I. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

II. EMERGENCY ITEMS

A. Discussion/Action of emergency items, if necessary.

III. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Any member of the public may address the Commission for a period not to exceed three minutes on any item of interest not on the agenda within the jurisdiction of the Commission. The Commission will listen to all communication, but in compliance with the Brown Act, will not take any action on items that are not on the agenda.

IV. APPROVAL OF CONSENT CALENDAR

(Executive Director recommends approval of consent calendar items)

A. Approval of ICTC Board Draft Minutes: July 27, 2011
B. Receive and File:
   1. Management Committee Draft Minutes: September 14, 2011
   2. ICTC TAC Draft Minutes: July 28, 2011
   3. ICTC SSTAC Draft Minutes: August 3, 2011
C. Amendment to the Agreement for the FY 2010-11 Financial Service Audit of the Regional Transportation Planning Agency

   The ICTC Management Committee met on September 14, 2011 and forwards this item to the ICTC Commission for review and approval:

CITIES OF BRAWLEY, CALEXICO, CALIPATRIA, EL CENTRO, HOLTVILLE, IMPERIAL, WESTMORLAND, IMPERIAL IRRIGATION DISTRICT AND COUNTY OF IMPERIAL
1. Authorize the Chairman to sign the amendment to the agreement for financial audit services for FY 2010-11, with the firm of Hutchinson and Bloodgood for the not to exceed fee of $32,800.00 effective July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012.

V. REPORTS

A. ICTC Executive Director
B. Southern California Association of Governments
C. California Department of Transportation – District 11
D. Commission Member Reports

VI. ACTION CALENDAR

A. Statewide Local Streets and Roads Assessment Project

The ICTC Management Committee met on September 14, 2011 and forwards this item to the ICTC Commission for review and approval:

1. Authorize the Chairman to sign a resolution authorizing the Imperial County Transportation Commission to contribute Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) Funding to the ongoing Statewide Local Streets and Roads Needs Assessment Project.

B. IMPERIAL VALLEY TRANSIT, Regional Fixed Route Bus Transit Service Year End Invoicing for the IVT - Blue and Green Lines for FY 2010-11

The ICTC Management Committee met on September 14, 2011 and forwards this item to the ICTC Commission for review and approval:

1. Authorize a FY 2010-11 year end payment to FIRST TRANSIT Inc. in an amount of $53,643.00 from cost savings for the Imperial Valley Transit (PY 01265) for a final payment for the IVT Blue and Green Lines (PY 01264).

C. Adoption of the Passenger Statistical Summary (PSS) Project for FY 2010-11 for Imperial Valley Transit (IVT)

The ICTC Management Committee met on September 14, 2011 and forwards this item to the ICTC Commission for review and approval:

1. Approve the Passenger Statistical Sampling Project for FY 2010-11.
2. Direct staff to forward the report to the National Transit Database (NTD)

D. Triennial Performance Audit of the Administration/Management of the Imperial County Transportation Commission - FY 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10

The ICTC Management Committee met on September 14, 2011 and forwards this item to the ICTC Commission for review and approval:

1. Approve the FY 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10 Triennial Performance Audit of the Imperial County Transportation Commission.
2. Direct staff to forward the FY 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10 Triennial Performance Audit of the Imperial County Transportation Commission to Caltrans.

VII. NEXT MEETING DATE AND PLACE
A. The next meeting of the Imperial County Transportation Commission will be held on Wednesday, October 26, 2011 at 6:00 p.m., at the County of Imperial Board Chambers, at 940 W. Main Street, El Centro, CA.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

A. Motion to adjourn
IV. CONSENT CALENDAR

A. APPROVAL OF ICTC BOARD DRAFT MINUTES: JULY 27, 2011

B. RECEIVE AND FILE:
1. MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE DRAFT MINUTES: SEPTEMBER 14, 2011
2. ICTC TAC DRAFT MINUTES: JULY 28, 2011
3. ICTC SSTAC DRAFT MINUTES: AUGUST 3, 2011
The following action minutes are listed as they were acted upon by the Imperial County Transportation Commission and as listed on the agenda for the meeting held Wednesday July 27, 2011 together with staff reports and related documents attached thereto and incorporated therein by reference.

I. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Vice-Chair Sanders called the Commission meeting to order at 6:25 p.m. Roll call was taken.

II. EMERGENCY ITEMS

A. There were none.

III. PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were none.

IV. APPROVAL OF CONSENT CALENDAR

A motion was made by M. Kelley and seconded by R. Kelley to approve the consent calendar; Motion carried unanimously.

4A. Approved ICTC Board Minutes for June 22, 2011
4B. Received and filed ICTC Management Committee Draft minutes for July 13, 2011
Received and filed ICTC TAC Draft minutes for June 23, 2011
Received and filed ICTC SSTAC minutes for July 6, 2011
4C. Extensions of the Transit Drug and Alcohol Audits Agreement FY 2011-12 and FY 2012-13, LPM and Associates
   1. Authorized the Chairman to sign the extension to the agreement for transit drug and alcohol services with the firm LPM and Associates for the not to exceed annual fee of $11,000.00, effective November 1, 2011 through November 30, 2013

4D. Extension of the Legal Services Agreement FY 2011-12, County Counsel – County of Imperial
   1. Authorized the Chairman to sign the agreement for the continuation of legal services between the County of Imperial and the Imperial County Transportation Commission for an annual cost not to exceed $10,000.00, effective July 11, 2011 through June 30, 2012
   2. Directed staff to forward the agreement to the County of Imperial

4E. Amendment to the Medexpress operating agreement FY 2011-12, ARC – Imperial Valley for the continued operation of the Medexpress
   1. Authorized the Chairman to sign an amendment document to the operating agreement with ARC-Imperial Valley for the continued operation of the Medexpress for the period effective July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012, with an annual not to exceed operating subsidy ($161,737.00) with 3% marketing funding ($6,065.00), maintenance escalator ($7,500.00) and fuel escalator.

4F. Amendment to the West Shores Dial-A-Ride Operating Agreement FY 2011-12, ARC – Imperial Valley for the continued operation of the West Shores Dial-A-Ride
   1. Authorized the Chairman to sign an amendment document to the operating agreement with ARC-Imperial Valley for the continued operation of the West Shores Dial-A-Ride for the period effective July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012, with an annual not to exceed operating subsidy ($72,385.00) with 3% marketing funding ($2,399.00), maintenance escalator ($3,500.00) and fuel escalator.

4G. Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) FY 2010-11 to FY 2015-16; Amendment #12
   1. Adopted the recommended 2011 RTIP Amendment #12
   2. Authorized staff to submit the documentation to SCAG for inclusion into the 2011 RTIP.

V. REPORTS

A. ICTC Executive Director

Mr. Baza had the following announcements and updates:
- There is a Tiger III grant opportunity recently announced by the U.S. Department of Transportation.
- The State budget included $3.3 million in Prop 1B funds, which creates potential opportunities for Imperial Valley.
- The Calexico West Port of Entry project is scheduled for completion, pending fund allocations.

B. Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)

Ms. Rosanna Bayon Moore had the following announcements and updates:
- Valley Center Open House and Reception will be held tomorrow, July 28, 2011 from 4:30 p.m. to 7:30 p.m.
- A 2012 RTP SCS Workshop was held before ICTC meeting from 2:30 p.m. to 5:30 p.m. at the County Board Chambers. Ms. Bayon Moore thanked all that attended.

- SCAG awarded Imperial Valley resident and recent high school graduate Anna Paulina Briceno Romo with a scholarship. Ms. Paulina will be attending UCSD and will major in engineering. The County of Imperial has agreed to host her as an intern for two weeks in August.

C. California Department of Transportation

Mr. Figge had the following announcements and updates:
- Brawley Stage 3 is moving forward and remains on schedule. There have been no changes to the completion date.
- Caltrans completed the relinquishment process for SR 86 and was approved by the CTC at their last meeting.
- Unfortunate accidents have taken the lives of 3 Caltrans District 11 employees in the last 7 weeks. The department has initiated safety meetings with all employees. The department is also working on publicizing the “move over” law. Mr. Figge urged all to please be careful.

D. Commission Member Reports

- Brawley Council member Ryan Kelley was recently appointed to the SCAG Transportation Policy Committee.

VI. ACTION CALENDAR

A. ICTC Overall Work Program (OWP) and Budget, Fiscal Year 2011-2012

The Draft Fiscal Year (FY) 2011/2012 Imperial County Transportation Commission (ICTC) Overall Work Program (OWP) and Budget was presented to Management Committee for their review and approval.

Last year was a historic year for ICTC. Senate Bill 607 (Ducheny) was created and ICTC was in operation in January 2010. In June 2010, the Board approved the ICTC’s first budget and work plan for FY 2010-2011. Other key accomplishments in 2010-2011, include the following milestones:

- Development and adoption of the ICTC Bylaws
- Completed the transfer of legal responsibilities from the Imperial Valley Association of Governments (IVAG) to ICTC
- Achieved Grantee status with the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and the Federal Highway Administration (FWHA) for eligibility and receipt of state and federal transportation funds of nearly $10 million for FY 2011-2012.
- Completed required policies and procedures for management of state and federal funds
- Transfer of administrative duties of the Local Transportation Authority (Measure D Sales Tax Program) to the ICTC
- Initiated and developed our partnerships with our Southern California transportation leaders within Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) multi-county region of Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, and Ventura, the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach, the San Diego Association of Governments, Caltrans, California Transportation Commission, FTA, FHWA, the U.S. Customs and Border Protection, and General Services Administration.
- A new ICTC website was launched and will be further enhanced in the coming year
Completed the procurement process and the award of our turn-key transit operations contracts for the Imperial Valley Transit (IVT) system and created a new identity for our ADA paratransit service called “IVT ACCESS”
- The IVT ACCESS will have roll out of a new vehicle fleet in the coming months and launched a new website for greater access to information for ADA passengers (www.IVTAcess.org)
- The IVT fixed route services will have a new fleet of 40 ft. buses within in year two of the contract and a complete redesign of the outdated IVT website is planned (ivtransit.org)
- Implemented the computerized dispatch and scheduling software for greater efficiencies.

Completed our relocation to a new shared office with SCAG and the Imperial Valley Economic Development Corporation (IVEDC)

Completed the ICTC’s first Strategic Plan that guides our priorities in this work plan and budget and the foreseeable future

For your review and approval, staff has prepared the Draft Fiscal Year 2011-2012 Overall Work Program and Budget Summary. The proposed budget is a culmination of efforts to identify all available revenues and expenditures for the new fiscal year.

ICTC Staff and Management Committee convened a Budget Workshop on June 23, 2011 and reviewed a final draft at the regularly scheduled ICTC Management Committee meeting on July 13, 2011. Following this effort, the Management Committee and staff present the Fiscal Year 2011-2012 OWP and Budget to the ICTC Commission for your review and approval.

1. As recommended by staff and the Management Committee, it is requested that the ICTC Board adopt the ICTC OWP and Budget for Fiscal Year 2011-2012.

A motion was made by Gran and seconded by M. Kelley, Motion was carried unanimously.

It was agreed that a quarterly review of the budget would be conducted by ICTC staff.

B. Adoption of ICTC’s Mission Statement

On May 11th, 2011, ICTC board members, management committee members and staff held its first Strategic Planning Workshop. The workshop was very beneficial to prioritize our core work programs and activities for the short term. A final element of the Strategic Planning Workshop encompassed the group’s development of proposed mission statements for the ICTC. Four proposals were recommended for future consideration and adoption. The suggested mission statements are as follows:

a. “Our mission is to enhance the quality of life and regional economy of Imperial County by ensuring safe, responsive and efficient transportation and transit solutions.”

b. “ICTC will guide the development of the regional transportation plan for the Imperial region and its Regional, State and Federal transportation improvement plans and updates.”

c. “ICTC will take the lead in the provision of transportation facilities and services to provide mobility and support economic development.”
d. “ICTC will provide local and regional transportation services and programs to enhance the quality of life for the Imperial County.”

As recommended by staff and the Management Committee, it is requested that the ICTC Board adopt ICTC’s Mission Statement:

“Our mission is to enhance the quality of life and regional economy of Imperial County by ensuring safe, responsive and efficient transportation and transit solutions.”

A motion was made by M. Kelley and seconded by Ritchie, Motion was carried unanimously.

C. Adoption of ICTC’s priorities as established at the Strategic Planning Workshop

On May 11, 2011 ICTC board members, staff, agency personnel and media convened the first ever strategic planning process for the organization. The group formulated a list of organization priorities.

As recommended by staff and the Management Committee, it is requested that the ICTC Board adopt ICTC’s priorities as established at the Strategic Workshop:

a) Regional Transportation Planning Functions
b) Consolidation of Fractured Transportation Services
c) Advocacy and Exposure for ICTC and the Region
d) Development of a Council of Governments (COG)
e) Build ICTC’s Administrative Capacity

A motion was made by Gran and seconded by M. Kelley, Motion was carried unanimously.

D. Agreement between the Imperial County Transportation Commission and City of Imperial for Human Resource Services for FY 2011-12

This agreement for support services will allow for the development of ICTC job classifications, duty statements; complete with benefits and salary structure. It will also facilitate the hiring and employment transition process and the development of required policies and procedures. Funding for this project has been identified in the ICTC OWP and Budget, FY 2011-12.

ICTC staff recommends that the ICTC Commission take the following action(s), after receipt of public comments, if any:

1. Authorize the Chairman to sign the agreement for human resource services with the City of Imperial for the not to exceed fee of $40,000.00 effective July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012.

A motion was made by M. Kelley and seconded by R. Kelley, Motion was carried unanimously.

VII. CLOSED SESSION – PERSONNEL MATTER

A. Pursuant to Government Code §54957, performance evaluation of the ICTC Executive Director.
1. Motion to Adjourn to Closed Session, M. Kelley and seconded by R. Kelley, **Motion was carried** unanimously.
2. Reconvene to open session, no action taken and nothing to report out.

**VIII. NEXT MEETING DATE AND PLACE**

The next meeting of the Imperial County Transportation Commission will be held on Wednesday, August 24, 2011 at 6:00 p.m., at the County of Imperial Board Chambers, at 940 W. Main Street, El Centro, CA.

**IX. ADJOURNMENT**

A motion was made to adjourn by Ritchie and seconded by R. Kelley, **Motion was carried** unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 6:54 p.m.
VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT:  
City of Brawley  Rosanna Bayon Moore  
City of Calipatria  Rom Medina  
City of El Centro  Ruben Duran  
City of Holtville  Alex Meyerhoff  
City of Imperial  Marlene Best  
County of Imperial  Jerry Santillan  
County of Imperial  William Brunet  
(Non-voting) ICTC  Mark Baza  

STAFF PRESENT:  Kathi Williams, David Salgado, Cristi Lerma  

OTHERS PRESENT:  Sam Amen (Caltrans), Chili Cilch (Caltrans), Bill Figge (Caltrans), Ross Cather (Bill Figge), Grace Conner (El Centro)  

The following minutes are listed as they were acted upon by the Imperial County Transportation Commission Management Committee and as listed on the agenda for the meeting held Wednesday, September 14, 2011 together with staff reports and related documents attached thereto and incorporated therein by reference.  

I. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL  
Chairman Medina called the Committee meeting to order at 10:45 a.m. Roll call was taken. Introductions were made.  

II. EMERGENCY ITEMS  
There were none.  

III. PUBLIC COMMENTS  
There were none.  

IV. CONSENT ITEMS  
A motion was made by Best, seconded by Meyerhoff to approve consent items 4A through 4C. Motion carried unanimously.  
A. Approved ICTC Management Committee Minutes for July 27, 2011.  
B. Received and filed:
1. ICTC Board Draft minutes for July 27, 2011
2. ICTC SSTAC of Imperial Valley Minutes for August 3, 2011
3. ICTC TAC of Imperial Valley Draft Minutes for July 28, 2011

C. Amendment to the Agreement for the FY 2010-11 Financial Service Audit of the Regional Transportation Planning Agency

1. Authorized the Chairman to sign the amendment to the agreement for financial audit services for FY 2010-11, with the firm Hutchinson and Bloodgood for the not to exceed fee of $32,800.00 effective July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012.

V. REPORTS

A. ICTC Executive Director
Ms. Williams’ announcement and updates included:
- An overview was given for the Dial-A-Ride (DAR) Consolidated Request for Proposals (RFP). The RFP is currently in draft form with the scope of work still in process. Ms. Williams requested from each agency a letter from the City Manager stating whether they would like to participate or opt out of the process. The letter is due on September 30th, 2011 according to the schedule given to city staff. The tentative schedule for the process will be: Distribution of the RFP in January 2011, responses by February 2011, with a new or different contract to begin on July 1, 2011.

Mr. Baza’ announcements and updates included:
- A Council of Governments (COG) Workshop is scheduled for September 30, 2011 at Coachella Valley Association of Governments (CVAG). All City Managers and Commissioners are invited to attend. The goal of the workshop is to give us goals and revenues of other agencies.
- The ICTC Budget for Fiscal Year 2011-2012 is now posted on the ICTC website at www.imperialctc.org.

B. Southern California Association of Governments
- Mr. Baza in the absence of a SCAG representative gave a few announcements:
  o Applications are being viewed for the Regional Affairs Officer for the Imperial office.
  o An opportunity with SCAG to obtain a receptionist to be shared with ICTC will be shortly posted.
- Ms. Bayon Moore gave a few updates:
  o New member orientation will take place at the regional office on September 26, 2011
  o The region wide luncheon with City Managers will be on September 28, 2011
  o Arnold San Miguel will be filling in for Imperial and Coachella Valley’s until a replacement is found for the Regional Affairs Officer.

C. California Department of Transportation – District 11
Mr. Sam Amen had the following updates:
- Dogwood project is moving forward.
- The SR 98 widening project will begin the design phase soon. This project was split into 4 phases due to funding.
- Brawley Stage 3 is moving forward and remains on schedule.

D. Committee Member Reports
- Ms. Best announced that Imperial City Hall will be rededicated on September 29th at 5:30 p.m. It will also be a Chamber of Commerce mixer.
VI. ACTION CALENDAR

A. Statewide Local Streets and Roads Assessment Project

Mr. Baza stated that the ICTC received a request from the California State Association of Counties (CSAC) and the League of Cities. This request was in regards to a contribution from all California regional agencies for financing for a Statewide needs assessment report on the condition of local streets and roads. A Statewide report was previously prepared in 2009. Both organizations indicate that this prior report was very beneficial in providing information to the several key organizations and the State legislature, as decisions were made on funding policies for local infrastructure, roadways and transportation. The total cost to update the report is estimated to be $250,000. Our region’s share would be $1,051. Staff would recommend participation in this process as the cost is minimal as compared to the possible benefits for our local streets and roads systems.

It is requested the ICTC Management Committee forward this item to the ICTC Commission for review and approval:

1. Authorize the Chairman to sign a resolution authorizing the Imperial County Transportation Commission to contribute Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) Funding to the ongoing Statewide Local Streets and Roads Needs Assessment Project.

A motion was made by Meyerhoff, seconded by Brunet, Motion carried unanimously.

B. IMPERIAL VALLEY TRANSIT, Regional Fixed Route Bus Transit Service Year End Invoicing for the IVT - Blue and Green Lines for FY 2010-11

Ms. Williams stated that the FY 2010-11 year end invoices were processed, ICTC staff identified that the fare revenue for IVT was higher than anticipated. The subsidy was therefore underutilized. This continues to reflect the increasing demand and increasing passenger ridership on the main line bus routes. As the FY 2010-11 year end invoices were processed, ICTC staff identified that the fare revenues for IVT Blue and Green Lines were lower than anticipated. However, there continues to be an increasing demand and passenger ridership continues to increase. Because the IVT system did not utilize its full subsidy amount, there is a cost savings that can be utilized to make an adjustment on the IVT Blue and Green Lines final invoice.

It is requested that ICTC Management Committee forward this item to the ICTC Commission for review and approval.

1. Authorize a FY 2010-11 year end payment to FIRST TRANSIT Inc. in an amount of $53,643.00 from cost savings for the Imperial Valley Transit (PY 01265) for a final payment for the IVT Blue and Green Lines (PY 01264).

A motion was made by Best seconded by Santillan, Motion carried unanimously.

C. Adoption of the Passenger Statistical Summary (PSS) Project for FY 2010-11 for Imperial Valley Transit (IVT)

Ms. Williams stated that due to the receipt of federal grants for public transit, federal reporting requirements state that transit systems are required to report on “passenger miles”. This process takes place every three years and is utilized to track the individual distance or mileage travelled by each boarding passenger. The County has administered this project since its original inception in
2008, on behalf of the ICTC. The County awarded the second iteration of this project for FY 2010-11 to the firm of *Rea and Parker Research, Inc.* again in May 2010. The project work effort commenced on July 1, 2010. The consultant has since developed the sampling methodology, and acquired staff who will monitor various bus routes throughout the fiscal year. A final report will be prepared based on the guidance of the federal requirements. This final report is due to the federal agency by October 2011.

It is requested the ICTC Management Committee forward this item to the ICTC Commission for review and approval:

1. Approve the Passenger Statistical Sampling Project for FY 2010-11.
2. Direct staff to forward the report to the National Transit Database (NTD)

A motion was made by Santillan, seconded by Best, *Motion carried* unanimously.

D. Triennial Performance Audit of the Administration/Management of the Imperial County Transportation Commission - FY 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10

Ms. Williams introduced Mr. Derek Wong, with the firm PMC, who reported recommendations and findings.

It is requested the ICTC Management Committee forward this item to the ICTC Commission for review and approval:

1. Approve the FY 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10 Triennial Performance Audit of the Imperial County Transportation Commission.
2. Direct staff to forward the FY 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10 Triennial Performance Audit of the Imperial County Transportation Commission to Caltrans.

A motion was made by Santillan, seconded by Duran, *Motion carried* unanimously.

I. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

A. An overview of the Value Analysis Study conducted in partnership with Imperial County and the City of El Centro to improve the oversight process for local projects on the State Highway System was presented by Ms. Chili Cilch of Caltrans. Ms. Cilch shared key study findings, recommendations, including plans for implementing process improvements. For more information on this study, you may contact Ms. Cilch at 619 688-4217. There will also be one more presentation made at the October 26th, ICTC meeting in El Centro.

VII. NEXT MEETING DATE AND PLACE

The next meeting of the Management Committee will be held on **Wednesday, October 12, 2011** at **10:30 a.m.**, at the **City of Westmorland**, Westmorland CA.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

A. Motion was made by Santillan and seconded by Bayon Moore, *Motion carried* and meeting adjourned at 12:25 p.m.
Present

Voting Attendees:

- Michael L. Hack  Consumer Chair (Chair)
- Rebecca Sanchez  Area Agency on Aging (Vice Chair)
- Michelle Schenck –Soto  Imperial County California Children Services
- Heddy McNeer  Consumer
- Rosyo Ramirez  IHSS – Public Authority
- Griselda Martinez  Imperial County Work Training Center
- Kathi Williams  CTSA – ICTC
- David Salgado  CTSA – ICTC
- Pablo Cerda  Imperial County Department of Social Services

Non-Voting Attendees:

- Mark Baza  ICTC
- Cristi Lerma  ICTC
- Jerry Arguelles  City of Calexico
- David A. Jones  First Transit
- Adriana C. Pacheco  Brawley Dial-A-Ride
- Isabel C. Pacheco  Brawley Dial-A-Ride

1. Chair Hack called the meeting to order at 10:10 am. A quorum was present. Introductions were made.

2. Minutes adopted for July 6, 2011.  \(\text{Sanchez/Soto) \text{ Motion Carried.}\)

3. CTSA Reports

   - Ms. Williams gave an overview of the Transit Finance Plan for Fiscal Year 2011-12, including federal, state and local revenues. A new fund source which will continue to be available is the LTA 2% local sales tax. There is estimated to be $150,000 for transit. These funds will allow the agencies to work with the Dial-A-Ride (DAR) operator’s services to re-implement weekday and Saturday hours.
   - Clarification was needed from the last SSTAC meeting as to questions raised regarding the farebox ratios for transit services: IVT has been set at 17%; IVT Blue/Green Line set at 4%; IVT
Access (ADA Paratransit) at 7.8%; and the Medexpress is set at 20%. The Blue and Greens lines’ farebox ratio is now averaged into the IVT system as a whole.

- Ms. Williams stated that the Triennial Performance Audits for the previous three years for each of the agencies with transit services is available in draft form on the ICTC website under financial reports. Comments were encouraged and due by August 12th, 2011.

- The West Shores Dial-A-Ride and Medexpress contracts were extended by the Commission for FY 2011-12.

- A redesign of the IVT website is currently underway. The new website will provide updated schedule information and mapping capabilities. The new feature planned will include the ability to click on your color coded route of choice which will produce a list of that routes schedule. Also being explored is the idea of the texting capability feature for each bus stop. The question whether funds would be available for these new features remains.

- IVT Access transition completed its first month of operations. El Centro residents that want to travel within the cities of El Centro and Imperial are being encouraged to use the El Centro and Imperial Dial-A-Rides. Beginning on August 22, 2011 enforcement to provide the ADA certification ID number will be used. Currently, staff is processing 20 applications per week on average. Mr. Jones added that IVT Access is scheduling 130-140 trips per day and accepting 150 calls each day. He also stated that IVT Access brochures would be available soon and that he would send some to social services agencies when he received them. IVT Access takes cash fares only, prepaid vouchers are available but that ticket sales are only for the fixed routes, including the Blue and Green lines. Mr. Salgado mentioned that he rode on IVT Access recently and that staffing concerns with the service are being addressed. He also stated that the transitional issues are tapering off now as well.

- Ms. Williams stated that the Paratransit RFP process that was directed to staff by the Commission is currently taking place. The first meeting with the various agency staff was held last Thursday, where a possible service structure was introduced by Ms. Williams. The schedule calls for the publication of the RFP by January 2, 2012.

- Ms. Williams announced that ICTC had their combined Open House and Reception last Thursday and thanked all who came.

4. Operator Reports

- Brawley DAR increased their fare to $1.50. Ms. Pacheco stated that passengers seem fine with the increase.

- Calexico DAR continues to be busy with no changes to service at this time.

- Mr. Jones stated that recently a demonstration bus that IVT will be providing in January 2012 was in the Valley for a route trial. IVT and ICTC staff were on board for the trial. The 40 foot Gillig will feature a low floor with no step entry with positions for 2 wheelchairs. They will also have tinted windows and be extra insulated. Mr. Jones stated that if a 3rd wheelchair position is needed, IVT Access or a Road Supervisor will be called to ensure the passenger gets transported.

- There was no new information provided by the operators for the El Centro, Imperial and West Shores Dial-a-Ride services.

5. General Discussion

- Ms. McNeer announced that on September 20, 2011 at 7:30 a.m. the United Way will be holding its annual breakfast at the El Centro PAL. Tickets are $10.00 in advance or $14.00 at the door.

6. Adjournment

- Meeting adjourned at 11:00 a.m. The next meeting will be on September 7, 2011 at the ICTC offices, located at 1405 N. Imperial Ave., Suite 1, El Centro, CA 92243.
IV. CONSENT CALENDAR

C. AMENDMENT TO THE AGREEMENT FOR THE FY 2010-11 FINANCIAL SERVICE AUDIT OF THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AGENCY
September 22, 2011

Mayor David Bradshaw, Chairman
Imperial County Transportation Commission
1405 N. Imperial Ave. Suite 1
El Centro, Ca. 92243

SUBJECT: Amendment to the Agreement for the FY 2010-11 Financial Service Audit of the Regional Transportation Planning Agency

Dear Commission Members:

Since approximately 2006, Hutchinson and Bloodgood, a professional CPA firm, has provided the financial audits of the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) under contract with the County of Imperial and is within its last year of the contract. As part of the ICTC transition to assume all related transit and transportation assets and liabilities of IVAG/County, ICTC staff recommends that this consultant contract be transferred to the ICTC.

The audit agreement is for work associated with FY 2010-11. However, there is additional work associated with this audit as the ICTC has added a fund in FY 2010-11 for regional planning services and related expenses. The CPA firm has requested an additional amount of $5,000 to complete the additional work.

Funding for this project is in the ICTC adopted 2011-12 Budget and specifically in the Transit Finance Plan; through the Transportation Development ACT (TDA) Fund, approved on July 23, 2011. Effective with the audits for the FY 2011-12, it is staff’s intention to circulate a competitive proposal for the financial audits.

ICTC Management Committee met on September 14th and forwards this item to the ICTC Commission for review and approval:

1. Authorize the Chairman to sign the amendment to the agreement for financial audit services for FY 2010-11, with the firm of Hutchinson and Bloodgood for the not to exceed fee of $32,800.00 effective July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012.

Sincerely yours,

MARK BAZA
Executive Director
August 30, 2011

Imperial County Transportation Commission
1405 North Imperial Avenue, Suite 1
El Centro, California 92243

We are pleased to confirm our understanding of the services we are to provide the Imperial County Transportation Commission (ICTC) for the year ended June 30, 2011.

We will audit the following individual fund financial statements of the ICTC and County of Imperial:

- Transportation Development Act (TDA) Administration, Fund 7076
- State Transit Assistance Fund (STA) Administration, Fund 7079
- ICTC Administration, Fund 7147 and ICTC Plans and Programs, Fund 7148
- ICTC Administration Program, Fund 7416
- SB 325 (Article 8a, 8e, 8c and 3) funds, Fund 7416
- Regional Planning and Programs, Fund 7417

The objective of our audits is the expression of an opinion as to whether the individual fund financial statements are fairly presented, in all material respects, in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America.

Our audit will be conducted in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America, the standards for financial audits contained in Government Auditing Standards, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States for applicable audits, and standards adopted by the Imperial County Transportation Commission, and will include tests of the accounting records and other procedures we consider necessary to enable us to express such an opinion. If our opinion on the individual fund financial statements is other than unqualified, we will fully discuss the reasons with you in advance. If, for any reason, we are unable to complete the audit or are unable to express an opinion, we may decline to express an opinion or may not issue a report as a result of this engagement.

We will also provide a report (that does not include an opinion) on internal control related to the financial statements and compliance with the provisions of applicable laws, regulations, contracts, agreements, and grants, noncompliance with which could have a material effect on the financial statements as required by Government Auditing Standards for applicable audits. The report on internal control and compliance will include a statement that the report is intended solely for the information and use of the audit committee, management, and specific legislative or regulatory bodies and is not intended to be and should not be used by anyone other than these specified parties. If during our audits we become aware that the funds are subject to an audit requirement that is not encompassed in the terms of this engagement, we will communicate to management and those charged with governance that an audit in accordance with U.S. generally accepted auditing standards and the standards for financial audits contained in Government Auditing Standards may not satisfy the relevant legal, regulatory, or contractual requirements.
Management Responsibilities

Management is responsible for establishing and maintaining effective internal control and for compliance with the provisions of applicable laws, regulations, contracts, agreements, and grants. In fulfilling this responsibility, estimates and judgments by management are required to assess the expected benefits and related costs of the controls. The objectives of internal control are to provide management with reasonable, but not absolute, assurance that assets are safeguarded against loss from unauthorized use or disposition, that transactions are executed in accordance with management’s authorizations and recorded properly to permit the preparation of program financial statements in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles, and that the program is managed in compliance with applicable laws and regulations and the provisions of contracts and grant agreements.

Management is responsible for making all program financial records and related information available to us, including any significant vendor relationships in which the vendor has responsibility for program compliance. We understand that you will provide us with such information required for our audit and that you are responsible for the accuracy and completeness of that information. Management’s responsibilities include adjusting the schedule to correct material misstatements and for confirming to us in the representation letter that the effects of any uncorrected misstatements aggregated by us during the current engagement and pertaining to the latest period presented are immaterial, both individually and in the aggregate, to the schedule taken as a whole.

You are responsible for establishing and maintaining internal controls, including monitoring ongoing activities; for the selection and application of accounting principles; and for the fair presentation in the schedule of the financial activities of the Department of Transportation Federal Transit Formula grant in conformity with U.S. generally accepted accounting principles.

You are responsible for the design and implementation of programs and controls to prevent and detect fraud, and for informing us about all known or suspected fraud or illegal acts affecting the organization involving (1) management, (2) employees who have significant roles in internal control, and (3) others where the fraud or illegal acts could have a material effect on the schedule. Your responsibilities include informing us of your knowledge of any allegations of fraud or suspected fraud or illegal acts affecting the government received in communications from employees, former employees, grantors, regulators, or others. In addition, you are responsible for identifying and ensuring that the entity complies with applicable laws and regulations and for taking timely and appropriate steps to remedy any fraud, illegal acts, or violations of contracts or grant agreements, or abuse that we may report.

Audit Procedures—General

An audit includes examining, on a test basis, evidence supporting the amounts and disclosures in the schedule; therefore, our audit will involve judgment about the number of transactions to be examined and the areas to be tested. We will plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable rather than absolute assurance about whether the schedule is free of material misstatement, whether from (1) errors, (2) fraudulent financial reporting, (3) misappropriation of assets, or (4) violations of laws or governmental regulations that are attributable to the entity or to acts by management or employees acting on behalf of the entity. Because the determination of abuse is subjective, Government Auditing Standards do not expect auditors to provide reasonable assurance of detecting abuse.

Because an audit is designed to provide reasonable, but not absolute assurance and because we will not perform a detailed examination of all transactions, there is a risk that material misstatements or noncompliance may exist and not be detected by us. In addition, an audit is not designed to detect immaterial misstatements or violations of laws or governmental regulations that do not have a direct and material effect on the schedule or on the program. However, we will inform you of any material errors and any fraudulent financial reporting or misappropriation of assets that come to our attention. We will also inform you of any violations of laws or governmental regulations that come to our attention, unless clearly inconsequential. Our responsibility as auditors is limited to the period covered by our audit and does not extend to any later periods for which we are not engaged as auditors.
Our procedures will include tests of documentary evidence supporting the transactions recorded in the accounts, and may include direct confirmation of receivables and certain other assets and liabilities by correspondence with selected individuals, funding sources, creditors, and financial institutions. We will also request written representations from your attorneys as part of the engagement, and they may bill you for responding to this inquiry. At the conclusion of our audit, we will also require certain written representations from you about the schedule and related matters.

**Audit Procedures—Internal Controls**

Our audit will include obtaining an understanding of the entity and its environment, including internal control, sufficient to assess the risks of material misstatement of the financial statements and to design the nature, timing, and extent of further audit procedures. Tests of controls may be performed to test the effectiveness of certain controls that we consider relevant to preventing and detecting errors and fraud that are material to the financial statements and to preventing and detecting misstatements resulting from illegal acts and other noncompliance matters that have a direct and material effect on the financial statements. Our tests, if performed, will be less in scope than would be necessary to render an opinion on internal control and, accordingly, no opinion will be expressed in our report on internal control issued pursuant to Government Auditing Standards.

An audit is not designed to provide assurance on internal control or to identify significant deficiencies. However, during the audit, we will communicate to management and those charged with governance internal control related matters that are required to be communicated under professional standards and Government Auditing Standards.

**Audit Procedures—Compliance**

As part of obtaining reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements are free of material misstatement, we will perform tests of the funds’ compliance with the provisions of applicable laws, regulations, contracts, agreements, and grants. However, the objective of our audit will not be to provide an opinion on overall compliance and we will not express such an opinion in our report on compliance issued pursuant to Government Auditing Standards.

**Audit Administration, Fees, and Other**

We understand that your employees will prepare all cash or other confirmations we request and will locate any invoices selected by us for testing.

The workpapers for these engagements are the property of Hutchinson and Bloodgood LLP and constitute confidential information. However, we may be requested to make certain workpapers available to Cognizant or Grantor Agencies pursuant to authority given to them by law or regulation. If requested, access to such workpapers will be provided under the supervision of Hutchinson and Bloodgood LLP personnel. Furthermore, upon request, we may provide photocopies of selected workpapers to Cognizant or Grantor Agencies. The Cognizant or Grantor Agencies may intend, or decide; to distribute the photocopies or information contained therein to others, including other governmental agencies.

You agree that any dispute that may arise regarding the meaning, performance or enforcement of this engagement will, prior to resorting to litigation, be submitted to mediation, and that the parties will engage in the mediation process in good faith once a written request to mediate has been given by any party to the engagement. Any mediation initiated as a result of this engagement shall be administered within the County of Imperial, California, by a member of the American Arbitration Association or the American Bar Association Section of Dispute Resolution, according to its mediation rules, and any ensuing litigation shall be conducted within said county, according to California law. The results of any such mediation shall be binding only upon agreement of each party to be bound. The costs of any mediation proceeding shall be shared equally by the participating parties.
Our fee for these services (Exhibit 1) will be at our standard hourly rates plus out-of-pocket costs (such as report reproduction, typing, postage, travel, copies, telephone, etc.) except that we agree that our gross fee, including expenses, will not exceed the fees listed in Exhibit 1. Our standard hourly rates vary according to the degree of responsibility involved and the experience level of the personnel assigned to your audit. Our invoices for these fees will be rendered each month as work progresses and are payable on presentation. The above fee is based on anticipated cooperation from your personnel and the assumption that unexpected circumstances will not be encountered during the audit. If significant additional time is necessary, we will discuss it with you and arrive at a new fee estimate before we incur the additional costs.

Government Auditing Standards require that we provide you with a copy of our most recent quality control review report. Our 2005 peer review report accompanies this letter.

We appreciate the opportunity to be of service to the Imperial County Transportation Commission and believe this letter accurately summarizes the significant terms of our engagement. If you have any questions, please let us know. If you agree with the terms of our engagement as described in this letter, please sign the enclosed copy and return it to us.

Sincerely,

HUTCHINSON AND BLOODGOOD LLP

[Signature]
Gary P. Glud

RESPONSE:

This letter correctly sets forth the understanding of the Imperial County Transportation Commission.

