in a savings of tax dollars for all citizens.

How does the sidewalk replacement program work?

Annually, certain areas of the City are scheduled for inspection based upon a rotation so that every area of the City is inspected once every four years. Inspections are performed by Public Works Department employees. Sidewalk sections in need of replacement are marked with white paint and recorded. Once marked, a notice is sent to the property owner in the spring of the following year by certified mail advising that replacement is necessary. If replacement has not been made by the deadline date stated in the letter, the City will have the replacement made by its contractor. Following completion of the work, the owner will be billed by the City’s Finance Department. Property owners have thirty days in which to pay the bill for replacement. If you choose not to pay, an assessment will be applied against your tax, duplicate and collected as an addition to your property taxes over a five year period.

A nominal interest charge on any unpaid balance will be added to the amount of assessment when certified to the County Auditor for collection with property taxes.

My sidewalk was marked in the fall for replacement. What do I need to do?

Nothing at this time. You will be receiving a letter from the City in the spring, which will explain the program and provide adequate time for you to obtain bids should you wish to have a contractor of your choice perform the work. We mark the sidewalks in the fall in order to collect data for quantities to seek bids from contractors in preparation of the springtime replacement.

How can I have my sidewalk replaced by the City’s contractor?

If you wish to have the City’s contractor replace your sidewalk, simply call the Construction Services Division at 867-4218 or allow the deadline date for replacement as stated in your certified letter to expire when it is sent to you in the spring. This will automatically place your marked sidewalk on the City’s replacement list. The sidewalk replaced by the City’s contractor has a one-year warranty from the date of installation.

Who pays for sidewalk ramps and curbs?

The City assumes the cost for replacement of areas of sidewalk intersections where the sidewalk extends toward the roadway (sometimes called sidewalk ramps). Private walks that extend out from the sidewalk (not at corner crossings) are the responsibility of the property owner.

Curb replacement is scheduled and paid for by the City when the road is resurfaced. To find out when your road is scheduled for resurfacing, contact the Street Division at 867-4212.

Can I do the work myself?

Yes, you may make the necessary replacement yourself or hire a contractor of your choice. All work must be completed according to City of Fairfield standards and requires inspection by the City. Prior to having the concrete poured you will need to contact the Construction Services Division at 867-4218 twenty-four hours in advance for inspection of the forms.
Jurisdictional Programs to Facilitate Sidewalk Maintenance
By Adjacent Property Owners

Survey Questions

Benchmark Jurisdiction: San Jose, CA
Person Interviewed: Eric Newton, Sr. Construction Inspector, Dept of Transportation, City of San Jose
Eric.newton@sanjoseca.gov
(408) 277-8148
Website: http://www.sanjoseca.gov/transportation/s_sidewalks.htm

Brief Summary. The City of San Jose, CA’s program is complaint driven. They received approximately 5300 complaints last year for both sidewalk pavement condition and vegetation barriers. After receiving a complaint and inspecting the sidewalk to verify noncompliance, the city notifies the property owner of their responsibility to repair their sidewalks. If they do not respond, the city notifies the property owner again at 46 days, and 56 days. After 60 days, the city will make the repair. The City of San Jose is committed to 100% compliance of all the sidewalks that are reported by complaints and found to be out of compliance.

Demographics

1. What is the population of your jurisdiction?
   Over 1 million (Wikipedia says in 7/2008 the population was 950,000)

2. What percentage of the population lives in urban versus rural settings?
   ___ Urban
   ___ Rural
   ___ Some rural, mostly urban

Standards

3. Does your jurisdiction have defined standards for sidewalk pavement condition and accessibility? If so, what are the sources of the standards?
   ___ Defined standards in which document: __brochure________
   ___ Basis - Explain
      Standards developed within the department. Cracks no greater than ½” in depth and 1” in width, lips no greater than ½”, slope no greater than 1:8.
Outreach

4. How are property owners informed of their responsibility to maintain their sidewalks in safe and accessible condition?

  x  Brochure – Sent to property owners at time of notification that sidewalk is out of compliance.
  x  Website
  ___ Newsletter
  ___ Real estate agent at time of house purchase
  ___ Other - Explain

Objectives

5. Has your jurisdiction made a commitment to having a certain percentage of sidewalks comply with safety and access standards within a specified timeframe? If so, what are the commitments?

  ___ No
  ___ Yes _____% of sidewalks will conform to standards within_____ years
  x  Other – Explain City has commitment of 100% compliance of sidewalks that have been reported by complaints, inspected and determined to be a hazard.

6. Are the commitments for compliance different for sidewalks maintained by your jurisdiction and those for which property owners are responsible?

  ___ No
  ___ Yes - Explain

7. Does the jurisdiction have a method for measuring and reporting year to year improvement in the percentage of sidewalks that are in compliance?

  ___ No
  ___ Yes - Explain
  There is 100% improvement in the sidewalks that were reported to be out of compliance.

Identification of Sidewalks in Need of Repair
8. Does the jurisdiction regularly perform jurisdiction-wide audits of sidewalk safety and accessibility? If so, how often are these audits conducted?

___ Yes, every ____ years the sidewalks throughout the jurisdiction are inspected.

_x No

9. Can you provide an estimate of staff time and resources required to perform these audits?

___ Staff hours per year
___ Other resources

No inspections except for when there is a complaint.

10. What methods are available for citizens to report hazards or barriers to accessibility?

___ Jurisdiction website online/downloadable form
_x Phone calls taken to report hazard/barrier
_x Emails taken to report hazard/barrier
___ Paper form provided at jurisdiction
___ Other - Explain

11. Does your jurisdiction coordinate with neighboring jurisdictions to ensure consistency of programs? If yes, please explain.

12. On a yearly basis, approximately what ratio of non-conforming sidewalks is identified by jurisdiction inspections versus citizen complaints?

Jurisdiction Inspections

100% Citizen Complaints

5300 complaints last year of which approximately 3000 were sidewalk repairs that were needed versus 2300 due to vegetation removal.

