

Monterey County Regional Taxi Authority

*City of Carmel-by-the-Sea • City of Del Rey Oaks • City of Monterey • City of Pacific Grove
City of Salinas • City of Sand City • City of Seaside • County of Monterey
Monterey Peninsula Airport District*

Technical Advisory Committee Meeting

**September 20, 2011
2:00PM-3:45PM**

**Board Room
Monterey Peninsula Airport, 200 Fred Kane Drive, Suite 200
Monterey, California**

AGENDA ITEMS

1. Call to order

1-1 Roll Call.

2. Public Comments on matters not on the Agenda.

3. Consent Agenda

3-1 Approve minutes of August 23, 2011, TAC meeting. (pg. 1)

4. Old Business

4-1 Review "long-distance deadhead" fares and provide comment to the RTA Board of Directors. (pg. 7)

4-2 Review third draft Equipment, Safety, Security and Operational Policy (ESSOP) and provide comment to the RTA Board of Directors. (pg. 9)

5. New Business

5-1 Review proposed administrative penalties/fines and provide comment to the RTA Board of Directors. (pg. 15)

6. Correspondence

7. Adjournment

This page left intentionally blank

MONTEREY REGIONAL TAXI AUTHORITY
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING
August 23, 2011
2:00 p.m.

TAMC
55-B Plaza Circle, Salinas, 93901

TAC Members:

Chris Sommers	Hospitality/Resort
Andy Klingelhofer (alt)	Education
Gary Cursio (alt)	Hospitality/Lodging
Kathi Krystal	Taxi/Driver
Tom Greer	Airport (arrived at 2:29 p.m.)
Steve Cardinalli	Taxi/Company Owner
Phil Penko	Law Enforcement
Roy G. Graham	Taxi/Independent
Tom Hicks	Public Transit
Tom Mancini	Seniors

Absent: Alma Almanza Disability
Eddie Estrada Hospitality/Restaurant

RTA Staff:

Deanna Smith	Deputy Secretary to the Board
Hunter Harvath	Assistant General Manager for Finance & Admin
Beronica Carriedo	Mobility Trainer

Public: Dave Laredo De Lay & Laredo
Lance Atencio MVT
Ken Griggs Monterey Airport District
Sam Martinez Yellow Cab Operator

Chair Penko called the meeting to order at 2:06 p.m.

Apology is made for any misspelling of a name.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT ON MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA

Sam Martinez of Yellow Cab stated that two (2) members of the TAC have abused their authority by showing favoritism among Taxicab Companies. He requested that John Narigi, Hospitality/Lodging Representative, and Chris Sommers, Hospitality/Resort Representative, be removed from the committee for violation of ethics.

3. CONSENT AGENDA

Tom Mancini motioned to approve the minutes of July 19, 2011 and was seconded by Roy Graham. Chair Penko abstained. The motion so carried.

Mr. Cardinalli arrived at 2:09 p.m.

4. OLD BUSINESS

4-1 Continue discussion on “long-distance deadhead” and weekend special fare proposals and provide comment to the Board.

Mr. Harvath referred the committee to four specific (4) items for discussion on page 7 of the agenda regarding long-distance deadhead fares.

Chair Penko asked if the maximum fare structure had been adopted by the RTA. Mr. Harvath confirmed that the fares had been adopted, but that at the last TAC meeting special fares for special events or weekends had been suggested, and Mr. Cardinalli had stated that more than one fare could be programmed in the taximeters.

Mr. Cardinalli stated that he was being sarcastic about the weekend fares because the hotels price-gouge the public on the weekends. He stated he was amazed that the RTA Board was interested in setting higher fares.

Chair Penko asked that the discussion return to the deadhead fares.

The committee discussed the problem with deadhead fares and considered options to fairly compensate taxi drivers when they had to drive long distances to pick up a fare that did not cover the fuel expense or travel time of the driver. Several drivers also stated that often passengers call multiple companies and take the first taxi to arrive, resulting in lost fares for other drivers who respond to the call.

Ms. Krystal suggested a mileage charge to get to the fare if the total fare did not cover costs.

Mr. Cardinalli stated that he did not believe a taxi company should be required to take a fare that would result in lost fares. Ms. Krystal and Mr. Graham agreed.