By: [Signature]
Title: Executive Director
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Title</strong></th>
<th><strong>Fund(s)</strong></th>
<th><strong>6/30/11</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Development Act (TDA) Administration</td>
<td>7076</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Transit Assistance Fund (STA) Administration</td>
<td>7079</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICTC Administration Fund and ICTC Plans and Programs Fund</td>
<td>7147 and 7148</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICTC Transit Planning and Programs</td>
<td>7416</td>
<td>6,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 325 (Article 8a, 8e, 8c and 3) Funds</td>
<td>7416</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Planning and Programs</td>
<td>7417</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$32,800</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Transportation Development Act Administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel</th>
<th>Estimated Hours</th>
<th>Hourly Rate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partners</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>2,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Accountant</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>2,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Adjustment of Proposed Fee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (blended)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$147.06</td>
<td>~5,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## ICTC Transit Planning and Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel</th>
<th>Estimated Hours</th>
<th>Hourly Rate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partners</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>4,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Accountant</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>3,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Adjustment of Proposed Fee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-2,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (blended)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$125.93</td>
<td>~6,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## State Transit Assistance Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel</th>
<th>Estimated Hours</th>
<th>Hourly Rate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partners</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>2,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Accountant</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>2,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Adjustment of Proposed Fee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (blended)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$147.06</td>
<td>~5,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## SB 325 (Article 8a, 8e, 8c and 3) Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel</th>
<th>Estimated Hours</th>
<th>Hourly Rate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partners</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>4,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Accountant</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>3,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Adjustment of Proposed Fee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-2,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (blended)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$111.11</td>
<td>~6,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## ICTC Administration Fund and ICTC Plans & Programs Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel</th>
<th>Estimated Hours</th>
<th>Hourly Rate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partners</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>2,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Accountant</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>2,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Adjustment of Proposed Fee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (blended)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$147.06</td>
<td>~5,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Regional Planning and Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel</th>
<th>Estimated Hours</th>
<th>Hourly Rate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partners</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>1,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Accountant</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>3,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Adjustment of Proposed Fee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (blended)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$125.00</td>
<td>~5,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VI. ACTION CALENDAR

A. STATEWIDE LOCAL STREETS AND ROADS ASSESSMENT PROJECT
September 19, 2011

Mayor David Bradshaw, Chairman
Imperial County Transportation Commission
1405 N. Imperial Avenue, Suite 1
El Centro, CA 92243

SUBJECT: Statewide Local Streets and Roads Assessment Project

Dear Commission Members:

The ICTC has received a request from the California State Association of Counties (CSAC) and the League of Cities. This request is in regards to a contribution from all California regional agencies for financing for a Statewide needs assessment report on the condition of local streets and roads. A Statewide report was previously prepared in 2009. Both organizations indicate that this prior report was very beneficial in providing information to the several key organizations and the State legislature, as decisions were made on funding policies for local infrastructure, roadways and transportation. The total cost to update the report is estimated to be $250,000.

Should the Commission choose to participate in this report process, it is possible to contribute a share of the expense of the report through the contributions of Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funding. A table has been provided that indicates that our region’s share would be $1,051.

Staff would recommend participation in this process as the cost is minimal as compared to the possible benefits for our local streets and roads systems.

The ICTC Management Committee met on September 14th and forwards this item to the ICTC Commission for review and approval:

1.Authorize the Chairman to sign a resolution authorizing the Imperial County Transportation Commission to contribute Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) Funding to the ongoing Statewide Local Streets and Roads Needs Assessment Project.

Sincerely yours,

MARK BAZA
Executive Director

BY: [Signature]

Kathi Williams
Administrative Analyst III

CITIES OF BRAWLEY, CALEXICO, CALIPATRIA, EL CENTRO, HOLTVILLE, IMPERIAL, WESTMORLAND, IMPERIAL IRRIGATION DISTRICT AND COUNTY OF IMPERIAL
RESOLUTION OF
THE IMPERIAL COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION (ICTC)

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE IMPERIAL COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION TO CONTRIBUTE REGIONAL SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM (RSTP) FUNDING TO THE ONGOING CALIFORNIA STATEWIDE LOCAL STREETS AND ROADS NEEDS ASSESSMENT

WHEREAS, the regional transportation network is comprised of local streets and roads facilities, highways, mass transit, airports, land ports and bicycle and pedestrian facilities;

WHEREAS, each transportation component is critical in ensuring a seamless, safe, and efficient multi-modal network in all communities across the State; and

WHEREAS, a significant percentage of the roads in California are locally owned and operated by cities and counties, where every trip begins and ends, and the local system is critical for safety and mobility of the traveling public, farm to market needs, multimodal needs and commerce; and

WHEREAS, while state and federal governments regularly assess their transportation system needs, until 2008 no such data existed for the local component of California’s transportation network; and

WHEREAS, Statewide, the local transportation infrastructure is deteriorating and underfunded and existing funding sources are not sufficient to meet the basic maintenance needs, without credible and defensible data, efforts to advocate for increased funding for transportation purposes is difficult at best; and

WHEREAS, the California Statewide Local Streets and Roads Network Needs Assessment provides critical analysis and information on the local transportation network’s condition and funding needs; and

WHEREAS, the results of the 2010 Assessment Update, which indicates that the condition of the local transportation network is deteriorating as predicted in the 2008 California Statewide Local Streets and Roads Needs Assessment, and is being used in the California Transportation Commission’s Statewide Transportation Needs Assessment; and

WHEREAS, it costs approximately $250,000 to update the California Statewide Local Streets and Roads Network Needs Assessment report every two years and cities and counties have voluntarily contributed and raised over $600,000 over the past four years to develop the first report, and fund the first update; and

WHEREAS, California’s cities and counties have requested financial support in addition to the technical support the regions have already provided, from Regional Transportation Planning Agencies to ensure the financial viability of the report into the future; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Imperial County Transportation Commission that it will contribute its proportional share towards the effort in support of the positive work that has been
done to date, the usefulness of the report findings and the continued use of the report that will serve as the collective transportation community advocates for scarce transportation revenues.

**PASSED AND ADOPTED** at a regular meeting of the Imperial County Transportation Commission held on ____________________________.

By: ____________________________
Chairman

ATTEST:

By: ____________________________
CRISTI LERMA
Secretary to the Commission
July 8, 2011

To: Executive Directors,
Regional Transportation Planning Agencies
Rural Counties Task Force

From: California State Association of Counties
League of California Cities

Re: Ongoing Financing for the California Statewide Local Streets and Roads Needs Assessment

Background. In 2009, the California State Association of Counties (CSAC) and the League of California Cities (League) released the results of the first ever comprehensive California Statewide Local Streets and Roads Needs Assessment. Spurred by a $250,000 contribution towards the effort from the County of Los Angeles, cities and counties made individual financial contributions to raise over $600,000 for the project. This initial funding allowed CSAC and the League to contract with Nichols Consulting Engineers for the development of the first report, and finance a two-year update.

Value of the Report. The report turned out to be more valuable than anyone anticipated. In addition to educating the public, local elected officials, and key policy- and decision-makers at the state and federal levels, on the condition, status of, and needs on the local streets and roads system, CSAC and League staff used the comprehensive data to advocate against, and avoid significant cuts to local transportation funding over a number of state budget cycles. The budget proposals would have been devastating to cities and counties across the state, and would have negatively affected the transportation network as a whole, considering the interdependence all modes of transportation have on one another. Specifically, CSAC and the League used the report to:

- Make a presentation to key members of the Legislature (and distribute the report to each member of the Legislature, Governor, and California’s congressional delegation);
- Make a presentation to the California Transportation Commission;
- Meet with the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) to discuss in detail the methodology, assumptions, and specific findings of the report;
- Make local presentations to Boards of Supervisors and City Councils; and
- Use the findings in numerous letters on legislation and the budget to avoid negative policies and budgetary decisions for local transportation funding.

Again, the results of the report were used to demonstrate the ongoing needs on the local streets and roads system during state budget discussions. The report was critical to our associations’ success in stopping significant cuts to transportation funding for cities and counties. In fact, the results of the 2010 Update were so well received, that they were incorporated into the CTC’s Statewide Transportation System Needs Assessment (near completion).

Funding Proposal. The response and impact received from the 2008 and 2010 reports has been very positive. However, an ongoing statewide local streets and roads needs assessment should be completed in conjunction with the State’s SHOPP to provide a complete picture of the needs of the State’s transportation system. To help continue this assessment, CSAC and the League are asking our regional partners to assist with the ongoing development of, and financing for this important report.
Based on the previous two reports, we estimate each two-year update to cost approximately $250,000. We plan to advertise a request for proposals in the coming months, and enter into a contract for two two-year updates necessitating an overall need of $500,000 for the next four years. We plan to raise half of the necessary funds for the four-year contract, or $250,000, with individual contributions from cities and counties. The Oversight Committee is asking our regional partners to contribute the other fifty-percent.

The Local Streets and Roads Needs Assessment Oversight Committee (Oversight Committee), consisting of representatives from CSAC, the League, the County Engineers Association of California (CEAC), Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPAs), and the Rural Counties Task Force (RCTF), has applied for a 2011 Caltrans planning grant as a partial financial resource for this effort. However, even with grant funding, we are requesting that our regional partners commit to providing fifty-percent or $250,000.

While representatives from the Oversight Committee have reached out to you during RTPA and RCTF meetings over the past few months, we wanted to make a formal request and ask in return for your official commitment to this effort. As discussed at RTPA and RCTF meetings, regions indicated support to contribute funds to the four year effort using the same formula used to determine Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) contributions to the Caltrans’ Cooperative Training Assistance Program (CTAP). Specifically, we request that each region send a letter to Caltrans by October 31, 2011 authorizing Caltrans to reduce its share of Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funding by the specific formula amounts shown in the attached chart as each region’s contribution to the effort. After October 31, Caltrans will reduce the RSTP balance for each Region, in accordance with the letter sent, with the amounts contributed from regions to be provided to the County Engineer’s Association of California (CEAC) who is responsible for payments on the contract.

Attached is a template letter to Denix Anbiah at Caltrans Local Assistance that you could use for your request to Caltrans. Please copy Kiana Buss with CSAC on your letter to Caltrans by email or hard copy (kbuss@counties.org or California State Association of Counties, 1100 K Street, Suite 101, Sacramento, CA 95814).

If you would prefer to contribute to this effort with different funds, please send a check, made out to “CEAC”, directly to Mehdi Sadjadi, CEAC Treasurer, 120 Round Court, Petaluma, CA 94952.

Finally, while Executive Directors in many regions have authority to contribute funds to this effort without board approval, for those that would like to take this action to their boards, a sample resolution that could be used is attached.

Contact. If you have any questions regarding this request, or want more information on the history of or specific findings from the reports, please contact DeAnn Baker, CSAC Senior Legislative Representative, at (916) 650-8104 or dbaker@counties.org or Jennifer Whiting, League Legislative Representative, at (916) 658-8249 or jwhiting@cacities.org. Thank you in advance for your consideration of our request.
A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE AGENCY NAME TO CONTRIBUTE REGIONAL SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM FUNDING TO THE ONGOING CALIFORNIA STATEWIDE LOCAL STREETS AND ROADS NEEDS ASSESSMENT EFFORT

WHEREAS, a regional transportation network is comprised of local streets and roads, highways, mass transit, airports, seaports, land ports, and bicycle and pedestrian facilities; and

WHEREAS, each transportation component is critical in ensuring a seamless, safe, and efficient multi-modal transportation network in all local communities across the state; and

WHEREAS, 81% of the roads in California are locally owned and operated by cities and counties, where every trip begins and ends, and the local system is critical for safety and mobility of the traveling public, farm to market needs, multimodal needs, and commerce; and

WHEREAS, while federal and state governments regularly assess their transportation system needs, until 2008, no such data existed for the local component of California's transportation network; and

WHEREAS, transportation infrastructure is underfunded and deteriorating and existing funding sources are not sufficient to meet even basic maintenance needs, but without credible and defensible data, efforts to advocate for increased funding for transportation purposes are difficult at best; and

WHEREAS, the California Statewide Local Streets and Roads Needs Assessment provides critical analysis and information on the local transportation network's condition and funding needs; and

WHEREAS, the results of the 2010 Assessment Update, which indicate that the condition of the local transportation network is deteriorating as predicted in the 2008 California Statewide Local Streets and Roads Needs Assessment, are being used in the California Transportation Commission's Statewide Transportation System Needs Assessment Report; and

WHEREAS, it costs approximately $250,000 to update the California Statewide Local Streets and Roads Needs Assessment report every two years and cities and counties have voluntarily contributed and raised over $600,000 over the past four years to develop the first report and fund the first update; and

WHEREAS, California's cities and counties have requested financial support, in addition to the technical support regions have already provided, from Regional Transportation Planning Agencies to ensure the financial viability of the report into the future; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE AGENCY NAME will contribute its proportional share towards the effort in support of the positive work that has been done to date, the usefulness of the findings of the report, and the continued use the report will serve as the collective transportation community advocates for scarce transportation revenues.

ADOPTED this ______ day of ______, 2011.
### Formula Distribution of RTPA contributions to the Statewide Local Streets and Roads (LSR) Needs Assessment

*Formulas based on Actual Final Distribution, 2009-2010 of RSTP/contributions to CTAP*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MPO/RTPA/County</th>
<th>STP Large Urbanized Area</th>
<th>STP Small Area</th>
<th>CTAP Adjustments</th>
<th>Percent Share to CTAP</th>
<th>LSR Assessment Contribution (2011-2015)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alpine</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$15,962</td>
<td>$18</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>$9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amador</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$463,808</td>
<td>$518</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
<td>$259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butte</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,684,681</td>
<td>$2,999</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calaveras</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$535,877</td>
<td>$599</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
<td>$299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colusa</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$248,474</td>
<td>$278</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
<td>$139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Norte</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$363,475</td>
<td>$406</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
<td>$203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado $235,934</td>
<td>$1,380,179</td>
<td>$1,805</td>
<td>$36.0%</td>
<td>$903</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>$7,331,640</td>
<td>$3,231,644</td>
<td>$11,801</td>
<td>2.36%</td>
<td>$5,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenn</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$349,547</td>
<td>$390</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
<td>$195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humboldt</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,671,796</td>
<td>$1,868</td>
<td>0.37%</td>
<td>$934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Co.</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,881,144</td>
<td>$2,101</td>
<td>0.42%</td>
<td>$1,051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inyo</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$237,123</td>
<td>$265</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>$132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kern</td>
<td>$5,234,356</td>
<td>$3,508,555</td>
<td>$9,767</td>
<td>1.95%</td>
<td>$4,883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,710,685</td>
<td>$1,911</td>
<td>0.38%</td>
<td>$956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$770,489</td>
<td>$861</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
<td>$430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lassen</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$447,000</td>
<td>$499</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Co Subtotal</td>
<td>$122,227,955</td>
<td>$3,559,626</td>
<td>$140,521</td>
<td>28.10%</td>
<td>$70,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTC including SJ Urbanized</td>
<td>$76,938,462</td>
<td>$12,701,465</td>
<td>$100,139</td>
<td>20.03%</td>
<td>$50,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madera</td>
<td>$1,057</td>
<td>$1,625,693</td>
<td>$1,817</td>
<td>0.36%</td>
<td>$909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariposa</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$226,354</td>
<td>$253</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>$126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mendocino</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,139,897</td>
<td>$1,273</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td>$637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merced</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,782,240</td>
<td>$3,108</td>
<td>0.62%</td>
<td>$1,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modoc</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$124,858</td>
<td>$139</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
<td>$70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mono</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$169,838</td>
<td>$190</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
<td>$95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$5,308,843</td>
<td>$5,931</td>
<td>1.19%</td>
<td>$2,965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,216,115</td>
<td>$1,359</td>
<td>0.27%</td>
<td>$679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange Co.</td>
<td>$37,548,803</td>
<td>$61,775</td>
<td>$42,016</td>
<td>8.40%</td>
<td>$21,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer</td>
<td>$2,292,691</td>
<td>$828,974</td>
<td>$3,487</td>
<td>0.70%</td>
<td>$1,744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumas</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$275,166</td>
<td>$307</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
<td>$154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside Co. Subtotal</td>
<td>$16,668,119</td>
<td>$3,752,470</td>
<td>$22,812</td>
<td>4.56%</td>
<td>$11,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACOG</td>
<td>$15,884,918</td>
<td>$4,349,633</td>
<td>$22,605</td>
<td>4.52%</td>
<td>$11,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Benito</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$703,429</td>
<td>$786</td>
<td>0.16%</td>
<td>$393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino Co Subtotal</td>
<td>$19,325,025</td>
<td>$3,263,265</td>
<td>$25,234</td>
<td>5.05%</td>
<td>$12,617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>$35,339,730</td>
<td>$8,141,978</td>
<td>$41,537</td>
<td>8.31%</td>
<td>$20,768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Joaquin</td>
<td>$4,274,525</td>
<td>$3,172,803</td>
<td>$8,320</td>
<td>1.66%</td>
<td>$4,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,259,618</td>
<td>$3,641</td>
<td>0.73%</td>
<td>$1,821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$5,276,931</td>
<td>$5,895</td>
<td>1.18%</td>
<td>$2,948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,377,499</td>
<td>$3,733</td>
<td>0.75%</td>
<td>$1,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shasta</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,157,248</td>
<td>$2,410</td>
<td>0.48%</td>
<td>$1,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$469,975</td>
<td>$52</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
<td>$26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siskiyou</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$585,389</td>
<td>$654</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
<td>$327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanislaus-Modesto</td>
<td>$3,975,402</td>
<td>$1,931,172</td>
<td>$6,598</td>
<td>1.32%</td>
<td>$3,299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRPA</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$609,861</td>
<td>$681</td>
<td>0.14%</td>
<td>$341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tehama</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$740,494</td>
<td>$827</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
<td>$414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$172,071</td>
<td>$192</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
<td>$96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulare</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$4,862,993</td>
<td>$5,433</td>
<td>1.09%</td>
<td>$2,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuolumne</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$720,171</td>
<td>$805</td>
<td>0.16%</td>
<td>$402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura</td>
<td>$6,753,360</td>
<td>$3,199,310</td>
<td>$11,118</td>
<td>2.22%</td>
<td>$5,559</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Statewide Totals:** $354,031,977 $93,544,593 $500,000 100.00% $250,000
Mr. Denix Anbiah  
Chief, Division of Local Assistance  
California Department of Transportation  
P.O. Box 942874 MS #1  
Sacramento, CA 94274-0001  

RE: LSR Statewide Needs Assessment Funding Concurrence  

Dear Mr. Anbiah:  

The AGENCY NAME concurs with the request to contribute to the Statewide Local Streets and Roads Needs Assessment Report effort led by the California State Association of Counties (CSAC) and the League of California Cities (League). AGENCY NAME understands that the region’s programming capacity of Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funding will be reduced by $AMOUNT to cover this four-year effort, and authorizes the Department to appropriately direct this funding to cover our share of the costs.  

We understand that the funding requested is proportionate to the Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPAs) shares. California’s cities and counties will contribute an equal amount as provided by regional agencies towards this effort.  

Please feel free to contact INSERT CONTACT NAME AND INFORMATION if you have any questions regarding AGENCY NAME’s participation in this program.  

Sincerely,  

Cc: Kiana Buss, California State Association of Counties
VI. ACTION CALENDAR

B. IMPERIAL VALLEY TRANSIT, REGIONAL BUS TRANSIT SERVICE YEAR END INVOICING FOR IVT – BLUE AND GREEN LINES FOR FY 2010-11
September 19, 2011

Mayor David Bradshaw, Chairman
Imperial County Transportation Commission
940 Main Street  Suite 204
El Centro, CA  92243

SUBJECT:  IMPERIAL VALLEY TRANSIT, Regional Fixed Route Bus Transit Service
Year End Invoicing for the IVT - Blue and Green Lines for FY 2010-11

Dear Commission Members:

**Imperial Valley Transit (IVT)** and its subcomponents; the **IVT Blue and Green lines** in El Centro, are the public fixed route bus systems and are operated by First Transit, Inc. under contract with the ICTC. The service has been existence since 1989.

The annual operating budget is established based on negotiations between First Transit and ICTC staff. A cost is first established, an estimate of farebox revenue is agreed upon and which is retained by First Transit. ICTC pays the remainder subsidy, in monthly installments to First Transit. The estimate of fare revenue is based on the historical receipts. However there are variables that can influence the actual fare revenue received. In the situation where the fare estimates are less than the actual receipts, and there are no instances of substandard quality of service attributed to the operator, subsidy adjustments may be necessary.

As the FY 2010-11 year end invoices were processed, ICTC staff identified that the fare revenue for IVT was higher than anticipated. The subsidy was therefore underutilized. This continues to reflect the increasing demand and increasing passenger ridership on the main line bus routes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IVT</th>
<th>Passenger Ridership</th>
<th>Farebox Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 10-11</td>
<td>606,806</td>
<td>$527,776</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the FY 2010-11 year end invoices were processed, ICTC staff identified that the fare revenues for IVT Blue and Green Lines were lower than anticipated. However, there continues to be an increasing demand and passenger ridership continues to increase.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IVT Blue and Green Lines Ridership</th>
<th>Farebox Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 10-11</td>
<td>$21,036</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CITIES OF BRAWLEY, CALEXICO, CALIPATRIA, EL CENTRO, HOLTVILLE, IMPERIAL, WESTMORLAND, IMPERIAL IRRIGATION DISTRICT AND COUNTY OF IMPERIAL
Because the IVT system did not utilize its full subsidy amount, there is a subsidy savings that can be utilized to make an adjustment on the IVT Blue and Green Lines final invoice.

The most recent instances of prior final adjustments on invoices include an adjustment of $74,000 in 2007 for the IVT system and an adjustment of $16,536 on the IVT Blue/Green line system in 2009.

Funding for this service is derived from the Transportation Development Act (TDA) Fund, the State Transit Assistance Fund (STA), as well as grants from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). Funding is dedicated in the ICTC Transit Finance Plan (#7076001) and administered by the Regional Transit Administration Program (IVT – 7416001-531075 PY 01265) and IVT-El Centro - #7416001-526010 PY 01264).

The ICTC Management Committee met on September 14th and forwards this item to the ICTC Commission for review and approval:

1. Authorize a FY 2010-11 year end payment to FIRST TRANSIT Inc. in an amount of $53,643.00 from cost savings for the Imperial Valley Transit (PY 01265) for a final payment for the IVT Blue and Green Lines (PY 01264).

Sincerely yours,

MARK BAZA
Executive Director

BY: [Signature]

Kathi Williams
Administrative Analyst III

Attachment
VI. ACTION CALENDAR

C. ADOPTION OF THE PASSENGER STATISTICAL SUMMARY (PSS) PROJECT FOR FY 2010-11 FOR IMPERIAL VALLEY TRANSIT (IVT)
September 19, 2011

Mayor David Bradshaw
Imperial County Transportation Commission
1405 N. Imperial Ave. Suite 1
El Centro, CA 92243

SUBJECT: Adoption of the Passenger Statistical Summary (PSS) Project for FY 2010-11 for Imperial Valley Transit (IVT)

Dear Commission Members:

Due to the receipt of federal grant funding for public transit, federal reporting requirements state that transit systems are required to report on “passenger miles.” This process takes place every three years and is utilized to track the individual distance or mileage travelled by each boarding passenger. Federal grant apportionments are also based on a variety of factors including census data and this type of reporting process.

Larger urban agencies typically have electronic or automatic passenger counters on their vehicles. However, this type of process can be cost prohibitive. As a result many medium to smaller agencies alternatively choose to develop a statistical sampling system instead, through qualified consultants.

The parameters of the project include a sampling methodology and compliance with a federal requirement for 95% confidence and a margin of error not to exceed plus or minus 10%.

The PSS project was required to be completed during FY 2010-11. This is the second time this type of project has been completed, the first project was completed in 2009. The County administered this project previously on behalf of the ICTC. The FY 2010-11 project was awarded to the firm of Rea and Parker Research, Inc. in May 2010. The project work effort commenced on July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011.

The consultant developed the sampling methodology, and acquired local staff who monitored various bus routes throughout the fiscal year. The final report has since been prepared based on the guidance of the federal requirements. This final report is due to the federal agency by October 2011.

CITIES OF BRAWLEY, CALEXICO, CALIPATRIA, EL CENTRO, HOLTVILLE, IMPERIAL, WESTMORLAND, IMPERIAL IRRIGATION DISTRICT AND COUNTY OF IMPERIAL
The following is a brief summary of the FY 2010-11 data sampling in comparison to the previous FY 2008-09 effort. The report indicates that all of the ridership data presented is very close to that from the FY 2008-09 sampling project, which confirms the reliability of the process and the study results.

"...Form 406A shows that the annual estimated unlinked passenger boardings and mileage is determined (with a margin of error of +/- 10 percent at 95 percent confidence) to be 950,515 riders who traveled 10,398,670 passenger miles during the year (Lines 16 and 17). In 2008-09, the corresponding estimates were 949,008 passengers and 10,294,546 passenger miles, indicating a great deal of consistency between the two periods..." (Passenger Statistical Sampling Project, Rea and Parker, Page 15).

The ICTC Management Committee met on September 14th and forwards this item to the ICTC Commission for review and approval:

1. Approve the Passenger Statistical Sampling Project for FY 2010-11.
2. Direct staff to forward the report to the National Transit Database (NTD)

Sincerely yours,

MARK BAZA
Executive Director

BY: [Signature]

Kathi Williams
Administrative Analyst III

Attachment
The County of Imperial provides fixed route bus service throughout the County through the services of Imperial Valley Transit, which was created in 1989. Imperial Valley Transit began as a 5 route system with 3 buses running Monday through Friday. The passenger ridership initially averaged approximately 3,000 passengers a month.

The service is operated by First Transit, Inc., administered by the Imperial County Department of Public Works, and funded by the Imperial Valley Association of Governments (IVAG). Funding is provided annually through the adopted IVAG Transit Finance Plan. The sources of the funding include, State Transit Assistance (STA), State Transportation Development Act (TDA), Federal 5311 and 5307 funds and local fare revenue.

The Federal Register of September 25, 1987, specifies that certain operating data must be collected from federally funded transit systems as part of the Section 15 Uniform System of Accounts and Records and Reporting System. One such required set of data that is required is an annual estimate of unlinked passenger trips and passenger miles that is reliable with 95 percent confidence to a margin of error of +/- 10 percent. The Urban Mass Transportation Administration and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) developed several suggested sampling techniques for collecting annual estimates of unlinked passenger trips and passenger miles. A transit agency may use a technique other than the UMTA recommended techniques as long as it meets the prescribed precision and confidence levels.

The County of Imperial contracted with Rea & Parker Research of San Diego, California to conduct the study that would require Rea & Parker Research personnel to ride randomly selected Imperial Valley Transit bus trips for a one year period that covered July 1, 2010-to-June 30, 2011. Rea & Parker Research had conducted the most recent passenger mile sampling for Imperial Valley Transit in 2008-2009.

Transit systems were now being offered the opportunity to convert to a new method of sampling supported by the National Transit Database (NTD). This new method would likely result in fewer samples required but in a highly irregular schedule that could make the securing and retention of employees to conduct the requisite counts to be problematic. Further, this new
sampling method required considerable trip-by-trip data from prior passenger mile estimates—records not required to be electronically maintained in order to compile the data for such prior estimates in order to complete the Daily Record Sheets that had been a part of the previous methodology. The decision was made to conduct this passenger mile estimate using the older, but still approved methodology, but to track and compile all individual bus trip data electronically so that the new methodology could be considered in the future.

The existing methodology indicated that for the 6 days per week that Imperial Valley Transit operated, two bus trips could be tallied every operating day for one year, or three trips every other day, 5 trips every third day, and so forth, as shown in the figure below.

The option was also available to devise a statistically valid method that differed from both the new and the established NTD methodologies. Rea & Parker Research elected to utilize the NTD methodology inasmuch as it is specifically designed to address small transit systems. As such, no determination of variance, standard deviation, margin of error, confidence levels or intervals was undertaken by Rea & Parker research independent of this established methodology. These statistics would have been required to develop a method of sampling unique to Imperial Valley Transit. Attached as an appendix to this report are the academic and professional consultative experiences of Richard A. Parker, Ph.D. and Louis M. Rea, Ph.D., principals of Rea & Parker Research and also principal investigators and analysts for this study.

In preparation for the commencement of the study, Rea & Parker Research entered each bus trip into an SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) database as a code, indicating weekday and Saturday, bus route number (each Imperial Valley Transit route runs in one direction only), and the number of the trip. For example, Route 50 on a weekday at 9:48am would have been
coded and entered as 50-04, the fourth Route 50 trip on weekdays and Saturday’s 5:20pm Route 100 would have been coded 100s-05, the fifth Saturday Route 100 trip. Five trips were randomly selected by the SPSS program for counting every three days.

No buses run for Imperial Valley Transit on Sundays or on several holidays throughout the year. Other buses might alter their route somewhat on certain days or run only one day per week. Still others curtail their trips when Imperial Valley College is not in session. Random selection of any bus that was not running on a given day caused a randomly selected replacement to be chosen.

The method that was selected for implementation was for 5 bus trips to be sampled every third day. Most weeks were configured in one of three formats: Monday and Thursday, Tuesday and Friday, or Wednesday and Saturday. If a holiday occurred on a selected day during any week, these pairings were altered. For example, if Thanksgiving Day were the scheduled Thursday, that week may have been rearranged with the Wednesday and Saturday pairing so that for those two weeks only, buses were sampled on Monday and Wednesday one week and Thursday and Saturday in the previous or succeeding week. Missed trips, of which there were very few, were made up on the same day of the week as the missed trip during the succeeding week.

One other variable required attention for this year’s study and that pertains to overflow buses. Imperial Valley Transit experiences considerable demand for boarding at the border in Calexico, and there are occasions when the existing Route 150 bus cannot accommodate that demand. At such times Imperial Valley Transit dispatches another bus to absorb this overflow demand. The overflow bus was added to the list of bus routes and selected for sampling similar to all other routes. Inasmuch as it was not known if the overflow bus was going to be needed on any particular day, a sixth trip was selected randomly for backup when the overflow was selected for sampling. On days when the overflow was not part of the sample but was needed, Imperial Valley Transit notified Rea & Parker research and that bus trip was added to the tally of trips run for that week.

On board personnel were given an assignment log (as depicted in the Exhibit A example) and trip sheets (Exhibit B example), as demonstrated on the next pages. The assignment log provided specific instructions about where to board each bus, where and when to exit, and if that trip was one that was selected for sampling. If the trip was selected, trip sheets were attached onto which
the Rea & Parker Research counting employee on board was to record boardings, alightings, and on-board counts between stops.

The Rea & Parker Research supervisor, who was based in the City of Imperial, collected and distributed these forms to the counting personnel and sent the manually completed forms twice per month to San Diego for data entry by Rea & Parker Research staff and math and logic checks by one of the principals of Rea & Parker Research—Richard A. Parker, Ph.D. or Louis M. Rea, Ph.D. At that point in time, the manual information was entered electronically, the distance between stops was added to the forms, and the total number of passenger miles could be determined. A completed trip sheet (Exhibit C) also follows in the next pages of this report for illustrative purposes. These completed forms were then compiled into an Excel file that maintained a running balance of counts and mileage. A sample of that Excel file also follows (Exhibit D), and it is this format that will facilitate consideration of NTD alternative sampling for future analyses.
# Imperial Valley Transit Passenger Sampling Assignment Log (EXHIBIT A)

**Assignment#** 55B  
**DATE:** 1-7-11  
**Employee:**  
**Day of Week:** Fri

## SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS FOR REPORTING/FINISHING IF OTHER THAN FIRST OR LAST STOP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting Time</th>
<th>Reporting Place</th>
<th>Finishing Time</th>
<th>Finishing Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## On-Board Bus Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bus Route</th>
<th>Trip Serial #</th>
<th>Beginning Stop</th>
<th>Begin Stop Time</th>
<th>Last Stop</th>
<th>Last Stop Time</th>
<th>Bus Scheduled for Data Collection?</th>
<th>Special Instructions after Last Stop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brawley E St &amp; Rio Vista</td>
<td>12:59P</td>
<td>El Centro State &amp; 14th</td>
<td>2:10P</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Stay on bus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>100-08</td>
<td>El Centro State &amp; 14th</td>
<td>2:10P</td>
<td>Calexico Hacienda</td>
<td>2:56P</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Stay on bus and with driver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td>Calexico Hacienda</td>
<td>3:06P</td>
<td>El Centro State &amp; 14th</td>
<td>4:20P</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>blu-10</td>
<td>El Centro State &amp; 14th</td>
<td>4:35P</td>
<td>El Centro State &amp; 14th</td>
<td>5:33P</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>200-10</td>
<td>El Centro State &amp; 14th</td>
<td>5:40P</td>
<td>Brawley E St &amp; Rio Vista</td>
<td>6:37P</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


# EXHIBIT B
SURVEY TRIP SHEET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1) Trip Serial No.</th>
<th>100-08</th>
<th>(2) Date</th>
<th>1-7-11</th>
<th>(3) Day of Week</th>
<th>Fri</th>
<th>(4) Time Period</th>
<th>Midday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(5) Route No.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(6) Vehicle Inventory Number</td>
<td></td>
<td>(7) Total Capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td>(8) Seated Capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) Stop No.</td>
<td>(10) Stop Description</td>
<td>(11) Odometer Reading</td>
<td>(12) Passengers Boarded</td>
<td>(13) Passengers De-Boarded</td>
<td>(14) Passengers On Board</td>
<td>(15) Distance Between Stops</td>
<td>(16) Passenger Miles (15) x (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 State St / 14th St.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 State St. / 8th St.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 State St. / 5th St.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 4th St. / Brighton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 4th St. / Wensley</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Ross St. / 10th St.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Imperial Ave. / Pepper</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Aurora / 14th St.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Aurora / 4th St.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 4th St. / Wake St.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Imperial Valley Mall</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Heber Family Apts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Dogwood/Hwy 86</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Heber Post Office</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Heber/Pitzer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Scaroni/Cole</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Scaroni/Hacienda</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(26) Capacity Miles</td>
<td>(7) x (22)</td>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(27) Seat Miles</td>
<td>(8) x (22)</td>
<td>Mean On Board</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SURVEY TRIP SHEET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stop No.</th>
<th>Stop Description</th>
<th>Odometer Reading</th>
<th>Passengers Boarded</th>
<th>Passengers De-Boarded</th>
<th>Passengers On Board</th>
<th>Distance Between Stops</th>
<th>Passenger Miles $(15) \times (16)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>State St. / 14th St.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Waterman / Main</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>La Brucherie/Orange</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>La Brucherie/Ross</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Imperial/Pepper</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ross/10th</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Clark Road/S. Loop Rd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Social Services Buildings</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Wake Ave</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4th St./Driftwood</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4th St./Wensley</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3rd/Brighton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1st/Brighton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Hope/Brighton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Dogwood/Orange</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Dogwood/Evan Hewes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Totals

- Capacity Miles $(7) \times (22)$: 0
- Seat Miles $(8) \times (22)$: 0
- Passenger Miles $(15) \times (16)$: 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(20)</th>
<th>(21)</th>
<th>(22)</th>
<th>(23)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity Miles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seat Miles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Miles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stop No.</td>
<td>Stop Description</td>
<td>Odometer Reading</td>
<td>Passengers Boarded</td>
<td>Passengers De-Boarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Park/5th St.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>State St./5th</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>State St./8th</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>State St. / 14th St.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(26) Capacity Miles = $(7) \times (22)$  
(27) Seat Miles = $(8) \times (22)$
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stop No.</th>
<th>Stop Description</th>
<th>Odometer Reading</th>
<th>Passengers Boarded</th>
<th>Passengers De-Boarded</th>
<th>Passengers On Board</th>
<th>Distance Between Stops</th>
<th>Passenger Miles (15) x (16)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>State/14th</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Imperial/Commercial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Imperial/Euclid</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bradshaw/86 (Costco)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>La Brucherie/Bradshaw -WalM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Aten / La Brucherie</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Aten/Myrtle</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Aten / Cross</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Imperial Valley College</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Barioni Ave./K St. (IID)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Imperial Post Office</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>15th &amp; Imperial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Legion Rd. / Hwy 86 (Hospital)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Brawley--K St./2nd St.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Brawley--K St/Imperial Ave</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Brawley--K St./S. 9th</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(26) Capacity Miles (7) x (22)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(27) Seat Miles (8) x (22)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>(23)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SURVEY TRIP SHEET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stop No.</th>
<th>Stop Description</th>
<th>Odometer Reading</th>
<th>Passengers Boarded</th>
<th>Passengers De-Boarded</th>
<th>Passengers On Board</th>
<th>Distance Between Stops</th>
<th>Passenger Miles (15) x (16)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Brawley--K St./S. Palm St.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Brawley--Palm St. / J St.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Brawley--S. Main St. / Palm</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Brawley--Main St. / 10th St.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Brawley--Main/North Plaza</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Brawley--Main/3rd St.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Brawley--E St./Rio Vista</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Westmorland--Center/Main</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Westmorland--Center/6th</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Calipatria--Main St. / Park</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Calipatria--111/Main</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Niland--111/Main</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Brawley--K St./S. Palm St.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(26) Capacity Miles (7) x (22)</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(27) Seat Miles (8) x (22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stop No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**EXHIBIT D**

**EXCEL COMPUTERIZD TRIP-BY-TRIP DATA ENTRY**

*(EXAMPLE: WEEK 1 INPUT)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Day of Week</th>
<th>Week #</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Boarded-UPT</th>
<th>Sum of Boardings</th>
<th>On-Board</th>
<th>Sum of On-Board</th>
<th>Bus Trip Distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7/1/2010</td>
<td>Thurs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>IVCNIL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/1/2010</td>
<td>Thurs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/1/2010</td>
<td>Thurs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/1/2010</td>
<td>Thurs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/1/2010</td>
<td>Thurs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>1531</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/6/2010</td>
<td>Tues</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>50.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/6/2010</td>
<td>Tues</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/6/2010</td>
<td>Tues</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>2493</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/6/2010</td>
<td>Tues</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2558</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/6/2010</td>
<td>Tues</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2586</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Passenger Miles=PMT</th>
<th>Sum of PMT</th>
<th>Capacity Miles</th>
<th>Sum of Capacity Miles</th>
<th>Seat Miles</th>
<th>Sum of Seat Miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>1249.3</td>
<td>1249.3</td>
<td>1088.1</td>
<td>1088.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>109.3</td>
<td>319.7</td>
<td>1569</td>
<td>319.7</td>
<td>1407.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>366.5</td>
<td>475.8</td>
<td>897</td>
<td>2466</td>
<td>607.2</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>439.2</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>903.5</td>
<td>3369.5</td>
<td>611.6</td>
<td>2626.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>479.6</td>
<td>1394.6</td>
<td>861.8</td>
<td>4231.3</td>
<td>569.9</td>
<td>3196.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>594.7</td>
<td>1989.3</td>
<td>3282.6</td>
<td>7513.9</td>
<td>2222</td>
<td>5418.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1989.3</td>
<td>132.6</td>
<td>7646.5</td>
<td>132.6</td>
<td>5551.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290.2</td>
<td>2279.5</td>
<td>1287</td>
<td>8933.5</td>
<td>871.2</td>
<td>6422.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>2342.6</td>
<td>291.9</td>
<td>9225.4</td>
<td>291.9</td>
<td>6714.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>2354.2</td>
<td>134.4</td>
<td>9359.8</td>
<td>134.4</td>
<td>6848.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FTA Form 406A was used to compile the Daily Trip-by-Trip Excel file totals for the year and to display the final results for the yearlong study.\(^1\) Form 406A shows (on Lines 1, 7, and 10) that a total of 16,785 unlinked boardings were counted for the year on the 520 sampled bus trips (32.28 boardings per bus trip). In 2008-2009 there were 33.18 boardings per sampled trip.