Methods for Enforcement of Property Owner’s Responsibility to Maintain Sidewalks to Standards

13. Are there ordinances or codes requiring property owners to maintain sidewalks to jurisdictional standards?

Yes – municipal code
14. Does the ordinance or code require the property owners to bring sidewalks into compliance within a specified timeframe? If so, what is the timeframe? Yes, 60 days

15. What is the process for notifying property owners of their responsibility to maintain their sidewalk to standards?

___ Property inspected prior to notification to verify non-compliance
___ Notification by letter
___ Notification by phone
___ Other - Explain

16. How and when do you follow up after notifying a property owner of a noncompliant sidewalk to assess whether a repair is being initiated? Initial letter is followed up by another letter after 46 days, and then again after 56 days. After 60 days, city will repair.

17. Are licensed contractors, inspections and standards for concrete repair required? There is an initial and final inspection. It is less expensive for the property owner to hire their own contractor rather than have the city contractor make the repair. City has to pay prevailing wage about $13/ft² and property owners only have to pay about $9/ft².

18. In practice, will the jurisdiction initiate repairs if property owner does not make repairs within specified timeframe? Yes, 100% of time.

Financing

19. If your jurisdiction makes repairs, following property owner failure to make the repairs within the specified timeframe, do you bill the property owner? Yes

20. Will the cost of repair be added to the property tax, a lien put on house, or addressed by some other method? Please explain. He believes the cost is added to the property tax.

21. If a lien is used, where does the funding come from to cover the costs until the house is sold?
22. Does your jurisdiction pay for any sidewalk repair on property adjacent to private property such as vegetation removal, grinding of sidewalks, or repair due to street tree damage?  
City used to grind sidewalks starting in 1999 as a courtesy due to having more money from grants but since 7/1/09 property owners are responsible for all repairs.

___ Vegetation removal  
___ Grinding of sidewalks < ___ inches  
___ Repair due to street tree damage

23. Does your jurisdiction offer any programs to assist property owners who cannot afford repairs?

___ No  
___x Yes – Explain  
City has a hardship program where if property owner income is less than 2 times the national Poverty level, then they will provide a loan to the property owner.

Resources

24. Approximately, how much staff time in your agency is devoted to working on sidewalk programs/projects and in particular programs that facilitate private property owner maintenance of their sidewalks?

___ FTE or Staff hours per week on sidewalk programs  
___ 3.5 FTE FTE or Staff hours per week on property owner sidewalk maintenance programs

25. Have you received grants to assist with any of the above sidewalk-related activities?

___ No  
___ If yes, what activities are funded and what was the source of funds?  
In the past, City had grants to grind sidewalks with a lip that was less than a certain height. This was as a courtesy to the property owners.

26. Can your agency share any forms, tools or efficiency tips? (public education, property owner notification, tracking of property owner repairs, notices of non-compliance, documents relating to jurisdiction initiated repairs)  
GPS units helpful for inspectors to track hazards. Use student interns for office work.
27. What major challenges did you encounter in the design and implementation of your program? How were these issues addressed?

28. Do you have other comments or suggestions?

   Eric noted that the City of Cupertino and City of Campbell have put a charge on their property tax in order for city to use for repairing sidewalk. This type of program eliminates all the expense of notifying and enforcing the sidewalk standards but may increase the liability for the city.

   It is important that the inspectors in the field have skills to talk to property owners about their responsibility to maintain the sidewalks. Inspectors with public relation skills are an important part of maintaining goodwill with the community! Rubber sidewalks are too soft.
SERVICES | SIDEWALKS & PARKSTRIPS

The sidewalk, park strip, and curb and gutter are located next to the street on the front and/or side portion of your property. The curb and gutter are located at the edge of the street pavement. The sidewalk is either separated from the curb by a park strip area, or is located adjacent to the curb.

Who is responsible for maintaining the sidewalk, park strip area and curb gutters?

The property owner is responsible for assuring that this area is properly maintained. By local ordinance and state law (Sections 14.16.2200 14.16.227) of the San Jose Municipal code, and Chapter 22 of Division 7, Part 3 of the California Streets and Highways Code), the owner of the fronting property is responsible for maintaining the sidewalk and park strip area, including the curb and gutter. Maintenance responsibility includes, but is not limited to, repair or replacement of damaged or displaced concrete, abatement of weeds or debris, and the trimming of trees and shrubs.

How does the City decide where sidewalk inspections will occur?

Inspections occur in response to citizen requests or when City employees observe damaged sidewalk.

How is the necessity and extent of concrete repair determined?

Repair of the sidewalk concrete is required if an inspection reveals:

- A sidewalk or concrete park strip where there is a vertical separation of more than one-half inch.
- Ramping, where there is a rise or depression of more than one inch within eight inches in conjunction with a vertical separation.
- A hole or opening in a break or construction joint of one inch or more.
- The breaking away or spalling of concrete with a minimum depth of more than one-half inch.

Curb and gutter repair is required if an inspection reveals:

- Problem in the area where pedestrians normally travel, such as a vertical separation of more than one-half inch or broken away section adjacent to a marginal walk or driveway approach.
- It is part of a driveway approach replacement.
- It represents a problem for vehicles.

How is the need for correction of landscape related problems determined?

- Visibility When park strip shrubbery interferes with vehicle operator visibility, trimming to a maximum height of thirty inches is required.
- Thorny Plants Varieties of cactus and century plants have thorns that could cause serious injury; thus, removal of thorny plants is required.
- Walkway and Gutter Clearance Trimming of ground cover or shrubs is required when there is encroachment onto the sidewalk or gutter.
- Obstacles in the Park Strip Elimination of tree stumps, large rocks, trash, holes, and some built-up planters are required. When the park strip is unimproved or landscaped and there is a drop that exceeds two inches below the concrete walk, the park strip must
be filled with dirt or other material (no asphalt).

**How are property owners notified that sidewalk/park strip repairs are necessary?**

Property owners are mailed a repair notice informing them of the necessary repairs. A permit for the repair is included with the repair notice.

**What are the options available for completing the work?**

- The property owner may do the work or hire a contractor to do the work.
- The property owner may choose to have the City assign the work to a contractor. Upon completion of the work by a City contractor, the property owner will be billed for the cost of the work plus the permit fees.

If within 60 days from the date of the letter/permit no action has been taken to commence with the needed repairs and/or corrections, the City will:

- Use the assessment procedures provided for in the California Streets and Highways Code and the San Jose Municipal Code to have the work completed.