Mr. Graham suggested allowing cab companies to negotiate the fare on a per call basis.

Mr. Hicks suggested using the already established wait time fare of \$35.00 per hour for travel time to get to the long-distance deadhead fare.

Mr. Harvath suggested that the TAC could also look at defining zip codes outside of the incorporated areas and apply a specific surcharge to travel to these areas.

Public Comment

Mr. Martinez asked Chair Penko if Mr. Harvath had the authority to advise or direct the committee. Mr. Penko stated that he could not direct the committee. Mr. Martinez asked that Mr. Harvath's suggestion be stricken from the record. Mr. Penko clarified that staff was authorized to make suggestions and provide recommendations, so the recommendation should not be stricken. Mr. Martinez suggested that taxi drivers run their meter as if they had picked up the fare, then add one-third (1/3) of the resulting deadhead fare to total fare.

Close Public Comment

Chair Penko asked if the Senior Voucher program could be used as a model for the deadhead fares. Mr. Harvath stated that many jurisdictions do not participate so it would not be the best model.

Mr. Harvath suggested that one advantage of defining surcharges by zip code is that they can be definitively provided to the public. All fares and fare structures, including surcharges must be displayed in the taxicab and available to the public.

Mr. Laredo, legal counsel, stated that the discussion contains two elements: 1) should there be areas or zones in which mandated service is not required; and 2) should there be a negotiated rate allowed in the areas beyond mandated service. Based on this scenario, he stated that if a request for service is within the non-mandated service area, companies be allowed to refuse service or negotiate a fare.

Mr. Graham made a motion that a long-distance deadhead fare surcharge not be established, and that each company be allowed to negotiate the fare on a per call basis. Mr. Mancini seconded the motion.

Mr. Penko opened the motion for discussion and asked whether a maximum negotiated rate be established. Ms. Krystal stated that it would depend on the length of the deadhead trip. Mr. Graham stated that this issue is an over-regulation of the taxi companies. Mr. Sommers stated concern over allowing negotiated rates. There was considerable discussion about the unintended consequences of negotiated rates, including price-gouging.

Mr. Hicks suggested that the item be tabled and asked if staff could come back with a map of the RTA jurisdiction to discuss defining zones based on distances.

Mr. Mancini made a substitute motion to continue the discussion until the next meeting, at which time staff can provide an analysis on geographic distances within RTA

jurisdiction and was seconded by Mr. Cardinalli. Mr. Graham agreed to withdraw his motion. The motion so carried.

Mr. Harvath stated that special weekend fares needed to be discussed. The consensus of the committee was to not establish special weekend fares.

4-2 Continue discussion on the Monterey County Regional Taxi Authority (RTA) Equipment, Safety, Security, and Operational Policy (ESSOP) and provide comment to the Board.

Mr. Harvath passed out a strike-out version for the TAC to review so unresolved issues were easily legible. He reminded everyone that the committee had made some suggestions at a former meeting, but it had never been completely reviewed.

The following suggestions were made:

- Item 2k: Change language to “vehicle does not have either operable left side and rear view mirrors or both left and right side mirrors.
- Item 3m: Change the last sentence to “The upholstery shall be in relatively good repair.”
- Item 3p: Add “as defined by the California Vehicle Code” to the end of the last sentence.
- Item 4a: Change “business” to “company.”
- Item 4b: Add “in compliance with County Weights and Measures regulations” to the end of the sentence.
- Item 5a: Strike “each passenger” and “the permit number.”
- Item 5b: Change the first sentence to read “All immediate disputes to fare shall be determined by a peace officer; anyone reporting after the fact shall be referred to an RTA staff member.”
- Item 5e and 5d: Combine items.
- Item 5g: Change “shall” to “should” in last sentence.

There was considerable discussion and disagreement on Items 3b and 5o. Mr. Cardinalli stated that he felt MST should not be involved in regulating the RTA because they allowed Coastal Yellow Cab to submit an application without alerting the TAC of their application and that their color scheme and name were similar to Yellow Cab. Ms. Krystal agreed that when the committee first discussed competing color schemes, MST should have alerted TAC of the conflict with the new company.