- 27.89 passengers on 93 sampled weekday a.m. peak hour bus trips (prior to 9:00 a.m.)—2008-2009 = 25.51 boardings per sampled trip.
- 38.54 boardings on 177 sampled midday weekday trips (9:00 a.m.—3:00 p.m.)—2008-2009 = 41.03 boardings per sampled trip.
- 26.16 boardings on 146 weekday p.m. peak bus trips (3:00 p.m.—7:00 p.m.)—2008-2009 = 25.71 boardings per sampled trip.
- and 19.89 on 19 nighttime trips (after 7:00 p.m.)—2008-2009 = 16.83 boardings per sampled trip.
- Saturdays, with fewer buses that run on the busier routes, typically, averaged 37.32 boardings per trip—2008-2009 = 40.62 boardings per sampled trip.

Inasmuch as Saturdays were oversampled relative to weekday trips, with 85 out of 520 sampled trips (16.3 percent of all sampled trips) in contrast to the actual weekly bus trips of 556 scheduled weekday trips and 31 scheduled Saturday trips (5.3 percent of all trips), the overall 32.28 boarding average is disproportionately high because of the higher boardings per trip on Saturdays. When weights are applied\(^2\), the mean number of boardings per trip system wide is reduced slightly to 31.20 (2008-2009 = 31.30 boardings per trip).

All of ridership averages presented above are very close to those from the 2008-2009 sampling, thereby strongly confirming both their validity and the methodological reliability of the study.

---

\(^{1}\) The original Form 406A was modified from its published version to accommodate the requisite weighting and to correct some errors in the form. The original Form 406A follows on the next page, with errors noted by yellow highlight. These errors were as follows:

1) Lines 11-12 on the original were repeats of lines 9-10 rather than the data shown on the modified Form 406A on lines 12-13, which was the clear intent, and

2) Line 10 on the original is shown as being calculated by dividing line 1 by line 7; whereas, the correct determination is line 4 divided by line 7

\(^{2}\) Inasmuch as the sample distribution does not precisely mirror the actual distribution of trips weighting was appropriate for Form 406A. Weights are equal to the total trips in the sample (Line 7—Sample Total column) divided by total number of bus trips sampled (Line 8—Sample Total column). Then, for each time period, that result is divided by the total number of trips in the sample by time period (7) divided by the total number of bus trips sampled by time period (8). These weights are then multiplied by sample totals to obtain sample data that is weighted to reflect the actual distribution of bus trips.
## Form 406A (Modified)
### ANNUAL DATA TO FTA: IMPERIAL VALLEY TRANSIT

**July 1, 2010 - June 30, 2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line No.</th>
<th>ITEM Description</th>
<th>AM PEAK</th>
<th>MIDDAY</th>
<th>PM PEAK</th>
<th>NIGHT</th>
<th>SATURDAY</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>WEIGHTED**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(20) Passengers Boarded</td>
<td>2594</td>
<td>6822</td>
<td>3819</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>3172</td>
<td>16785</td>
<td>16221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(21) Passengers on Board</td>
<td>26724</td>
<td>74710</td>
<td>39702</td>
<td>3831</td>
<td>38030</td>
<td>182997</td>
<td>173666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(22) Bus Trip Distance</td>
<td>2108.1</td>
<td>3562.4</td>
<td>2930.8</td>
<td>328.5</td>
<td>2729.5</td>
<td>11659.3</td>
<td>11064.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(23) Passenger Miles</td>
<td>31963.8</td>
<td>66364</td>
<td>41333.8</td>
<td>2666.9</td>
<td>41300</td>
<td>183628.5</td>
<td>174314.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>(26) Capacity Miles</td>
<td>108355.3</td>
<td>174150.8</td>
<td>141207</td>
<td>13484.6</td>
<td>159246.2</td>
<td>596443.9</td>
<td>551895.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>(27) Seat Miles</td>
<td>77569.9</td>
<td>128447.7</td>
<td>102716.5</td>
<td>10532</td>
<td>109689.6</td>
<td>428555.7</td>
<td>400220.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>(28) Trips in Sample</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>29447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>(29) Total Number of Bus Trips</td>
<td>7495</td>
<td>10119</td>
<td>9081</td>
<td>1155</td>
<td>1581</td>
<td>29447</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>WEIGHTS**</td>
<td>1.423150979</td>
<td>1.009547173</td>
<td>1.09835595</td>
<td>1.073471875</td>
<td>0.328454511</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sample Averages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line No.</th>
<th>ITEM Description</th>
<th>AM PEAK</th>
<th>MIDDAY</th>
<th>PM PEAK</th>
<th>NIGHT</th>
<th>SATURDAY</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>WEIGHTED**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Unlinked Passengers (Boardings) per Trip</td>
<td>27.89</td>
<td>38.54</td>
<td>26.16</td>
<td>19.89</td>
<td>37.32</td>
<td>32.28</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Passenger Miles per Trip (4/7)</td>
<td>343.70</td>
<td>374.94</td>
<td>283.11</td>
<td>140.36</td>
<td>485.88</td>
<td>335.2</td>
<td>335.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Capacity Miles per Trip (5/7)</td>
<td>1165.11</td>
<td>983.90</td>
<td>967.17</td>
<td>709.72</td>
<td>1873.48</td>
<td>1147.01</td>
<td>1061.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Seat Miles per Trip (6/7)</td>
<td>834.08</td>
<td>725.69</td>
<td>703.54</td>
<td>554.32</td>
<td>1290.47</td>
<td>824.15</td>
<td>769.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>% Passenger Miles to Seat Miles per Trip</td>
<td>0.412</td>
<td>0.517</td>
<td>0.402</td>
<td>0.253</td>
<td>0.377</td>
<td>0.428</td>
<td>0.436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>% Passenger Miles to Capacity Miles per Trip</td>
<td>0.295</td>
<td>0.381</td>
<td>0.293</td>
<td>0.198</td>
<td>0.259</td>
<td>0.308</td>
<td>0.316</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Annual Totals (weighted by number of trips)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line No.</th>
<th>ITEM Description</th>
<th>AM PEAK</th>
<th>MIDDAY</th>
<th>PM PEAK</th>
<th>NIGHT</th>
<th>SATURDAY</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>WEIGHTED**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Annual Unlinked Passenger Trips (10*8)</td>
<td>209054</td>
<td>390010</td>
<td>237537</td>
<td>22978</td>
<td>58999</td>
<td>950515</td>
<td>918578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Annual Total Passenger Miles (11*8)</td>
<td>2576007.32</td>
<td>3793996.14</td>
<td>2570905.74</td>
<td>162119.45</td>
<td>768180.00</td>
<td>10398670.08</td>
<td>9871208.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Applying these mean numbers of unlinked boardings and correspondingly determined passenger miles (based on number of passengers on-board and distance between stops) reveals the final estimates required for the federal database. **Form 406A shows that the annual estimated unlinked passenger boardings and mileage is determined (with a margin of error of +/- 10 percent at 95 percent confidence) to be 918,578 riders who traveled 9,871,209 passenger miles during the year (Lines 16 and 17).** In 2008-2009, the corresponding estimates were 894,537 passengers and 9,602,013 passenger miles, indicating a great deal of consistency between the two periods, with 2010-2011 showing an increase of approximately 24,000 unlinked passenger trips and 269,000 passenger miles.

Form 406A also breaks down the total ridership and mileage by time of day (Lines 16 and 17).

- There are 209,054 unlinked boardings annually during weekday a.m. peak periods, traveling 2,576,007 miles. Corresponding totals from 2008-2009 were 190,077 unlinked boardings and 2,543,680 passenger miles.
- Midday riders on weekdays total 390,010 per year and 3,793,996 miles. In 2008-2009, ridership showed 396,254 unlinked boardings and 3,753,544 miles.
- Peak riders during the weekday p.m. periods total 237,537 and 2,570,906 miles (2008-2009 = 232,032 boardings and 2,436,605 miles).
- Weekday nights have 22,978 riders traveling 162,119 miles (an increase from 2008-2009 when there were 17,028 boardings and 119,020 miles), whereas all others listed herein are very similar (within the 10 percent margin of error) to 2008-2009.
- Saturdays have 58,999 riders and 768,180 miles (2008-2009 = 59,146 boardings and 749,164 miles).

Imperial Valley Transit vehicles experience their highest percentage occupancy (Line 14) during midday on weekdays, with 51.7% of seat miles occupied (2008-2009 = 44.4%), followed by the weekday morning peak period (41.2 percent—2008-2009 = 37.1%), and, as would be expected, night times have the lightest occupancy (25.3 percent—2008-2009 = 23.5%). In 2008-2009, Saturdays carried the second highest load (41.3%) instead of weekday morning peak. Overall, for all buses, 43.6 percent of seats are occupied with 31.6 percent of the combined seated and
standing capacity occupied, and in 2008-2009, the corresponding occupancies were 39.7% of seats and 26.6% of seated and standing capacity.\footnote{There was a redetermination downward of some standing capacities that were used in 2008-2009, and the increase in combined seated and standing occupancy is partially impacted by this change. As such the increased seated and standing occupancy in 2010-2011 overstates the difference between the years}
**ANNUAL DATA TO FTA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line No.</th>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>WEEKDAYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AM PEAK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(20) Passengers Boarded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(21) Passengers on Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(22) Bus Trip Distance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(23) Passenger Miles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>(26) Capacity Miles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>(27) Seat Miles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>(28) Trips in Sample</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>(29) Total Number of Bus Trips</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Unlinked Passengers per Trip (1/7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Passenger Miles per Trip (1/7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Unlinked Passengers per Trip (1/7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Passenger Miles per Trip (4/7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*DO = Directly Operated PT = Purchased Transportation

Sample Plan Used____________________

Date Prepared ________________ Date Updated ______________________
APPENDIX: Qualifications of Rea & Parker Research

Richard A. Parker, Ph.D.

Louis M. Rea, Ph.D.
Rea & Parker Research is a survey and market research and economic consulting firm based in San Diego, California. Rea & Parker Research also has facilities in Los Angeles. Rea & Parker Research is a division of Rea & Parker, Incorporated, a California corporation—incorporated in 1985 (Fed ID: 33-0156230). Its home office in San Diego is located at 4875 Casals Place, San Diego, CA 92124 (mailing address: P.O. Box 421079, San Diego, CA 92142-1079). Telephone numbers for Rea & Parker Research are 858-279-5070 and 858-279-1170 (fax). The website is www.rea-parker.com.

It was founded by its present owners, Louis M. Rea, Ph.D., and Richard A. Parker, Ph.D., in 1984 and was incorporated in 1985. Rea & Parker Research has grown into a well-respected, financially stable, and substantial research organization with clients throughout the State of California and the Southwest who will attest to the firm's ability to deliver a quality product within the originally designated budget and in accordance with the contracted time schedule.

Dr. Parker is the firm's President and Dr. Rea its Vice-President. Dr. Rea and Dr. Parker are also professors in the School of Public Affairs at San Diego State University. Dr. Parker and Dr. Rea are co-authors of a highly successful book, Designing and Conducting Survey Research: A Comprehensive Guide, published by Jossey-Bass Publishers in 1992, with a second edition published in 1997, and a third edition in 2005.

Rea & Parker Research utilizes the university offices and state-of-the-art computer facilities, along with access to renowned scholars and reference material when necessary. There are four regularly employed members of the staff: Richard A. Parker, Ph.D., Louis M. Rea, Ph.D., Sherry Ryan, Ph.D., and Sharon Gomez, with part-time research assistant help from graduate and undergraduate student assistants.

Drs. Parker and Rea have extensive experience in public and urban affairs regarding the collection of primary demographic, attitudinal, and market-related data through survey research and focus group analysis. Rea & Parker Research has a significant history of success in deriving marketing data from ethnic minority groups. Further, they are highly regarded economic consultants, particularly in the areas of fiscal impact analysis, urban economic development, and site specific commercial, retail, and residential evaluation.

Rea & Parker Research has designed and conducted surveys and market research for a significant list of clients, including:

- State of California--Senate Rules Committee
- State of California--Senate Special Committee on Border Issues
- State of California--Office of the Auditor General
- State of California--Office of the Attorney General
- California Department of Transportation (CALTRANS)
- San Diego County Sheriffs’ Department
- San Diego County Water Authority
- San Diego Unified School District
- Imperial Irrigation District
• Otay Water District
• San Diego Gas & Electric
• County of San Diego
• County of Orange
• City of San Diego
• City of San Diego Housing Commission
• City of Escondido
• City of Carlsbad
• City of Oceanside
• City of Poway
• City of Davis
• City of St. Helena
• City of Dana Point
• City of Holtville
• Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
• Southern California Regional Rail Authority (Metrolink)
• Orange County Transportation Authority
• Bay Area Rapid Transit
• San Diego Metropolitan Transit System
• Riverside Transit Agency
• Imperial Valley Transit
• Southern California Association of Governments
• Imperial Valley Association of Governments
• San Diego Association of Governments
• Santa Clarita Transit
• Sweetwater Authority
• San Diego County Taxpayers Association
• San Diego County Law Library
• California Center for Sustainable Energy
• City Heights Community Development Corporation (City of San Diego)
• Centre City Development Corporation (City of San Diego)
• North Park Main Street Association (San Diego)
• San Luis Rey Indian Water Authority
• La Jolla Band of Mission Indians
• Viejas Enterprises
• Foxwoods Development
• Wallace, Roberts and Todd--Planners and Architects (San Francisco)
• Westec Services, Inc. (Salt Lake City)
• Joint Labor/Management Committee-Retail Food Industry
• San Diego/Imperial Counties Labor Council AFL-CIO
• PRC Engineering
• RECON, Incorporated
• Christiansen and Wallace
• Stevens Planning Group
• IBI Group
• Brian Mooney and Associates--Urban Planners
• MNA Consulting Services
• Stoorza, Ziegaus, & Metzger--Public Relations
• Southwest Strategies, LLC
• Stirling Enterprises
• Pardee Construction Company
Richard A. Parker, Ph.D. is a Professor of Practice in the School of Public Affairs at San Diego State University where he teaches graduate and undergraduate courses in statistics, survey research, urban economic development, finance, and real estate. Dr. Parker possesses extensive analytical experience in statistical survey research, market analysis, land use, real estate development and valuation, and transportation issues. He will serve as the co-Project Director.

Dr. Parker has been a consultant to both the public and private sectors for almost 30 years. He has specialized in sample survey research for various governmental agencies and market research for retail, commercial, residential, and recreational development. Particular emphasis has been placed upon market research conducted in the field of transportation, with a myriad of rider/on-board surveys, intercept surveys, telephone surveys, and focus group projects having been performed for several transportation agencies. Dr. Parker has further established his reputation with regard to fiscal impact studies, urban redevelopment, and environmental impact/socioeconomic and demographic analyses. Dr. Parker has also been involved on a consultative basis with a number of issues concerning economic and population growth impacts in Southern California and has published a variety of articles, monographs, and books on these subjects. He has further participated in various panel discussions, delivered expert testimony to legislatures and courts, and appeared on several radio and television programs on behalf of his clients.

Dr. Parker is a graduate of Brown University, the University of California at Berkeley, and UCLA. He possesses degrees in Business Administration from those institutions (B.S., MBA, and Ph.D.) plus a further graduate degree in City Planning (MCP) from San Diego State University.
Louis M. Rea, Ph.D. is Vice-President of Rea & Parker Research and professor of City Planning in the School of Public Affairs at San Diego State University. Dr. Rea teaches graduate courses in statistical analysis, transportation planning, survey research, and urban/fiscal problems. He has published a variety of articles, participated in panel discussions, and delivered numerous papers at professional conferences throughout the United States. He has extensive experience as a researcher and consultant in California and particularly in San Diego and the Los Angeles area for the past 30 years. Dr. Rea will be Co-Project Director for this study.

Dr. Rea has conducted and supervised numerous projects in the areas of transportation research and transit planning, including on-board bus/train surveys, ride checks, intercept surveys, and focus groups. He has also conducted Internet and telephone surveys in numerous consulting and research assignments for municipal jurisdictions and private businesses throughout Southern California. Dr. Rea has prepared environmental impact reports and market analyses for various commercial/recreational developments and has analyzed the feasibility of assessment districts and direct benefit financing. Dr. Rea has also prepared demographic and economic profiles and projections for various projects.

Dr. Rea is a graduate of Colgate University in New York, where he earned a BA. He received a Master of Regional Planning (MRP) and Ph.D. in Social Science from Syracuse University in Regional Planning.

Complete resumes are attached.

Survey Research Consultative Projects

San Diego County Water Authority Public Opinion Surveys


Also for the San Diego County Water Authority:

• Prepared, implemented, and analyzed survey of General Managers and Department Heads of 23 member agencies about satisfaction, effectiveness, usefulness of services and programs provided by Water Authority in 2003 and 2005
• Prepared, implemented, and analyzed employee satisfaction survey of Engineering Department.
• Prepared, implemented, and analyzed 400 respondent survey among San Diego County contractors regarding project labor agreements and public works contracting.
• 2008—two 600 person telephone surveys tracking before and after impacts of public awareness campaign concerning water conservation.
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority:

On-Board and Telephone Bus Surveys

- On-Board bus survey for MTA, Foothill Transit, and Duarte Transit concerning expansion of Gold Line—800 respondents

- Conducted the On-Board Bus Survey for Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority, including 40,000 rider/on-board surveys, 2,500 follow-up telephone interviews, and 10 focus groups.

- Final deliverables include/included 4 reports:
  - Satisfaction, travel patterns, fare media, and demographics of 31,000 weekday bus riders on LACMTA buses and those of 12 municipal transit operators within Los Angeles County (Alhambra Community Transit, Culver City Bus Lines, Commerce Transit, Pasadena ARTS, Cerritos-On-Wheels (COW), Santa Monica Big Blue Bus, Los Angeles Commuter Express, Santa Clarita Transit, Torrance Transit, Carson Circuit, El Monte Trolley, and Foothill Transit).
  - Satisfaction, travel patterns, fare media, and demographics of 3,500 weekend bus riders on LACMTA buses.
  - Detailed follow-up telephone survey of 2,500 weekday riders of MTA and 12 municipal operators expanding upon demographics, satisfaction, problem occurrence, importance/concern, travel behavior, use of MTA website, customer service, and marketing media and messages.
  - Geocoded home, origin (production), boarding, alighting, and destination (attraction) data is presented in color graphics by line, service sector, and planning area.
  - Prepared the on-board survey instrument for LACMTA and each of the 12 municipal operators and had its surveyors ride the buses of randomly selected bus runs from June, 2001 to December, 2001, with follow-up surveys also conducted on-board during March, 2002.
  - Prepared and tested the survey instrument in 10 focus group sessions conducted in Los Angeles County and in two extensive on-board pretests involving almost 1,000 respondents. Focus groups were conducted in different geographical areas of the County, among different age and ethnic groups, and in both Spanish and English.
The telephone survey consisted of 39 questions, including 110 individual variables. The mean survey time was 13.09 minutes, administered in both English and Spanish. Media information concerning messages communicated on television was added to more typical transportation-based questions. It was conducted from late January to early March, 2002. The analysis consisted of detailed crosstabulations, correlations, and analyses of variance in order to assess market segmentation strategies.

**On-Board and Telephone Rail Surveys**

- On-Board survey of Gold Line riders concerning expansion plans—800 respondents
- Conducted the On-Board Rail Survey for **Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority**, including 15,000 rider/on-board surveys, 1,000 follow-up telephone interviews, and 3 focus groups.
  - Final deliverables include/included 4 reports:
    - Satisfaction, travel patterns, fare media, and demographics of 12,000 weekday riders on LACMTA Metro Rail—Blue, Green, and Red Lines.
    - Satisfaction, travel patterns, fare media, and demographics of 3,000 weekend bus riders on LACMTA Metro Rail—Blue, Green, and Red Lines.
    - Detailed follow-up telephone survey of 1,000 weekday and weekend riders of Metro Rail expanding upon demographics, satisfaction, problem occurrence, importance/concern, travel behavior, use of MTA website, customer service, and marketing media and messages.
    - Geocoded home, origin (production), and destination (attraction) data is presented in color graphics by line.
  - Prepared the on-board survey instrument for LACMTA and had its surveyors ride the trains on randomly selected runs from August, 2001 to October, 2001, with follow-up surveys also conducted on-board during February, 2002.
  - Prepared and tested the survey instrument in 3 focus group sessions conducted in Los Angeles County and in two extensive on-board pretests involving almost 500 respondents. Focus groups were conducted in different geographical areas of the County, among different age and ethnic groups, and in both Spanish and English.
The telephone survey consisted of 42 questions, including 103 individual variables. The mean survey time was 12.29 minutes, administered in both English and Spanish. It was conducted from late January to early March, 2002. Media information concerning messages communicated on television was added to more typical transportation-based questions. The analysis consisted of detailed crosstabulations, correlations, and analyses of variance in order to assess market segmentation strategies.

**Telephone Survey**

- 600-person telephone survey in San Gabriel Valley concerning expansion of Gold Line and Measure R

**Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA):**

**Market Program Consultant—Seniors, Pre-Seniors, and Hispanics**

Marketing program consultant in OCTA’s effort to attract and retain more riders, particularly from Hispanic and senior citizen groups. Sixteen focus groups were scheduled and twelve conducted (four having been deferred at OCTA’s request to July, 2002).

Focus groups were held among riders and non-riders in Hispanic and senior citizen population enclaves. Further focus groups were held among pre-seniors (age 55-64) in order to ascertain information about their willingness to ride the buses as they grow older and what they would require in order to do so with much satisfaction.

Marketing messages were tested, including a new logo, new bus schedules, and OCTA publications. Intensive examination of media usage, including radio stations preferred, television channels watched, and newspapers read, was undertaken. Advertisements that are successful among these groups were explored.

Also conducted were two 600-person telephone surveys among Latino and senior residents of Orange County. These surveys pursued much the same information as the focus groups, including media usage, television programs watched, community cable programming information, and so forth in a quantitative mode that permits tracking and trend analysis over time. Detailed analysis using crosstabulations, analyses of variance, correlations, and regression, and factor analysis were undertaken as a part of the segmentation effort.

**CenterLine Customer Profile**

Conducted the CenterLine Customer Profile for the Orange County Transportation Authority involving intercept surveys of 8,800 potential urban light rail users, 1,500 telephone survey interviews, and 12 focus group/roundtables. Final analysis assessed likely ridership, preferred destinations, trip purposes, public support, demographic and psychographic profiles of potential light rail ridership.
Twenty-one sites were selected in Orange County that were to be likely destinations for a proposed light rail system. Randomly selected individuals at sites including Disneyland, John Wayne Airport, University of California-Irvine, California State University-Fullerton, Main Street Santa Ana, Civic Center, UCI Medical Center, South Coast Plaza, and others were surveyed in person to determine their interest in using the proposed light rail system, their current transportation behavior, and design/marketing themes. This intercept survey was a short 4-minute interview to determine how far people would walk, how often they would ride, for what purpose (employment/recreation), among others.

These intercept interviews were followed-up by detailed 18-minute telephone interviews of randomly selected residents of central Orange County and western Riverside and San Bernardino Counties. These surveys were to establish greater depth of understanding of the potential market, including demographics and transportation needs/desires. Detailed analysis using crosstabulations, analyses of variance, correlations, and regression, and factor analysis were undertaken as a part of the segmentation effort.

At the same time as the surveys were being conducted, 12 focus groups throughout the County (Fullerton, Santa Ana, Costa Mesa, Irvine, Orange, and Anaheim) involving mayors, city council persons, business leaders, local merchants, tourism officials, and the general public were being held to uncover the qualitative richness behind the quantitative intercept and telephone survey data pertaining to public perceptions of the system, public fears of disruption, desired routes, and local needs.

**Additional research projects for the Orange County Transportation Authority**

- Prepared, conducted and analyzed 2,000 person rider/on-board bus survey for the Orange County Transportation Authority regarding monthly, weekly, and daily bus pass sales. Prepared questionnaire, administered survey, analyzed data in order to assess potential for expanding bus pass sales.

- Prepared Multi-Cultural Market Assessment Study for transportation services in Orange County. Formulated baseline data and marketing strategies for long- and short-term transportation related issues facing Orange County's diverse multicultural communities, with particular emphasis upon Hispanic and Vietnamese communities. Administered three different statistical surveys including intercept and rider/on-board formats, each in English, Spanish, and Vietnamese.

- Prepared, conducted and analyzed Vietnamese ridership study, including in-person intercept survey, telephone sample survey, and focus group among Vietnamese community leaders regarding current bus service and future transit needs in the Vietnamese areas of Orange County.

- 2007—Analyzed 2,000 person ACCESS (disabled paratransit) customer service satisfaction survey.

- 2007—conducted and analyzed counts of passengers on Amtrak and Metrolink trains at every Orange County station plus Oceanside, Norwalk, and Commerce.
• 2008—Focus groups (4) concerning integration and improvements to service (Metrolink, Amtrak, Coaster) along Los Angeles-San Diego (LOSSAN South) corridor

• 2008/2009—Rail safety study including observations at each of 54 at-grade rail crossings in Orange County, interviews with 60 local decision makers and other community leaders, and 600 person residential telephonic survey.

• Conducted focus groups among senior/disabled bus riders and full fare bus riders concerning proposed restructuring of bus fares. Also conducted roundtable meetings with coach operators and social service agency representatives.

• Conducted public participation portion of Orange County Bus Improvement Project (BUSLINK). Prepared report based upon focus group discussions with bus users and non-users, employee transportation coordinators, real estate developers, senior citizens, students, transportation advocates, Orange County employers, and members of ethnic minority communities throughout the County. Final report summarized the perceptions of focus group participants concerning potential improvements to the bus system.

• Conducted focus group discussions with Metrolink commuter rail users and non-users within Orange County for purposes of identifying service and marketing issues and opportunities. Prepared final report summarizing findings from these focus group discussions.

• Conducted focus group discussions with clients of ACCESS paratransit service for purposes of identifying the viability of alternative transportation options.

• Conducted focus groups among users of ACCESS for purposes of refining six strategies for providing a financially viable service to ACCESS customers and prepared formal final report.

• Conducted a series of roundtable discussions concerning the implementation of changes in the ACCESS system pertaining to reservations, eligibility, schedule, rates, pick-up and delivery policy, etc., and prepared formal final report.

• Conducted focus group discussions concerning Master Plan of Countywide Commuter Bikeways and prepared formal report.

• Prepared Multi-Cultural Market Assessment update, including focus groups within the Hispanic community concerning the marketing of transportation services. Evaluated the success of programs commenced following the initial Multi-Cultural Market Assessment.

• Conducted focus group and roundtable discussions with community leaders, general public, and representatives of goods movement/freight industry regarding long-range transportation planning in Orange County.

• Conducted focus groups among businesses and residents of Orange County concerning recommended Corridor (Fullerton-Irvine) Transportation Strategy.
• Conducted focus groups among residents of northern, central, and southern Orange County regarding the FastForward long-range transportation.

• Conducted roundtables and focus groups concerning routing issues and public support for the CenterLine urban light rail system proposed for Orange County.

State of California (Senate Rules Committee, Senate Select Committee on Border Issues, and Office of the Auditor General)

• Analysis of fiscal impact of undocumented immigrants on public services in San Diego County and California, including criminal justice system, education, and public health. Further identified estimated number of undocumented residents and their contributions to State and local tax revenues. Also included in the analysis were federal revenues, false documentation issues, and macro-economic impacts. Study included substantial primary data gathering techniques, including direct interviews with undocumented immigrant workers and INS returnees. Prepared, administered, and analyzed sample surveys of undocumented immigrants in San Diego County for purposes of determining employment characteristics, revenue generation, demographics, and migration patterns. Research included extensive face-to-face interviews and structured roundtable discussions.

City of Oceanside

• Prepared, implemented, and analyzed telephonic survey of 803 residents of Northern San Diego County concerning awareness, behavior, and opinions about water runoff pollution.

San Diego County

• Prepared, implemented, and analyzed 1,305 person telephonic survey of unincorporated area residents concerning awareness, behavior, and opinions about water runoff pollution.

• Conducted, analyzed and reported upon two 600-person telephonic public opinion and awareness surveys before and after public awareness campaign to inform county residents about emergency preparedness.

• Prepared, implemented, and analyzed 8 intercept surveys of law library users concerning classes offered, benefits, opportunities for improvement.

• Evaluated the San Diego Community Planning Process as viewed by planning group participants and informed parties (developed questionnaire, analyzed data, and prepared a final report).
City of Coronado

- Prepared, implemented, and analyzed 600 respondent in-person intercept survey of visitors to identify places of staying, recreational activities, modes of transportation.

City of Carlsbad

- Prepared, implemented, and analyzed citywide sample telephone survey of 600 respondents concerning future urban commercial development in this fast growing Northern San Diego County city. Extensive analysis of underlying values through various development scenarios and conjoint analytical techniques was featured.

City of San Diego

- Prepared, implemented, and analyzed 400 person telephone survey of residents of three low income San Diego communities concerning issues such as crime, economic development, city services, and the success of the City's "Weed and Seed Program."

- Prepared, administered, and analyzed sample survey of San Diego County residents for purposes of assessing utilization and demand factors for Mission Bay Park in San Diego. This survey of 850 persons served to inform the revision of the Park's Master Plan.

- Analysis of market for existing condominium developments in downtown San Diego. Detailed analysis included extensive survey and corresponding statistical and qualitative analysis including recommendations for future market composition.

- Consultant for the revitalization of an older commercial retail area in mid-city San Diego seeking to rejuvenate its retail base. Three surveys and a series of key participant discussions were performed in conjunction with this effort--existing retailers, potential retailers, and residents of the area--plus corresponding statistical and qualitative analysis. Final report included a recommended retail structure for the community that would be realistic, implementable, and sensitive to the diversity of ethnicity in this community.

- Prepared, conducted, and analyzed 600 person telephone survey in mid-city for purposes of establishing need for community court in the area populated by myriad low-income minority and immigrant groups. Also in-person interviews/surveys of 100 local business owners.

- Prepared, implemented and analyzed 400 person survey of City residents concerning water supply awareness, conservation attitudes and behaviors, and opinions about water recycling.
San Diego Unified School District

- Survey of 400 San Diego County building contractors concerning advantages and disadvantages of performing construction tasks for the San Diego Unified School District.

County of Orange

- Prepared, implemented, and analyzed 1,040 person telephone survey of unincorporated area (North Tustin) in order to assess level of service satisfaction issues and potential annexation/sphere of influence adjustments

County of San Diego

- Prepared, implemented and analyzed two 600 person surveys of County residents concerning emergency preparedness before and after public information campaign

Otay Water District

- 2011 Customer Awareness and Satisfaction Survey (n = 300)
- 2010 Desalination Survey—400 respondents and 2 focus groups
- 2010 Employee Satisfaction online survey
- 2009 Customer Awareness and Satisfaction Survey of 300 customers of the District
- 2009 Large Users Drought Telephone Survey
- 2008 Customer Service telephone survey of 300 participants prepared, conducted, and analyzed.
- 2008 Customer Awareness and Satisfaction telephone survey of 300 participants prepared, conducted, and analyzed
- 2008 Employee Satisfaction survey prepared conducted and analyzed using web-based instrument.
- 2007 residential customer satisfaction/awareness (n=300) telephone survey prepared, implemented and analyzed. Emphasis upon customer satisfaction and conservation measures.
- 2007 Call Center customer service telephone survey (n = 200) focused upon satisfaction with customer service and communications.
- 2005 customer satisfaction survey of 350 residential customers concerning behavior, opinion, customer service, desalination, water reclamation, and conservation practices.
Imperial Irrigation District

- Instruction to energy traders in use of mathematical and statistical tools to aid in their requisite analyses.
- Developed statistical models that predict energy consumption based upon various climactic conditions to within 1-3% of actual.

San Luis Rey Indian Water Authority

- Prepared and supervised administration of detailed census and opinion survey of 2,500 members of five Indian tribes. Particular emphasis was given to issues of importance to the tribes’ members such as job opportunities, education, cultural issues, economic development opportunities and transportation access issues. Focus group sessions with each tribe were utilized to complement the survey findings. Final report included both census data and fully tabulated and statistically analyzed summary of the opinions of reservation residents.

City of Poway, California

- Prepared, administered, and statistically analyzed a mail survey of 800 Poway businesses regarding their needs and opinions concerning Poway’s business climate and future opportunities. Final report included detailed analysis and exposition, including recommendations where appropriate.
- Prepared, administered, and statistically analyzed a mail survey of 6,000 Poway households concerning their opinions regarding a variety of issues of importance to the City for future planning. Final report included fully tabulated results with accompanying statistical reports.

North Park Main Street Association

- Conducted two intercept surveys—business owners and shoppers in San Diego Main Street National Historic Preservation Area in order to determine shopping needs and level of improvement or decline in area since the implementation of the Main Street program.

City of Dana Point, California

- Prepared recreation and parks needs assessment survey for administration to general public.

City of Davis

- Prepared, administered, and analyzed sample survey of 833 residents of Davis, California for purposes of assessing utilization, demand, and tax allocation factors for City of Davis Department of Parks and Recreation in concert with the preparation of the Master Plan.
City of St. Helena

- Prepared, administered, and analyzed 400 respondent sample survey of City of St. Helena, California residents for purposes of General Plan revisions.

Santa Clarita Transit

- Three focus groups among Latinos, commuters, and local bus riders to identify service and marketing-related issues and policies for rider attraction and retention.

Southern California Regional Rail Authority (Metrolink)

- Determined the requisite two-stage sample for Federal Transportation Agency requirements for annual passenger and mileage calculations.

- Conducted a 3,500 person rider/on-board sample survey on 7 Metrolink lines regarding customer satisfaction, importance, problem occurrences, travel behavior, marketing strategies, and demographics. Also undertaken were precise counts of passenger boardings and alightings at each station for each train in the Metrolink train system.

- Conducted a 6,000 person rider/on-board sample survey on 6 Metrolink lines regarding customer satisfaction, importance, problem occurrences, travel behavior, marketing strategies, and demographics.

- Conducted focus groups with student riders and potential riders of Metrolink.

- Conducted Riverside County rider focus groups for Metrolink regarding use of new stop and need for reverse commute trains.

California Department of Transportation

- Prepared growth inducement study for State Route 56 through the northern portion of the City of San Diego. Study included fiscal impacts as well as housing, employment, and income forecasts; also included were planning implications of possible growth inducing factors associated with the construction of the highway.

- Conducted focus groups and web-based survey of CALTRANS engineers regarding job satisfaction and staff morale.

- Eight surveys among pilot study riders of combined commuter train/rental car system of commuting.

San Diego County Sheriff’s Department

- Established analysis by station (11) of workload and availability for calls for service among Sheriff’s patrol deputies. Over 3,000 samples drawn and analyzed to establish manpower needs.
Utilized scientific sample to analyze time savings applicable to the conversion of arrest data to laptop computers from manual entry. Final report included specific determination of manpower hours saved and recommendations for software and operational policy changes in order to maximize technological advantages.

- Workload analysis based upon sample of time logs from Sheriff's Communication Center and Monte Carlo simulations in order to identify necessary staffing levels for 9-1-1, radio, and administrative communications throughout San Diego County

**Bay Area Rapid Transit**

- Market analysis and ridership projection for two stations located on East Bay line of BART.

**Southern California Association of Governments**

- 800 person survey and 6 focus groups to determine desired route for high-speed rail from Northern California between Los Angeles and San Diego.

- 5200 person survey of pedestrian, passenger vehicle, and commercial truck border crossers at Calexico and Algodones/Yuma pertaining to trip purpose, frequency, origin/destination, and other factors.

**Riverside Transit Agency**

- On-board survey of 8000 riders of Riverside bus system regarding satisfaction, frequency, demographics

- On-board survey and count of RTA bus lines that intersect with Downtown Riverside Transit Terminal in order to identify magnitude and nature of travel disruptions that will occur when terminal is relocated

- On-Board survey of commuter bus lines

- Intercept of 1000 passengers transferring and/or ending trip at Downtown Terminal

**San Diego Metropolitan Transit System**

- On-board counts of weekend contract service

- Conducted focus groups concerning routing/scheduling and planning/marketing issues for the expansion of the San Diego Trolley.

**San Diego Association of Governments**

- Focus groups concerning carpool, vanpool, transit alternative commute options.
Imperial Valley Transit

- Year long sample survey (2010-2011) and count of passengers on-board buses in order to meet Federal Transportation Agency requirements for statistically reliable estimate of annual passenger miles traveled.

- Year long sample survey (2008-2009) and count of passengers on-board buses in order to meet Federal Transportation Agency requirements for statistically reliable estimate of annual passenger miles traveled

University of California PATH/SANDAG

- Six Month panel for focus groups and surveys at start and end concerning new transit plan that utilizes rental cars at either end of transit trip.

University of California, Davis

- Web-based survey of all identifiable San Francisco Bay Area water management professionals concerning water conservation policies and practices, including follow-up telephone interviews.

City of Escondido

- Prepared, administered, and statistically analyzed telephone survey of 425 residents concerning library facilities.

California Center for Sustainable Energy

- Focus groups concerning the use of solar energy for residential power users – both contractors and residents participated.

- Focus groups among homeowners with photovoltaic systems, real estate professionals, and city/county permitting and inspection officials concerning barriers to and solutions pertaining to photovoltaic system installation and ownership.

Expert Witness: Survey Research and Statistical Analysis

Seyfarth Shaw, LLP

- Analyzed and testified as expert witness
  - Ikon Office Solutions regarding overtime and meal break survey
  - Orange County Register regarding adequacy of statistical survey sampling of and statistical conclusions drawn from employees
  - Kaiser Permanente (2 cases) – pharmacy managers
  - Bank of America—employee overtime
Sheppard, Mullin, Richter & Hampton, LLP

- Expert witness regarding statistical surveys and labor-hour issues in class action litigation (Bank of America).
- Expert Witness regarding employee claims for clothing expense reimbursement.