The major steps of this procedure are as follows:

- The owner or person in possession of the property is mailed a "Notice to Repair" followed one week later by a second "Notice to Repair" marked "Second Notice." The property will be inspected. If still no action has been taken, the work will be contracted out. A fee will be charged to cover the cost of administering the contract on all landscape repairs and removal and/or replacement of concrete.
- The property owner is billed for the contract cost plus the administration fee after the work is completed.
- If the property owner elects not to pay the bill, the City Council will hold a public hearing at which the assessment may be protested. If the Council confirms the assessment and the bill remains unpaid, the City will file a lien on the property. The cost of repairs plus interest will then appear on the property owner's next property tax statement.

**What methods are used to repair sidewalks?**

Most sidewalks are repaired by removal and replacement of the concrete. The only exceptions to this are single-family homes with sidewalks raised less than 1 ½ inch. If the raise has a clean straight edge, the sidewalk is marked with the letter "G" and may be ground down to meet the adjacent sidewalk.

To report a sidewalk problem or request an inspection, please call the Sidewalk Section at (408) 277-3158.
Subject Property: [redacted]

Recently we received a request to perform an inspection of the concrete conditions in the public right-of-way adjacent to the property referenced above. Based upon State Law and the San Jose Municipal Code, property owners are responsible for the maintenance of the sidewalk, curb, gutter and parkstrip areas adjacent to their property (please see the enclosed brochure for additional information). Our inspection of the concrete conditions in the sidewalk, curb, gutter and parkstrip areas adjacent to your property revealed deficiencies that you are required to correct. Specifically, you are required to correct the following condition(s):

- Remove and replace 186 square feet of sidewalk marked by green arrows.
- Remove 65 square feet of parkstrip marked with green arrows and replace with dirt.
- Perform concrete sidewalk grinds at 6 locations (grind are marked with the letter [G] and are a max of 5' wide).

You have three options for taking care of this work:

1) You may complete the repair work yourself.
2) You may hire a contractor to do the work for you.
3) You may authorize the City to complete the repairs for you and invoice you for the work.

In all cases, the City will provide all required inspections as part of the required permit fees outlined below. Please note that all repairs performed by you or a contractor hired by you must be consistent with industry quality standards and comply with the terms and conditions of the attached permit. Depending on how you choose to have the repairs completed, below are the estimated costs that will be billed to you by the City after the work has been completed and approved. Please do not send payment until you receive an invoice.

Option 1: All work is performed by you or your own contractor.

- Permit Fees: $90.00

Option 2: You authorize the city to assign all of the work to a city contractor.

- Concrete repair work $2,917.88
- Sidewalk Grinds $173.70
- Permit Fees: $110.00
- Total Estimate: $3,201.58

Option 3: You or your contractor complete all of the concrete repair work and authorize the city to complete the sidewalk grinds.

- Sidewalk Grinds $173.70
- Permit Fees: $20.00
- Total Estimate: $193.70
Option 4: You or your contractor complete the sidewalk grinds and you authorize the city to complete the concrete repair work.

- Concrete repair work $2,917.88  
- Permit Fees:$110.00  
- Total Estimate:$3,027.88

If you elect to authorize the City to make any of the repairs for you, please use the enclosed post card to authorize the City to make the repairs. Check the appropriate box(es), sign and return the post card, and the City will proceed with the repairs.

You will receive an invoice after the repairs are completed and have passed a final inspection. Payments must be made to the City within 30 days from the date of the invoice or the City may seek collections efforts and/or a lien against your property.

Please be advised that work performed by the City on behalf of private property owners is subject to the City's Prevailing Wage Rate policy. As a result, doing the work yourself or hiring your own contractor may be less expensive than authorizing the City to perform the work for you.

If you have not completed the repairs within sixty (60) days of the date of this notice, the City will complete the repairs for you and invoice you for the cost as shown above. The invoice must be paid within the timeframe discussed above or the City may seek collection efforts and/or a lien against your property. If you are unable to complete the repairs within sixty (60) days, you may request a thirty (30) day extension if you provide a copy of a signed contract with a contractor to have the work completed.

Tito Dhanota, Sidewalk Inspector  
Extension # 5  
E-Mail Address  tito.dhanota@sanjoseca.gov
2ND REPAIR NOTICE

October 06, 2009

Subject Property: 1330 SO. SAN JOSE CA 95119

Our records indicate that you have not responded to our request to complete sidewalk repairs adjacent to your property at the above-referenced location. Please understand that according to local ordinance (Sections 14.16.2200 - 14.16.2270 of the San Jose Municipal Code) and state law (Chapter 22 of Division 7, Part 3 of the California Streets and Highway Code), the property owner is responsible for assuring that this area is properly maintained.

The repair notice sent to you asked that you correct the following condition(s):

- Remove and replace 186 square feet of sidewalk marked by green arrows.
- Remove 65 square feet of parkstrip marked with green arrows and replace with dirt.
- Perform concrete sidewalk grind at 6 locations (grind are marked with the letter [G] and are a max of 5’ wide).

You may do the work yourself, hire a contractor, or authorize the City to complete the repairs for you. **If you want the City to complete the repair(s), your estimated cost is $3,201.58.** Included in this estimated cost is a $110.00 Permit fee charged by the City.

You are further notified that if within 14 days after the date of this notice, you have not commenced or are not proceeding with the completion of said repairs, the City of San Jose shall complete said repairs and bill you for the cost estimate amount shown above.

If you have already corrected the items listed above, please call our office at **(408) 277-3158** and request a final inspection if you have not already done so. Please be advised that subsequent repair notices are automatically generated until the work is completed and approved.

Sincerely,

Tito Dhanota, Sidewalk Inspector
Extension # 5

E-Mail Address: tito.dhanota@sanjoseca.gov
FINAL REPAIR NOTICE

October 14, 2009

San Jose State University  Mike Ham
1200 E. 16TH ST.
SAN JOSE 95112

Subject Property: WASHINGTON SQ, SAN JOSE 95112

Our records indicate that you have not responded to our request to complete sidewalk repairs adjacent to your property at the above-referenced location. Please understand that according to local ordinance (Sections 14.16.2200 - 14.16.2270 of the San Jose Municipal Code) and state law (Chapter 22 of Division 7, Part 3 of the California Streets and Highway Code), the property owner is responsible for assuring that this area is properly maintained.

The repair notice sent to you asked that you correct the following condition(s):

- Remove and replace 186 square feet of sidewalk marked by green arrows.
- Remove 65 square feet of parkstrip marked with green arrows and replace with dirt.

You may do the work yourself, hire a contractor, or authorize the City to complete the repairs for you. **If you want the City to complete the repair(s), your estimated cost is $3,201.58** Included in this estimated cost is a $110.00 Permit fee charged by the City.

You are further notified that if within 7 days after the date of this notice, you have not commenced or are not proceeding with the completion of said repairs, the City of San Jose shall complete said repairs and bill you for the cost estimate amount shown above.

If you have already corrected the items listed above, please call our office at **(408) 277-3158** and request a final inspection if you have not already done so. Please be advised that subsequent repair notices are automatically generated until the work is completed and approved.

Sincerely,

Tito Dhanota, Sidewalk Inspector  Extension # 5

E-Mail Address tito.dhanota@sanjoseca.gov

NO3
Sidewalk Repair
PERMIT

All work involving the removal and replacement of concrete must comply with the following conditions:

1. Remove concrete at cold joints or by saw cutting at paint markings.
2. Remove all tree roots within 12 inches of the bottom of the concrete, except:
   a. No pruning of roots within 12 inches from the trunk at ground level.
   b. No pruning of roots greater than 4 inches in diameter on trees greater than 30 inches in diameter.
   c. No pruning of roots on Historic American Elms in the downtown area.
3. Inspection by City staff of concrete forms prior to pouring is required only for curb and gutter repairs.
   Please provide the City a 24-hour advance notice for curb and gutter forms inspections.
4. Use a 3,000 psi (pound per square inch) 6-sack concrete mix.
5. Finished surfaces shall be troweled with a "light" broom finish of a "professional" appearance meeting industry standards.
6. Sidewalk grinding shall be performed so that the sidewalk has a smooth surface.
   a. The finish slope shall be a maximum of 8:1.
   b. Grinds shall be performed the entire width of the sidewalk. No portion of a vertical separation shall remain at the completion of a grind.
7. Any work performed that is not consistent with industry standards or these provisions will not be accepted by the City and must be corrected immediately.
8. All work must be completed within 60 days from the date on this notice. You may request a 30 day extension if you provide a copy of a signed contract with a contractor to have the work completed.
9. After the repairs are completed, please call the number below for a final inspection. The City will perform the final inspection within 14 days of your request. If the repairs are consistent with industry standards and these provisions, your repair file will be closed.
10. If the work is not accepted and you do not make the corrections requested by the City, the City will proceed with completing the repairs and bill you for the work completed.

The City of San Jose does not endorse or guarantee the work of any contractor. To find a qualified contractor, you might try the newspapers or yellow pages of your telephone book.

After you complete the repairs, PLEASE CALL FOR A FINAL INSPECTION, so we may close your file. We will perform final inspections within 14 days of your request. Your cooperation is greatly appreciated. If you need assistance, please call the sidewalk section at (408) 277-3158.
SIDEWALK REPAIR PROGRAM
FINANCIAL HARDSHIP INFORMATION

This information is for property owners requesting financial hardship consideration in relation to sidewalk repairs. Financial hardship assistance is available to owner-occupied, single family residences only. Approval of Financial Hardship assistance is limited to available funding; although applicants may qualify under the current income guidelines, assistance may be denied if funding is not available.

On approval of this application, the City will perform the subject repairs at no cost to the property owner. In order to qualify for financial assistance, the property owner must meet the following guidelines:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF PERSONS IN FAMILY</th>
<th>ANNUAL INCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$21,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$29,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$36,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$44,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$51,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$59,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>$66,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$74,020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Guidelines are twice the “National Poverty Level”

If you do not meet these guidelines, but have special circumstances that you feel you would like to have reviewed, please complete the application. If you have any questions, call 277-3158. Please mail the completed application and necessary documents to: City of San Jose, Sidewalk Repair Program, 1404 Mabury Road, San Jose, CA 95133.
CITY OF SAN JOSE
Request for Financial Hardship
Sidewalk Repair Program

Name: ____________________________  
Social Security Number: ______________  Telephone Number: ______________
Mailing Address: ____________________________
Sidewalk Repair Address: ____________________________

Reason for requesting Financial Hardship assistance:
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Total Gross Household Income is:  Monthly $ _______  Annual $ _______

PROOF OF INCOME IS REQUIRED IN ORDER TO PROCESS THIS APPLICATION:
You must include a copy of your current Federal Income Tax Return (form 1040 or 1040A) and copies of all the following that apply to your application:
*Letter 1722 from the IRS for non-income adults (1-800-829-1040)
*Previous year's Verification of Social Security Income (SSI)(1-800-772-1213)
*The previous year's Welfare or General Assistance eligibility (Notice of Action/Income Verification)
* The previous year's Documentation of Unemployment Development Department (EDD) (408-436-5600)

Total Number of Dependents:
Please list names and relationship to the applicant; if no dependents, please indicate "none".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I declare, under penalty of perjury that the foregoing statement and information provided by me is true and correct, and I am aware that the City of San Jose will perform a credit check to verify the above information.

Signature: ____________________________  Date: ______________

You will be notified within 30 days of the disposition of your request for Hardship

For official use only

Hardship is:  Granted  Denied

Signature ____________________________  Date: ______________

Reason for Denial:
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
**Property Summary**

- **APN**
- **House number or description**
- **Alpha**
- **Dir**
- **Street Name**
- **Suffix**
- **City**
- **Zip**
- **Zoning**

**Property Location**

**Owner**

- **First Name**
- **M I**
- **Last Name**
- **Phone #**
- **Mail Address**
- **City, ST**
- **Zip**
- **O/O**

**Complaint Info.**

- **Received By**
- **Override**
- **Call Y**
- **Complaint Date and Time**
- **Priority**
- **Date Assigned**
- **Date Insp.**
- **Inspector**

**Inspection Requested**

- **Sidewalk**
- **Driveway Approch**
- **Curb And Gutter**
- **Landscape**
- **Park Strip**
- **PS Fill Only**
- **Root Barrier**
- **Other**