Higgs, Fletcher & Mack, LLP

- Analyzed and testified (deposition) as expert witness regarding statistical survey concerning appraisal of commercial real estate subject to condemnation.

Paul, Plevin, Sullivan & Connaughton, LLP

- Contracted as expert witness regarding adequacy of statistical survey sampling of and statistical conclusions drawn from employees—2 cases (Kelly Services, Inc. –declaration–and one other settled prior to any declaration being filed that cannot, therefore, be disclosed)

Akins, Gump, Strauss, Hauer & Feld

- Contracted as expert witness regarding adequacy of statistical survey sampling and conclusions drawn from employees in labor-hour class action (CVS Pharmacy, Inc.).

Economic, Financial, and Fiscal Impact Analyses

State of California (Senate Rules Committee, Senate Select Committee on Border Issues, and Office of the Auditor General)

- Analysis of fiscal impact of undocumented immigrants on public services in San Diego County, including criminal justice system, education, and public health. Further identified estimated number of undocumented residents and their contributions to State and local tax revenues. Included in the analysis were federal revenues, false documentation issues, and macro-economic impacts. Study included substantial primary data gathering techniques, including direct interviews with undocumented immigrant workers and INS returnees for purposes of determining employment characteristics, revenue generation, demographics, and migration patterns.

California Department of Transportation

- Prepared growth inducement study for State Route 56 through the northern portion of the City of San Diego. Study included fiscal impacts as well as housing, employment, and income forecasts; also included were planning
implications of possible growth inducing factors associated with the construction of the highway.

San Diego Unified School District

- Economic analysis of impacts on project cost and employment associated with using Project Stabilization Agreements for construction projects.

San Diego County Taxpayers' Association

- Prepared economic and financial analysis of San Diego County Multiple Species Conservation Program for presentation to Planning Commission, City Council, and Board of Supervisors, including imposition of fee required to assemble the land.
- Prepared analysis of economic effects of proposed San Diego development impact fee program. Study included both academic, theoretical analysis and practical fiscal impact considerations.
- Written analysis and critique of Planned Growth and Taxpayer Relief Initiative – Development Impact Fee proposal for consideration before San Diego City Council.
- Fiscal Impact Analysis of Olivenhein Dam project of San Diego County Water Authority
- Prepared general fiscal impact analysis of mobile home rent control ordinances in State of California.

Westfield Shopping Centers

- Analysis of proposed City of San Diego Affordable Housing Impact Fee, including recalculation and allocation among land uses
- Analysis of potential sales and fiscal impact due to expansion of University Town Center, La Jolla, CA

San Diego Aircraft Carrier Museum Foundation

- Prepared fiscal impact analysis regarding the establishment of the USS Midway aircraft carrier museum on San Diego Bay.

Pardee Construction Company

- Prepared Economic Impact Analysis of proposed all-cargo airport at Brown Field, including job creation and related industrial/commercial/visitor development
• Prepared Economic/Fiscal Impact Analysis of 2,650 acre “high-end” Pacific Highlands Ranch residential development in Carmel Valley area of San Diego. Included determination of impact fees.

Westbrook Development

• Economic/Fiscal Impact Analysis of 2,550 acre residential/commercial/resort development at Fanita Ranch in Santee. Included determination of impact fees for the development and alternative use as open space.

Genstar Development

• Economic/Fiscal Impact Analysis of 3,000 acre 4S Ranch residential/commercial development in San Diego County. Included determination of development impact fees.

San Diego Gas & Electric

• Analysis of feasibility and fiscal impact of City of San Marcos proposal to form and operationalize its own municipal utility—Discovery Valley Utility


• Economic analysis of Sunrise PowerLink to Imperial County

• Analysis of fiscal impact of Carlsbad agricultural protection measures proposed on 2006 ballot

• Development of economic impact and fiscal model applicable to Sunrise PowerLink, smart meters, ECO substation, South Bay Substation, Dynamic pricing, and renewable energy development)

Southwest Strategies, LLC

• Fiscal Impact analysis for potential rezoning of industrial land to residential in Oceanside, California—determined and compared impact fees for industrial and residential use, including transportation impact fees.

• Analysis of proposed City of San Diego Affordable Housing Impact Fee, including recalculation and allocation among land uses.

• Socio-economic profile of residents of 5 affordable housing developments in the City of Poway, including demographics, spending, impacts on crime, schools, property values

• Examination of financial implications of rezoning Old Town National City to remove non-conforming industrial uses
Shea Properties

- Fiscal impact of proposed redevelopment of Barrio Logan with Mercado and affordable housing in San Diego.

- Fiscal impact of second project planned for Barrio Logan

Pacifica Companies

- Community impact analysis of proposed coastal hotel/resort in San Diego County. Included fiscal impact, economic impact, new market tax credit analysis and employment generation.

Laing Urban

- Fiscal Impact analysis for potential rezoning of industrial land to residential in Culver City, California-- determined and compared impact fees for industrial and residential use, including transportation impact fees.

San Diego-Imperial Counties Labor Council AFL-CIO

- Analysis of San Diego County Water Authority-Imperial Irrigation District water transfer in terms of environmental and economic obstacles faced and economic development opportunities to be derived from funds to be available within the Imperial Valley.

WESTEC Services, Inc.

- Prepared socioeconomic present condition, impact, and mitigation sections of Environmental Impact Report for California State Prison and San Diego County jail and honor camp at Otay Mesa. Also prepared project description and statement of needs chapter, crime rate and socioeconomic hazards sections.

Mooney & Associates

- Prepared socioeconomic present condition, impact, and mitigation sections of economic impact report for expansion of San Diego County jail in Santee. Also prepared project description and statement of needs chapter, crime rate and socioeconomic hazards sections.

Joint Labor Management Committee of the Retail Food Industry

- Analysis of impacts of large “big box” retailers upon existing merchants. Particular emphasis upon downtown impacts and planning consequences in light of movement toward smart growth. San Diego’s City of Villages strategy was assessed in this regard.

- Economic Impact of supercenter retail development upon California jobs, health and welfare expenditures, and general economic conditions.
City of San Diego

- Determined shopping needs and level of improvement or decline in North Park community since the implementation of the Main Street Historic Preservation Program.
  - Analysis of market for existing condominium developments in downtown San Diego. Detailed analysis included extensive survey and corresponding statistical and qualitative analysis including recommendations for future market composition.
  - Consultant for the revitalization of an older commercial retail area in mid-city San Diego seeking to rejuvenate its retail base. Final report included a recommended retail structure for the community that would be realistic, implementable, and sensitive to the diversity of ethnicity in this community.

La Jolla Band of Mission Indians

- Marketing and management consultants for Sengme Oaks Water Park, a water theme amusement park in Northern San Diego County. Prepared formal marketing and management plans for the Park.

Merrill Lynch Commercial Real Estate

- Provided a variety of on-going property valuation and real estate consultative services including improved and unimproved real property appraisals and land use feasibility planning for large acreage.

City of Carlsbad

- Analyzed future urban commercial development in fast growing Northern San Diego County city.

Chelsea Investments, Inc.

- Analysis of job creation for three development proposals: Children’s Village in San Diego, child care facilities and four-story offices in San Diego, and residential/commercial development in San Luis Rio Colorado, AZ.

Stirling Enterprises

- Fiscal Impact analysis of proposal to rezone parcel of industrial land into multiple residential in Oceanside, California--determined and compared impact fees for industrial and residential use, including transportation impact fees
  - Projected Jobs-Housing equilibrium point for City of Oceanside

Viejas Enterprises
- Socio-economic analysis of proposal to locate Indian casino in City of Calexico, California

- Socio-economic/fiscal impact analysis of tribal casino in Alpine, California

**Foxwoods/Pauma Development**

- Multiplier, Housing Needs, Employment, Crime, Pathological Gambling analyses for casino development in northern San Diego County

**County of Orange**

- Prepared, implemented, and analyzed study of unincorporated area (North Tustin) in order to assess level of service satisfaction issues and potential annexation/sphere of influence and fee adjustments.

**Housing Solutions**

- Socio-economic profile of residents of 5 affordable housing developments in the City of Poway, including demographics, spending, impacts on crime, schools, property values

**National City Smart Growth Coalition**

- Planning and economic consultant to business owners in National City Westside regarding new land use plan for community.

**City of Davis**

- Prepared, administered, and analyzed study of Davis, California for purposes of assessing utilization, demand, and tax allocation factors for City of Davis Department of Parks and Recreation in concert with the preparation of the Master Plan.

**Subway, Inc. and Pacific Century Development**

- Analysis of two sites in Blythe, CA to determine market absorption potential for new hotel/motel developments.

**City of Holtville**

- Economic consultant to City in process of dissolving Joint Powers Authority in order to secure fair share of proceeds.

**San Diego Housing Commission**

- In accordance with the City of San Diego SRO Preservation Ordinance, an inventory of all existing guest rooms in the City of San Diego was performed in order to retroactively identify rooms that qualified as single room occupancy hotel rooms as of December 1985, December 1987 and May 1988. The purpose
of this survey was to identify a baseline number of such units for presentation purposes. Prepared SRO identification methodologies, computerization formats, statistical analyses, and final report with room-by-room breakdown.

Rodney Company/Rancho Guejito

- Fiscal impact and economic analysis of proposed Multiple Species Conservation Program—North County.
- Fiscal impact and economic analysis of proposed General Plan Update for San Diego County
- Analysis of impact of San Diego County General Plan upon transportation, education, and public safety services in rural San Diego County.
- Economic analysis of impact of protection of arroyo toad from Santa Barbara County to San Diego County
Richard A. Parker, Ph.D.

Education
Ph.D. University of California, Los Angeles (Los Angeles, California)
Pacific Western University (Los Angeles, California)
Doctor of Philosophy (Business Administration)
M.B.A. University of California, Berkeley (Berkeley, California)
Master of Business Administration
M.C.P. San Diego State University (San Diego, California)
Master of City Planning
B.S. Brown University (Providence, Rhode Island)
University of California, Berkeley (Berkeley, California)
Bachelor of Science — Business Administration
(Phi Beta Kappa)

Selected Professional Experience
1985–present Professor of Practice, School of Public Affairs, San Diego State University
Courses taught: Seminar in Urban Planning Methodologies (undergraduate and graduate), Financing
Urban Development (graduate), Quantitative Methods (Statistics) (graduate), Seminar in Quantitative
Approaches to Public Administration (graduate), Quantitative Techniques in Urban Planning (graduate),
Contemporary Urban Issues (upper division undergraduate), Public Finance (graduate and upper division
undergraduate), Seminar in Economics of Urban and Regional Planning (graduate), Public Policy
(undergraduate and graduate)

1984–present President, Rea & Parker Research/Economic Solutions
President/Project Director of survey and market research and economic consulting firm based in San Diego,
California, with facilities in Los Angeles and Orange County. Extensive experience in public and urban
affairs regarding the collection of primary demographic, attitudinal, and market-related data through survey
research and focus group analysis. Highly regarded economic consultant, particularly in the areas of fiscal
impact analysis, urban economic development, and site specific commercial, retail, and residential
evaluation.

Selected Survey Research Clients include State of California, San Diego County, Orange County,
Imperial County, Cities of San Diego, Escondido, Carlsbad, Oceanside, Poway, Davis, Holtville, and
Dana Point, SANDAG, SCAG, IVAG, San Diego MTS, Orange County Transportation Authority,
Los Angeles County MTA, Southern California Regional Rail Authority (Metrolink), Bay Area
Rapid Transit, Imperial Valley Transit, Santa Clarita Transit, CALTRANS, San Diego County
Water Authority, Otay Water District, San Diego Housing Commission, San Diego Unified School
District, California Center for Sustainable Energy.

Expert witness regarding survey research and statistical analysis for Bank of America, Kaiser
Permanente, NASSCO/General Dynamics, Ikon Office Equipment, Orange County Register/
Freedom Communications, CVS Pharmacies, Wet Seal.

Economic consultant to Westfield Shopping Centers, San Diego Gas & Electric, Imperial Irrigation
District, Viejas Enterprises, Foxwoods Casinos, Retail Food Industry Council, Pardee Homes, Shea
Communities, San Diego Aircraft Carrier Museum Foundation, Stirling Cargo Airports, Subway,
Inc., Housing Solutions Alliance, San Diego County Taxpayers Association, among others.

Selected Publications:
Designing and Conducting Survey Research: A Comprehensive Guide (with Louis M. Rea, Ph.D., 1992

Awards: Bernays Award of Merit—Specialty Publication—Westfield University Town Center
Expansion
LOUIS M. REA, Ph.D.

EDUCATION

Ph.D. Economics, Public Management (Social Science), The Maxwell School, Syracuse University, 1975
M.R.P. Master of Regional Planning, The Maxwell School, Syracuse University, 1973
B.A. Economics, Colgate University, Hamilton, New York 1971
(Phi Beta Kappa, Cum Laude, Honors in Economics)

PROFESSIONAL EMPLOYMENT

Professor: School of Public Affairs, San Diego State University, 1975-present

Director: School of Public Administration and Urban Studies, 1983-2006.
Responsible for the management and direction of the School of Public Administration and Urban Studies, consisting of 40 employees, including 30 full time and part time faculty, and 10 support and research staff; responsible for managing the School’s resources valued at approximately $4.0 million, consisting of funds in the areas of personnel, supplies and services, computer hardware, scholarships, endowments, and SDSU Foundation accounts; provide supervision of all personnel matters, including recruitment and hiring of full and part-time faculty as well as staff positions; oversee reappointment, tenure, and promotion process; schedule classes; prepare and implement school’s academic strategic plan, business plan, student learning goals and objectives, and faculty hiring practices; responsible for fund raising and development.

Vice President and Principal Consultant: Rea and Parker Research/Economic Solutions, 1984-present
Provide professional consulting services to client agencies (both public and private) seeking research data and studies for executive decision making. Provide services in the areas of transportation research including on-board bus and rail surveys, survey research associated with customer satisfaction and market feasibility analysis, economic and fiscal impact analysis, program evaluation, and public policy analysis including land use, housing, immigration, and tourism.

Selected clients include State of California, San Diego County, Orange County, and Imperial County; cities of San Diego, Escondido, Carlsbad, Poway, and Davis; authorities including SANDAG, SCAG, San Diego MTS, Orange County Transportation Authority, Los Angeles County MTA, Southern California Regional Rail Authority, San Diego County Water Authority, Otay Water District and CALTRANS.

Visiting Professor: University of California, San Diego, Graduate School of International Relations and Pacific Studies, 2006-present.
Teach a required graduate course in program design and evaluation to students pursuing a Master’s Degree in International Relations.

PUBLICATION

VI. ACTION CALENDAR

September 19, 2011

Mayor David Bradshaw  
Imperial County Transportation Commission  
1405 N. Imperial Ave, Suite 1  
El Centro, Ca. 92243

SUBJECT: Triennial Performance Audit of the Administration/Management of the Imperial County Transportation Commission – FY 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10

Dear Commission Members:

The State of California requires that Transportation Planning Agencies undergo a performance audit every three years. As a result, the Imperial County Transportation Commission underwent a triennial performance audit of its activities. The consultant conducted audit focused primarily on administration of the Transportation Development Act (TDA) over a three year period of time. This is the sixth audit of this type to be conducted since the requirement was created in the TDA, however the first audit of the newly established Commission.

This audit is not a financial audit but a review of compliance with transit service related Public Utilities Codes and prudent management practices. More specifically this audit involved reviewing the processes and policies including, but not limited to; the ICTC Budget and Transit Financing Plan, the Allocation Schedule, the Article 8 financial claim processing, administration of the Social Services Transportation Advisory Council, conduct of the annual Unmet Transit Needs Public Hearing process, and transit planning and operations management of the public transit services by the public agencies.

During the process, public and social service agencies, as well as, the transit operators were contacted for input. Transit operations were evaluated.

The draft audit documents were made available to all agencies and the transit operators, In addition the documents were available on the ICTC website. Comments were solicited from July 1st through August 15th. No comments were received.

A final report is presented for review and approval. Staff from the consultant firm of Pacific Municipal Consultants will be present at the meeting to present an overview and answer questions.
The ICTC Management Committee met on September 14th and forwards this item to the ICTC Commission for review and approval:

1. Approve the FY 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10 Triennial Performance Audit of the Imperial County Transportation Commission.
2. Direct staff to forward the FY 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10 Triennial Performance Audit of the Imperial County Transportation Commission to CALTRANS.

Sincerely yours,

MARK BAZA
Executive Director

BY: [Signature]

Kathi Williams
Administrative Analyst III
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Section I

Introduction

California’s Transportation Development Act (TDA) requires that a triennial performance audit be conducted of public transit entities that receive TDA revenues. The performance audit serves to ensure accountability in the use of public transportation revenue.

The Imperial County Transportation Commission (ICTC) engaged PMC to conduct a performance audit of AIM Transit covering the most recent triennial period, fiscal years 2007–2008 through 2009–2010. The purpose of the performance audit is to evaluate AIM Transit’s effectiveness and efficiency in its use of TDA funds to provide specialized public transportation in its service area. This evaluation is required as a condition for continued receipt of these funds for public transportation purposes. In addition, the audit evaluates AIM Transit’s compliance with the conditions specified in the California Public Utilities Code (PUC). This task involves ascertaining whether AIM Transit is meeting the PUC’s reporting requirements. Moreover, the audit includes calculations of transit service performance indicators and a detailed review of AIM Transit’s administrative functions. From the analysis that has been undertaken, a set of recommendations has been made for the agency which is intended to improve the performance of specialized transit operations.

In summary, this TDA audit affords the opportunity for an independent, constructive, and objective evaluation of the organization and its operations that otherwise might not be available. The methodology for the audit included in-person interviews with AIM Transit executive and operations management, collection and review of agency documents, data analysis, and on-site observations. The Performance Audit Guidebook for Transit Operators and Regional Transportation Planning Entities published by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) was used to guide in the development and conduct of the audit.

Overview of the Transit System

AIM Transit, or Areawide Independent Mobility, is the countywide intercity demand response transit service. It provides Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) complementary paratransit service within a ½-mile corridor to Imperial Valley Transit (IVT) routes with the same service hours as IVT. Service is curb to curb and is open to eligible ADA-certified passengers, as well as to seniors over 60 years of age on a space-available basis. The paratransit service is administered by the County of Imperial and is operated by ARC-Imperial Valley, a Social Services nonprofit 501(c)(3) organization.

Imperial County is geographically located in the southeastern corner of California, stretching from the United States-Mexico border on the south, Riverside County on the north, San Diego County on the west, and the State of Arizona on the east. The terrain varies from 235 feet below sea level
at the Salton Sea to 4,548 feet at Blue Angel Peak. The county’s geographical land area encompasses 4,597 square miles and is traversed by 2,555 miles of roadways. Major highways include Interstate 8 and State Routes (SR) 7, 78, 86, 98, 111, and 115.

Population growth has seen a marked increase in recent years. According to the 2010 U.S. Census Data, the county’s population is 174,528. The California Department of Finance 2010 estimate reports a countywide population of 183,029. The county seat and largest city is El Centro with an estimated population of 42,598 based on the 2010 U.S. Census. The population of El Centro is followed in descending order by those of Calexico, Brawley, Imperial, Calipatria, Holtville, and Westmorland.

System Characteristics

AIM Transit operates from 6:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, and Saturdays from 6:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. The service does not operate on Sundays and the following holidays: New Year’s Day, Martin Luther King Day (observed), Presidents’ Day, Memorial Day (observed), Independence Day (observed), Labor Day, Veterans Day, Thanksgiving, and Christmas. Reservations for service are accepted up to 14 days in advance.

Fares

The fares charged by AIM Transit for ADA-certified passengers are twice the amount of the IVT fixed-route fare and are based on a zone system. The fare being set at two times the IVT fare is in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements. Personal care attendants for ADA passengers ride free of charge while non-ADA-certified passengers are charged three times the fixed route fare. Personal care attendants accompanying non-ADA-certified passengers are required to pay the same fare. Cash is an acceptable form of payment when boarding the vehicle. For subscription and non-subscription trips, AIM Transit offers direct billing for social service agencies. The AIM Transit fare schedule is summarized below in Table I-1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Passenger Category</th>
<th>One Zone</th>
<th>Multi-Zone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADA-Certified</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior (60+)/Non-ADA</td>
<td>$2.25</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ARC-Imperial Valley

Fleet

AIM Transit is operated with a fleet of six vehicles plus two back-up vehicles as of FY 2009–2010, all of which are owned by ARC-Imperial Valley. The fleet is described in Table I-2 below.
**Table I-2**
AIM Transit Fleet Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Manufacturer</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Fuel Type</th>
<th>Seat/Wheelchair Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Chevy 5500</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Diesel</td>
<td>22/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Ford E450</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Gasoline</td>
<td>20/2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Back-Up Vehicles**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Manufacturer</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Fuel Type</th>
<th>Seat/Wheelchair Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Ford E450</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Diesel</td>
<td>20/3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: ARC-Imperial Valley*

The fleet conforms to the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990 in regard to wheelchair accessibility.
Section II

Operator Compliance Requirements

This section of the audit report contains the analysis of AIM Transit’s ability to comply with state requirements for continued receipt of TDA funds. The evaluation uses the guidebook, *Performance Audit Guidebook for Transit Operators and Regional Transportation Planning Agencies, September 2008 (third edition)*, which was developed by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) to assess transit operators. The updated guidebook contains a checklist of eleven measures taken from relevant sections of the Public Utilities Code and the California Code of Regulations. Each of these requirements is discussed in the table below, including a description of the system’s efforts to comply with the requirements. In addition, the findings from the compliance review are described in the text following the table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operator Compliance Requirements</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Compliance Efforts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The transit operator submitted annual reports to the RTPA based upon the Uniform System of Accounts and Records established by the State Controller. Report is due 90 days after end of fiscal year (Sept. 28/29), or 110 days (Oct. 19/20) if filed electronically (Internet).</td>
<td>Public Utilities Code, Section 99243</td>
<td>Completion/submittal dates: FY 2008: September 29, 2008 FY 2009: September 21, 2009 FY 2010: September 23, 2010 Conclusion: Complied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The operator has submitted annual fiscal and compliance audits to the RTPA and to the State Controller within 180 days following the end of the fiscal year (Dec. 27), or has received the appropriate 90-day extension by the RTPA allowed by law.</td>
<td>Public Utilities Code, Section 99245</td>
<td>Completion/submittal dates: FY 2008: June 5, 2009 FY 2009: December 15, 2009 FY 2010: January 12, 2011 Conclusion: Partial Compliance. FY 2008 Fiscal &amp; Compliance Audit was completed and received after the 90-day extension period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The CHP has, within the 13 months prior to each TDA claim submitted by an</td>
<td>Public Utilities Code, Section 99251 B</td>
<td>Imperial County through its contract operator participates in the CHP Transit Operator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Operator Compliance Requirements Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operator Compliance Requirements</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Compliance Efforts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>operator, certified the operator’s compliance with Vehicle Code Section 1808.1 following a CHP inspection of the operator’s terminal.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliance Program in which the CHP has conducted inspections within the 13 months prior to each TDA claim. The County’s contract operator received a satisfactory rating for all inspections conducted on AIM Transit vehicles during the audit period. Conclusion: Complied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The operator’s claim for TDA funds is submitted in compliance with rules and regulations adopted by the RTPA for such claims.</td>
<td>Public Utilities Code, Section 99261</td>
<td>As a condition of approval, the County’s annual claims for Local Transportation Funds are submitted in compliance with rules and regulations adopted by ICTC. ICTC staff provides assistance as needed in completing the claims. The County’s claims are submitted generally during the fall of the claim year as required by ICTC. During the audit period, the claims were submitted on October 10, 2008, and November 6, 2009. Conclusion: Complied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operator Compliance Requirements</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Compliance Efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If an operator serves urbanized and non-urbanized areas, it has maintained a ratio of fare revenues to operating costs at least equal to the ratio determined by the rules and regulations adopted by the RTPA.</td>
<td>Public Utilities Code, Section 99270.1</td>
<td>This requirement is not applicable, as AIM Transit provides specialized service and is subject to a different farebox ratio. <strong>Conclusion: Not Applicable</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| The operator’s operating budget has not increased by more than 15% over the preceding year, nor is there a substantial increase or decrease in the scope of operations or capital budget provisions for major new fixed facilities unless the operator has reasonably supported and substantiated the change(s). | Public Utilities Code, Section 99266 | Percentage increase in AIM Transit’s operating budget:  
FY 2008: 14.72%  
FY 2009: 2.76%  
FY 2010: 14.77%  
The increases in the operating budget can be attributed to the addition of a sixth bus in July 2009 as well as a rise in fuel costs.  
Source: Statistical Summary Reports – Operating costs less depreciation  
**Conclusion: Complied** |
| The operator’s definitions of performance measures are consistent with Public Utilities Code Section 99247, including (a) operating cost, (b) operating cost per passenger, (c) operating cost per vehicle service hour, (d) passengers per vehicle service hour, (e) passengers per vehicle service mile, (f) total passengers, (g) transit vehicle, (h) vehicle service | Public Utilities Code, Section 99247 | The County’s definition of performance measures as tracked and recorded by the contract operator is consistent with Public Utilities Code Section 99247. However, more consistency between data in internal and external reports is required.  
**Conclusion: Complied** |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operator Compliance Requirements</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Compliance Efforts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hours, (i) vehicle service miles,</td>
<td>Public Utilities Code,</td>
<td>This requirement is not applicable, as AIM Transit provides specialized service and is subject to a different farebox ratio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and (j) vehicle service hours per employee.</td>
<td>Sections 99268.2, 99268.3, 99268.12, 99270.1</td>
<td><strong>Conclusion: Not Applicable</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the operator serves an urbanized area, it has maintained a ratio of fare revenues to operating costs at least equal to one-fifth (20 percent), unless it is in a county with a population of less than 500,000, in which case it must maintain a ratio of fare revenues to operating costs of at least equal to three-twentieths (15 percent), if so determined by the RTPA.</td>
<td>Public Utilities Code, Sections 99268.2, 99268.4, 99268.5</td>
<td>Under PUC Section 99268.5, the farebox ratio requirement for exclusive services for elderly and disabled is 10 percent. AIM Transit’s operating ratios using internal financial data were as follows:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2008: 10.58%</td>
<td>FY 2009: 11.45%</td>
<td>FY 2010: 10.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: Statistical Summary Reports</td>
<td><strong>Conclusion: Complied</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table II-1  
Operator Compliance Requirements Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operator Compliance Requirements</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Compliance Efforts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The current cost of the operator’s retirement system is fully funded with respect to the officers and employees of its public transportation system, or the operator is implementing a plan approved by the RTPA which will fully fund the retirement system within 40 years. | Public Utilities Code, Section 99271 | The County contracts with a private nonprofit provider for operations, while the cost of County staff’s retirement is fully funded under the 1937 Act County Employees’ Retirement Law.  
**Conclusion: Complied** |
| If the operator receives state transit assistance funds, the operator makes full use of funds available to it under the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 before TDA claims are granted. | California Code of Regulations, Section 6754(a)(3) | During the audit period, STAF revenues were used to fund AIM Transit. Both Imperial County and ARC utilize available federal funds.  
**Conclusion: Complied** |

**Findings and Observations from Operator Compliance Requirements Matrix**

1. Of the compliance requirements pertaining to AIM Transit, the operation fully complied with eight out of the nine requirements. The operator was found in partial compliance with the timely submittal of its annual fiscal audits. Two additional compliance requirements did not apply to AIM Transit (e.g., rural/urban farebox recovery ratios).

2. AIM Transit’s farebox recovery ratio remained above the required 10 percent standard. The fare increase in FY 2009 helped to maintain the farebox. The fare increase was intended to offset rising fuel costs and service cutbacks. The average systemwide farebox recovery ratio was 10.68 percent during the triennial review period.

3. Through its contract operator, the County participates in the CHP Transit Operator Compliance Program and received inspections of AIM Transit vehicles within the 13 months prior to each TDA claim. Satisfactory ratings were made for all inspections conducted during the audit period.

4. The operating budget exhibited modest increases since FY 2007, with the highest increases realized in FY 2008 and FY 2010. The addition of a sixth bus and increased fuel costs were responsible for the increases in the operating budget.
Section III

Prior Triennial Performance Recommendations

AIM Transit’s efforts to implement the recommendations made in the prior triennial audit are examined in this section of the report. For this purpose, each prior recommendation for the agency is described, followed by a discussion of the agency’s efforts to implement the recommendation. Conclusions concerning the extent to which the recommendations have been adopted by the agency are then presented.

Prior Recommendation 1

Implement No Show Policy and Procedures.

Actions taken by AIM Transit

AIM Transit has taken steps to implement and enforce a no-show policy and procedures. According to the contract operator, no-shows have been more prevalent on AIM Transit subscription services. The contract operator now charges for no-shows after a total of three no-shows. Following such action, the driver will not be dispatched until further notice. A review of the passenger service report during the audit period shows a 36 percent decline in the number of no-shows from 1,874 in FY 2009 to 1,205 in FY 2010.

Conclusion

This recommendation has been implemented.

Prior Recommendation 2

Conduct regular on-time performance checks.

Actions taken by AIM Transit

The operator conducts on-time performance checks in two ways. The first way is to check the driver’s route manifest with the dispatch logs. This is conducted by operations staff routinely on an eight-day rotation. The second method involves an FTA/TSI-certified Driver Trainer, who tracks and reports on-time performance. On-time performance is one of the metrics reported in the management summary report.

Conclusion

This recommendation has been implemented.
Prior Recommendation 3

Develop written capital vehicle replacement plan.

Actions taken by AIM Transit

The contract operator has taken steps to develop a capital vehicle replacement plan that has been highly successful in the procurement of new vehicles through the FTA Section 5310 grant program. The contractor’s Transportation Coordinator has been responsible for compiling and maintaining an annual fleet inventory along with a spreadsheet detailing vehicle funding sources, acquisition dates, and depreciation rates. Accessory equipment, such as radios, is also included in the spreadsheet.

Conclusion

This recommendation has been implemented.

Prior Recommendation 4

Implement the incentives and penalties provisions in the service contract.

Actions taken by AIM Transit

The service contract for AIM Transit contains standards and evaluation criteria to allow for the measurement of the performance and efficiency of services provided. The performance standards measured are Passengers per Hour, Passengers per Day, Cost per Passenger, Subsidy per Passenger, Cost per Mile, Cost per Hour, and Farebox. These performance standards are recorded and tracked by the statistical summary report developed by the contractor, and monitored by ICTC staff. Other service criteria not stipulated in the service contract such as on-time performance, accidents, roadcalls, and no-shows are tracked on the management summary and passenger service reports. The contract operator has met the performance standards stipulated in its service contract without incentives or penalties being implemented by ICTC.

Conclusion

This recommendation has been implemented.

Prior Recommendation 5

Develop annual marketing plan.
Actions taken by AIM Transit

The AIM Transit service contract stipulates that the contract operator is responsible for the development of a marketing plan with a corresponding budget of 5 percent of the total cost of the service for the fiscal year. Such a plan would include the development and preparation of all marketing materials for AIM Transit, subject to the approval of the County. The contractor developed a glossy multi-fold bilingual brochure for the service as well as a half-page advertisement appearing in the Imperial County Area Agency on Aging Senior Services Directory. Other focused marketing efforts have included attractive flyers and advertising listings in the local Yellow Pages. AIM Transit’s efforts at marketing have been stymied by the reduction of its marketing budget in March 2010 due to reduced revenues.

Conclusion

This recommendation has been partially implemented.

Prior Recommendation 6

Develop AIM Transit specific website.

Actions taken by AIM Transit

As part of its marketing plan, a website was developed promoting AIM Transit. The website went live in October 2009 and features a Spanish-language version in addition to a riders guide, downloadable eligibility form, and online contact form.

Conclusion

This recommendation has been implemented.

Prior Recommendation 7

Record roadcalls as part of the management summary report.

Actions taken by AIM Transit

The tracking and recording of roadcalls provide trend analysis of the number of vehicle failures during revenue service. Such data can assist with identifying the root cause of potential service issues while gauging the level of maintenance of the vehicles. The contract operator began recording roadcalls in its management summary report commencing with the FY 2009 summary.

Conclusion

This recommendation has been implemented.
**Prior Recommendation 8**

Adjust the FTEs shown in the Annual State Controller Report.

**Actions taken by AIM Transit**

In a review of the performance data summaries compiled by ICTC for AIM Transit, the full-time equivalents (FTE) count does not appear to be calculated accurately. The FTE data appear to be an annual aggregate total of the number of employees or monthly FTEs. When queried about this discrepancy, the contractor was able to demonstrate an accurate accounting of FTEs on the operations side. Employee hours are detailed and formulized to provide an FTE figure totaled monthly and annually. However, County personnel have yet to include their staff hours and provide an accurate accounting thereof. Therefore, it is suggested that County personnel responsible for preparing the State Controller Report track their time charged to transit administration according to the formula calculation for FTEs and accurately incorporate the FTE information provided by the contractor.

**Conclusion**

This recommendation has not been implemented and is carried forward in this audit for full implementation.
Section IV

TDA Performance Indicators

This section reviews AIM Transit’s performance in providing service in an efficient and effective manner. TDA requires that at least five specific performance indicators be reported, which are contained in the following table. Farebox is not one of the five specific indicators, but is shown as a compliance measure. Findings from the analysis are contained in the section following the table, followed by the analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating Cost</td>
<td>$600,333</td>
<td>$688,692</td>
<td>$707,671</td>
<td>$812,206</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Passengers</td>
<td>34,635</td>
<td>36,303</td>
<td>35,954</td>
<td>36,799</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Service Hours</td>
<td>14,307</td>
<td>12,056</td>
<td>12,003</td>
<td>12,421</td>
<td>-13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Service Miles</td>
<td>166,926</td>
<td>207,995</td>
<td>201,441</td>
<td>213,128</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee FTEs</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Revenue</td>
<td>$68,189</td>
<td>$72,860</td>
<td>$81,059</td>
<td>$81,361</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Cost per Passenger</td>
<td>$17.33</td>
<td>$18.97</td>
<td>$19.68</td>
<td>$22.07</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Cost per Vehicle Service Hour</td>
<td>$41.96</td>
<td>$57.12</td>
<td>$58.96</td>
<td>$65.39</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Cost per Vehicle Service Mile</td>
<td>$3.60</td>
<td>$3.31</td>
<td>$3.51</td>
<td>$3.81</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passengers per Vehicle Service Hour</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passengers per Vehicle Service Mile</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Service Hours per Employee</td>
<td>1,067.7</td>
<td>886.5</td>
<td>937.7</td>
<td>941.0</td>
<td>-11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Fare per Passenger</td>
<td>$1.97</td>
<td>$2.01</td>
<td>$2.25</td>
<td>$2.21</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fare Recovery Ratio</td>
<td>11.36%</td>
<td>10.58%</td>
<td>11.45%</td>
<td>10.02%</td>
<td>-11.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ARC-Imperial Valley & ICTC Summary Reports.

Column graphs on the following pages are used to depict the trends for select performance indicators (Graphs IV-1 through IV-6).
Graph IV-1
Operating Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>FY 2007</th>
<th>FY 2008</th>
<th>FY 2009</th>
<th>FY 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$602,000</td>
<td>$620,000</td>
<td>$634,000</td>
<td>$680,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph IV-2
Ridership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>FY 2007</th>
<th>FY 2008</th>
<th>FY 2009</th>
<th>FY 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33,500</td>
<td>34,000</td>
<td>34,500</td>
<td>35,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph IV-3
Operating Cost per Passenger

Graph IV-4
Operating Cost per Vehicle Service Hour
Findings from Verification of TDA Performance Indicators

1. **Operating cost per vehicle service hour**, an indicator of cost efficiency, increased 55.8 percent from $41.96 in FY 2007 to $65.39 in FY 2010. Overall vehicle service hours declined 13.2 percent, while operating costs exhibited an increase of 35.3 percent during the three-year period. Operating costs increased by an 10.7 percent annualized rate with increases of nearly 15 percent in FY 2008 and FY 2010 due to a rise in fuel costs and the addition of a sixth vehicle. On the other hand, vehicle service hours exhibited an annualized decline of 4.2 percent, with FY 2008 showing the largest decline of 15.7 percent.

2. **Operating cost per passenger**, an indicator of cost effectiveness, increased at half the rate of the cost per service hour. Cost per passenger increased 27.3 percent from $17.33 in FY 2007 to $22.07 in FY 2010. Overall ridership grew at a modest 6.2 percent during the period from 34,635 passengers in FY 2007 to 36,799 passengers in FY 2010, amounting to a 2.1 percent annualized rate of growth. This rate of growth was not sufficient to offset operating costs, which exhibited a higher increase.

3. **Passengers per vehicle service hour**, which measures the effectiveness of the service delivered, increased 22.4 percent between FY 2007 and FY 2010 from 2.4 passengers per hour to 3.0 passengers per hour. The average number of passengers per hour remained at a 3.0 passengers from FY 2008 through FY 2010. Even with this modest growth in passenger trips, service hours decreased from 14,307 hours in FY 2007 to 12,421 hours in FY 2010. It appears that AIM Transit was able to accommodate more trips even when service hours exhibited a downward trend.

4. **Passengers per vehicle service mile**, another indicator of service effectiveness, decreased by 16.8 percent from 0.21 in FY 2007 to 0.17 in FY 2010. Service miles increased by 27.7 percent from 166,926 miles in FY 2007 to 213,128 in FY 2010, while ridership increased by 6.2 percent. On an annualized basis, service miles increased by 9.1 percent, with the highest increase of 24.6 percent occurring in FY 2008.

5. **Vehicle service hours per employee** decreased 11.9 percent between FY 2007 and FY 2010 from 1,067.7 to 941.0. This correlates with the 1.5 percent decline in full-time equivalents (FTEs) as well as the 13.2 percent decline in service hours. FTEs are derived by the contract operator through the formula of dividing total annual employee hours and then dividing by 2000.