**Landscaping Items**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSC</th>
<th>WDA</th>
<th>S30</th>
<th>PST</th>
<th>PPT</th>
<th>RIT</th>
<th>Hrs.</th>
<th>Grinds</th>
<th>GB</th>
<th>SW</th>
<th>DW</th>
<th>C/G</th>
<th>PS RF</th>
<th>PS FO</th>
<th>RB</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>&lt;1&quot;</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>&gt;1&quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Inspection Results**

- **Comments To Propertyowner**
- **Inspection Notes**
  - Issued Permit to Mike Ham @ San Jose State on 08/14/09.
  - Location is on 4th St. adj. to Main Entrance Parking Garage between San Carlos & San Salvador. Need

**Letters**

- **Hardship Received**
- **Hardship App. Mailed**
- **Hardship Approved**

**Construction**

- **Grinder**
- **R&R**
- **Landscape**
- **Other**
- **PW Contractor**
- **AC Patch**

**ESTIMATE**

- **No Invoice**
- **Finance Remarks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SW</th>
<th>DW</th>
<th>C/G</th>
<th>PS</th>
<th>PSFO</th>
<th>RB</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$13.43</td>
<td>$14.67</td>
<td>$50.46</td>
<td>$50.46</td>
<td>$4.13</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R&amp;R Total</th>
<th>LS Total</th>
<th>Fee</th>
<th>Gr. total</th>
<th>Invoice Date</th>
<th>Invoice #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$143.00</td>
<td>$3,201.58</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WHO MAKES THE REPAIRS?
You may complete the repair work yourself or hire a contractor to do the work for you; it is your choice. However, all concrete work must comply with the following conditions:
1. Remove concrete at cold joints or by saw cutting at paint marks.
2. Remove all tree roots (less than 4” in diameter) within 12 inches of the top of the concrete.
3. Use 3,000 psi 6 sack concrete mix.
4. Concrete shall have a minimum depth of 4 inches for sidewalks, 6 inches for driveway approaches and gutters, and 12 inches for curbs.
5. Forms inspections are required on all curb and gutter repairs.
6. Score marks shall match adjacent sidewalk or curb & gutter section patterns.
7. Finished surface shall be a towed, “light” broom finish, and have a “professional” appearance.

CAN ANYTHING BE DONE TO MINIMIZE FUTURE CONCRETE DISPLACEMENT BY TREE ROOTS?
To reduce the chance of future concrete displacement, trees can be root-pruned and a plastic barrier installed as shown:

In this procedure, tree roots within 12 inches of the surface are severed and a root barrier is installed to prevent future root growth in this area. Root pruning should only be done on one side (curb or sidewalk) of the tree at a time, with a two-year interval doing the other side. Care must be taken when root pruning to avoid underground utilities. Before any work is performed, the property owner must obtain a permit from the Arborist Section (408-277-2762).

WHAT ARE THE OPTIONS AND PROCESS FOR PROPERTY OWNERS
Property owners may do the work themselves, hire a contractor, or have the City assign the work to a contractor to complete the repairs. Upon completion of the work by a City contractor the property owner will be billed for the work plus the permit fees.
If within 60 days from the date of the letter no action is taken to commence with the needed repairs and/or corrections, the City will use the assessment procedure provided for in the California Streets and Highway Code and the San Jose Municipal Code to have the work completed. The property owner will be billed for the repairs plus the permit fee after the work is completed. If the property owner elects not to pay the bill, the City Council will hold a public hearing at which time the assessment may be protested. If the Council confirms the assessment and the bill remains unpaid, the City will file a lien on the property. The cost of the repairs and fees, plus interest will then appear on the property owner’s next property tax statement.

HOW CAN I FIND A CONTRACTOR?
The yellow pages or the classified section of the newspaper are a good place to start. The property owner must obtain the permit, and insure that the inspections are made and the work is done in accordance with City standards.

HOW IS THE NEED FOR CORRECTION OF LANDSCAPE DETERMINED?
Landscape correction notices are sent to those properties which have landscaping interfering with the public right-of-way.
The following are some of the things which may trigger a notification to the property owner:
• Visibility – When park strip shrubbery interferes with vehicle operator visibility, trimming to a maximum height of thirty inches is required.
• Thorny Plants – Varieties of cactus and century plants have thorns that could cause serious injury; thus, removal of thorny plants is required.
• Wideway and Gutter Clearance – Trimming of ground cover or shrubs is required where there is any encroachment onto the sidewalk or gutter.
• Obstacles in the Park Strip – Elimination of tree stumps, large rocks, trash, holes, and some built-up planter areas is required. When the park strip is unimproved or landscaped and there is a drop that exceeds two inches below the concrete walk, the park strip must be filled with dirt or other material (no asphalt).

SIDEWALK MAINTENANCE SECTION
(408) 277-3158
(www.sanjoseca.gov/transportation)

For more information or to obtain a permit call
(408) 277-3158.
WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR MAINTAINING THE SIDEWALK,
PARK STRIP AREA AND CURB & GUTTERS?
The property owner is responsible for maintaining the sidewalk, park strip area and curb & gutters adjacent to their property (Sections 14.16.2200 – 14.16.2270 of the San Jose Municipal Code and Chapter 22 of Division 7, Part 3 of the California Streets and Highways Code). Maintenance responsibility includes repair of damaged concrete, abatement of weeds or debris and the trimming of trees and shrubs. For more information on trees and shrubs, see the section entitled “Correction of Landscape” on the back of this brochure.

WHAT SERVICES ARE PROVIDED BY THE CITY?
The City will provide the following services:
- Provide all necessary inspections
- Enforce all repairs and violations
- Hardship Assistance

◊ INSPECTIONS
Inspections of damaged sidewalks will occur in response to citizen requests or when City employees observe sidewalk damage. For sidewalk damage that requires replacement of concrete, the City will mark the area with green arrows. For minor sidewalk raises, the City will mark the sidewalk with the letter “G” for grinding only. Property owners are then issued a repair notice and a permit by mail. Property owners have the option to hire their own contractor or assign the work to the City and be billed for the cost of repairs.

Final inspections and curb & gutter forms inspections are required on all repairs.

◊ PERMITS
Permits are required for all sidewalk repairs. Property owners may request a permit by calling (408) 277-3158.

◊ ENFORCEMENT
If a property owner fails to make the repairs within the prescribed time, the City will perform the needed repairs and bill the property owner for the work. For more information on the options and process, see the back of this brochure.

◊ HARDSHIP ASSISTANCE
The City will complete sidewalk removal and replacement work at no cost for qualifying low-income residents. This program is based on available funding. To request a Hardship Application, please call (408) 277-3158.

Help the city and your neighbors by providing a safe and attractive neighborhood for everyone to enjoy!
Appendix C

Standards
Sidewalk Standards Used to Determine Compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act

The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) was passed in 1990 to protect the civil rights of persons with disabilities. It prohibits discrimination on the basis of disability in many areas including transportation. The ADA requires the establishment of design criteria for the construction and alteration of facilities. These requirements, which have been developed by the U. S. Access Board, are known as the ADA Accessibility Guidelines (ADAAG).

The U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) and the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) published the identical sections 1-10 of the ADAAG in 1991 as the ADA Standards for Accessible Design. The ADA Standards for Accessible Design are enforceable under the ADA whereas the ADAAG are only advisory.

Although public and private entities that design, construct or alter sidewalks are obligated under the ADA to make them accessible to and usable by people with disabilities, accessibility standards for public sidewalks (with the exception of the curb ramp requirements) have not yet been developed. The U.S. Access Board added four additional sections to the ADAAG in 1994 including proposed public right-of-way guidelines. The proposed guidelines received negative feedback and thus the Access Board decided to withdraw the guidelines. The Board is currently developing new guidelines for public rights-of-way. The Revised Draft Guidelines were published in 2005 and can be found at the following website (http://www.access-board.gov/prowac/draft.htm#r3). The draft guidelines that relate to property owner maintenance of sidewalks are listed below. Final guidelines are expected to be available by the end of 2010. In order to become enforceable under ADA, the Public Rights-of-Way section of the ADAAG would have to be incorporated into the ADA Standards for Accessible Design by DOJ and DOT.

R301 Pedestrian Access Route

R301.3.1 Continuous Width. The minimum continuous and unobstructed clear width of a pedestrian access route shall be 1.2 m (4.0 ft), exclusive of the width of the curb.

R301.4.1 Cross Slope. The cross slope of the walkway of a pedestrian access route shall be 2 percent maximum.

R301.4.2 Street or Highway Grade. Where the walkway of a pedestrian access route is contained within a street or highway border, its grade shall not exceed the general grade established for the adjacent street or highway.

R301.5 Surface. The surface of the pedestrian access route shall be firm, stable and slip resistant.

R301.5.2 Surface Discontinuities. Surface discontinuities shall not exceed 13 mm (0.50 in) maximum. Vertical discontinuities between 6.4 mm (0.25 in) and 13
mm (0.5 in) maximum shall be beveled at 1:2 minimum. The bevel shall be applied across the entire level change. **R301.7 Horizontal Openings**

**R301.7.1 Walkway Joints and Gratings.** Openings shall not permit passage of a sphere more than 13 mm (0.5 in) in diameter. Elongated openings shall be placed so that the long dimension is perpendicular to the dominant direction of travel.

**R401 Protruding Objects**

**R401.1 General.** Protruding objects on sidewalks and other pedestrian circulation paths shall comply with R401 and shall not reduce the clear width required for pedestrian access routes.

**R401.2 Protrusion Limits.** Objects with leading edges more than 685 mm (27 in) and not more than 2 m (80 in) above the finish surface or ground shall protrude 100 mm (4 in) maximum horizontally into the pedestrian circulation path.

**Pedestrian Access Route (Sidewalk) Maintenance Standards for Santa Cruz County and Benchmark Jurisdictions**

**Surface**

Capitola - Surface should not have cracking exceeding ½ inch vertical or horizontal.
Santa Cruz – Breaking or spalling* shall not exceed a depth of ½ inch.
Scotts Valley - Not available.
Watsonville - Breaking or spalling* shall not exceed a depth of ½ inch.
Unincorporated County – Not available
Corvallis, OR– Surface shall not be a very rough surface that would cause a tripping hazard. Surface shall not have severe cracking resulting in loose or unstable pieces.
Fairfield, OH – Surface shall not be a very rough surface of coarse stone (spalling*).
San Jose, CA – Breaking away or spalling* shall not exceed a depth of ½ inch.
Access Board Draft Guidelines – Surface shall be firm, stable and slip resistant.

**Vertical Separation**

Capitola - Shall not exceed ½ inch.
Santa Cruz – Shall not exceed 1/2 inch.
Scotts Valley - Not available.
Watsonville - Shall not exceed ½ inch.
Unincorporated County – Not available
Corvallis, OR – Shall not exceed 1 inch.
Fairfield, OH – Shall not exceed ½ inch.
San Jose, CA – Shall not exceed ½ inch.
Access Board Draft Guidelines – Shall not exceed ½ inch.

**Horizontal Separation**

Capitola - Shall not exceed ½ inch.
Santa Cruz – Shall not exceed 3/8 inch.
Scotts Valley - Not available.
Watsonville - Shall not exceed ½ inch.
Unincorporated County – Not Available
Corvallis, OR – Shall not exceed 1 inch.
Fairfield, OH – Shall not exceed ½ inch.
San Jose, CA – Shall not exceed 1 inch.
Access Board Draft Guidelines – Shall not exceed ½ inch.

**Ramping**

Capitola - Cross slope shall not exceed 2 percent
Santa Cruz – Shall not exceed a rise or depression of 1 inch vertical to 8 inches horizontal in conjunction with a vertical separation.
Scotts Valley - Not available.
Watsonville - Cross slope shall not exceed 2 percent
Unincorporated County – ADA compliance required
Corvallis, OR - Cross slope shall not exceed ¾ inch vertical to 1 foot horizontal.
Fairfield, OH – Cross slope shall not exceed ¾ inch vertical to 1 foot horizontal.
San Jose, CA - Shall not exceed a rise or depression of 1 inch vertical to 8 inches horizontal in conjunction with a vertical separation.
Access Board Draft Guidelines – Cross slope shall not exceed 2 percent.