6. **Farebox recovery** for AIM Transit remained slightly above the minimum TDA requirement of 10 percent during the audit period, averaging 10.68 percent. Operating costs outpaced revenues at a higher rate percentage-wise (35.3 percent versus 19.3 percent), resulting in declining yet sustainable farebox recovery. A fare increase implemented in FY 2009 was intended to offset the increase in costs while helping to maintain adequate farebox returns.
Conclusion from the Verification of TDA Performance Indicators

AIM Transit provides complementary demand-responsive service in the Imperial Valley service area within the ¾ mile “corridor” of the IVT fixed-route system. AIM Transit also provides service within a 30-minute pick up window. Given its large service area, AIM Transit has managed to maintain its farebox recovery in spite of notable cost increases and growth in service miles. The growth in operating costs has outpaced the growth in passenger trips and revenues. The average number of passengers remained stable at 3.0 passengers per hour. Farebox returns have remained slightly above the minimum TDA requirement of 10 percent in spite of a decline of 11.8 percent from FY 2007 to FY 2010, which amounts to an average annualized decline of 3.7 percent.

The increase in operating costs has been attributed to the spike in fuel costs as well as the additional of a sixth vehicle. In an effort to contain costs and sustain the farebox, fares were increased in FY 2009 to generate higher passenger revenue. In addition, AIM Transit underwent a 9 percent cut in its operating budget, amounting to $92,860 effective March 2010.
Data Consistency

In a review of data consistency among external reports, fiscal year-end operations data was compared between the annual State Controller Report and two internal reports prepared by the contract operator and ICTC. Data for AIM Transit detailed on the State Controller Report appears to be inclusive of other demand responsive services operating in Imperial County. Table IV-2 shows the side-by-side comparison during the audit period (FYs 2008, 2009, and 2010) and including the base year of FY 2007.

Overall, there are some discrepancies and consistencies among the three data sets. A review of the two internal data sets shows relative consistency. The only significant variances between the two is in the vehicle service miles category for FYs 2007 and 2008. For example, there is a 343 variance in the FY 2007 data and a 1,941 variance in the FY 2008 data. On the other hand, the State Controller Report data show more significant variances when compared to the internal data sets. As was mentioned earlier, the data may be inclusive of other County-supported demand-response services such as West Shores Dial-A-Ride. It is suggested that County personnel tasked with the preparation of the State Controller Report make a note in the report indicating that data from more than one demand-response carrier is being reported along with a breakdown of the performance data for each individual carrier.

Table IV-2
Data Consistency Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TDA Statistic</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Base Year FY 2007</th>
<th>Audit Review Period FY</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FY 2008</td>
<td>FY 2009</td>
<td>FY 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlinked Passengers</td>
<td>ARC Statistical Summary Report</td>
<td>34,635</td>
<td>36,303</td>
<td>35,954</td>
<td>36,799</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ICTC Performance Summary</td>
<td>34,635</td>
<td>36,303</td>
<td>35,954</td>
<td>36,803</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Controller Report*</td>
<td>31,625</td>
<td>38,451</td>
<td>36,450</td>
<td>28,613</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Service Hours</td>
<td>ARC Statistical Summary Report</td>
<td>14,307</td>
<td>12,056</td>
<td>12,003</td>
<td>12,421</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ICTC Performance Summary</td>
<td>14,313</td>
<td>12,060</td>
<td>12,006</td>
<td>12,241</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Controller Report*</td>
<td>13,143</td>
<td>12,926</td>
<td>12,364</td>
<td>9,741</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Service Miles</td>
<td>ARC Statistical Summary Report</td>
<td>166,926</td>
<td>207,995</td>
<td>201,441</td>
<td>213,128</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ICTC Performance Summary</td>
<td>166,583</td>
<td>206,054</td>
<td>201,441</td>
<td>213,293</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Controller Report*</td>
<td>164,405</td>
<td>232,924</td>
<td>213,050</td>
<td>173,394</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Operational data inclusive of other Dial-A-Ride services
Section V

Review of Operator Functions

This section provides an in-depth review of various functions within the AIM Transit operation. The review highlights accomplishments, issues, and/or challenges that were determined during the audit period. The following departments and functions were reviewed at the County and the contract operator:

- Operations & Planning
- Maintenance
- Marketing
- General Administration & Management

Operations & Planning

AIM Transit has served as Imperial County’s ADA complimentary paratransit carrier since June 1994. It operates along a ¾-mile corridor of most IVT fixed routes and has a 30-minute pick up window. The fixed-route service area is designated into service zones entitled the Primary, Secondary, and Remote zones. The Primary Zone is on a north-south axis with the cities of Brawley, Imperial, El Centro, and Calexico and corresponding unincorporated area in between. The two Secondary Zones are: (1) the cities of Calipatria and Westmorland and the community of Niland, and (2) the City of Holtville and the community of Seeley, with corresponding parts of Imperial County in between. There are four Remote Zones that encompass the communities of Winterhaven, Bombay Beach and the East Shores Communities, Salton City and the West Shores Communities, and Ocotillo. The IVT fixed route provides deviated service to comply with ADA in the remote zones.

For planning purposes, there are two travel corridors and three zones. The North-South Corridor is on a north-south axis, and the East-West Corridor is on an east-west axis. AIM Transit provides service six days a week in the Primary and Secondary service areas but not in the Remote Zones.

The service is administered by the County of Imperial and has been operated by ARC-Imperial Valley since 1994. ARC-Imperial Valley is based in El Centro. The most recent five-year contract was executed in October 2006 and approved by the County in December 2006. The service contract has undergone two modifications. The first modification allowed for the number of vehicles to increase from five to six as well for cost adjustments.

The County reimburses the contract operator for additional fuel costs through the fuel escalator clause over and above the budget amount and any savings from other areas of operations. The fuel clause protects ARC from additional fuel expenses given the significant increase in fuel prices. Each month, ARC invoices the County for the additional fuel expenses as a separate line item on
the invoice. In this manner, the fuel clause acts as a pass-through measure for the County to reimburse the expense.

As of July 2009, AIM Transit operated six vehicles with two vehicles serving as back-up. A seventh vehicle was planned to be utilized for service in January 2010, but was withdrawn due to a reduction in operating subsidies. Many of the service requests are for travel to the county’s two largest cities: Calexico and El Centro. AIM Transit is the only ADA demand-response transit operator in the county to run service on Saturday after the budget reductions in FY 2009-10 that affected other public transit operations. Most trips average 12 miles in distance, with outbound deadhead mileage common.

The fares are structured on a zonal system and are charged twice the amount of IVT fixed route fares for ADA-certified passengers and three times the amount for non-ADA passengers. Approximately 58 percent of trips are by cash and the remainder is subscription-based. ARC receives an updated ADA list compiled by ICTC on a monthly basis. If fare receipts are shorted, drivers are expected to make up the difference.

Drivers are assigned to routes and contract based upon skill level and personality traits. They must also have a high logistic aptitude and geographic knowledge of the service area. Approximately 70 percent of drivers are cross-trained. In addition, two of the five dispatchers on staff are trained as drivers.

The service contract for AIM Transit contains standards and evaluation criteria to allow for the measurement of the performance and efficiency of services provided. The performance standards measured are Passengers per Hour, Passengers per Day, Cost per Passenger, Subsidy per Passenger, Cost per Mile, Cost per Hour, and Farebox. A summary of the performance standards and the actual operation performance for each measure is presented in Table V-1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator/Measure</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>FY 2007</th>
<th>FY 2008</th>
<th>FY 2009</th>
<th>FY 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passengers Per Hour</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passengers Per Day</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>113.9</td>
<td>119.8</td>
<td>118.3</td>
<td>121.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Per Passenger</td>
<td>$22.75</td>
<td>$17.33</td>
<td>$18.97</td>
<td>$19.68</td>
<td>$22.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidy Per Passenger</td>
<td>$20.54</td>
<td>$16.13</td>
<td>$17.34</td>
<td>$17.84</td>
<td>$20.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Per Mile</td>
<td>$4.28</td>
<td>$3.60</td>
<td>$3.31</td>
<td>$3.51</td>
<td>$3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Per Hour</td>
<td>$38.94</td>
<td>$41.96</td>
<td>$57.12</td>
<td>$58.96</td>
<td>$65.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farebox</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11.36%</td>
<td>10.58%</td>
<td>11.45%</td>
<td>10.02%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** ARC-Imperial Valley

AIM Transit operations have met or exceeded performance standards for most indicators. The only indicator where there has been an issue concerns Cost per Hour. The elevated hourly costs may be attributed to the deadhead time intervals as well as the time it takes to pick up and secure wheelchair-bound passengers. Although AIM Transit has maintained or exceeded its 10 percent
farebox requirement, the overall farebox has been trending downward. The incentive and penalty provisions contained in the service contract have not yet been implemented by the County.

ARC-Imperial Valley utilizes a manual dispatching system for AIM Transit. According to ARC’s Director of Transportation, federal grants would only cover up to 80 percent of the cost for an automated dispatching system.

ARC provides an annual management summary report that records operational data such as wheelchair life failures, accidents, vandalism, and roadcalls. A monthly management summary report is also maintained and includes the number of service days, farebox revenues, mileage (revenue/deadhead), hours (revenue/deadhead), passenger count, passenger miles, passenger category, and trip purpose. The report also includes trip denials and comments received. Two of the operational measures reported on the management summary report are accidents and on-time performance. These measures are summarized in Table V-2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table V-2</th>
<th>Accidents &amp; On-Time Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accidents</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Time Performance</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: ARC-Imperial Valley*

The number of accidents reported during the period has been negligible. Only one accident was reported for FY 2008 and FY 2009, respectively. There were no accidents reported for FY 2010. On-time performance has improved during the period, increasing from 94 percent to 98 percent of scheduled trips. This trend averages out to a 96 percent on-time performance rate for the period.

Customer service trends are monitored on the passenger service report, which are presented on the same spreadsheet as the management summary report. This report includes a tally of cancellations, no-shows, comments, complaints, and compliments. Table V-3 below summarizes the number of cancellations, trip denials, and no-shows received during the audit period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table V-3</th>
<th>Cancellations, Denials &amp; No-Show</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancellations</td>
<td>1,901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trip Denials</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Shows</td>
<td>1,912</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: ARC-Imperial Valley*

The number of cancellations and trip denials has declined significantly during the audit period. This trend reflects the effort to implement and enforce the no-show policy as per a prior audit recommendation. ARC now charges for no-shows after a total of three no-shows. No-shows continue to be more prevalent on subscription services.
Unlike cancellations and no-shows, trip denials are not reported on the passenger service report. ARC maintains a monthly denial log that contains the date and time of the request, pickup and destination addresses, and reason for the denial. There are nine alphabetical codes utilized for the reason given for each denial. The most common reasons for a denial include a pickup address outside of the corridor, not being able to renegotiate dates and times, same-day trip requests, and a passenger not qualifying for the service. The denial log is attached to the monthly management summary information sheet.

Another measure of customer service is in the tracking of complaints and compliments on the passenger service report tallied for the service year. Complaints and compliments are summarized in Table V-4 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2007</th>
<th>FY 2008</th>
<th>FY 2009</th>
<th>FY 2010</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complaints</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ARC-Imperial Valley

The number of complaints reported have averaged five annually, peaking at 12 complaints in FY 2008. There were four compliments received over the same period.

**Planning**

Service planning for AIM Transit relies on several approaches consisting of public forums, plans, and studies. Pursuant to the TDA claims process, ICTC conducts annual Unmet Transit Needs hearings. Unmet Transit Needs are, at a minimum, those public transportation or specialized transportation services that are identified in the Regional Short-Range Transit Plan (SRTP), Regional Transportation Plan, or similar Mobility Plan which have not been implemented or funded. Unmet Transit Needs identified during the process must also be found “reasonable to meet” based upon a set of five criteria in order to be implemented. Testimony received during the Unmet Needs process over the course of the audit period requested expanded service on Sundays.

ICTC commissioned a fare study of the transit agencies under its jurisdiction in 2008. For several of the operators, the farebox recovery ratios had been declining over the past few years given the growth in operating costs, primarily from fuel and insurance. The *Public Transit Services Fare Analysis* (Nelson/Nygaard 2008) proposed four fare options for AIM Transit, two each under a prior zone structure as well as two under a new zone structure. The analysis suggested that AIM Transit adopt a new fare structure and recommended a 25 percent increase for the local fare.

The new fare zone structure complements the new zone structure developed and implemented for IVT. The ICTC (formerly IVAG) Board selected Option 3 as the preferred alternative for adoption. This alternative called for ADA-certified passengers to pay twice the IVT zone fare and non-ADA-certified passengers to pay three times the fare.
An updated SRTP was commissioned by ICTC in January 2011 and is currently being developed. The primary objectives of the SRTP will be to review existing performance and prioritize operating and capital expenditures to maintain and recommend improvements to the regional transit system. The prior SRTP was adopted in FY 2004, and the new SRTP will review and evaluate the related goals, policies, objectives, and standards developed for that plan. In addition, it will provide a five-year plan for operations including, but not limited to, specifics on fares, service levels, route changes, service policy changes, inter-operator agreements, spare ratios, and other characteristics.

A Request for Proposals (RFP) was released in March 2011 by ICTC for the provision of ADA paratransit services concurrent with the fixed-route services. The fleet requirements for paratransit services include two 29-foot buses, three 27-foot buses, and three 22-foot buses for a total fleet of eight vehicles. The fleet would include a spare ratio of 20 percent. The farebox standard would remain at 10 percent pursuant to TDA guidelines. The estimated annual hours proposed would be 12,250 hours, and the estimated annual mileage proposed would be 225,000 with operations scheduled Monday through Saturday. The new contract would also include a series of incentives and penalties through the implementation of a Performance-Based Incentive System. The contract operator would be allowed to make recommendations as to changes to improve paratransit service on a case-by-case basis.

**Maintenance**

ARC has developed a four-phase vehicle maintenance protocol for the vehicles utilized by AIM Transit. The first phase involves the Driver’s Daily Vehicle Inspection Report (DVIR), which is completed prior to the first and second shifts to discover any mechanical defects that would prevent safe operation of the vehicles. The DVIR consists of a 30-point inspection checklist. ARC displays a daily mileage board indicating the current mileage of each vehicle and the mileage when each type of maintenance check is required.

The second phase involves an in-house 1,500-mile vehicle inspection along with a mid-point inspection prior to the third phase. The purpose of this inspection is to discover and correct any mechanical defect that may have occurred since the time of the last inspection either in-house or at a repair facility.

The third phase consists of a 3,000-mile/45-day inspection performed by an outside repair facility with certified technicians. This involves an inspection, oil change, and lubrication as mandated by the Department of Transportation. In addition, the purpose of this inspection is to discover and correct mechanical defects that are denoted during the thorough inspection by a certified Automotive Service Excellence (ASE) mechanic. The fourth phase involves the California Highway Patrol (CHP) Annual Bus and Terminal Inspection, which occurs at 13-month intervals.

Vehicle maintenance is performed by several dedicated vendors locally. Dion International Trucks, LLC, located at 397 East Evan Hewes Highway in El Centro, provides service on General Motors (Chevrolet) vehicles. El Centro Motors located at 1520 Ford Drive in El Centro provides service on
Ford vehicles. Radiator and glass repairs are performed by MJ Radiators & Glass Service located at 363 West State Street in El Centro. Escobedo Auto Body Shop located at 361 East Main Street in El Centro performs body work on the vehicles. Vehicles are taken to Desert Auto Plaza in El Centro or to a dealership in San Diego for warranty repairs.

ARC keeps in stock serpentine belts for the Chevrolet vehicles which require replacement every 5,000 to 7,000 miles. Otherwise, the parts inventory is very low at ARC, given most vehicle maintenance and repair is performed at the vendor’s location. The annual cost for vehicle repair and maintenance increased 22 percent from $84,891.12 in FY 2007 to $103,697.03 in FY 2010.

Vehicle fueling is handled through McNeece Brothers Oil of El Centro located at 691 East Heil Avenue only a few blocks away from ARC’s offices. A special fleet discount is applied on fuel purchases exceeding 10,000 gallons monthly. According to ARC financial reports, annual fuel costs increased nearly 37 percent from $102,730.66 in FY 2007 to $139,402.36 in FY 2010. This increase is attributed to the overall increase in fuel costs during the period as well as the addition of a sixth vehicle to the AIM Transit fleet.

The contract operator, as per a prior audit recommendation, began tracking roadcalls on its management summary report in FY 2009. Table V-5 below provides a summary of roadcalls incurred on the AIM Transit system for FYs 2009 and 2010.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadcalls</th>
<th>FY 2007</th>
<th>FY 2008</th>
<th>FY 2009</th>
<th>FY 2010</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NR=Not Reported  
Source: ARC-Imperial Valley

A review of the management summary report reveals that most of the roadcalls occurred during the summer months, which are characterized by hot temperatures that affect the optimal performance of vehicle air conditioning systems. The service contract stipulates that thorough air conditioning inspections and repairs be executed and completed on all vehicles no later than April 1 of each contractual year.

**Marketing**

ARC is responsible for marketing the service on behalf of the County and coordinates the placement, scheduling, and distribution of all advertising and promotional materials to promote ridership. The contract with the County stipulates that the marketing budget is 5 percent of the AIM Transit budget, which is higher than the marketing percentage for ARC’s contracts with the cities of Imperial and El Centro because of the need for a dedicated website that includes ADA eligibility information and downloadable bilingual forms. The contract also requires ARC to develop an annual marketing plan at least 30 days prior to the end of the fiscal year for approval by the County. ARC has made efforts to develop and implement a marketing plan in spite of
budgetary constraints. With the cut in operating subsidies in March 2010, the marketing budget was subject to significant reductions.

A glossy color tri-fold brochure has been developed for AIM Transit. The brochure, which is printed in English and Spanish, provides a map of the service area, fare schedule, and general information on how the service operates. There is a one-half page color advertisement featured in the Imperial County Area Agency on Aging Senior Services Directory. The ad contains a photo of an AIM Transit vehicle along with contact numbers. Flyers are also employed to announce service or fare changes. ARC has created a paratransit data sheet that provides a listing of all the Dial-A-Ride services operated in Imperial County. A website was developed for AIM Transit (http://www.aimtransit.com/) which went live in October 2009. The website was active until July 1, 2011 when a new website for regional ADA service was activated (http://ivtaccess.org). The service is also listed in the local Yellow Pages telephone directory. Marketing efforts were reduced due to the cut in operating subsidies.

ARC has developed and provides passenger comment cards. The Transportation Service Questionnaire contains 10 questions and is printed in English and Spanish. ARC provides a statistical summary of the frequency and patterns of comments in its passenger service report. The report gives a breakdown of comments received as well as the number of complaints (written or phoned in) and compliments. The comment cards are primarily submitted directly to the contractor for processing which is part of industry practice and typically contained in the service contract. An alternative is for the comment cards to be addressed to and postage paid by the oversight agency for tracking purposes. Another option is for the public phone number to report a comment be changed to reflect the number for the oversight agency.

**General Administration & Management**

During the audit period, AIM was administered by County staff serving under the umbrella agency IVAG. The service has been operated under various contracts since the service was implemented in June 1994. The newly created ICTC, through adopting resolution, assumed the transfer of duties and obligations as the successor agency to IVAG. Among the duties transferred included the continued management of AIM. In addition to the oversight of AIM provided by ICTC staff through contract management and monitoring, discussions about service are held through committees including the Social Services Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC) that advises ICTC on transit matters pertaining to the needs of transit-dependent and transit-disadvantaged persons.

ARC is a nonprofit, 501(c)(3) social services agency that provides a number of services to the disabled community such as vocational programs, residential services, first aid/CPR training, and paratransit services. ARC’s transportation division is the largest paratransit provider in Imperial County. ARC is governed by a Board of Directors and an Executive Director. Serving under the Board and Executive Director is the Director of Transportation, who oversees the paratransit services operation. The Director of Transportation is assisted by an Office Manager and Operations Supervisor. The Operations Supervisor oversees the dispatchers, schedulers, trainers, maintenance personnel, and drivers. In addition to the management and supervisory-level staff, ARC has 27 full-time drivers and 5 dispatchers. Drivers are assigned to contracted services based
upon their aptitude and customer service skills. The Director of Transportation reported higher than average employee turnover in FY 2010 due to wage increase deferrals and benefit cuts.

Drivers undergo a minimum of 80 hours of training consisting of 40 hours classroom and 40 hours behind-the-wheel instruction. Classroom instruction encompasses first aid, cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR), sensitivity/empathy training, Commercial Driver’s License (CDL) study and testing, ADA requirements, radio usage, and dispatch procedures. The behind-the-wheel instruction consists of pre-trip and post-trip inspections, brake and transmission checks, wheelchair lift operation and securement, and the SMITH system driving skill techniques. The SMITH system encompasses five keys for safe vehicle operation: (1) aim high in steering; (2) get the big picture; (3) keep eyes moving; (4) leave an out; and (5) make sure other drivers see you.

In addition to the aforementioned training protocol, new drivers are placed on a route under the supervision of a senior-level driver or route trainer who “rides along” to reinforce skills previously learned during the initial trainings. There are also ongoing in-service trainings such as mandatory monthly safety meetings, check rides, road observations, and retraining. Drivers are subject to retraining in the event of an accident or unfavorable evaluation.

ARC provides a comprehensive benefits package to its full-time employees including retirement options through a 401K plan. However, there have been no employer contributions toward retirement for three years due to reduced operator subsidies and higher costs. The value of the benefits package is calculated to be approximately $3.35 an hour on average.

Grant Administration & Funding

The primary source of intergovernmental grant funding for AIM Transit is derived from the countywide TDA apportionment. During the audit period, AIM Transit received both Local Transportation Fund (LTF) and State Transit Assistance (STA) funding support. Due to uncertain STA funding during the audit period, ICTC began shifting the funding subsidy for AIM using more LTF while available STA was transferred to IVT. ICTC has since resumed funding AIM with STA monies. Table V-6 provides a summary of TDA funding allocation toward the countywide paratransit program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TDA Funding</th>
<th>FY 2007</th>
<th>FY 2008</th>
<th>FY 2009</th>
<th>FY 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LTF (SB325)</td>
<td>$177,820</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$354,673</td>
<td>$788,934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STA (AB2551)</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$757,049</td>
<td>$423,136</td>
<td>$118,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$677,820</td>
<td>$757,049</td>
<td>$777,809</td>
<td>$906,934</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Transit Finance Plan, ICTC

TDA funding support for operations has gradually increased during the audit period. The total TDA allocation increased by more than a third since the FY 2007 base year. The County received a
higher STA allocation than LTF allocations earlier in the period. By FY 2010, that trend reversed as the State Budget crisis impeded the availability of STA funds.

As a nonprofit social services agency, ARC has successfully applied for and received Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5310 grant funding toward paratransit vehicle procurement and other related equipment. Grant applications are scored and ranked by ICTC. ARC has compiled an annual bus inventory and depreciation schedule for AIM Transit vehicles. Buses and associated equipment are listed along with the funding source, acquisition date, and annual and monthly depreciation amounts, as well as date of full depreciation.
Findings and Recommendations

The following material summarizes the major findings obtained from this triennial audit covering FYs 2008 through 2010. A set of recommendations is then provided.

Triennial Audit Findings

1. Of the compliance requirements pertaining to AIM Transit, the operation fully complied with eight out of the nine requirements. The operator was found in partial compliance with the timely submittal of its annual fiscal audits. Two additional compliance requirements did not apply to AIM Transit (e.g., rural/urban farebox recovery ratios).

2. AIM Transit’s farebox recovery ratio remained above the required 10 percent standard. The fare increase in FY 2009 helped to maintain the farebox. The fare increase was intended to offset rising fuel costs and service cutbacks. The average systemwide farebox recovery ratio was 10.68 percent during the triennial review period.

3. Through its contract operator, the County participates in the CHP Transit Operator Compliance Program and received inspections of AIM Transit vehicles within the 13 months prior to each TDA claim. Satisfactory ratings were made for all inspections conducted during the audit period.

4. The operating budget exhibited modest increases since FY 2007, with the highest increases realized in FY 2008 and FY 2010. The addition of a sixth bus and increased fuel costs were responsible for the increases in the operating budget.

5. AIM Transit implemented five out of the eight prior audit recommendations. One recommendation was partially implemented. Two recommendations were not implemented, one because it is not yet warranted for implementation, while the other has been carried forward in this audit for full implementation.

6. Given its large service area, AIM Transit has managed to maintain its farebox recovery in spite of notable cost increases and growth in service miles. The growth in operating costs outpaced the growth in passenger trips and revenues. The increase in operating costs has been attributed to the spike in fuel costs as well as the additional of a sixth vehicle.

7. In an effort to contain costs and sustain the farebox, fares were increased in FY 2009 to generate higher passenger revenue. In addition, AIM Transit underwent a 9 percent cut in its operating budget, amounting to $92,860 effective March 2010. AIM Transit was administered by ICTC for the County of Imperial and operated by ARC-Imperial Valley during the audit period.
8. AIM Transit operations have met or exceeded performance standards for most indicators. The only indicator where there has been an issue concerns Cost per Hour. The elevated hourly costs may be attributed to the deadhead time intervals as well as the time it takes to pick up and secure wheelchair-bound passengers.

9. ARC provides an annual management summary report that records operational data such as wheelchair life failures, accidents, vandalism, and roadcalls. Customer service trends are monitored on the passenger service report, which is presented on the same spreadsheet as the management summary report. This report includes a tally of cancellations, no-shows, comments, complaints, and compliments.

10. A Request for Proposals (RFP) was released in March 2011 by ICTC for the provision of countywide paratransit services concurrent with the fixed-route services. The estimated annual hours proposed would be 12,250 hours and the estimated annual mileage proposed would be 225,000 with operations scheduled Monday through Saturday. The new contract would also include a series of incentives and penalties through the implementation of a Performance-Based Incentive System.

11. ARC is responsible for marketing the service on behalf of the County and coordinates the placement, scheduling, and distribution of all advertising and promotional materials to promote ridership. The contract with the County stipulates that the marketing budget is five percent of the AIM Transit budget which included making available the regional ADA eligibility application and downloadable bilingual forms on a dedicated website.

12. As a nonprofit social services agency, ARC has successfully applied for and received Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5310 grant funding toward paratransit vehicle procurement and other related equipment. ARC has compiled an annual bus inventory and depreciation schedule for AIM Transit vehicles. Buses and associated equipment are listed along with the funding source, acquisition date, and annual and monthly depreciation amounts, as well as date of full depreciation.
**Triennial Audit Recommendations**

1. **Record trip denials on the annual passenger service report.**

   The contract operator, ARC-Imperial Valley, has developed a thorough process for recording and classifying trip denials on AIM Transit. ARC maintains a monthly denial log that contains the date and time of the request, pickup and destination addresses, and reason for the denial. There are nine alphabetical codes utilized for the reason given for each denial. The monthly denial log is attached to a monthly management summary report, and the number of denials is noted on the report. Unlike cancellations and no-shows, trip denials are not reported on the passenger service report. It is suggested that trip denial data be included concurrently with cancellation and no-show data on the passenger service report.

2. **Adjust the FTEs shown in the annual State Controller Report.**

   This recommendation has been carried forward from the prior audit. In a review of the performance data summaries compiled by ICTC for AIM Transit, the FTE count does not appear to be calculated accurately. The FTE data appear to be an annual aggregate total of the number of employees or monthly FTEs. When queried about this discrepancy, the contractor was able to demonstrate an accurate accounting of FTEs on the operations side. Employee hours are detailed and formulized to provide an FTE figure totaled monthly and annually. However, County personnel have yet to include their staff hours and provide an accurate accounting thereof. Therefore, it is suggested that County personnel responsible for preparing the State Controller Report track their time charged to transit administration according to the formula calculation for FTEs and accurately incorporate the FTE information provided by the contractor as well as include the FTE data compiled from the contract operator.
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Section I

Introduction

California’s Transportation Development Act (TDA) requires that a triennial performance audit be conducted of public transit entities that receive TDA revenues. The performance audit serves to ensure accountability in the use of public transportation revenue.

The Imperial County Transportation Commission (ICTC) engaged PMC to conduct a performance audit of the City of Brawley Dial-A-Ride service covering the most recent triennial period, fiscal years 2007–2008 through 2009–2010. The purpose of the performance audit is to evaluate the system’s effectiveness and efficiency in its use of TDA funds to provide specialized public transportation in its service area. This evaluation is required as a condition for continued receipt of these funds for public transportation purposes. In addition, the audit evaluates the City of Brawley’s compliance with the conditions specified in the California Public Utilities Code (PUC). This task involves ascertaining whether the City is meeting the PUC’s reporting requirements. Moreover, the audit includes calculations of transit service performance indicators and a detailed review of the City’s administrative functions. From the analysis that has been undertaken, a set of recommendations has been made for the agency which is intended to improve the performance of specialized transit operations.

In summary, this TDA audit affords the opportunity for an independent, constructive, and objective evaluation of the organization and its operations that otherwise might not be available. The methodology for the audit included in-person interviews with administrative and operations management, collection and review of agency documents, data analysis, and on-site observations. The Performance Audit Guidebook for Transit Operators and Regional Transportation Planning Entities published by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) was used to guide in the development and conduct of the audit.

Overview of the Transit System

Dial-A-Ride is a general public demand-response service within the City of Brawley. Dial-A-Ride was established in September 1985 as a private for-profit service. The service continues to be operated today under a private contract with Sonia Corina Incorporated dba Sunrise Driving Service, a nonprofit 501(c)(3) entity. Sunrise Driving Service has retained and assisted the original private operator of the dial-a-ride service.

The City of Brawley is located in the center of Imperial County at the junction of State Routes (SR) 78, 86, and 111. The city has a total land area of 5.8 square miles. Brawley is a general law city incorporated in 1908 and has a council-manager form of government. Based upon the 2010 U.S. Census, the city’s population is 24,953. The 2010 population is estimated to be 27,743 as reported by the California Department of Finance.
System Characteristics

The City of Brawley Dial-A-Ride system is a general public service comprising subscription trips and same-day demand-response services. The system primarily serves senior citizens. Service is provided within the city limits of Brawley with the exception of the San Diego State University (SDSU), Imperial Valley Campus located on State Route 78 one mile east of town. The campus began operations in 2005, and subsequently dial-a-ride service was extended to the campus.

Dial-A-Ride operates from 7:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday. The service does not operate weekends and the following holidays: New Year’s Day, Martin Luther King Day (observed), Presidents’ Day, Memorial Day (observed), Independence Day (observed), Labor Day, Veterans Day, Thanksgiving, and Christmas. Reservations for service are accepted up to seven days in advance.

Weekday service hours were reduced and Saturday service eliminated effective March 2010 due to budget cuts. Prior to this service reduction, Brawley Dial-A-Ride operated from 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. during the week and from 9:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. on Saturday.

The fare for a one-way trip is $1.00. The fare for children under the age of five years old is 50 cents. The City sells tickets to local social service agencies such as the Local Area Agency on Aging and Catholic Charities.

Brawley Dial-A-Ride is operated with a fleet of three vehicles plus one back-up vehicle owned and operated by Sunrise Driving Services as described in Table I-1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Manufacturer</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Fuel Type</th>
<th>Seat/Wheelchair Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Chevy Astro</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Gasoline</td>
<td>7/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Ford Starcraft</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Gasoline</td>
<td>8/2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Back-Up Vehicles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Manufacturer</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Fuel Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Chevy Venture</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Gasoline</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Sunrise Driving Service

The fleet conforms to the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990 in regard to wheelchair accessibility. An agreement is also in place that AIM Transit will provide assistance to Brawley Dial-A-Ride in the event of a lift breakdown on their transit vehicle. With advance notice, AIM Transit will provide limited assistance up to three days maximum.
Section II

Operator Compliance Requirements

This section of the audit report contains the analysis of the City of Brawley’s ability to comply with state requirements for continued receipt of TDA funds. The evaluation uses the guidebook, *Performance Audit Guidebook for Transit Operators and Regional Transportation Planning Agencies, September 2008 (third edition)*, which was developed by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) to assess transit operators. The updated guidebook contains a checklist of eleven measures taken from relevant sections of the Public Utilities Code and the California Code of Regulations. Each of these requirements is discussed in the table below, including a description of the system’s efforts to comply with the requirements. In addition, the findings from the compliance review are described in the text following the table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operator Compliance Requirements</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Compliance Efforts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The transit operator submitted annual reports to the RTPA based upon the Uniform System of Accounts and Records established by the State Controller. Report is due 90 days after end of fiscal year (Sept. 28/29), or 110 days (Oct. 19/20) if filed electronically (Internet).</td>
<td>Public Utilities Code, Section 99243</td>
<td>Completion/submittal dates: FY 2008: October 20, 2008 FY 2009: October 15, 2009 FY 2010: October 14, 2010 Conclusion: Complied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The operator has submitted annual fiscal and compliance audits to the RTPA and to the State Controller within 180 days following the end of the fiscal year (Dec. 27), or has received the appropriate 90-day extension by the RTPA allowed by law.</td>
<td>Public Utilities Code, Section 99245</td>
<td>Completion/submittal dates: FY 2008: April 22, 2009 FY 2009: February 24, 2010 FY 2010: March 10, 2011 Conclusion: Partial Compliance. FY 2008 Fiscal &amp; Compliance Audit was completed and received after the 90-day extension period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The CHP has, within the 13 months prior to each TDA claim submitted by an</td>
<td>Public Utilities Code, Section 99251 B</td>
<td>The City of Brawley through its contract operator participates in the CHP Transit Operator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table II-1
Operator Compliance Requirements Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operator Compliance Requirements</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Compliance Efforts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>operator, certified the operator’s compliance with Vehicle Code Section 1808.1 following a CHP inspection of the operator’s terminal.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliance Program in which the CHP has conducted inspections within the 13 months prior to each TDA claim. Inspection dates applicable to the audit period were April 4, 2008; April 30, 2009; and March 23, 2010. The City’s contract operator received a satisfactory rating for all inspections conducted on Brawley Dial-A-Ride vehicles during the audit period. Conclusion: Complied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The operator’s claim for TDA funds is submitted in compliance with rules and regulations adopted by the RTPA for such claims.</td>
<td>Public Utilities Code, Section 99261</td>
<td>As a condition of approval, the City’s annual claims for Local Transportation Funds are submitted in compliance with rules and regulations adopted by ICTC. ICTC staff provides assistance as needed in completing the claims. The City’s claims are submitted generally during the spring of the claim year as required by ICTC. Conclusion: Complied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operator Compliance Requirements</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Compliance Efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If an operator serves urbanized and non-urbanized areas, it has maintained a ratio of fare revenues to operating costs at least equal to the ratio determined by the rules and regulations adopted by the RTPA.</td>
<td>Public Utilities Code, Section 99270.1</td>
<td>This requirement is not applicable, as Brawley Dial-A-Ride serves a non-urbanized area. Conclusion: Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The operator’s operating budget has not increased by more than 15% over the preceding year, nor is there a substantial increase or decrease in the scope of operations or capital budget provisions for major new fixed facilities unless the operator has reasonably supported and substantiated the change(s).</td>
<td>Public Utilities Code, Section 99266</td>
<td>Percentage increase in Brawley Dial-A-Ride’s operating budget:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FY 2008: +9.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FY 2009: +26.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FY 2010: -7.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The FY 2009 increase in the operating budget above 15 percent can be attributed to the service contract extension containing expanded service hours. The FY 2009 increase was substantiated. The budget decrease in FY 2010 reflects the cutback in service hours and Saturday operations. Source: FY 2008 &amp; FY 2009 Annual Fiscal and Compliance Audits &amp; FY 2010 State Controller Report Conclusion: Complied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The operator’s definitions of performance measures are consistent with Public Utilities Code Section 99247, including (a) operating cost, (b) operating cost per</td>
<td>Public Utilities Code, Section 99247</td>
<td>The City’s definition of performance measures as tracked and recorded by the contract operator is consistent with Public Utilities Code Section 99247. However, more</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table II-1
Operator Compliance Requirements Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operator Compliance Requirements</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Compliance Efforts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>passenger, (c) operating cost per vehicle service hour, (d) passengers per vehicle service hour, (e) passengers per vehicle service mile, (f) total passengers, (g) transit vehicle, (h) vehicle service hours, (i) vehicle service miles, and (j) vehicle service hours per employee.</td>
<td>Public Utilities Code, Sections 99268.2, 99268.3, 99268.12, 99270.1</td>
<td>consistency between data in internal and external reports is required. Conclusion: Complied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the operator serves an urbanized area, it has maintained a ratio of fare revenues to operating costs at least equal to one-fifth (20 percent), unless it is in a county with a population of less than 500,000, in which case it must maintain a ratio of fare revenues to operating costs of at least equal to three-twentieths (15 percent), if so determined by the RTPA.</td>
<td>Public Utilities Code, Sections 99268.2, 99268.3, 99268.12, 99270.1</td>
<td>This requirement is not applicable, as Brawley Dial-A-Ride serves a non-urbanized area. Conclusion: Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the operator serves a rural area, or provides exclusive services to elderly and disabled persons, it has maintained a ratio of fare revenues to operating costs at least equal to one-tenth (10 percent).</td>
<td>Public Utilities Code, Sections 99268.2, 99268.4, 99268.5</td>
<td>Brawley Dial-A-Ride’s operating ratios using audited data were as follows:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FY 2008: 13.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FY 2009: 10.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FY 2010: 11.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Source: Annual Fiscal and Compliance Audits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conclusion: Complied</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table II-1
### Operator Compliance Requirements Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operator Compliance Requirements</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Compliance Efforts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The current cost of the operator’s retirement system is fully funded with respect to the officers and employees of its public transportation system, or the operator is implementing a plan approved by the RTPA which will fully fund the retirement system within 40 years.</td>
<td>Public Utilities Code, Section 99271</td>
<td>The City contracts with a private nonprofit provider for operations, while the cost of City staff’s retirement is fully funded under the California Public Employees Retirement System (CalPERS). Conclusion: Complied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the operator receives state transit assistance funds, the operator makes full use of funds available to it under the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 before TDA claims are granted.</td>
<td>California Code of Regulations, Section 6754(a)(3)</td>
<td>This measure is not applicable, as federal formula grant funds are not utilized and Brawley Dial-A-Ride does not receive STAF revenues. Conclusion: Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings and Observations from Operator Compliance Requirements Matrix

1. Of the compliance requirements pertaining to Brawley Dial-A-Ride, the operation fully complied with seven out of the nine requirements. The operator was found in partial compliance with the timely submittal of its annual fiscal audits. Three additional compliance requirements did not apply to Brawley Dial-A-Ride (e.g., rural/urban farebox recovery ratios and federal formula funding).

2. Brawley Dial-A-Ride’s farebox recovery ratio remained above the required 10 percent standard. The average systemwide farebox recovery ratio was 11.77 percent during the triennial review period.

3. Through its contract operator, the City participates in the CHP Transit Operator Compliance Program and received inspections of Brawley Dial-A-Ride vehicles within the 13 months prior to each TDA claim. Satisfactory ratings were made for all inspections conducted during the audit period.

4. The operating budget exhibited a modest increase FY 2008, with the highest increase realized in FY 2009 due to a service contract extension containing expanded service hours. The budget decrease in FY 2010 reflects the cutback in service hours and Saturday operations.
Section III

Prior Triennial Performance Recommendations

The City of Brawley’s efforts to implement the recommendations made in the prior triennial audit are examined in this section of the report. For this purpose, each prior recommendation for the agency is described, followed by a discussion of the City’s efforts to implement the recommendation. Conclusions concerning the extent to which the recommendations have been adopted by the agency are then presented.

Prior Recommendation 1

Maintain CHP inspection reports in the central City files.

Actions taken by the City of Brawley

The contract operator, on behalf of Brawley Dial-A-Ride, began participating in the CHP Transit Operator Compliance Program during the audit period. As the contractor has coordinated with the CHP on inspections, City staff who administers the Dial-A-Ride program has not been receiving copies of the inspection reports to maintain on file. During the auditor site visit involving both the contractor and City staff, copies of the CHP reports were made available for review. City staff responsible for administering the program was advised to always request and maintain copies on file.

Conclusion

This recommendation has not been implemented and is carried forward in this audit for full implementation.

Prior Recommendation 2

Consider fuel costs as a pass-through expense from the contractor to the City.

Actions taken by the City of Brawley

Fuel costs are considered by the City a part of the overall contracted transit costs, and not considered as a separate variable expense. The transit budget prepared by Sunrise Driving Service is on a cost per hour basis and is inclusive of fuel costs, the number of hours and other previous costs. Therefore, the City does not reimburse the contractor for actual fuel costs incurred. The City of Brawley Transit Agreement for 2007–2008 (including its three extensions) does not include a provision for fuel costs as a pass-through expense nor does it include a fuel escalator clause.
Conclusion

This recommendation has not been implemented.

Prior Recommendation 3

Correctly record revenue hours and miles according to TDA definitions.

Actions taken by the City of Brawley

In response to this recommendation, the City has had the contract operator start recording revenue hours and miles for Brawley Dial-A-Ride in accordance with TDA definitions and guidelines. This would include tracking the beginning and ending mileage each time a passenger is picked up and dropped off. Revenue hours and miles are recorded in the monthly statements as well as in the annual performance data summaries received by the City.

Conclusion

This recommendation has been implemented.

Prior Recommendation 4

Continue to engage in active management of the dial-a-ride service contract.

Actions taken by the City of Brawley

The City of Brawley Public Works Department has been actively managing the dial-a-ride contract since 2008. The Public Works Director is in regular contact with the contract operator on a quarterly basis and reviews the transit budget annually. The department’s contract manager compiles information received from the operators into reports for the City Council and Finance Department.

Conclusion

This recommendation has been implemented.

Prior Recommendation 5

Establish basic process to file and review complaints against the service.

Actions taken by the City of Brawley
This recommendation is still in the process of implementation. The contract operator currently utilizes an incident report for the recording of complaints. Complaints are generally handled directly by the contractor without any involvement by City staff. The contractor is working on more formalized complaint procedures that would include having complaints reviewed and placed on file at the City.

Conclusion

This recommendation has been partially implemented.

Prior Recommendation 6

Implement the no-show policy in the contract.

Actions taken by the City of Brawley

The City of Brawley Transit Agreement for 2007–2008 (including its three extensions) contains a Cancellations and No-Show Policy. The policy stipulates a series of four actions that the contractor must observe in regard to cancellations and no-shows. This includes the provision that in the event of three consecutive no-shows by a passenger, the contract operator would send a notice of intent to suspend service for up to five business days and detailing the reasons for such suspension. In addition to this policy, the contractor records the number of no-shows and cancellations in its vehicle operations data summaries. The number of no-shows recorded during the audit period has declined from 3,420 in FY 2007 to 2,593 in FY 2010.

Conclusion

This recommendation has been implemented.

Prior Recommendation 7

Add additional performance data to the monthly summary reports of service.

Actions taken by the City of Brawley

This recommendation is still in the process of implementation. The monthly statement that is prepared and submitted to the City includes mileage, hours, passenger trips, and fares. However, no-shows, cancellations, complaints, and roadcalls continue to be recorded separately.

Conclusion

This recommendation has been partially implemented.
Prior Recommendation 8

Conduct rider survey.

Actions taken by the City of Brawley

This recommendation was suggested in light of the population growth and development taking place in the city as a means to understand and better serve the transit service’s customer base. Such a survey could determine where service could be enhanced as well as be integrated into the update of the ICTC Short-Range Transit Plan. In response, the City has started working on a survey to be completed.

Conclusion

This recommendation has not been implemented and is carried forward in this audit for full implementation.
Section IV

TDA Performance Indicators

This section reviews Brawley Dial-A-Ride’s performance in providing service in an efficient and effective manner. TDA requires that at least five specific performance indicators be reported, which are contained in the following table. Farebox is not one of the five specific indicators, but is shown as a compliance measure. Findings from the analysis are contained in the section following the table, followed by the analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating Cost*</td>
<td>$189,317</td>
<td>$207,219</td>
<td>$262,282</td>
<td>$242,295</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Passengers</td>
<td>29,374</td>
<td>26,780</td>
<td>27,615</td>
<td>28,575</td>
<td>-2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Service Hours</td>
<td>5,543</td>
<td>5,193</td>
<td>5,569</td>
<td>5,339</td>
<td>-3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Service Miles</td>
<td>58,426</td>
<td>54,529</td>
<td>55,229</td>
<td>53,605</td>
<td>-8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee FTEs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Revenue*</td>
<td>$28,216</td>
<td>$27,156</td>
<td>$26,826</td>
<td>$29,025</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Cost per Passenger</td>
<td>$6.45</td>
<td>$7.74</td>
<td>$9.50</td>
<td>$8.48</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Cost per Vehicle Service Hour</td>
<td>$34.15</td>
<td>$39.90</td>
<td>$47.10</td>
<td>$45.38</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Cost per Vehicle Service Mile</td>
<td>$3.24</td>
<td>$3.80</td>
<td>$4.75</td>
<td>$4.52</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passengers per Vehicle Service Hour</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passengers per Vehicle Service Mile</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Service Hours per Employee</td>
<td>1,385.8</td>
<td>1,298.3</td>
<td>1,856.3</td>
<td>1,334.8</td>
<td>-3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Fare per Passenger</td>
<td>$0.96</td>
<td>$1.01</td>
<td>$0.97</td>
<td>$1.02</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fare Recovery Ratio</td>
<td>14.90%</td>
<td>13.10%</td>
<td>10.23%</td>
<td>11.98%</td>
<td>-19.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ICTC; FYs 2008–10 Annual Fiscal Audits

*FY 2007 through FY 2010 Operating Cost & Fare Revenue data are audited figures.

Column graphs on the following pages are used to depict the trends for select performance indicators (Graphs IV-1 through IV-6).
Graph IV-1
Operating Costs

Graph IV-2
Ridership
Graph IV-3
Operating Cost per Passenger

FY 2007  FY 2008  FY 2009  FY 2010

Graph IV-4
Operating Cost per Vehicle Service Hour

FY 2007  FY 2008  FY 2009  FY 2010
Graph IV-5
Passengers per Vehicle Service Hour

FY 2007 FY 2008 FY 2009 FY 2010
4.7 4.8 4.9 5.0 5.1 5.2 5.3 5.4

Graph IV-6
Fare Recovery Ratio

FY 2007 FY 2008 FY 2009 FY 2010
0% 2% 4% 6% 8% 10% 12% 14% 16%
Findings from Verification of TDA Performance Indicators

1. **Operating cost per vehicle service hour**, an indicator of cost efficiency, increased 32.9 percent from $34.15 in FY 2007 to $45.38 in FY 2010. Overall vehicle service hours declined 3.7 percent, while operating costs exhibited an increase of 28 percent during the three-year period. Operating costs increased by a 9.5 percent annualized rate characterized by a 26.6 percent increase in FY 2009 due to a contract amendment that increased service costs and hours. On the other hand, vehicle service hours exhibited an annualized decline of 1.1 percent partly attributed to the cutback in hours and Saturday service in March 2010.

2. **Operating cost per passenger**, an indicator of cost effectiveness, increased at about the same rate as the cost per service hour. Cost per passenger increased 31.6 percent from $6.45 in FY 2007 to $8.48 in FY 2010. Overall ridership decreased 2.7 percent during the period from 29,374 passengers in FY 2007 to 28,575 passengers in FY 2010, amounting to a 0.7 percent annualized rate of decline. Passenger trips declined 8.8 percent in FY 2008, increasing 3.1 and 3.5 percent in FYs 2009 and 2010.

3. **Passengers per vehicle service hour**, which measures the effectiveness of the service delivered, increased by a very slight 1.0 percent between FY 2007 and FY 2010 from 5.3 passengers per hour to 5.4 passengers per hour. The average number of passengers per hour declined during the intervening years to 5.2 in FY 2008 and 5.0 in FY 2009. Even with this modest growth in passenger trips, service hours decreased from 5,543 hours in FY 2007 to 5,339 hours in FY 2010. This reflects the fluctuations in service hours based on the various contract amendments that transpired during the period.

4. **Passengers per vehicle service mile**, another indicator of service effectiveness, increased by 6.0 percent from 0.50 in FY 2007 to 0.53 in FY 2010. In contrast, vehicle service miles decreased by 8.3 percent from 58,426 miles in FY 2007 to 53,605 in FY 2010, while ridership also decreased but by only 2.7 percent. On an annualized basis, service miles decreased by 2.8 percent, only increasing 1.3 percent in FY 2009 and reflecting the increase in service hours.

5. **Vehicle service hours per employee** decreased 3.7 percent between FY 2007 and FY 2010 from 1,385.8 to 1,334.8. While the number of full-time equivalents (FTEs) remained relatively constant, the decline in this measure correlates with the same percentage decline in service hours. FTEs are derived by the formula of dividing total annual employee hours and then dividing by 2,000.

6. **Farebox recovery** for Brawley Dial-A-Ride exhibited a declining trend yet remained above the minimum TDA requirement of 10 percent during the audit period, averaging 11.77 percent. The growth in operating costs outpaced fare revenues at a higher rate percentage-wise (28 percent versus nearly 3 percent), resulting in the declining yet sustainable farebox
recovery. Farebox returns had an annualized decline of 5.6 percent for the period yet exhibited a 17.1 percent increase in FY 2010.

Conclusion from the Verification of TDA Performance Indicators

Brawley Dial-A-Ride provides general public, demand-responsive transit service within the city of Brawley as well as to the SDSU, Imperial Valley Campus. The service has managed to maintain its farebox recovery in spite of the growth in operating costs outpacing revenues by a ratio of about 10 to 1. The annualized increase in costs was 9.5 percent during the period, with an overall increase of 28 percent. Farebox returns have remained slightly above the minimum TDA requirement of 10 percent in spite of a decline of 19.6 percent from FY 2007 to FY 2010, which amounts to an average annualized decline of 5.6 percent. Fares have remained unchanged at $1.00 per passenger trip, and multi-fare tickets have been phased out.

The increase in operating costs has been attributed to the contract amendment that became effective October 2008 that increased weekday service hours and the overall budget from about $197,000 to $282,782. Vehicle service hours increased 7.2 percent in FY 2009 when this amendment took place. A subsequent amendment in March 2010 reduced weekday service hours and eliminated Saturday service. Passenger service efficiencies have been impacted by the increase in wheelchair passengers, which average 16 per day.
Data Consistency

In a review of data consistency among external reports, fiscal year-end operations data was compared between the annual State Controller Report and two internal reports prepared by the Brawley Dial-A-Ride contract operator and ICTC. Table IV-2 shows the side-by-side comparison during the audit period (FYs 2008, 2009, and 2010) and including the base year of FY 2007.

Overall, there are some discrepancies and consistencies among the three data sets. A review of the two internal data sets shows relative consistency. The only significant variance between the two is in the vehicle service miles category for FY 2010. For example, there is a 6,410 variance in the data for that performance measure. On the other hand, the State Controller Report data show more significant variances when compared to the internal data sets for FY 2008 unlinked passengers and FY 2009 vehicle service hours. It appears that the City personnel responsible for preparing the State Controller Report inputted the passenger trip data instead of the service hour data for FY 2010 and omitted a digit from the passenger data for FY 2008. Although the remaining data appear fairly accurate, it is suggested that the City exercise greater discretion when transferring data from the internal to external reports.

Table IV-2
Data Consistency Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TDA Statistic</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Base Year FY 2007</th>
<th>Audit Review Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FY 2008</td>
<td>FY 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlinked Passengers</td>
<td>Brawley Dial-A-Ride Data</td>
<td>29,374</td>
<td>26,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ICTC Performance Summary</td>
<td>29,374</td>
<td>26,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Controller Report</td>
<td>28,244</td>
<td>2,316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Service Hours</td>
<td>Brawley Dial-A-Ride Data</td>
<td>5,525</td>
<td>5,192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ICTC Performance Summary</td>
<td>5,543</td>
<td>5,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Controller Report</td>
<td>5,541</td>
<td>5,192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Service Miles</td>
<td>Brawley Dial-A-Ride Data</td>
<td>58,426</td>
<td>54,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ICTC Performance Summary</td>
<td>58,426</td>
<td>54,529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Controller Report</td>
<td>58,426</td>
<td>54,528</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section V

Review of Operator Functions

This section provides an in-depth review of various functions within the Brawley Dial-A-Ride operation. The review highlights accomplishments, issues, and/or challenges that were determined during the audit period. The following departments and functions were reviewed at the City of Brawley:

- Operations & Planning
- Maintenance
- Marketing
- General Administration and Management

Operations & Planning

Brawley Dial-A-Ride has been in operation since September 1985. The service began as a sole volunteer effort by Brawley resident Isabel Pacheco under the name of Sunrise Driving Service with one van operating 11 hours during the week and 4 hours on Saturday. Administration and oversight of the transit system was transferred to the City of Brawley Public Works Department in 2008.

The dial-a-ride service is open to the general public, with priority given to senior citizens and persons with disabilities. Most trips have occurred on the east side of the city where more medical facilities are located. There are three large senior residential complexes in Brawley ranging from 30 to 80 units. In addition, there are more available activities and services that cater to seniors and disabled persons in the city, thus providing the stimulus for additional trips aboard Brawley Dial-A-Ride. Other riders include homemakers, low-income persons, and domestic and medical workers. Peak times of operation are between 7:00 a.m. and 8:00 a.m. to transport service workers to homes and medical facilities, and between 10:00 a.m. and 1:00 p.m. to transport riders to and from senior lunch programs. The subscription services are offered to several local social service agencies such as Catholic Charities, DayOut adult daycare, and CalWORKS.

Brawley Dial-A-Ride phased out the multi-ride ticket due to budget cuts; however, the one-way fare remained at $1.00 per one-way trip. Passenger trips average 20 to 30 minutes. The Wal-Mart located along SR 86 is a huge passenger generator and serves as a de facto transit hub. Brawley Dial-A-Ride transports one passenger to the SDSU, Imperial Valley Campus located just east of Brawley on Wednesdays. The number of wheelchair-bound passengers averages up to 16 per day, an increase from about 4 per day. The operator noted that it takes about 15 minutes to load each wheelchair-bound passenger.
There have been several service contract amendments during the audit period since the original contract was approved in 2005. The first amendment was the City of Brawley Transit Agreement 2007–2008, which covered the period from July 1, 2007, through June 30, 2008. This agreement was approved by the City Council on April 15, 2008, with an operating subsidy of $196,919.39. The hours of operation prescribed for the primary vehicle were Monday through Friday from 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. and Saturdays from 9:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. The hours of operation prescribed for the secondary vehicle were Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. The second contract amendment was approved on October 8, 2008, which provided for a one-year extension of the 2007–2008 agreement through June 30, 2009. This contract extension expanded the hours of operations during the week by five hours (6:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.) and increased the operating subsidy to $242,782.10. The third amendment, approved on October 20, 2009, extended the service contract to February 28, 2010, with no changes in compensation and hours. A fourth amendment, approved March 23, 2010, reduced service hours to Monday through Friday from 7:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. and eliminated Saturday service. This amendment would expire on December 31, 2010, and had a $16,000 monthly impact.

The contract operator provides a monthly statement to the City detailing operational data. The monthly statement presents a breakdown of the number of service hours, mileage, passengers, and fares for each day of service. Other measures include service hours per full-time employee and passengers per mile. Annual operational data include the number of passengers, service days, service hours, revenue mileage, subscription service passes, and fare revenue. Two contract staff members, including the dispatcher, count the fare receipts. Fare receipts are deposited every Wednesday at the City of Brawley Finance Department.

Although the monthly statement includes important operational data, no-shows, cancellations, complaints, and roadcalls continue to be recorded separately. Table V-1 below summarizes the number of cancellations and no-shows received during the audit period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table V-1</th>
<th>Cancellations &amp; No-Shows</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancellations</td>
<td>1,473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Shows</td>
<td>3,420</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Sunrise Driving Service

The number of cancellations has increased because of longer trip times that are attributed to increased traffic coupled with shared rides, leading some to call a taxi instead. In addition, there have been more last minute calls and pick ups for service, thus leading to longer trip times and more cancellations. In contrast, no-shows have declined significantly during the audit period, reflecting the operator’s effort to implement and enforce the no-show policy as per a prior audit recommendation. It is suggested that cancellation and no-show data be included as part of the monthly statement and totaled annually.
**Planning**

Service planning for Brawley Dial-A-Ride relies on several approaches consisting of public forums, plans, and studies. Pursuant to the TDA, ICTC undertakes the annual Unmet Transit Needs process. Unmet Transit Needs are, at a minimum, those public transportation or specialized transportation services that are identified in the Regional Short-Range Transit Plan (SRTP), Regional Transportation Plan, or similar Mobility Plan which have not been implemented or funded. Unmet Transit Needs identified during the process must also be found “reasonable to meet” based upon a set of five criteria in order to be implemented. Testimony received from seven residents during the February 11, 2010, Unmet Transit Needs public hearing affirmed support for retaining the Dial-A-Ride service within Brawley. Their comments were referred to the City for further review and follow-up.

ICTC commissioned a fare study of the transit agencies under its jurisdiction in 2008. For several of the operators, the farebox recovery ratios had been declining over the past few years given the growth in operating costs primarily from fuel and insurance. The *Public Transit Services Fare Analysis* (Nelson/Nygaard 2008) recommended a fare increase for Brawley Dial-A-Ride from $1.00 to $1.25 per one-way trip. Although Brawley has consistently met or exceeded its minimum 10 percent farebox requirement, the fare increase was recommended because of the increased upward pressures on operating costs as well as the fact that fares had not been increased for some time.

An updated SRTP was commissioned by ICTC in January 2011 and is currently being developed. The primary objectives of the SRTP will be to review existing performance and prioritize operating and capital expenditures to maintain and recommend improvements to the transit system in the Imperial Valley. The prior SRTP was adopted in FY 2004, and the new SRTP will review and evaluate the related goals, policies, objectives, and standards developed for that plan. In addition, it will provide a five-year plan for operations including, but not limited to, specifics on fares, service levels, route changes, service policy changes, inter-operator agreements, spare ratios, and other characteristics. The SRTP would also present a cost-benefit analysis as well as review a possible consolidation of dial-a-ride.

As for the City of Brawley, a fixed-route community circulator has been proposed, which would be modeled after the IVT Blue and Green Line circulators operating in El Centro. Such a circulator would be branded as the Gold Line. In anticipation of further transit service expansion and coordination, the City in partnership with ICTC has planned and designed for the construction of the Brawley Transfer Terminal Transit Station on Plaza Drive and 5th Street south of City Hall. The proposed transfer terminal will have a total of six vehicle bays: three for buses (IVT/Amtrak Connection), one for Dial-A-Ride, one for taxi services, and one for the proposed Gold Line circulator. Design of the new terminal was completed in June 2011.
Maintenance

The contract operator is responsible for developing a maintenance program in order to ensure the safe and efficient operation of vehicles and equipment utilized for the transit service. The maintenance protocol includes daily and periodic inspections as well as scheduled maintenance. In addition, Brawley Dial-A-Ride participates in the CHP Transit Operator Compliance Program. Vehicles are stored at the Sunrise Driving Service facility located at 183 South Fifth Street in Brawley, which is gated and under security camera surveillance.

Drivers perform vehicle inspections by completing a daily 23-point vehicle inspection log prior to pulling out the vehicle. This report is completed and signed by the first driver assigned to the vehicle each day and is submitted on Fridays. All defects requiring attention are reported to the office immediately in order that repairs can be arranged.

Routine oil changes and transmission service are performed every 3,000 miles/45 days. The Ford vehicles are serviced by David & Sons Truck Repair located at 1597 Main Street in Brawley. The two Chevy vehicles receive routine maintenance at Pep Boys in El Centro. Tire mounting and wheelchair lift maintenance are conducted by Gonzales Welding Auto Repair, 1553 Main Street, Brawley. Vehicle washes take place at the Brawley Plaza Auto & Accessories located at 132 S Plaza Street in Brawley.

An auto repair maintenance report is compiled for each vehicle in the transit fleet. Information includes the date of service, form of payment, mileage, invoice, vendor, and description of the service performed. Roadcalls are also reported on the maintenance reports, which are denoted as service calls. Table V-2 below provides a summary of roadcalls incurred by Brawley Dial-A-Ride during the audit period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadcalls</th>
<th>FY 2007</th>
<th>FY 2008</th>
<th>FY 2009</th>
<th>FY 2010</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roadcalls</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Sunrise Driving Service*

Most roadcalls generally occur during the summer months, which are characterized by hot temperatures (100 degrees and above) that affect the optimal performance of vehicle air conditioning systems.
Marketing

The contract operator is responsible for providing a marketing program subject to the review and the approval of the City. As per the service contract, the operator coordinates the placement and distribution of all advertising and promotional materials to promote ridership.

The contract operator has developed a glossy tri-fold brochure with information about the history of dial-a-ride, services offered, fares, days and hours of operation, and contact numbers. The brochure, which is printed in English, has not been updated since 2004 and therefore does not reflect the recent service changes and the elimination of multi-ride tickets. In addition to the brochure, the contract operator distributes flyers to local agencies, City Hall, the library, and local grocery stores such as Garcia Market and Von’s Supermarket on Main Street. Flyers were distributed informing passengers of the service cuts implemented in March 2010. There have been no passenger surveys performed to date; however, the SRTP update may include surveys as part of its findings.

The transit service is listed as a transportation resource in the Imperial Valley Senior Services Directory provided by the Imperial County Area Agency on Aging. The City of Brawley is currently updating its website. A search of the website under the Public Works page did not reveal information about the dial-a-ride service. Many pages of the website are incomplete, which is an indication that it is still under construction.

General Administration & Management

The City of Brawley operates as a general law city under a council-manager form of government. The five-member City Council serves as the principal policy-making body. The Mayor and Mayor Pro-Tempore are elected by the Council for two-year terms. The Council convenes on the first and third Tuesday of the month at 6:00 p.m. The City Council provides policy direction to the City Manager, who oversees City operations. All other department heads in the City serve under the direction of the City Manager.

Brawley Dial-A-Ride is administered by the Public Works Director, who is assisted by the department’s contract manager. The City Manager and Finance Director formerly administered the dial-a-ride contract until it was transferred to the Public Works Department in 2008. The Finance Department prepares the TDA claim forms for submittal to ICTC, while the City Council annually reviews and approves the dial-a-ride contract. The City Council is engaged with the transit budget and service provision. Performance data is presented in staff reports to the Council.

In addition, the Finance Department completes the annual State Controller Report with data derived from the performance data spreadsheet. The contract is regulated according to the provisions of ADA, TDA, the Federal Transportation Administration (FTA), and other applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations. The Public Works Director regularly attends the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and Social Service Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC) meetings at ICTC.
Sonia Corina, the umbrella organization for Sunrise Driving Service, provides an administrative, budgetary, and legal framework for the contract operator. The contract operator employs two full-time drivers including a supervisor, two full-time dispatcher/office staff, and one volunteer. Sonia Corina Incorporated commits 5 to 10 percent of three other staff persons toward administration and grants management. The nonprofit’s board policy is to grow the transit service as the population of Brawley grows. Health benefits have been extended to part-time employees.

Drivers are recruited primarily through the CalWORKS program and must possess a Class B license. General Public Paratransit Vehicle (GPPV) certification is not required since the Dial-A-Ride fleet vehicles carry fewer than 15 passengers. New drivers undergo a minimum of 80 hours of training consisting of one week of behind-the-wheel instruction with a supervisor and an additional week’s training with the supervisor riding along. Classroom instruction encompasses first aid/CPR, wheelchair handling instruction videos, and monthly training sheets. Random drug testing is conducted through Cal-Test.

**Grant Administration & Funding**

The primary source of intergovernmental grant funding for Brawley Dial-A-Ride is derived from the City’s TDA apportionment, which is primarily from the Local Transportation Fund (LTF). Table V-3 provides a summary of TDA funding allocation toward the City’s paratransit program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TDA Funding</th>
<th>FY 2007</th>
<th>FY 2008</th>
<th>FY 2009</th>
<th>FY 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LTF – (SB325)</td>
<td>$140,552</td>
<td>$178,250</td>
<td>$194,400</td>
<td>$227,007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Transit Finance Plan, ICTC*

The growth in the City’s allocation is reflective of the service contract amendments that involved expanded service hours. Also, based on the FY 2010–11 ICTC Transit Finance Plan, Brawley is slated to receive $20,000 in County Local Transportation Authority (LTA) revenues derived from the renewed local transportation sales tax. The renewed tax includes allocations for transit projects.

In addition to TDA funding, the County/ICTC received a $300,000 American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA) earmark (FTA Section 5309 grant) toward the construction of the Brawley Transfer Terminal Transit Station located on Plaza Drive and 5th Street in downtown Brawley. The earmark was in addition to the $620,899 in FTA Section 5311 pass-through funds secured for the purchase of right-of-way and development of designs for the transfer terminal.
Section VI

Findings and Recommendations

The following material summarizes the major findings obtained from this triennial audit covering FYs 2008 through 2010. A set of recommendations is then provided.

Triennial Audit Findings

1. Of the compliance requirements pertaining to Brawley Dial-A-Ride, the operation fully complied with seven out of the nine requirements. The operator was found in partial compliance with the timely submittal of its annual fiscal audits. Three additional compliance requirements did not apply to Brawley Dial-A-Ride (e.g., rural/urban farebox recovery ratios and federal formula funding).

2. Brawley Dial-A-Ride’s farebox recovery ratio remained above the required 10 percent standard. The average systemwide farebox recovery ratio was 11.77 percent during the triennial review period.

3. Through its contract operator, the City participates in the CHP Transit Operator Compliance Program and received inspections of Brawley Dial-A-Ride vehicles within the 13 months prior to each TDA claim. Satisfactory ratings were made for all inspections conducted during the audit period.

4. The operating budget exhibited a modest increase FY 2008, with the highest increase realized in FY 2009 due to a service contract extension containing expanded service hours. The budget decrease in FY 2010 reflects the cutback in service hours and Saturday operations.

5. Brawley implemented five out of the eight prior audit recommendations. One recommendation was partially implemented. Two recommendations were not implemented and have been carried forward in this audit for full implementation.

6. The service has managed to maintain its farebox recovery in spite of the growth in operating costs outpacing revenues by a ratio of 10 to 1. The annualized increase in costs was 9.5 percent during the period, with an overall increase of 28 percent.

7. Farebox returns have remained slightly above the minimum TDA requirement of 10 percent in spite of a decline of 19.6 percent from FY 2007 to FY 2010, which amounts to an average annualized decline of 5.6 percent. Fares have remained unchanged at $1.00 per passenger trip, and multi-fare tickets have been phased out.

8. There have been several service contract amendments during the audit period since the original contract was approved in 2005. The first amendment was the City of Brawley Transit Agreement 2007–2008, which covered the period from July 1, 2007, through June 30, 2008.
The second contract amendment expanded the hours of operations during the week by five hours (6:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.) and increased the operating subsidy to $242,782.10. A fourth amendment, approved March 23, 2010, reduced service hours to Monday through Friday from 7:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. and eliminated Saturday service.

9. The contract operator provides a monthly statement to the City detailing operational data. The monthly statement presents a breakdown of the number of service hours, mileage, passengers, and fares for each day of service. Other measures include service hours per full-time employee, and passengers per mile.

10. Testimony received from seven residents during the February 11, 2010, Unmet Transit Needs public hearing affirmed support for retaining the Dial-A-Ride service within Brawley. Their comments were referred to the City for further review and follow-up.

11. In anticipation of further transit service expansion and coordination, the City has proposed the construction of the Brawley Transfer Terminal Transit Station on Main Street adjacent to Plaza Park. The proposed transfer terminal will have a total of six vehicle bays: three for buses (IVT/Amtrak Connection), one for Dial-A-Ride, one for taxi services, and one for the proposed Yellow Line circulator.

12. The contract operator has developed a glossy tri-fold brochure with information about the history of dial-a-ride, services offered, fares, days and hours of operation, and contact numbers. The brochure, which is printed in English, has not been updated since 2004 and therefore does not reflect the recent service changes and the elimination of multi-ride tickets.

13. Brawley Dial-A-Ride is administered by the Public Works Director, who is assisted by the department’s contract manager. The City Manager and Finance Director formerly administered the dial-a-ride contract until it was transferred to the Public Works Department in 2008. The Finance Department prepares the TDA claim forms for submittal to ICTC, while the City Council annually reviews and approves the dial-a-ride contract.

14. Brawley is slated to receive $20,000 in County Local Transportation Authority (LTA) revenues. The City received a $300,000 American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA) earmark toward the construction of the Brawley Transfer Terminal Transit Station located on Main Street in downtown Brawley.
Triennial Audit Recommendations

1. Maintain CHP inspection reports in the central City files.

This recommendation is carried over from the previous audit. Brawley Dial-A-Ride participates in the CHP Transit Operator Compliance Program, in which transit vehicles undergo annual maintenance and safety inspections. Such inspections are coordinated between the CHP and the contract operator. City of Brawley Public Works Department staff who administers the Dial-A-Ride program has not been receiving copies of the inspection reports to maintain on file. During the auditor site visit involving both the contractor and City staff, copies of the CHP reports were made available for review. City staff responsible for administering the program was advised to always request and maintain copies on file. It is suggested that the Public Works Department have copies as well as the Finance Department, which prepares the City's TDA claim.

2. Include additional performance data in the monthly statement.

In response to a prior audit recommendation, the contract operator has been recording revenue hours and miles for Brawley Dial-A-Ride in accordance with TDA definitions and guidelines. This would include tracking the beginning and ending mileage each time a passenger is picked up and dropped off. Revenue hours and miles are recorded in the monthly statements as well as in the annual performance data summaries received by the City. The monthly statement that is prepared and submitted to the City includes revenue mileage, hours, passenger trips, and fares. However, no-shows, cancellations, complaints, and roadcalls continue to be reported on a separate sheet. It is suggested that all performance measures be included on the monthly statement along with a year-to-date total.

3. Update marketing collateral to reflect changes in service and bilingual format.

The contract operator is tasked with the production and distribution of marketing materials for Brawley Dial-A-Ride. Such materials have included a brochure and flyers that presented general information about service days, hours, fares, and reservations. The brochure, which is printed in English, has not been updated since 2004 and therefore does not reflect the recent service changes and the elimination of multi-ride tickets. It is suggested that the brochure be updated with information on the recent service changes as well as have a bilingual format in English and Spanish.


This recommendation is carried over from the previous audit. As a tool to gauge customer satisfaction and to plan future service, a rider survey would be useful. The SRTP update currently under way may include passenger surveys as part of its scope. It is recommended that the City coordinate with ICTC about conducting a rider survey to determine where
passengers are traveling and how to best plan for improvements and/or expansion in the future. Another option would be to partner with the Imperial Valley Regional Occupation Program (IVROP) to perform the survey.

5. **Include Dial-A-Ride information on updated City of Brawley website.**

The City of Brawley is currently updating its website. A search of the website under the Public Works page did not reveal information about the transit service. Many pages of the website are incomplete, which is an indication that it is still under construction. Since Dial-A-Ride is one of the services offered by the City, it is suggested that a page devoted to the transit service with links to regional services be developed and made available as part of the City’s website. Once the City’s transit terminal is developed, this would prove to be an invaluable tool and convenience to the public.
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Section I

Introduction

California’s Transportation Development Act (TDA) requires that a triennial performance audit be conducted of public transit entities that receive TDA revenues. The performance audit serves to ensure accountability in the use of public transportation revenue.

The Imperial County Transportation Commission (ICTC) engaged PMC to conduct a performance audit of the City of Calexico Dial-A-Ride service covering the most recent triennial period, fiscal years 2007–2008 through 2009–2010. The purpose of the performance audit is to evaluate the system’s effectiveness and efficiency in its use of TDA funds to provide specialized public transportation in its service area. This evaluation is required as a condition for continued receipt of these funds for public transportation purposes. In addition, the audit evaluates the City of Calexico’s compliance with the conditions specified in the California Public Utilities Code (PUC). This task involves ascertaining whether the City is meeting the PUC’s reporting requirements. Moreover, the audit includes calculations of transit service performance indicators and a detailed review of the City’s administrative functions. From the analysis that has been undertaken, a set of recommendations has been made for the agency which is intended to improve the performance of specialized transit operations.

In summary, this TDA audit affords the opportunity for an independent, constructive, and objective evaluation of the organization and its operations that otherwise might not be available. The methodology for the audit included in-person interviews with administrative and operations management, collection and review of agency documents, data analysis, and on-site observations. The Performance Audit Guidebook for Transit Operators and Regional Transportation Planning Entities published by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) was used to guide in the development and conduct of the audit.

Overview of the Transit System

Calexico Dial-A-Ride is a specialized demand response service that operates within the City of Calexico. The service is administered by the City Utilities Department and is currently operated by First Transit, a private for-profit transportation carrier. Demand-response service is available only to seniors 60 years and older and persons with disabilities seven days a week. General public riders are not eligible to ride Calexico Dial-A-Ride. Additional transportation is made available directly to the Calexico Nutrition site Monday through Friday.

The City of Calexico is located on the international border opposite the city of Mexicali, Baja California Norte, Mexico. The city is at the junction of State Routes (SR) 7, 98, and 111. SR 111 connects Calexico with Interstate 8, located 5 miles to the north. The city was founded in 1899, incorporated in 1908, and has a total land area of 6.2 square miles. It operates under a council-manager form of government. Based upon the 2010 U.S. Census, the city’s population is 38,572.
The 2010 population is estimated to be 40,075 as reported by the California Department of Finance.

System Characteristics

Calexico Dial-A-Ride operates from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. seven days a week within the city limits. The service does not operate on the following holidays: New Year’s Day, Martin Luther King, Jr. Day (observed), Presidents’ Day, Memorial Day (observed), Independence Day (observed), Labor Day, Veterans Day, Thanksgiving, and Christmas. Reservations for service are accepted from one to 14 days in advance. The fare for a one-way trip was 75 cents during the audit period and was later increased to $1.00 effective July 2010.