**Obstacles**

Capitola - 3-foot clearance must be maintained around above grade obstacles.
Santa Cruz – No encroachment of ground cover or shrubs onto sidewalk.
Scotts Valley – Not available.
Watsonville - Minimum of 36” clear around obstacle
Unincorporated County – ADA compliance required Corvallis, OR -
Fairfield, OH – Water stop boxes, gas stop boxes, etc. need to be at proper grade.
San Jose, CA -
Access Board Draft Guidelines – Protruding objects shall not reduce clear width as required for pedestrian access routes.

* Spalling - Spalling is a result of water entering brick, concrete or natural stone and forcing the surface to peel, pop out or flake off. This is because there is salt in water. Salt pushes outward from the inside. Eventually, spalling can cause crumbling and destruction of a structure.
Appendix D

Resources
United States Department of Transportation
Policy Statement on Bicycle and Pedestrian Accommodation
Regulations and Recommendations
Signed on March 11, 2010 and announced March 15, 2010

(http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bikeped/policy_accom.htm)

Note: Also available on the United States Department of Transportation Website

Purpose
The United States Department of Transportation (DOT) is providing this Policy Statement to reflect the Department’s support for the development of fully integrated active transportation networks. The establishment of well-connected walking and bicycling networks is an important component for livable communities, and their design should be a part of Federal-aid project developments. Walking and bicycling foster safer, more livable, family-friendly communities; promote physical activity and health; and reduce vehicle emissions and fuel use. Legislation and regulations exist that require inclusion of bicycle and pedestrian policies and projects into transportation plans and project development. Accordingly, transportation agencies should plan, fund, and implement improvements to their walking and bicycling networks, including linkages to transit. In addition, DOT encourages transportation agencies to go beyond the minimum requirements, and proactively provide convenient, safe, and context-sensitive facilities that foster increased use by bicyclists and pedestrians of all ages and abilities, and utilize universal design characteristics when appropriate. Transportation programs and facilities should accommodate people of all ages and abilities, including people too young to drive, people who cannot drive, and people who choose not to drive.

Policy Statement
The DOT policy is to incorporate safe and convenient walking and bicycling facilities into transportation projects. Every transportation agency, including DOT, has the responsibility to improve conditions and opportunities for walking and bicycling and to integrate walking and bicycling into their transportation systems. Because of the numerous individual and community benefits that walking and bicycling provide — including health, safety, environmental, transportation, and quality of life — transportation agencies are encouraged to go beyond minimum standards to provide safe and convenient facilities for these modes.

Authority
This policy is based on various sections in the United States Code (U.S.C.) and the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) in Title 23—Highways, Title 49—Transportation, and Title 42—The Public Health and Welfare. These sections, provided in the Appendix, describe how bicyclists and pedestrians of all abilities should be involved throughout the planning process, should not be adversely affected by other transportation projects, and should be able to track annual obligations and expenditures on nonmotorized transportation facilities.
Recommended Actions

The DOT encourages States, local governments, professional associations, community organizations, public transportation agencies, and other government agencies, to adopt similar policy statements on bicycle and pedestrian accommodation as an indication of their commitment to accommodating bicyclists and pedestrians as an integral element of the transportation system. In support of this commitment, transportation agencies and local communities should go beyond minimum design standards and requirements to create safe, attractive, sustainable, accessible, and convenient bicycling and walking networks. Such actions should include:

- Considering walking and bicycling as equals with other transportation modes: The primary goal of a transportation system is to safely and efficiently move people and goods. Walking and bicycling are efficient transportation modes for most short trips and, where convenient intermodal systems exist, these nonmotorized trips can easily be linked with transit to significantly increase trip distance. Because of the benefits they provide, transportation agencies should give the same priority to walking and bicycling as is given to other transportation modes. Walking and bicycling should not be an afterthought in roadway design.
- Ensuring that there are transportation choices for people of all ages and abilities, especially children: Pedestrian and bicycle facilities should meet accessibility requirements and provide safe, convenient, and interconnected transportation networks. For example, children should have safe and convenient options for walking or bicycling to school and parks. People who cannot or prefer not to drive should have safe and efficient transportation choices.
- Going beyond minimum design standards: Transportation agencies are encouraged, when possible, to avoid designing walking and bicycling facilities to the minimum standards. For example, shared-use paths that have been designed to minimum width requirements will need retrofits as more people use them. It is more effective to plan for increased usage than to retrofit an older facility. Planning projects for the long-term should anticipate likely future demand for bicycling and walking facilities and not preclude the provision of future improvements.
- Integrating bicycle and pedestrian accommodation on new, rehabilitated, and limited-access bridges: DOT encourages bicycle and pedestrian accommodation on bridge projects including facilities on limited-access bridges with connections to streets or paths.
- Collecting data on walking and biking trips: The best way to improve transportation networks for any mode is to collect and analyze trip data to optimize investments. Walking and bicycling trip data for many communities are lacking. This data gap can be overcome by establishing routine collection of nonmotorized trip information. Communities that routinely collect walking and bicycling data are able to track trends and prioritize investments to ensure the success of new facilities. These data are also valuable in linking walking and bicycling with transit.
- Setting mode share targets for walking and bicycling and tracking them over time: A byproduct of improved data collection is that communities can establish targets for increasing the percentage of trips made by walking and bicycling.
- Removing snow from sidewalks and shared-use paths: Current maintenance provisions require pedestrian facilities built with Federal funds to be maintained in the same manner as other roadway assets. State Agencies have generally established levels of service on various routes especially as related to snow and ice events.
- Improving nonmotorized facilities during maintenance projects: Many transportation agencies spend most of their transportation funding on maintenance rather than on constructing new facilities. Transportation agencies should find ways to make facility improvements for pedestrians and bicyclists during resurfacing and other maintenance projects.
Conclusion

Increased commitment to and investment in bicycle facilities and walking networks can help meet goals for cleaner, healthier air; less congested roadways; and more livable, safe, cost-efficient communities. Walking and bicycling provide low-cost mobility options that place fewer demands on local roads and highways. DOT recognizes that safe and convenient walking and bicycling facilities may look different depending on the context — appropriate facilities in a rural community may be different from a dense, urban area. However, regardless of regional, climate, and population density differences, it is important that pedestrian and bicycle facilities be integrated into transportation systems. While DOT leads the effort to provide safe and convenient accommodations for pedestrians and bicyclists, success will ultimately depend on transportation agencies across the country embracing and implementing this policy.