Calexico Dial-A-Ride is operated with a fleet of three vehicles plus one back-up vehicle as described in Table I-1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Manufacturer</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Fuel Type</th>
<th>Seat/Wheelchair Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Ford E-450 El Dorado National</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Gasoline</td>
<td>17/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Back-Up Vehicle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>El Dorado National</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Gasoline</td>
<td>21/2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: First Transit*

The fleet conforms to the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990 in regard to wheelchair accessibility.
Section II

Operator Compliance Requirements

This section of the audit report contains the analysis of the City of Calexico’s ability to comply with state requirements for continued receipt of TDA funds. The evaluation uses the guidebook, *Performance Audit Guidebook for Transit Operators and Regional Transportation Planning Agencies, September 2008 (third edition)*, which was developed by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) to assess transit operators. The updated guidebook contains a checklist of eleven measures taken from relevant sections of the Public Utilities Code and the California Code of Regulations. Each of these requirements is discussed in the table below, including a description of the system’s efforts to comply with the requirements. In addition, the findings from the compliance review are described in the text following the table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operator Compliance Requirements</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Compliance Efforts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The transit operator submitted annual reports to the RTPA based upon the Uniform System of Accounts and Records established by the State Controller. Report is due 90 days after end of fiscal year (Sept. 28/29), or 110 days (Oct. 19/20) if filed electronically (Internet).</td>
<td>Public Utilities Code, Section 99243</td>
<td>Completion/submittal dates:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FY 2008: October 6, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FY 2009: November 16, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FY 2010: October 27, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Conclusion:</strong> Partial Compliance due late submittal of FY 2009 &amp; FY 2010 reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The operator has submitted annual fiscal and compliance audits to the RTPA and to the State Controller within 180 days following the end of the fiscal year (Dec. 27), or has received the appropriate 90-day extension by the RTPA allowed by law.</td>
<td>Public Utilities Code, Section 99245</td>
<td>Completion/submittal dates:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FY 2008: February 15, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FY 2009: November 6, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FY 2010: March 25, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Conclusion:</strong> Complied.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The CHP has, within the 13 months prior to each TDA claim submitted by an operator, certified the</td>
<td>Public Utilities Code, Section 99251 B</td>
<td>The City of Calexico through its contract operator participates in the CHP Transit Operator Compliance Program in which</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operator Compliance Requirements</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Compliance Efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>operator’s compliance with Vehicle Code Section 1808.1 following a CHP inspection of the operator’s terminal.</td>
<td>Public Utilities Code, Section 99261</td>
<td>the CHP has conducted inspections within the 13 months prior to each TDA claim. Inspection dates applicable to the audit period were May 7, 2009; April 12, 2010; and November 30, 2010. The City’s contract operator received a satisfactory rating for all inspections conducted on Calexico Dial-A-Ride vehicles during the audit period, with minor violations reported during the April and November 2010 inspections. <strong>Conclusion: Complied</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The operator’s claim for TDA funds is submitted in compliance with rules and regulations adopted by the RTPA for such claims.</td>
<td></td>
<td>As a condition of approval, the City’s annual claims for Local Transportation Funds are submitted in compliance with rules and regulations adopted by ICTC. ICTC staff provides assistance as needed in completing the claims. The City’s claims are submitted generally during the spring of the claim year as required by ICTC. <strong>Conclusion: Complied</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operator Compliance Requirements</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Compliance Efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If an operator serves urbanized and non-urbanized areas, it has maintained a ratio of fare revenues to operating costs at least equal to the ratio determined by the rules and regulations adopted by the RTPA.</td>
<td>Public Utilities Code, Section 99270.1</td>
<td>This requirement is not applicable, as Calexico Dial-A-Ride serves a non-urbanized area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Conclusion: Not Applicable</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The operator’s operating budget has not increased by more than 15% over the preceding year, nor is there a substantial increase or decrease in the scope of operations or capital budget provisions for major new fixed facilities unless the operator has reasonably supported and substantiated the change(s).</td>
<td>Public Utilities Code, Section 99266</td>
<td>Percentage increase in Calexico Dial-A-Ride’s operating budget:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FY 2008: +10.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FY 2009: +1.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FY 2010: -1.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The FY 2008 increase in the operating budget can be attributed to the change in contract operator and the rise in fuel costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Source: Annual Fiscal and Compliance Audits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Conclusion: Complied</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The operator’s definitions of performance measures are consistent with Public Utilities Code Section 99247, including (a) operating cost, (b) operating cost per passenger, (c) operating cost per vehicle service hour, (d) passengers per vehicle service hour, (e) passengers per vehicle service mile, (f) total passengers, (g) transit</td>
<td>Public Utilities Code, Section 99247</td>
<td>The City’s definition of performance measures as tracked and recorded by the contract operator is consistent with Public Utilities Code Section 99247. However, more consistency between data in internal and external reports is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Conclusion: Complied</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operator Compliance Requirements</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Compliance Efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vehicle, (h) vehicle service hours, (i) vehicle service miles, and (j) vehicle service hours per employee.</td>
<td>Public Utilities Code, Sections 99268.2, 99268.3, 99268.12, 99270.1</td>
<td>This requirement is not applicable, as Calexico Dial-A-Ride serves a non-urbanized area. <strong>Conclusion: Not Applicable</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the operator serves an urbanized area, it has maintained a ratio of fare revenues to operating costs at least equal to one-fifth (20 percent), unless it is in a county with a population of less than 500,000, in which case it must maintain a ratio of fare revenues to operating costs of at least equal to three-twentieths (15 percent), if so determined by the RTPA.</td>
<td>Public Utilities Code, Sections 99268.2, 99268.4, 99268.5</td>
<td>Under PUC Section 99268.5, the farebox ratio requirement for exclusive services for elderly and disabled is 10 percent. Calexico’s operating ratios using audited and internal financial data were as follows: FY 2008: 9.22% FY 2009: 7.36% FY 2010: 9.18% <strong>Source: Annual Fiscal and Compliance Audits</strong> <strong>Conclusion: Not in compliance</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table II-1
Operator Compliance Requirements Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operator Compliance Requirements</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Compliance Efforts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The current cost of the operator’s retirement system is fully funded with respect to the officers and employees of its public transportation system, or the operator is implementing a plan approved by the RTPA which will fully fund the retirement system within 40 years.</td>
<td>Public Utilities Code, Section 99271</td>
<td>The City contracts with a private provider for operations, while the cost of City staff’s retirement is fully funded under the California Public Employees Retirement System (CalPERS). Conclusion: Complied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the operator receives state transit assistance funds, the operator makes full use of funds available to it under the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 before TDA claims are granted.</td>
<td>California Code of Regulations, Section 6754(a)(3)</td>
<td>This measure is not applicable, as federal formula grant funds are not utilized and Calexico Dial-A-Ride does not receive State Transit Assistance Fund (STAF) revenues. Conclusion: Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings and Observations from Operator Compliance Requirements Matrix

1. Of the compliance requirements pertaining to Calexico Dial-A-Ride, the operation fully complied with seven out of the nine requirements. The operator was in partial compliance with the timely submittal of its State Controller Reports but was not in compliance with meeting its farebox standard. Three additional compliance requirements did not apply to Calexico Dial-A-Ride (e.g., rural/urban farebox recovery ratios and federal formula funding).

2. Calexico Dial-A-Ride’s farebox recovery ratio remained below the required 10 percent standard. The average systemwide farebox recovery ratio was 8.58 percent during the triennial review period.

3. Through its contract operator, the City participates in the CHP Transit Operator Compliance Program and received inspections of Calexico Dial-A-Ride vehicles within the 13 months prior to each TDA claim. Satisfactory ratings were made for all inspections conducted during the audit period.

4. The operating budget exhibited a modest increase FY 2008 and a smaller increase in FY 2009 attributed to the change in contract operator and rising fuel costs. The FY 2010 budget exhibited a small decrease.
Section III

Prior Triennial Performance Recommendations

The City of Calexico’s efforts to implement the recommendations made in the prior triennial audit are examined in this section of the report. For this purpose, each prior recommendation for the agency is described, followed by a discussion of the City’s efforts to implement the recommendation. Conclusions concerning the extent to which the recommendations have been adopted by the agency are then presented.

Prior Recommendation 1

Consider fuel costs as a pass-through expense from the contractor to the City.

Actions taken by the City of Calexico

The contractor generally is responsible for fuel costs as part of its contract with the City. Under the most recent service contract dated September 2008, the City included a fuel escalator clause which provides extra compensation should fuel costs increase beyond the operator’s control and negotiated rate. The fuel escalator is determined by adjusting the vehicle fuel budget line downward by any savings found in any line item category which has not been fully utilized when the full amount of the fuel costs are exceeded. Any requests for an additional fuel subsidy are reviewed by the Director of Utility Services at the end of the fiscal year accompanied by an accounting by the operator along with invoices substantiating the increase.

Conclusion

This recommendation has been implemented.

Prior Recommendation 2

Schedule and conduct California Highway Patrol certification inspections at state-required intervals.

Actions taken by the City of Calexico

The contract operator for Calexico Dial-A-Ride participates in the California Highway Patrol (CHP) Transit Operator Compliance Program. Copies of the CHP reports of the three inspections conducted during the audit period were made available for review by the contract operator. The service contract stipulates that the operator comply with all CHP requirements.

Conclusion

This recommendation has been implemented.
**Prior Recommendation 3**

Continue to engage in active management of the dial-a-ride service contract.

**Actions taken by the City of Calexico**

The City’s transit program is managed by the Utility Services Department. The Director of Utility Services and staff have taken a more active role in the dial-a-ride program. A Request for Proposals was released by the department in May 2008 for operations of the service. A new contractor began operating the service in September 2008. External reports prepared by the Finance Department, such as the State Controller Report, are reviewed by Utility Services. Once reviewed, they are presented to and approved by the City Council. The Director or his designee will meet with the contractor regarding complaints and farebox issues if there is a trend.

**Conclusion**

This recommendation has been implemented.

**Prior Recommendation 4**

Consider including financial incentives and penalties in the next service contract.

**Actions taken by the City of Calexico**

A performance-based incentive program is included in the most current service contract as part of the goal of the City to foster and maintain a cooperative relationship between the City and the contractor. Incentives and penalties are based on 10 criteria encompassing on-time performance, missed pick-ups, miles between accidents and roadcalls, annual CHP inspection reports, preventative maintenance, noncompliance with vehicle appearance, reporting, passenger comfort, and Air Resources Board requirements.

**Conclusion**

This recommendation has been implemented.

**Prior Recommendation 5**

Implement the no-show policy in the contract.

**Actions taken by the City of Calexico**

The dial-a-ride service contract contains a Cancellations and No-Show Policy. The policy stipulates a series of four actions that the contractor must adhere to in regard to cancellations and no-shows. This includes the provision that in the event of three consecutive no-shows by a passenger, the contract operator would send a notice of intent to suspend service for up to five business days.
and detailing the reasons for such suspension. The City will meet with the contractor regarding the level of no-shows should there be a trend.

Conclusion

This recommendation has been implemented.

Prior Recommendation 6

Request additional monthly operations data from the contract operator and maintain the data on file at the City.

Actions taken by the City of Calexico

As stipulated in the service contract, it is the responsibility of the contractor to collect data on the operation of the transit system and supply such data to the Director of Utility Services on a monthly basis. Monthly operations data is required to be attached to the monthly invoice received by the City. A sample invoice reviewed by the auditor included a monthly billing log that contains the total number of passengers carried and total and revenue hours, as well total and revenue miles. Additional operational information such as on-time performance, roadcalls, complaints by type, accidents, cancellations, and no-shows were not included.

Conclusion

This recommendation has not been implemented and is carried forward in this audit for full implementation.

Prior Recommendation 7

Correctly provide revenue hours and miles to IVAG (now ICTC) according to TDA definitions.

Actions taken by the City of Calexico

The current contract operator submits invoices and billing logs that reflect costs for revenue service hours in accordance with TDA definitions and service contract terms. This information is reviewed by the Utility Services Department and submitted to ICTC for inclusion into its transit performance data monitoring.

Conclusion

This recommendation has been implemented.

Prior Recommendation 8

Increase marketing coordination and awareness between the City and contract operator.
Actions taken by the City of Calexico

Pursuant to the service contract, the contractor is responsible for scheduling, placement, and distribution of all advertising and marketing materials for the transit service. Both the City and contract operator have been proactive in this regard. Flyers about the service or service changes have been produced and distributed. On the City’s part, the Utility Services Director has given presentations about the service before senior citizen and paratransit-dependent audiences. As an added bonus, the contract operator has chartered special senior trips from Calexico to Brawley for free.

Conclusion

This recommendation has been implemented.

Prior Recommendation 9

Place information about the City’s Dial-A-Ride on the City’s website.

Actions taken by the City of Calexico

Information about Calexico Dial-A-Ride has been made available on the City’s website. The information is accessed by a link on the right margin of the Utility Services Department page. The page presents general information about the service, targeted ridership, reservation protocol, service days and hours, and rider etiquette.

Conclusion

This recommendation has been implemented.
Section IV

TDA Performance Indicators

This section reviews the City of Calexico Dial-A-Ride’s performance in providing service in an efficient and effective manner. TDA requires that at least five specific performance indicators be reported, which are contained in the following table. Farebox is not one of the five specific indicators, but is shown as a compliance measure. Findings from the analysis are contained in the section following the table, followed by the analysis.

### Table IV-1

Calexico Dial-A-Ride Performance Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating Cost*</td>
<td>$324,758</td>
<td>$359,575</td>
<td>$363,581</td>
<td>$359,227</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Passengers</td>
<td>46,546</td>
<td>45,607</td>
<td>36,012</td>
<td>41,601</td>
<td>-10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Service Hours</td>
<td>8,600</td>
<td>8,630</td>
<td>7,765</td>
<td>7,759</td>
<td>-9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Service Miles</td>
<td>76,000</td>
<td>88,363</td>
<td>81,876</td>
<td>96,124</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee FTEs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>133.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Revenue*</td>
<td>$33,740</td>
<td>$33,139</td>
<td>$26,758</td>
<td>$32,981</td>
<td>-2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Cost per Passenger</td>
<td>$6.98</td>
<td>$7.88</td>
<td>$10.10</td>
<td>$8.64</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Cost per Vehicle Service Hour</td>
<td>$37.76</td>
<td>$41.67</td>
<td>$46.82</td>
<td>$46.30</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Cost per Vehicle Service Mile</td>
<td>$4.27</td>
<td>$4.07</td>
<td>$4.44</td>
<td>$3.74</td>
<td>-12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passengers per Vehicle Service Hour</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>-0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passengers per Vehicle Service Mile</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>-29.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Service Hours per Employee</td>
<td>2,866.7</td>
<td>2,876.7</td>
<td>1,109.3</td>
<td>1,108.4</td>
<td>-61.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Fare per Passenger</td>
<td>$0.72</td>
<td>$0.73</td>
<td>$0.74</td>
<td>$0.79</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fare Recovery Ratio</td>
<td>10.39%</td>
<td>9.22%</td>
<td>7.36%</td>
<td>9.18%</td>
<td>-11.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ICTC; FYs 2007–10 Annual Fiscal Audits

*FY 2007 through FY 2010 Operating Cost & Fare Revenue data are audited figures.

Column graphs on the following pages are used to depict the trends for select performance indicators (Graphs IV-1 through IV-6).
Graph IV-3
Operating Cost per Passenger

Graph IV-4
Operating Cost per Vehicle Service Hour
Findings from Verification of TDA Performance Indicators

1. **Operating cost per vehicle service hour**, an indicator of cost efficiency, increased 22.6 percent from $37.76 in FY 2007 to $46.30 in FY 2010. Overall vehicle service hours declined 9.8 percent, while operating costs exhibited an increase of 10.6 percent during the three-year period. Operating costs increased by a 3.5 percent annualized rate characterized by a 10.7 percent increase in FY 2008 due to a rise in fuel costs. On the other hand, vehicle service hours decreased 9.8 percent during the period and exhibited an annualized decline of 3.3 percent.

2. **Operating cost per passenger**, an indicator of cost effectiveness, increased at about the same rate as the cost per service hour. Cost per passenger increased 23.8 percent from $6.98 in FY 2007 to $8.64 in FY 2010. Overall ridership decreased 10.6 percent during the period from 46,546 passengers in FY 2007 to 41,601 passengers in FY 2010, amounting to a 2.5 percent annualized rate of decline. In contrast to this trend, total passengers increased 15.5 percent in FY 2010 after declines of 2.0 and 21.0 percent in FYs 2008 and 2009.

3. **Passengers per vehicle service hour**, which measures the effectiveness of the service delivered, decreased by a very slight 0.9 percent between FY 2007 and FY 2010, remaining at 5.4 passengers per hour with declines reported during the intervening years of 5.3 in FY 2008 and 4.6 in FY 2009. This reflects the 9.8 percent decline in vehicle service hours as well as in total passengers.

4. **Passengers per vehicle service mile**, another indicator of service effectiveness, decreased by 29.3 percent from 0.61 in FY 2007 to 0.43 in FY 2010. In contrast, vehicle service miles increased by 26.5 percent from 76,000 miles in FY 2007 to 96,124 in FY 2010, while ridership decreased by 10.6 percent. On an annualized basis, service miles increased by 8.8 percent, only decreasing 7.3 percent in FY 2009.

5. **Vehicle service hours per employee** decreased 61.3 percent between FY 2007 and FY 2010 from 2,866.7 to 1,108.4 due to the change in contract operator and more accurate reporting of this measure. The initial number of full-time equivalents (FTEs) reported was 3 for FYs 2007 and 2008 whereas the number increased to 7 for the subsequent years to include City staff hours. FTEs are derived by the formula of dividing total annual employee hours and then dividing by 2000.

6. **Farebox recovery** for Calexico Dial-A-Ride exhibited a declining trend and fell below the minimum TDA requirement of 10 percent during the audit period, averaging 8.58 percent from a high of 10.39 percent during the FY 2007 base year. While operating costs grew at a moderate rate, passenger trips and revenue contracted. Farebox returns had an annualized decline of 2.2 percent for the period yet exhibited a 24.8 percent increase in FY 2010.
Conclusion from the Verification of TDA Performance Indicators

Calexico Dial-A-Ride provides specialized demand-responsive transit service within the City of Calexico. Although operating costs rose modestly during the audit period, passenger trips and revenues contracted, which kept farebox returns below the minimum TDA requirement of 10 percent. Fares remained unchanged at $0.75 per passenger trip during the audit period until fares were increased to $1.00 in July 2010. The $0.25 fare increase should help Calexico Dial-A-Ride attain the 10 percent minimum farebox return.

With the change in contract operator in September 2008, the system saw improved performance as well as more accurate data reporting in accordance with TDA guidelines. During FY 2010, operating costs decreased 1.2 percent whereas passenger trips increased 15.5 percent, service miles increased 17.4 percent, revenues increased 23.7 percent, and farebox returns increased 25.2 percent. Service hours exhibited a slight decline of 0.1 percent during that fiscal year. Together with the modest fare increase at the beginning of FY 2011, these trends should enable Calexico Dial-A-Ride to reach and sustain its farebox standard.
Data Consistency

In a review of data consistency among external reports, fiscal year-end operations data was compared between the annual State Controller Report and the internal reports prepared by ICTC. Internal report data from the contract operator was unavailable. Table IV-2 shows the side-by-side comparison during the audit period (FYs 2008, 2009, and 2010) and including the base year of FY 2007.

Overall, there are some discrepancies and consistencies between the two data sets. The FY 2007 data are consistent. For FY 2008, there is a slight variance in the passenger data and a more than 10,000-mile variance in the vehicle service mile data. For FY 2009, there is only a slight variance in the vehicle service hour data and a more than 10,000-passenger difference in the passenger data. For FY 2010, again there is a slight variance in the vehicle service hour data and a nearly 11,000-mile variance in vehicle service miles. The variances in data may be attributed to the change in contract operator in 2008 as well as the absence of performance data from the previous contract operator for verification purposes.

Table IV-2
Data Consistency Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TDA Statistic</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Base Year FY 2007</th>
<th>Audit Review Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FY 2008</td>
<td>FY 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlinked Passengers</td>
<td>ICTC Performance Summary</td>
<td>46,546</td>
<td>45,607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Controller Report</td>
<td>46,546</td>
<td>45,631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Service Hours</td>
<td>ICTC Performance Summary</td>
<td>8,600</td>
<td>8,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Controller Report</td>
<td>8,600</td>
<td>8,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Service Miles</td>
<td>ICTC Performance Summary</td>
<td>76,300</td>
<td>88,363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Controller Report</td>
<td>76,300</td>
<td>78,603</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section V

Review of Operator Functions

This section provides an in-depth review of various functions within the City of Calexico Dial-A-Ride operation. The review highlights accomplishments, issues, and/or challenges that were determined during the audit period. The following departments and functions were reviewed at the City of Calexico and with the contract operator:

- Operations & Planning
- Maintenance
- Marketing
- General Administration & Management

Operations & Planning

As required by the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), the City of Calexico provides demand-response paratransit services to individuals whose disability or mobility precludes the independent use of the fixed-route bus services. The provision of paratransit services is reflected in the City’s Mission Statement which reads as follows:

Together, we pledge to provide effective and efficient services in a courteous and respectful manner to improve the quality of life for all, in our unique border community.

Dial-A-Ride has been operating in the City of Calexico since August 1982. The service was initially operated directly by the City until operations were contracted out in 1994. Calexico Dial-A-Ride underwent a change in contract operator during the audit period. Calexico Transit System (CTS) operated Dial-A-Ride from January 2004 through August 2008.

The City released a Request for Proposals in May 2008 to invite submittals from other qualified transportation providers to operate the service for a five-year term. As part of the selection process, the City appointed an independent review committee comprising transit-dependent individuals such as seniors, disabled persons, youth, and day-care providers. Bids were received from five companies, from which the top three were chosen for further review. First Transit, the operator of Imperial Valley Transit (IVT) and the El Centro Blue and Green Lines, was chosen to operate Calexico Dial-A-Ride.

The service contract with First Transit became effective September 2008 for a five-year term. First Transit’s operations facility is located at 792 Ross Road in El Centro. The facility sits on just over 3 acres and features several structures and bus parking, which can accommodate future growth requirements for the fleet, and provides self-supporting maintenance in-house. The facility also supports a bus wash station, upper-floor storage, small employee lounge and kitchen, lockers, and three maintenance bays.
The existing service contract provides measured increases in the hourly fixed rate paid to the contract operator for each year the contract is in effect. The operator is responsible for the collection of fare revenue, which is subtracted from the costs to determine the actual monthly subsidy. In light of rising fuel costs, the contract contains a fuel escalator clause that provides extra compensation over and above the budget amount and any savings from other areas of operations. The fuel clause protects First Transit from additional fuel expenses given the significant increase in fuel prices. Each month, First Transit invoices the City for the additional fuel expenses as a separate line item on the invoice. In this manner, the fuel clause acts as a pass-through measure for the City to reimburse the expense.

The City Council approved a $0.25 fare increase in June 2010, increasing the fare from $0.75 to $1.00, which became effective July 2010. Prior to implementation of the fare increase, the City contracted with the Imperial Valley Regional Occupational Program (IVVROP) to conduct a survey of senior citizen communities to gauge their thoughts and solicit input about such an increase. Fare receipts from the prior day’s runs are counted each morning by two employees in a dedicated money room. An armored guard service picks up the receipts and transports them to the bank for deposit.

Drivers are required to report into dispatch upon departing the operations yard, at the last stop, when handling a wheelchair passenger, after an accident or breakdown, during a passenger emergency, or when running five minutes late. First Transit invested $26,000 in a communications upgrade in August 2010. The Advance Tech-Nextel System is equipped with a Tier 2 Emergency frequency. The new system is the same used by commuter traffic monitoring systems in the Los Angeles area and involves less downtime than the previous repeater radio system. Dial-A-Ride vehicles are not equipped with Automatic Vehicle Locator (AVL), Global Positioning Systems (GPS), or cameras. There have been discussions with ICTC about procuring grant funds for the acquisition of AVL and camera systems.

First Transit provides a monthly operations report in tandem with its service invoice to the City. The invoice features the total number of revenue hours, cost per hour, and the revenues from the subscription and farebox services. The operations report provides a breakdown of trips for each day of service and driver. Passenger trips are categorized based on the fare paid and whether the passenger was a senior, disabled, or with the nutrition/subscription program. The number of no-shows, cancellations, and wheelchairs are also presented.

However, the monthly report does not include other operations data, such as accidents, roadcalls, and complaints received. First Transit was able to provide a breakdown of those measures for the purposes of this audit. The prior contract operator did not provide a summary of vehicle operations data, which is reflected in the FY 2007 base year and FY 2008. The number of accidents reported during audit period is summarized below in Table V-1.
As was noted previously, accident data for FY 2007 and FY 2008 was unavailable. For FY 2009, no accidents were reported and for FY 2010, only two accidents were reported.

Customer service trends are also monitored by the contract operator. Cancellations and no-shows are reported monthly and attached to the service invoice to the City. Table V-2 below summarizes the number of cancellations and no-shows received during the audit period.

The number of cancellations and no-shows has shown notable declines. This trend reflects the effort to implement and enforce the no-show policy as per a prior audit recommendation. It is suggested that this data be included as part of the monthly statement and totaled annually. The contractor is required to complete a minimum of 99 percent of all trips scheduled and accepted.

Another customer service measure is complaints. The contract operator tracks complaints separately and provides a brief narrative of the complaint or incidents that is kept on file. Table V-3 below provides a summary of complaints received during the audit period.

A number of complaints were reported during FY 2009 after the change in contract operator. This could be attributed to a number of factors, such as improved reporting procedures and passengers not being accustomed to the new operator. The following year, complaint levels dropped significantly. City staff has confirmed that complaints have been minimal overall. The City will meet with the contract operator in regard to complaints and farebox issues should there be a trend.
As an exclusive dial-a-ride service targeted to the needs of seniors and disabled persons, Dial-A-Ride drivers check driver’s licenses and other forms of identification to verify age and disability status. However, the city should develop and publicize a formal list of acceptable forms of identification as a means to standardize the ride eligibility process, including eligibility through ADA certification. A list of suggested types of identification for senior and disabled riders is provided in the recommendations section.

Planning

Service planning for Calexico Dial-A-Ride relies on several approaches consisting of public forums, plans, and studies. Pursuant to TDA, ICTC conducts the annual Unmet Transit Needs process. Unmet Transit Needs are, at a minimum, those public transportation or specialized transportation services that are identified in the Regional Short-Range Transit Plan (SRTP), Regional Transportation Plan or similar Mobility Plan which have not been implemented or funded. Unmet Transit Needs identified during the process must also be found “reasonable to meet” based upon a set of five criteria in order to be implemented. None the comments from the Unmet Transit Needs hearings pertained to the Dial-A-Ride service. The only testimony received concerning Calexico had to do with requests for intercity service between Calexico and Holtville, which would be provided by IVT.

ICTC commissioned a fare study of the transit agencies under its jurisdiction in 2008. For several of the operators, the farebox recovery ratios had been declining over the past few years given the growth in operating costs primarily from fuel and insurance. The Public Transit Services Fare Analysis (Nelson/Nygaard 2008) recommended a fare increase for Calexico Dial-A-Ride from $0.75 to $1.00 per one-way trip. Calexico has struggled to meet its minimum 10 percent farebox requirement since FY 2007. A fare increase was recommended because of the increased upward pressures on operating costs as well as the fact that fares had not been increased for some time. The City Council implemented this recommendation in June 2010.

An updated SRTP was commissioned by ICTC in January 2011 and is currently being developed. The primary objectives of the SRTP will be to review existing performance and prioritize operating and capital expenditures to maintain and recommend improvements to the transit system in the Imperial Valley. The prior SRTP was adopted in FY 2004, and the new SRTP will review and evaluate the related goals, policies, objectives, and standards developed for that plan. In addition, it will provide a five-year plan for operations including, but not limited to, specifics on fares, service levels, route changes, service policy changes, inter-operator agreements, spare ratios, and other characteristics. The SRTP would also present a cost-benefit analysis as well as a possible consolidated dial-a-ride farebox.

As for the City of Calexico, a fixed-route community circulator has been proposed as part of an FTA Section 5304 planning grant and would be modeled after the IVT Blue and Green Line circulators operating in El Centro. Such a circulator would be branded as the “Orange Line,” which would allow for timed connections with the IVT Regional Service at a designated stop in Calexico. In anticipation of further transit service expansion and coordination, another FTA Section 5304 grant has been secured for a transfer terminal feasibility study in Calexico.
**Maintenance**

Most basic maintenance for Calexico Dial-A-Ride vehicles is performed at the First Transit facility in El Centro. There are three service bays with portable floor jacks to raise the vehicles for routine inspections of the vehicle undercarriage. The Preventative Maintenance Inspection (PMI) is configured on an A-B-C-D schedule. “Dry” inspections are performed every 3,000 miles or 45 days, and “wet” inspections are performed every 6,000 miles. Wet inspections include oil changes. Drivers complete a vehicle inspection form prior to each run. The daily vehicle inspection consists of 44 points and three major categories: (1) Vehicle Exterior Checks; (2) Vehicle Interior Checks; and (3) Brakes System Checks. The form consists of a top copy and two carbon copies. The California Highway Patrol (CHP) inspects the transit vehicles on a monthly basis as part of its commercial trucking task force, which is as thorough as an annual CHP Annual Bus and Terminal Inspection.

On-site maintenance is performed by two mechanics, which are supervised by a maintenance manager. The mechanic work shifts are staggered to ensure constant coverage throughout all hours of operation. The first shift commences at 4:45 a.m. and the second shift commences at 1:00 p.m. Major maintenance, such as engine and transmission work, is performed off-site by Automotive Service Excellence (ASE)-certified vendors. NAPA Auto Parts located at 258 East Main Street in El Centro performs engine rebuild work. RPM Engine Service in Pomona also performs engine and transmission rebuild work. Vehicles are washed by staff on-site after hours with an auto washer located on the east side of the maintenance building. Calexico Dial-A-Ride’s vehicles are fueled at the SoCo Group in El Centro at 350 East Main Street and in Calexico at 940 South Imperial Avenue.

First Transit utilizes the Infor Datastream 7i maintenance software program, which, among other capabilities, tracks mileage, parts inventory, and PMIs. Mileage and fuel data are manually uploaded to the system daily. The software is tied electronically to First Transit company management and can be reviewed by the area’s director of maintenance. Parts inventory is monitored at each phase of a purchase order execution: upon request, activation, and completion. The system advises when the PMIs are due and maintains separate records for 3,000-mile and 6,000-mile inspections.

The parts inventory was valued at $28,764 as of February 2011, which was 2 percent over the allotted amount due to the availability of suspension parts. A Detailed Maintenance Index (DMI) report is generated weekly to monitor parts levels. Inventories for air conditioning compressors and belts are increased during the summer months. In addition, cycle counts are conducted quarterly. Tires are purchased new, and disposed tires are tracked. First Transit participates in a national tire recycling program sponsored by Michelin and Bridgestone.

Roadcalls were not tracked consistently prior to the change in contract operator effective September 2008. Table V-4 below provides a summary of roadcalls incurred by Calexico Dial-A-Ride during the audit period.
### Roadcalls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadcalls</th>
<th>FY 2007</th>
<th>FY 2008</th>
<th>FY 2009</th>
<th>FY 2010</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NR=Not Reported  
Source: First Transit

Roadcalls were fairly nominal during the years that they were tracked, with a slight increase in FY 2010 over the previous year. Roadcalls are not denoted on the monthly operations report and invoice that the City receives.

### Marketing

The contract operator is responsible for marketing the transit service on behalf of the City. Pursuant to the service contract, the operator is supposed to provide a marketing plan indicating all proposed activities with a corresponding budget of 3 percent of the total annual operating cost. First Transit provides basic marketing materials that include the distribution of flyers to senior residential communities and centers in the service area. As an added promotional effort, First Transit has provided free special senior trips to Brawley on a charter basis. Most other marketing efforts have been through word of mouth.

Efforts by the City to promote the service involve providing general information on the City’s website [http://www.calexico.ca.gov/](http://www.calexico.ca.gov/). A link to the Dial-A-Ride information page is provided on the menu located on the right-hand margin of the Utility Services page. In addition to general information, the page provides fare information, hours of operation, reservation instructions, rider etiquette, and contact information for customer comments and concerns.

### General Administration & Management

The City of Calexico operates as a general law city under a council-manager form of government. The five-member City Council serves as the principal policy-making body. The Mayor and Mayor Pro-Tem are elected by the Council and are chosen from among the five council members and rotate on an annual basis. The Council convenes on the first and third Tuesday of the month at 6:30 p.m. The City Council provides policy direction to the City Manager, who oversees City operations. All other department heads in the City serve under the direction of the City Manager, who oversees the administration of the City’s ten departments.

Calexico Dial-A-Ride is administered through the City’s Utility Services Department, located at 608 Heber Avenue. The department is responsible for providing and maintaining the City’s infrastructure, submitting project funding requests, and overseeing construction projects. The seven divisions that make up the department are the airport, recycling, solid waste, wastewater treatment, water distribution, water treatment, and transit. TDA claim forms are prepared by the City’s Finance Department and approved by the City Council. Utility Services staff prepares the transit budget and projections, and provides general administration and liaison with the contract.
operator. The transit budget is determined by the hourly rate charged by the contractor multiplied by the hours of operation from the prior year.

The contract operator, First Transit, is the United States subsidiary of First Transit PLC headquartered in the United Kingdom. U.S. operations are headquartered in Cincinnati, Ohio, and local operations are in El Centro. Staff dedicated to Dial-A-Ride operations include five drivers (4 full-time, 1 part-time) and one dispatcher. Administrative and support staff consist of a general manager, an operations manager, one maintenance manager, two mechanics, two bus washers, and one clerical person. Non-management employees are represented by Teamsters, Local 542. The current Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) is effective through March 2012. Drivers are cross-trained and all dispatchers and staff are trained as drivers. An employee handbook provides a detailed summary of rules, policies, and benefits. Employees are required to sign the handbook acknowledgment.

Potential drivers are required to have a Class B license with a passenger endorsement. However, most drivers have a Class A license. Drivers undergo classroom and behind-the-wheel instruction totaling 80 hours. The training conducted by a DMV-certified instructor on staff is audited by the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) on a regular basis. In addition, there is a 2-hour monthly in-service training featuring the Safety Solution Team, which reviews safety procedures. As safety awareness is the top priority for the operator, there are also quarterly safety rallies, and fluorescent green safety vests are worn by all staff members while on duty.

There is a 90-day probationary period for new employees. After probation, full-time employees are eligible for benefits. Benefits include medical, dental, and vision plans. In addition, employees receive $10,000 in employer-paid life insurance and the option of long-term disability insurance. There are several types of employee incentives such as employee appreciation barbecues, food and raffles during monthly safety trainings, and points earned toward free lunches and television sets for zero accidents.

First Transit has a zero-tolerance policy as it pertains to drug and alcohol abuse. A drug and alcohol handbook stipulates the company’s policies and protocols. Random drug testing is performed through Cal-Test Drug Testing Services in Imperial. There is no second testing on negative dilutes.

**Grant Administration & Funding**

The primary source of intergovernmental grant funding for Calexico Dial-A-Ride is derived from the City’s TDA apportionment, which is primarily from the Local Transportation Fund (LTF). Table V-5 provides a summary of TDA funding allocation towards the City’s paratransit program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table V-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calexico Dial-A-Ride TDA Funding Allocations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TDA Funding</th>
<th>FY 2007</th>
<th>FY 2008</th>
<th>FY 2009</th>
<th>FY 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LTF – (SB325)</td>
<td>$270,247</td>
<td>$270,247</td>
<td>$401,011</td>
<td>$390,770</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Transit Finance Plan, ICTC
The growth in the City’s allocation is reflective of the new service contract containing a fuel escalator clause as well as population growth within the service area. Based on the FY 2010–11 ICTC Transit Finance Plan, Calexico is slated to receive $20,000 in County Local Transportation Authority (LTA) revenues derived from the renewed local transportation sales tax. The renewed tax includes allocations for transit projects.
Section VI

Findings and Recommendations

The following material summarizes the major findings obtained from this triennial audit covering FYs 2008 through 2010. A set of recommendations is then provided.

Triennial Audit Findings

1. Of the compliance requirements pertaining to Calexico Dial-A-Ride, the operation fully complied with seven out of the nine requirements. The operator was in partial compliance with the timely submittal of its State Controller Reports but was not in compliance with meeting its farebox standard. Three additional compliance requirements did not apply to Calexico Dial-A-Ride (e.g., rural/urban farebox recovery ratios and federal formula funding).

2. Calexico Dial-A-Ride’s farebox recovery ratio remained below the required 10 percent standard. The average systemwide farebox recovery ratio was 8.58 percent during the triennial review period.

3. Through its contract operator, the City participates in the CHP Transit Operator Compliance Program and received inspections of Calexico Dial-A-Ride vehicles within the 13 months prior to each TDA claim. Satisfactory ratings were made for all inspections conducted during the audit period.

4. The operating budget exhibited a modest increase in FY 2008 and a smaller increase in FY 2009 attributed to the change in contract operator and rising fuel costs. The FY 2010 budget exhibited a small decrease.

5. Calexico implemented eight out of the nine prior audit recommendations. One recommendation was partially implemented. One recommendation that pertains to maintaining operational data on file at the City was not implemented and has been carried forward in this audit for full implementation.

6. Although operating costs rose modestly during the audit period, passenger trips and revenues contracted, which kept farebox returns below the minimum TDA requirement of 10 percent.

7. With the change in contract operator in September 2008, the system saw improved performance as well as more accurate data reporting in accordance with TDA guidelines. During FY 2010, operating costs decreased 1.2 percent whereas passenger trips increased 15.5 percent, service miles increased 17.4 percent, revenues increased 23.7 percent, and farebox returns increased 25.2 percent.

8. The City released a Request for Proposals in May 2008 to invite submittals from other qualified transportation providers to operate the service for a five-year term. First Transit, the operator
of Imperial Valley Transit (IVT) and the El Centro Blue and Green Lines, was chosen to operate Calexico Dial-A-Ride. The service contract with First Transit became effective September 2008 for a five-year term.

9. First Transit invoices the City for the additional fuel expenses as a separate line item on the invoice. In this manner, the fuel clause acts as a pass-through measure for the City to reimburse the expense.

10. The City Council approved a $0.25 fare increase in June 2010, increasing the fare from $0.75 to $1.00, which became effective July 2010. Prior to implementation of the fare increase, the City contracted with the Imperial Valley Regional Occupational Program (IVVROP) to conduct a survey of senior citizen communities to gauge their thoughts and solicit input about such an increase.

11. First Transit provides a monthly operations report in tandem with its service invoice to the City. The invoice features the total number of revenue hours, cost per hour, and the revenues from the subscription and farebox services. The operations report provides a breakdown of trips for each day of service and driver.

12. Calexico Dial-A-Ride is administered through the City’s Utility Services Department, which is responsible for providing and maintaining the City’s infrastructure, submitting project funding requests, and overseeing construction projects. TDA claim forms are prepared by the City’s Finance Department and approved by the City Council. Utility Services staff prepares the transit budget and projections, and provides general administration and liaison with the contract operator.

13. First Transit staff dedicated to Dial-A-Ride operations include five drivers (4 full-time, 1 part-time) and one dispatcher. Administrative and support staff consist of a general manager, an operations manager, one maintenance manager, two mechanics, two bus washers, and one clerical person. Non-management employees are represented by Teamsters, Local 542.
**Triennial Audit Recommendations**

1. **Request additional monthly operations data from the contract operator and maintain the data on file at the City.**

   This recommendation is carried over from the previous audit. As stipulated in the service contract, it is the responsibility of the contractor to collect data on the operation of the transit system and supply such data to the Director of Utility Services on a monthly basis. Monthly operations data is required to be attached to the monthly invoice received by the City. A sample invoice reviewed by the auditor included a monthly billing log that contains the total number of passengers carried and total and revenue hours, as well total and revenue miles. Additional operational information such as on-time performance, roadcalls, complaints by type, accidents, cancellations, and no-shows were not included. Upon inquiry by the auditor, the contract operator did not have this information readily compiled and available. Therefore, it is suggested that this additional operational data (i.e., on-time performance, roadcalls, complaints by type, accidents, cancellations, trip denials, and no-shows) be regularly compiled, tracked, and included in the monthly reports to the City.

2. **Implement the system of incentive rewards and penalties to ensure the performance standards are met in the contract.**

   Attachment 4 of the service contract provides a performance-based incentive program to be used as an outline for measuring the contract operator’s performance and building a cooperative relationship between the City and First Transit. Although most performance standards have either been met or exceeded by the contract operator, a series of incentives and penalties through the implementation of a performance-based incentive system would ensure continued service quality and spur greater efficiencies that could support the minimum farebox standard and control costs. It is suggested that the City implement and enforce these provisions as well as monitor actual performance against the criteria.

3. **Enhance passenger ride eligibility and verification.**

   Operating as a specialized transit service, Calexico Dial-A-Ride limits its ridership to senior citizens 60 years and older, and disabled persons. Due to this limitation, verification of rider eligibility is required prior to boarding. The city should clearly state the forms of identification that are acceptable to ride specialized DAR. Several accepted forms of identification include the following:

   For Senior Riders:

   - Medicare Card and proper identification
   - Driver’s License or State of California (DMV) I.D. Card
For People with Disabilities:

- ADA I.D. Card or letter
- DMV Disabled Person Placard Identification Card/Receipt
- Social Security Medicare Card and proper identification or disability insurance award letter
- V.A. letter confirming a disability of 50% or greater.

It is suggested that the City collaborate with ICTC for providing ADA certification as one form of disability verification. ICTC currently conducts ADA certifications for the regional ADA paratransit service, which could then also be valid for rides on the city DAR services. In this manner, a centralized database of ADA certified riders is maintained countywide and can be shared among DAR providers.
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Section I

Introduction

California’s Transportation Development Act (TDA) requires that a triennial performance audit be conducted of public transit entities that receive TDA revenues. The performance audit serves to ensure accountability in the use of public transportation revenue.

The Imperial County Transportation Commission (ICTC) engaged PMC to conduct a performance audit of the City of El Centro Dial-A-Ride service covering the most recent triennial period, fiscal years 2007–2008 through 2009–2010. The purpose of the performance audit is to evaluate the system’s effectiveness and efficiency in its use of TDA funds to provide specialized public transportation in its service area. This evaluation is required as a condition for continued receipt of these funds for public transportation purposes. In addition, the audit evaluates the City of El Centro’s compliance with the conditions specified in the California Public Utilities Code (PUC). This task involves ascertaining whether the City is meeting the PUC’s reporting requirements. Moreover, the audit includes calculations of transit service performance indicators and a detailed review of the City’s administrative functions. From the analysis that has been undertaken, a set of recommendations has been made for the agency which is intended to improve the performance of specialized transit operations.

In summary, this TDA audit affords the opportunity for an independent, constructive, and objective evaluation of the organization and its operations that otherwise might not be available. The methodology for the audit included in-person interviews with administrative and operations management, collection and review of agency documents, data analysis, and on-site observations. The Performance Audit Guidebook for Transit Operators and Regional Transportation Planning Entities published by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) was used to guide in the development and conduct of the audit.

Overview of the Transit System

The City of El Centro Dial-A-Ride is a specialized demand-response service that operates within the City of El Centro. Demand response service is currently available only to seniors 60 years and older and persons with disabilities. General public riders are no longer eligible to ride El Centro Dial-A-Ride. The service is administered by the City of El Centro, subsidized by ICTC, and operated through a contract by ARC-Imperial Valley (ARC), a social services nonprofit 501(c)(3) organization. The dial-a-ride service was established in January 1980 and has been operated by ARC since 2000.

El Centro is the county seat and largest city in Imperial County. It is located at the junction of Interstate 8 and State Routes (SR) 86 and 111. The city has a total land area of 10.75 square miles. El Centro was incorporated on April 16, 1908, and has a council-manager form of government. Based upon the 2010 U.S. Census, the city’s population is 42,598. The 2010 population is estimated to be 45,365 as reported by the California Department of Finance.
System Characteristics

El Centro Dial-A-Ride is a door-to-door service. The transit system operates five days a week from 7:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m., Monday through Friday. The service does not operate weekends and the following holidays: New Year’s Day, Martin Luther King, Jr. Day (observed), Presidents’ Day, Memorial Day (observed), Independence Day (observed), Labor Day, Veterans Day, Thanksgiving, and Christmas. The fare for a one-way trip is $1.25.

Weekday service hours were reduced and Saturday service eliminated effective March 2010. Prior to this service reduction, El Centro Dial-A-Ride operated from 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday.

El Centro Dial-A-Ride is operated with a fleet of two vehicles plus one back-up vehicle as described in Table I-1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Manufacturer</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Fuel Type</th>
<th>Seat/Wheelchair Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Ford E450</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Gasoline</td>
<td>16/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Ford E450</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Gasoline</td>
<td>16/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Back-Up Vehicle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Ford E450</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Gasoline</td>
<td>16/2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ARC-Imperial Valley

The fleet conforms to the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990 in regard to wheelchair accessibility.
Section II

Operator Compliance Requirements

This section of the audit report contains the analysis of the City of El Centro’s ability to comply with state requirements for continued receipt of TDA funds. The evaluation uses the guidebook, *Performance Audit Guidebook for Transit Operators and Regional Transportation Planning Agencies, September 2008 (third edition)*, which was developed by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) to assess transit operators. The updated guidebook contains a checklist of eleven measures taken from relevant sections of the Public Utilities Code and the California Code of Regulations. Each of these requirements is discussed in the table below, including a description of the system’s efforts to comply with the requirements. In addition, the findings from the compliance review are described in the text following the table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operator Compliance Requirements</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Compliance Efforts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The transit operator submitted annual reports to the RTPA based upon the Uniform System of Accounts and Records established by the State Controller. Report is due 90 days after end of fiscal year (Sept. 28/29), or 110 days (Oct. 19/20) if filed electronically (Internet).</td>
<td>Public Utilities Code, Section 99243</td>
<td>Completion/submittal dates: FY 2008: October 16, 2008 FY 2009: October 19, 2009 FY 2010: October 8, 2010 Conclusion: Complied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The operator has submitted annual fiscal and compliance audits to the RTPA and to the State Controller within 180 days following the end of the fiscal year (Dec. 27), or has received the appropriate 90-day extension by the RTPA allowed by law.</td>
<td>Public Utilities Code, Section 99245</td>
<td>Completion/submittal dates: FY 2008: December 15, 2008 FY 2009: January 6, 2010 FY 2010: December 30, 2010 Conclusion: Complied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The CHP has, within the 13 months prior to each TDA claim submitted by an operator, certified the</td>
<td>Public Utilities Code, Section 99251 B</td>
<td>The City of El Centro through its contract operator participates in the CHP Transit Operator Compliance Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table II-1
Operator Compliance Requirements Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operator Compliance Requirements</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Compliance Efforts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>operator’s compliance with Vehicle Code Section 1808.1 following a CHP inspection of the operator’s terminal.</td>
<td></td>
<td>in which the CHP has conducted inspections within the 13 months prior to each TDA claim.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inspection dates applicable to the audit period were December 13, 2006; March 5, 2008; March 8, 2008; March 18, 2008; April 6, 2009; April 7, 2009; September 15, 2009; May 25, 2010; and May 26, 2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The operator’s claim for TDA funds is submitted in compliance with rules and regulations adopted by the RTPA for such claims.</td>
<td>Public Utilities Code, Section 99261</td>
<td>As a condition of approval, the City’s annual claims for Local Transportation Funds are submitted in compliance with rules and regulations adopted by ICTC. ICTC staff provides assistance as needed in completing the claims.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The City’s claims are submitted generally during the spring of the claim year as required by ICTC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Conclusion: Complied</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusion: Complied
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operator Compliance Requirements</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Compliance Efforts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If an operator serves urbanized and non-urbanized areas, it has maintained a ratio of fare revenues to operating costs at least equal to the ratio determined by the rules and regulations adopted by the RTPA.</td>
<td>Public Utilities Code, Section 99270.1</td>
<td>This requirement is not applicable, as El Centro Dial-A-Ride is a specialized service in an urban area. Conclusion: Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The operator’s operating budget has not increased by more than 15% over the preceding year, nor is there a substantial increase or decrease in the scope of operations or capital budget provisions for major new fixed facilities unless the operator has reasonably supported and substantiated the change(s).</td>
<td>Public Utilities Code, Section 99266</td>
<td>Percentage increase in El Centro Dial-A-Ride’s operating budget: FY 2008: +10.08% FY 2009: -1.91% FY 2010: -8.05% The operating budget did not increase by more than 15 percent during the period. The budget decreases in FY 2009 and FY 2010 are attributed to the change in service characteristics from a general public service to a specialized service in September 2008 as well as service reductions effective March 2010. Source: FY 2008–2010 Annual Fiscal and Compliance Audits Conclusion: Complied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The operator’s definitions of performance measures are consistent with Public Utilities Code Section 99247, including (a) operating cost,</td>
<td>Public Utilities Code, Section 99247</td>
<td>The City’s definition of performance measures as tracked and recorded by the contract operator is consistent with Public Utilities Code</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table II-1
Operator Compliance Requirements Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operator Compliance Requirements</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Compliance Efforts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(b) operating cost per passenger, (c) operating cost per vehicle service hour, (d) passengers per vehicle service hour, (e) passengers per vehicle service mile, (f) total passengers, (g) transit vehicle, (h) vehicle service hours, (i) vehicle service miles, and (j) vehicle service hours per employee.</td>
<td>Section 99247. However, more consistency between data in internal and external reports is required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Conclusion:</strong> Complied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the operator serves an urbanized area, it has maintained a ratio of fare revenues to operating costs at least equal to one-fifth (20 percent), unless it is in a county with a population of less than 500,000, in which case it must maintain a ratio of fare revenues to operating costs of at least equal to three-twentihths (15 percent), if so determined by the RTPA.</td>
<td>Public Utilities Code, Sections 99268.2, 99268.3, 99268.12, 99270.1</td>
<td>This requirement applied in FY 2008, as Dial-A-Ride was still a general public service. When DAR transitioned to a specialized service during FY 2009, the requirement was no longer applicable. The operating ratio for FY 2008 was 14.03%, which fell below the minimum 20% ratio. Source: FY 2008 Annual Fiscal and Compliance Audits <strong>Conclusion:</strong> Not Complied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the operator serves a rural area, or provides exclusive services to elderly and disabled persons, it has maintained a ratio of fare revenues to operating costs at least equal to one-tenth (10 percent).</td>
<td>Public Utilities Code, Sections 99268.2, 99268.4, 99268.5</td>
<td>The farebox ratio for Dial-A-Ride under PUC Section 99268.5 became effective once the service transitioned to a specialized system. The farebox ratio requirement for exclusive services for elderly and disabled is 10 percent. El Centro Dial-A-Ride’s operating ratios using audited financial data were as follows:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table II-1
### Operator Compliance Requirements Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operator Compliance Requirements</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Compliance Efforts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FY 2009: 14.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FY 2010: 15.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Source: FY 2009–2010 Annual Fiscal and Compliance Audits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conclusion: Complied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The current cost of the operator’s retirement system is fully funded with respect to the officers and employees of its public transportation system, or the operator is implementing a plan approved by the RTPA which will fully fund the retirement system within 40 years.</td>
<td>Public Utilities Code, Section 99271</td>
<td>The City contracts with a private nonprofit provider for operations, while the cost of City staff’s retirement is fully funded under California Public Employees Retirement System (CalPERS).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conclusion: Complied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the operator receives state transit assistance funds, the operator makes full use of funds available to it under the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 before TDA claims are granted.</td>
<td>California Code of Regulations, Section 6754(a)(3)</td>
<td>This measure is not applicable, as federal formula grant funds are not utilized and El Centro Dial-A-Ride does not receive State Transit Assistance Fund (STAF) revenues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conclusion: Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings and Observations from Operator Compliance Requirements Matrix

1. Of the compliance requirements pertaining to El Centro Dial-A-Ride, the operation fully complied with eight requirements. Two additional compliance requirements did not apply to El Centro Dial-A-Ride (e.g., rural/urban farebox recovery ratios and federal funding). The system was not compliant with the urban farebox ratio for general public services during FY 2007-08.

2. El Centro Dial-A-Ride’s farebox recovery ratio remained above the required 10 percent standard for a specialized service. The City has been able to exceed the 10 percent ratio since designating Dial-A-Ride as a specialized service for the elderly and disabled in September 2008. Prior to this change, the service operated as a general public dial-a-ride, which was subject to a 20 percent farebox requirement. The average systemwide farebox recovery ratio was 14.67 percent during the triennial review period. The City took proactive measures to meet the compliance requirements.

3. Through its contract operator, the City participates in the CHP Transit Operator Compliance Program and received inspections of El Centro Dial-A-Ride vehicles within the 13 months prior to each TDA claim. Satisfactory ratings were made for all inspections conducted during the audit period.

4. The operating budget exhibited an increase of approximately 10 percent in FY 2008, followed by declines during the subsequent fiscal years. The budget reductions in FY 2009 and FY 2010 reflect the change in service characteristics from a general public service to a specialized service in September 2008 as well as service reductions effective March 2010.
Section III

Prior Triennial Performance Recommendations

The City of El Centro’s efforts to implement the recommendations made in the prior triennial audit are examined in this section of the report. For this purpose, each prior recommendation for the agency is described, followed by a discussion of the City’s efforts to implement the recommendation. Conclusions concerning the extent to which the recommendations have been adopted by the agency are then presented.

Prior Recommendation 1

Evaluate service structure in light of declining farebox.

Actions taken by the City of El Centro

At the time of this recommendation, the transit service operated as a general public dial-a-ride, which was subject to a 20 percent minimum farebox requirement due to the City’s urbanized area designation. The City found it difficult to meet and sustain this standard due to declining farebox trends. In addition, Imperial Valley Transit (IVT) recently launched two local circulator routes to better meet the city’s general transit needs. In light of these developments, the City restructured Dial-A-Ride into a specialized service for the elderly and disabled in September 2008. By operating as a specialized service, the City is subject to a 10 percent minimum farebox ratio. The system’s farebox performance has exceeded the 10 percent minimum.

Conclusion

This recommendation has been implemented.

Prior Recommendation 2

Clarify designation of primary transit contact at the City and provide cross-training.

Actions taken by the City of El Centro

In previous years, a Public Works Analyst was the primary point of contact and transit administrator. Since this individual is no longer with the City, Dial-A-Ride administration duties have been shared between the Public Works Director and City Engineer, with support from Public Works and Finance Department staff. Both designated staff members regularly attend the ICTC Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meetings and are in regular contact with the operator.

Conclusion

This recommendation has been implemented.
**Prior Recommendation 3**

Implement the incentives and penalties provisions in the service contract.

**Actions taken by the City of El Centro**

The scope of work for El Centro Dial-A-Ride attached to the contractor service agreement contains a table of incentives and penalties (Attachment 1-d) to allow for the measurement of the performance and efficiency of services based on nine criteria: on-time performance, missed pickups, miles between accidents and roadcalls, annual CHP inspection reports, preventative maintenance, noncompliance with vehicle appearance, reporting, and passenger comfort.

Performance measures are Passengers per Hour, Passengers per Day, Cost per Passenger, Subsidy per Passenger, Cost per Mile, Cost per Hour, and Farebox. These performance measures are recorded and tracked by the statistical summary report developed by the contractor. Other service criteria such as on-time performance, accidents, roadcalls, and no-shows are tracked on the management summary and passenger service reports. However, the tracking of roadcalls and accidents is not based on mileage, but is instead recorded per occurrence. The contract operator has met the performance standards stipulated in its service contract without incentives or penalties being implemented by the City. This contract provides a set of established criteria that the city should review as a means to regularly measure performance.

**Conclusion**

This recommendation has not been implemented by way of regular review of the contract performance measures by the city and is carried forward in this audit for full consideration.

**Prior Recommendation 4**

Conduct regular on-time performance checks.

**Actions taken by the City of El Centro**

The operator conducts on-time performance checks in two ways. The first way is to check the driver’s route manifest with the dispatch logs. This is conducted by operations staff routinely on an eight-day rotation. The second method involves an FTA/TSI-certified Driver Trainer, who tracks and reports on-time performance. On-time performance is one of the metrics reported in the management summary report.

**Conclusion**

This recommendation has been implemented.
Prior Recommendation 5

Record roadcalls as part of the management summary report.

Actions taken by the City of El Centro

The tracking and recording of roadcalls provide trend analysis of the number of vehicle failures during revenue service. Such data can assist with identifying the root cause of potential service issues while gauging the level of maintenance of the vehicles. The contract operator began recording roadcalls in its management summary report commencing with the FY 2009 summary.

Conclusion

This recommendation has been implemented.

Prior Recommendation 6

Place information about the City’s Dial-A-Ride on the City’s website.

Actions taken by the City of El Centro

This recommendation was prompted by the lack of prominent coverage and ease of access of Dial-A-Ride service information. This issue was also brought up during an Unmet Transit Needs hearing. The link for Dial-A-Ride is currently one of the four “Important Links” listed on the Public Works page, which leads to the contract operator website. The Public Works Director indicated that the link and associated information will be placed on the “Residents” page of the website where a link to IVT already exists. The web interface was recently changed in order to accommodate this change.

Conclusion

This recommendation has been implemented.
Section IV

TDA Performance Indicators

This section reviews the City of El Centro Dial-A-Ride’s performance in providing service in an efficient and effective manner. TDA requires that at least five specific performance indicators be reported, which are contained in the following table. Farebox is not one of the five specific indicators, but is shown as a compliance measure. Findings from the analysis are contained in the section following the table, followed by the analysis.

Table IV-1
El Centro Dial-A-Ride Performance Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating Cost</td>
<td>$206,589</td>
<td>$227,408</td>
<td>$223,058</td>
<td>$205,103</td>
<td>-0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Passengers</td>
<td>25,824</td>
<td>25,625</td>
<td>25,681</td>
<td>26,022</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Service Hours</td>
<td>4,634</td>
<td>4,611</td>
<td>4,559</td>
<td>4,189</td>
<td>-9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Service Miles</td>
<td>54,425</td>
<td>51,859</td>
<td>51,803</td>
<td>45,487</td>
<td>-16.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee FTEs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Revenue</td>
<td>$32,065</td>
<td>$31,911</td>
<td>$31,901</td>
<td>$32,145</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Cost per Passenger</td>
<td>$8.00</td>
<td>$8.87</td>
<td>$8.69</td>
<td>$7.88</td>
<td>-1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Cost per Vehicle Service Hour</td>
<td>$44.58</td>
<td>$49.32</td>
<td>$48.93</td>
<td>$48.96</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Cost per Vehicle Service Mile</td>
<td>$3.80</td>
<td>$4.39</td>
<td>$4.31</td>
<td>$4.51</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passengers per Vehicle Service Hour</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passengers per Vehicle Service Mile</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Service Hours per Employee</td>
<td>1,544.7</td>
<td>1,537.0</td>
<td>1,519.7</td>
<td>947.7</td>
<td>-38.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Fare per Passenger</td>
<td>$1.24</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>$1.24</td>
<td>$1.24</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fare Recovery Ratio</td>
<td>15.52%</td>
<td>14.03%</td>
<td>14.30%</td>
<td>15.67%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ARC-Imperial Valley; FYs 2007–10 Annual Fiscal Audits
*FY 2007 through FY 2010 Operating Cost & Fare Revenue data are audited figures.

Column graphs on the following pages are used to depict the trends for select performance indicators (Graphs IV-1 through IV-6).
Graph IV-1
Operating Costs

- FY 2007: $190,000
- FY 2008: $225,000
- FY 2009: $220,000
- FY 2010: $200,000

Graph IV-2
Ridership

- FY 2007: 25,400
- FY 2008: 25,500
- FY 2009: 25,600
- FY 2010: 26,000
Graph IV-3
Operating Cost per Passenger

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Operating Cost per Passenger</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2007</td>
<td>$7.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2008</td>
<td>$8.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2009</td>
<td>$7.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2010</td>
<td>$7.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph IV-4
Operating Cost per Vehicle Service Hour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Operating Cost per Vehicle Service Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2007</td>
<td>$42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2008</td>
<td>$49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2009</td>
<td>$48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2010</td>
<td>$48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings from Verification of TDA Performance Indicators

1. **Operating cost per vehicle service hour**, an indicator of cost efficiency, increased by a modest 9.8 percent from $44.58 in FY 2007 to $48.96 in FY 2010. Overall vehicle service hours declined 9.6 percent, while operating costs exhibited a slight decline of just under 1 percent during the three-year period. On an annualized basis, the growth in operating costs remained relatively unchanged, with a 10.1 increase in FY 2008 due to higher fuel costs followed by two years of declines. Vehicle service hours exhibited an annualized decline of 3.2 percent, with FY 2010 showing the largest decline of 8.1 percent.

2. **Operating cost per passenger**, an indicator of cost effectiveness, decreased 1.5 percent from $8.00 in FY 2007 to $7.88 in FY 2010. Overall ridership grew at a slight 0.8 percent during the period from 25,824 passengers in FY 2007 to 26,022 passengers in FY 2010, amounting to a 0.3 percent annualized rate of growth. Part of this trend may be attributed to the change from a general public service to a specialized dial-a-ride service in September 2008 along with additional service cutbacks in March 2010.

3. **Passengers per vehicle service hour**, which measures the effectiveness of the service delivered, increased 11.5 percent between FY 2007 and FY 2010 from 5.6 passengers per hour to 6.2 passengers per hour. The average number of passengers per hour remained at 5.6 passengers from FY 2007 through FY 2009. Even with this modest growth in passenger trips, service hours decreased from 4,634 hours in FY 2007 to 4,169 hours in FY 2010. On an annualized basis, service hours decreased at a rate of 3.2 percent.

4. **Passengers per vehicle service mile**, another indicator of service effectiveness, increased by 20.6 percent from 0.47 in FY 2007 to 0.57 in FY 2010. In contrast, service miles decreased by 16.4 percent from 54,425 miles in FY 2007 to 45,487 in FY 2010, while ridership increased modestly over the same period. On an annualized basis, service miles decreased by 5.7 percent, with the most notable decline (12.2 percent) occurring in FY 2010.

5. **Vehicle service hours per employee** decreased 38.6 percent between FY 2007 and FY 2010 from 1,544.7 to 947.7. This decrease correlates with the decline in vehicle service hours in spite of the 47.3 percent increase in full-time equivalents (FTEs) during the period. FTEs are derived by the contract operator through the formula of dividing total annual employee hours and then dividing by 2000.

6. **Farebox recovery** for El Centro Dial-A-Ride remained above the minimum TDA requirement of 10 percent during the audit period, averaging 14.67 percent. With the change from a general public to a specialized service operator in FY 2009, El Centro was no longer subject to the 20 percent farebox return requirement. The growth in passenger trips and revenues along with the decline in operating costs allowed El Centro to see a modest 1 percent increase in farebox returns during the period.
Conclusion from the Verification of TDA Performance Indicators

El Centro Dial-A-Ride went from a general public demand-responsive service to a specialized service for senior and disabled riders during FY 2009 in order for the system to increase efficiencies and meet a lower farebox return requirement of 10 percent. Additional service changes in March 2010 entailed the elimination of Saturday service and a reduction in weekday service hours. These changes resulted in declining operating costs, service hours, and miles. Slight improvements were realized in passenger trips and revenues.

Before the change to a specialized service, El Centro Dial-A-Ride was subject to a 20 percent farebox requirement due to its designation as a general public carrier operating in an urbanized area. During FYs 2007 and 2008, the system fell short of meeting its farebox due to a 10.1 percent increase in operating costs in FY 2008 attributed to a rise in fuel costs. Expected migration of able-bodied people to the Blue and Green Line resulted in some expected ridership drop on dial-a-ride. However, the Blue and Green Line have increased travel options for the general public that would not otherwise be available once DAR had become a specialized service. As a specialized demand-response service, El Centro Dial-A-Ride has been able to realize greater cost and service efficiencies characterized by slightly higher farebox returns.
Data Consistency

In a review of data consistency among external reports, fiscal year-end operations data was compared between the annual State Controller Report and two internal reports prepared by the El Centro Dial-A-Ride contract operator and ICTC. Table IV-2 shows the side-by-side comparison during the audit period (FYs 2008, 2009, and 2010) and including the base year of FY 2007.

Overall, there are some discrepancies and consistencies among the three data sets. A review of the two internal data sets shows relative consistency. The only significant variance between the two concerns the FY 2008 data. For example, there is a 6,865 difference in passenger trips, a 1,193 difference in service hours, and a 13,831 difference in service miles. The contract operator and State Controller data are fairly consistent for that reporting year. On the other hand, the ICTC data are inconsistent with the contractor and State Controller data for FY 2008. For subsequent years, there are a few discrepancies between the internal data and the State Controller Report data. There is an 866-mile and 1,609-mile difference in the service mile data for FYs 2009 and 2010, respectively. Minor discrepancies are noted in the passenger and service hour data. Although the remaining data appear fairly accurate, it is suggested that the City exercise greater discretion when transferring data from the internal to external reports.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TDA Statistic</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Base Year FY 2007</th>
<th>Audit Review Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FY 2007</td>
<td>FY 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlinked Passengers</td>
<td>ARC Statistical Summary Report</td>
<td>25,824</td>
<td>25,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ICTC Performance Summary</td>
<td>25,824</td>
<td>18,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Controller Report</td>
<td>25,824</td>
<td>25,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Service Hours</td>
<td>ARC Statistical Summary Report</td>
<td>4,634</td>
<td>4,611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ICTC Performance Summary</td>
<td>4,635</td>
<td>3,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Controller Report</td>
<td>4,634</td>
<td>4,612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Service Miles</td>
<td>ARC Statistical Summary Report</td>
<td>54,425</td>
<td>51,859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ICTC Performance Summary</td>
<td>54,425</td>
<td>38,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Controller Report</td>
<td>54,425</td>
<td>51,859</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section V

Review of Operator Functions

This section provides an in-depth review of various functions within the City of El Centro Dial-A-Ride operation. The review highlights accomplishments, issues, and/or challenges that were determined during the audit period. The following departments and functions were reviewed at the City of El Centro and with the contract operator:

- Operations & Planning
- Maintenance
- Planning and Marketing
- General Administration & Management

Operations & Planning

El Centro Dial-A-Ride has undergone several changes affecting the scope and provision of service. The service is administered by the City of El Centro and has been operated by ARC-Imperial Valley within the city limits of El Centro since 2000. The current five-year contract was executed and approved by the City in September 2006 and is effective through June 30, 2012.

The City’s small urban area designation, based on the 2000 Census, resulted in a change in the Dial-A-Ride farebox requirement from 10 percent to 20 percent. The 20 percent requirement became increasingly difficult to attain in recent years. In addition, based on the City’s analysis, Dial-A-Ride lost 4.67 percent of its general public ridership to the El Centro Blue Line Circulator during FY 2008, with only about 18 percent general public remaining of the total ridership. In September 2008, the El Centro City Council passed Resolution 08-92 to limit Dial-A-Ride services to disabled persons and senior citizens aged 60 and older for the purposes of adhering to the 10 percent minimum farebox ratio in accordance with the TDA statute.

Since becoming an exclusive dial-a-ride service targeted to the needs of seniors and disabled persons, the City has worked on verifying rider eligibility. Based on staff interviews, Dial-A-Ride drivers check driver’s licenses and other forms of identification to verify age and disability status. However, the city should develop and publicize a formal list of acceptable forms of identification as a means to standardize the ride eligibility process, including eligibility through ADA certification. A list of suggested types of identification for senior and disabled riders is provided in the recommendations section.

Subsequent changes occurred in FY 2010. In March 2010, the transit budget was cut by 21 percent due to the State Budget crisis and the need to make adjustments. resulting in a reduction in service hours and the elimination of Saturday service. Prior to this service reduction, El Centro Dial-A-Ride operated from 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday. Five options were analyzed, ranging from an 8.9 percent reduction to a 27.12 percent reduction in the total service...
cost for the four-month period commencing March 1, 2010, through June 30, 2010. Based on ARC’s analysis, the transportation budget prepared by ICTC had been overstated by about $16,500, which limited the extent of the budget impacts. All marketing efforts were suspended except for telephone directory listings. The reduction in operations amounted to $19,756. In spite of these recent budgetary and service cutbacks, El Centro has managed to sustain farebox levels above the 10 percent required minimum.

The service contract details a list of incentives and penalties to allow for the measurement of the performance and efficiency of services based on nine criteria: on-time performance, missed pick-ups, miles between accidents and roadcalls, annual CHP inspection reports, preventative maintenance, noncompliance with vehicle appearance, reporting, and passenger comfort. These criteria are not actively monitored by the City for the purpose of applying the incentives and penalties, although it is good practice to conduct some level of checks of actual performance against the criteria.

Performance measures are Passengers per Hour, Passengers per Day, Cost per Passenger, Subsidy per Passenger, Cost per Mile, Cost per Hour, and Farebox. These performance measures are recorded and tracked by the statistical summary report developed by the contractor. Other service criteria such as on-time performance, accidents, roadcalls, and no-shows are tracked on the management summary and passenger service reports. ARC also provides a quarterly and annual statement. In addition, ARC keeps the farebox revenues and subtracts them from the invoice provided to the City. When submitted to ICTC, these measures are compared to benchmarks contained in the prior Short Range Transit Plan.

ARC-Imperial Valley utilizes a manual dispatching system for El Centro Dial-A-Ride. According to ARC’s Director of Transportation, federal grants would only cover up to 80 percent of the cost for an automated dispatching system with the city having to help cover the local match.

The annual management summary report compiled by ARC records operational data such as wheelchair life failures, accidents, vandalism, and roadcalls. A monthly management summary report is also maintained and includes the number of service days, farebox revenues, mileage (revenue/deadhead), hours (revenue/deadhead), passenger count, passenger miles, passenger type category, and trip purpose. The report also includes trip denials and comments received. Two of the operational measures reported on the management summary report are accidents and on-time performance. These measures are summarized in Table V-1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2007</th>
<th>FY 2008</th>
<th>FY 2009</th>
<th>FY 2010</th>
<th>Total/Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accidents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Time Performance</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ARC-Imperial Valley

The number of accidents reported during the period has been negligible. Only one accident was reported during the period in FY 2010. There were no accidents reported during the other years of
the audit period. On-time performance has improved during the period, increasing from 94 percent to 99 percent of scheduled trips. This trend averages out to a 97 percent on-time performance rate for the period and is attributed to the change in service provision from a general public service to an exclusive dial-a-ride operation.

Customer service trends are monitored on the passenger service report, which are presented on the same spreadsheet as the management summary report. This report includes a tally of cancellations, no-shows, comments, complaints, and compliments. Table V-2 below summarizes the number of cancellations, trip denials, and no-shows received during the audit period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table V-2: Cancellations, Denials &amp; No-Shows</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancellations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trip Denials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Shows</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ARC-Imperial Valley

The number of cancellations and no-shows has declined significantly during the audit period. This trend reflects the effort to implement and enforce the no-show policy as per a prior audit recommendation. ARC now charges for no-shows after a total of three no-shows. No-shows continue to be more prevalent on subscription-based services. On the other hand, trip denials increased from 47 in FY 2007 to 141 in FY 2010. The increase in denials is attributed to not being able to honor same-day ride requests generally during peak periods and not being able to renegotiate an alternative pick-up time. Another reason is attributed to riders not qualifying for El Centro Dial-A-Ride given the recent service changes.

Unlike cancellations and no-shows, trip denials are not reported on the passenger service report. ARC maintains a monthly denial log that contains the date and time of the request, pick-up and destination addresses, and reason for the denial. There are nine alphabetical codes utilized for the reason given for each denial. The denial log is attached to the monthly management summary information sheet.

Another measure of customer service is in the tracking of complaints and compliments on the passenger service report and tallied for the service year. ARC dispatchers keep a record of complaints received, which are reported to the City. Complaints and compliments are summarized in Table V-3 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table V-3: Complaints &amp; Compliments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ARC-Imperial Valley
The number of complaints reported has averaged 3.25 annually, peaking at 6 complaints in FY 2008. There were no formal compliments received during the period. Overall, the City is satisfied with the service provided by ARC.

Planning

Service planning for El Centro Dial-A-Ride relies on several approaches consisting of public forums, plans, and studies. Pursuant to the TDA claims process, ICTC conducts annual Unmet Transit Needs hearings. Unmet Transit Needs are, at a minimum, those public transportation or specialized transportation services that are identified in the Regional Short Range Transit Plan (SRTP), Regional Transportation Plan or similar Mobility Plan which have not been implemented or funded. Unmet Transit Needs identified during the process must also be found “reasonable to meet” based upon a set of five criteria in order to be implemented. Testimony received during the Unmet Needs process over the course of the audit period pertained more to the fixed-route services operating in El Centro. There was no specific testimony in regard to El Centro Dial-A-Ride.

ICTC commissioned a fare study of the transit agencies under its jurisdiction in 2008. For several of the operators, the farebox recovery ratios had been declining over the past few years given the growth in operating costs primarily from fuel and insurance. The Public Transit Services Fare Analysis (Nelson/Nyggaard 2008) concluded that the 20 percent farebox would not be attainable in the near future without an adjustment in the current $1.25 fare. In FY 2007, the farebox recovery ratio fell below the standard of 20 percent. The analysis also found a decrease in revenue hours and a significant increase in operating costs. It was suggested in the analysis that the El Centro Dial-A-Ride fare be raised to $1.75 to be consistent with the Imperial Dial-A-Ride intercity fare, since most Imperial Dial-A-Ride passengers travel to El Centro. Since El Centro Dial-A-Ride ceased being a general public service, the City has been subject to a 10 percent farebox requirement. Fares have remained at the $1.25 level.

An updated SRTP was commissioned by ICTC in January 2011 and is currently being developed. The primary objectives of the SRTP will be to review existing performance and prioritize operating and capital expenditures to maintain and recommend improvements to the regional transit system. The prior SRTP was adopted in FY 2004, and the new SRTP will review and evaluate the related goals, policies, objectives, and standards developed for that plan. In addition, it will provide a five-year plan for operations including, but not limited to, specifics on fares, service levels, route changes, service policy changes, inter-operator agreements, spare ratios, and other characteristics.

Maintenance

ARC has developed a four-phase vehicle maintenance protocol for the vehicles utilized by El Centro Dial-A-Ride. The first phase involves the Driver’s Daily Vehicle Inspection Report (DVIR), which is completed prior to the first and second shifts to discover any mechanical defects that would prevent safe operation of the vehicles. The DVIR consists of a 30-point inspection checklist.
ARC displays a daily mileage board indicating the current mileage of each vehicle and the mileage when each type of maintenance check is required.

The second phase involves an in-house 1,500-mile vehicle inspection along with a mid-point inspection prior to the third phase. The purpose of this inspection is to discover and correct any mechanical defect that may have occurred since the time of the last inspection either in-house or at a repair facility.

The third phase consists of a 3,000-mile/45-day inspection performed by an outside repair facility with certified technicians. This involves an inspection, oil change, and lubrication as mandated by the Department of Transportation. In addition, the purpose of this inspection is to discover and correct mechanical defects that are denoted during the thorough inspection by a certified Automotive Service Excellence (ASE) mechanic. The fourth phase involves the California Highway Patrol (CHP) Annual Bus and Terminal Inspection, which occurs at 13-month intervals.

Vehicle maintenance is performed by several dedicated vendors locally. El Centro Motors, located at 1520 Ford Drive in El Centro, provides service on Ford vehicles. Radiator and glass repairs are performed by MJ Radiators & Glass Service located at 363 West State Street in El Centro. Escobedo Auto Body Shop, located at 361 East Main Street in El Centro, performs body work on the vehicles. Vehicles are taken to Desert Auto Plaza in El Centro or to a dealership in San Diego for warranty repairs. The parts inventory is very low at ARC given most vehicle maintenance and repair is performed at the vendor’s location. The annual cost for vehicle repair and maintenance increased 9.3 percent from $19,747.36 in FY 2007 to $21,578.47 in FY 2010.

Vehicle fueling is handled through McNeece Brothers Oil of El Centro located at 691 East Heil Avenue only a few blocks away from ARC’s offices. A special fleet discount is applied on fuel purchases exceeding 10,000 gallons monthly. According to ARC financial reports, annual fuel costs increased 9.3 percent from $24,019.28 in FY 2007 to $26,246.52 in FY 2010. This modest increase reflects the decrease in service hours from the change to being an exclusive dial-a-ride operation.

The contract operator, as per a prior audit recommendation, began tracking roadcalls on its management summary report in FY 2008. Table V-4 below provides a summary of roadcalls incurred on El Centro Dial-A-Ride from FY 2008 through FY 2010.

Table V-4
Roadcalls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2007</th>
<th>FY 2008</th>
<th>FY 2009</th>
<th>FY 2010</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roadcalls</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NR=Not Reported
Source: ARC-Imperial Valley

A review of the management summary report showed that the sole roadcall occurred in August 2008 during the peak of extreme summer temperatures that affect the optimal performance of vehicle air conditioning systems. The service contract stipulates that thorough air conditioning
inspections and repairs be executed and completed on all vehicles no later than April 1 of each contractual year.

The City performs maintenance and major repairs of bus shelters located in El Centro. It has a contract with Spectrum Advertising of El Centro to provide cleaning services for in-kind advertising. Several bus shelters are equipped with solar lighting.

**Marketing**

ARC is responsible for marketing the service on behalf of El Centro and coordinates the placement, scheduling, and distribution of all advertising and promotional materials to promote ridership. The contract with the City stipulates that the marketing budget not exceed $1,500 for the fiscal year. The contract also requires ARC to develop an annual marketing plan at least 30 days prior to the end of the fiscal year for approval by the City. ARC has made efforts to develop and implement a marketing plan in spite of budgetary constraints. With the cut in operating subsidies in March 2010, the marketing budget was subject to significant reductions amounting to approximately $1,000.

There is a one-quarter-page color advertisement featured in the Imperial County Area Agency on Aging Senior Services Directory. The ad contains a photo of an El Centro Dial-A-Ride vehicle along with contact numbers. Flyers are also employed to announce service or fare changes. ARC has created a paratransit data sheet that provides a listing of all the dial-a-ride services operated in Imperial County. The service is also listed in the local Yellow Pages telephone directory. Internet marketing consists of a hyperlink on the Public Works page of the City of El Centro webpage [http://www.cityofelcentro.org/pworks/index.asp](http://www.cityofelcentro.org/pworks/index.asp) that connects to the ARC-Imperial Valley transportation services webpage: [http://www.arciv.org/transportation.php](http://www.arciv.org/transportation.php). The ARC webpage only contains basic information about the various dial-a-ride services operated. There is no information regarding fares, service areas, or hours of operation.

ARC has developed and provides passenger comment cards. The Transportation Service Questionnaire contains 10 questions and is printed in English and Spanish. ARC provides a statistical summary of the frequency and patterns of comments in its passenger service report. The report gives a breakdown of comments received as well as the number of complaints (written or phoned in) and compliments.

**General Administration & Management**

The City of El Centro operates as a charter city under a council-manager form of government. The five-member City Council serves as the principal policy-making body. The Mayor is selected from the Council to serve a one-year term. The Council convenes on the first and third Tuesday of the month at 6:00 p.m. The City Council provides policy direction to the City Manager, who oversees City operations. Dial-A-Ride administration duties have been shared between the Public Works Director and City Engineer, with support from Public Works and Finance Department staff. Staff delivers an annual report to the City Council on transit operations and on an as needed basis. Both designated staff members regularly attend the ICTC Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meetings.