Ray LaHood, United States Secretary of Transportation
California Streets and Highway Code, Chapter 22, Article 2, Section 5610

The owners of lots or portions of lots fronting on any portion of a public street or place when that street or place is improved or if and when the area between the property line of the adjacent property and the street line is maintained as a park or parking strip, shall maintain any sidewalk in such condition that the sidewalk will not endanger persons or property and maintain it in a condition which will not interfere with the public convenience in the use of those works or areas save and except as to those conditions created or maintained in, upon, along, or in connection with such sidewalk by any person other than the owner, under and by virtue of any permit or right granted to him by law or by the city authorities in charge thereof, and such persons shall be under a like duty in relation thereto.
**Barden v. City of Sacramento**

The Americans with Disabilities Act requires all programs, services and activities of state and local governments to be accessible. The concept is commonly referred to as “program access.”

Program access to existing facilities was required by January 26, 1995. However, some cities argued that sidewalks did not constitute a city program, service or activity.

When the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals dismissed this argument in 2002, in *Barden v. City of Sacramento*, cities were required to reconsider their responsibilities to provide accessible sidewalks.

*Barden* issues, findings, and terms of settlement are described at the following City of Sacramento web address.

(www.cityofsacramento.org/generalservices/documents/BAgreement.doc)
Caltrans settles lawsuit over disabled access

The agency proposes to spend $1.1 billion to ease use of sidewalks, crosswalks and park-and-ride facilities. A judge and federal officials must review the 30-year deal.

By Dan Weikel

December 23, 2009

In a landmark court settlement proposed Tuesday, Caltrans agreed to spend $1.1 billion over the next 30 years to repair and improve state-controlled sidewalks, crosswalks and park-and-ride facilities so they are accessible for people with disabilities.

The settlement, filed at the federal courthouse in Oakland, was a major victory for civil rights activists, who have been battling for years with the transportation agency to provide equal access to public rights-of-way for the blind and those who use wheelchairs, canes or walkers.

Advocates said they hoped that the agreement would become a national model for resolving disputes between the disabled and other state and local governments.

The class-action lawsuit that sparked the settlement has been closely watched by local officials and powerful municipal organizations, such as the National League of Cities and the League of California Cities. The groups have long contended that such lawsuits unnecessarily burden financially strapped cities that are already struggling to comply with federal and state access requirements.

"We have won a significant victory," said Ben Rockwell, 64, of Long Beach, a wheelchair user who has long complained to Caltrans about poor sidewalk conditions along Pacific Coast Highway. "While this work might not be finished in my lifetime, I hope that future generations will see better access throughout all areas of the state because of what has been done here."

The settlement applies to about 2,500 miles of sidewalk, crosswalks and 300 park-and-ride facilities that are owned and maintained by Caltrans. Intersections, pedestrian overpasses and underpasses are also subject.

Attorneys from Disability Rights Advocates, a nonprofit law firm based in Berkeley, contend that miles of sidewalk are impassible for people with handicaps and that thousands of required wheelchair ramps along state routes are either missing, do not comply with federal law or lack warnings such as bumps that the blind can feel underfoot.
The conditions, they say, are dangerous and can force wheelchair users, for example, to detour onto streets.

Hundreds of thousands of Californians with disabilities will be affected by the agreement. At least 300,000 people in the state have serious vision impairments, 350,000 use wheelchairs, and about 700,000 rely on walkers, canes or crutches. The numbers are expected to increase significantly as the baby boom generation ages.

"This settlement is a win-win," said Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger. "It would be inexcusable to continue to delay these modifications. Instead of debating this through the legal process for the next decade, costing millions of taxpayer dollars, we are taking action to get this work completed."

The settlement will pay for remedying access problems at tens of thousands of sites along Caltrans sidewalks and at other pedestrian facilities. Department officials said the money would come from the State Highway Operation and Protection Program, a pool of state and federal funds.

Under the agreement, the state will spend $25 million per year for the first five years, $35 million per year for the next 10 years, $40 million per year for the 10 years after that, and $45 million per year for the final five years.

The amount is far greater than the $10 million a year Caltrans had budgeted to bring walkways and other pedestrian facilities into compliance.

In addition, Caltrans agreed to upgrade existing curb ramps that do not comply with access laws, and to install curb ramps where needed when existing roads are resurfaced or reconstructed. Similarly, Caltrans must comply with state and federal access laws for new construction and provide temporary pedestrian routes around those sites that can be used by everyone.

Former Caltrans Director Will Kempton estimated in 2008 that the agency needed to install about 10,000 curb ramps statewide, retrofit about 50,000 existing curb ramps, reconstruct hundreds of miles of sidewalk and modify pedestrian crossings at 15,000 intersections, including the installation of audible signals for the blind.

Before it is finalized, the settlement proposal needs to be reviewed by a federal judge, participants in the class-action suit and the U.S. Department of Justice. The court also must approve legal fees and costs to be paid by Caltrans. The estimates range between $3.75 million and $8.75 million.

"This settlement is unprecedented in terms of its money and scope," said Mary-Lee Kimber, an attorney for Disability Rights Advocates. "We commend Caltrans. Improving sidewalks is a major step toward integrating people with disabilities into the community at large."

Californians for Disability Rights Inc., the California Council for the Blind, Rockwell, and Dimitri Belser, 51, of Berkeley, who has a vision impairment, filed the federal lawsuit in August 2006. They alleged that Caltrans had violated the 1990 Americans with Disabilities Act, a federal law that requires improvements in accessibility whenever sidewalks or other pedestrian facilities are built or undergo major repairs.

The lawsuits specifically mention Pacific Coast Highway in Long Beach and California 13, known in Berkeley as Ashby Avenue. Shortly after the case against Caltrans went to trial in September, U.S. District Judge Saundra Brown Armstrong discontinued the testimony and ordered both sides to discuss the
possibility of a settlement. "We have always been trying to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act," said Ronald Beals, Caltrans' chief counsel. "But we knew there were needs out there and we wanted to do the best we could to work with the community. I think we can fix most of these problems."

dan.weikel@latimes.com
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