Mr. Laredo, legal counsel for the RTA, suggested that three (3) options were before the TAC regarding Item 3b: 1) do not regulate the color scheme at all; 2) establish a restriction on competing color schemes from this day forward; or 3) establish guidelines to require existing companies with competing color schemes to change their taxicab color, although he was not sure this was possible. Disagreements arose and no recommendation was provided.

A disagreement arose between Mr. Cardinalli and Mr. Sommers regarding a refusal of service by Yellow Cab and several hotels in the area. The committee was unable to resolve the issue of refusal of service. Mr. Laredo suggested that more information was needed before

discussion on this Item continued. It was recommended that Item 5o be referred back to staff to provide a rationale for the item.

5. NEW BUSINESS

5-1 Consider Administrative Penalty Fines and provide comment to the Board.

There was no discussion on this item.

6. CORRESPONDENCE

None.

There being no further comments, Chair Penko adjourned the meeting at 4:28 p.m.

Prepared by:



Deanna Smith, Deputy Secretary

This page left intentionally blank

To: Technical Advisory Committee
From: Hunter Harvath, Assistant General Manager – Finance & Administration
Subject: “Long-Distance Deadhead” special fares

RECOMMENDATION:

Review “long-distance deadhead” fares and provide comment to the RTA Board of Directors.

DISCUSSION:

At the June 16 and July 19, 2011, meetings of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), extensive discussion occurred regarding a regional taxi fare structure. Ultimately, the committee voted to recommend a maximum fare structure of \$3.50 for flag drop/initial charge, \$3.50 per mile, and \$35.00 per hour for wait time, as a basic fare structure, which was adopted by the RTA Board at its July 25, 2011 meeting.

Also at that meeting, the RTA Board referred back to the committee for additional consideration a potential special fare or surcharge for “long-distance deadhead” trips – that is, short duration trips whose origin and destination occur far outside of the cities and unincorporated areas (i.e., Pebble Beach) in which most taxi trips occur. This type of trip is far more expensive to provide than the taxi fare that is collected. Points for discussion by the TAC related to the “long-distance deadhead” issue may include:

- What is the definition of a long-distance deadhead trip?
- How much extra fare should be charged for this trip?
- Should the extra charge be a flat fee or a per mile fee?
- How should abuse of the “long-distance deadhead” extra fee be monitored?

Possible solutions to consider include charging the extra flat fee for trips in various outlying geographic areas without a localized cab service (i.e., Carmel Valley Village, Prunedale, etc.) or setting the taximeter with a different fare structure for these “long-distance deadhead” trips. At the August 23, 2011, meeting of the TAC, staff was asked to bring maps of the Monterey County Regional Taxi Authority jurisdictions for discussion to see if a boundary could be easily set that would designate where surcharges should be allowed to be levied. Staff will be providing these maps to your Committee on the day of the meeting for additional discussion and consideration of this matter.

SUBMITTED BY:



Hunter Harvath

To: Technical Advisory Committee
From: Hunter Harvath, Assistant General Manager – Finance & Administration
Subject: Equipment, Safety, Security and Operational Policy

RECOMMENDATION:

Review third draft Equipment, Safety, Security and Operational Policy (ESSOP) and provide comment.

DISCUSSION:

In accordance with RTA Ordinance 2011-001, approved by the RTA Board of Directors on April 25, 2011, Section 32 of the Monterey County Regional Taxi Authority Regulations calls for the adoption of an Equipment, Safety, Security and Operational Policy (ESSOP):

32. EQUIPMENT AND OPERATING REGULATIONS

An Equipment, Safety, Security, and Operations Policy shall be promulgated and adopted by the RTA Board by Resolution, and shall have the force of law. Vehicles and their operators must remain in compliance with the most recent RTA Board adopted Equipment, Safety, Security, and Operations Policy. Violation of this Policy may result in suspension or removal of permits to operate within the RTA jurisdictions. The Equipment, Safety, Security, and Operations Policy may be amended by Resolution from time to time.

This Policy would further the mission and goals of the Regional Taxi Authority and would facilitate compliance with federal, state and local laws. At its February 28, 2011, meeting the RTA Board of Directors referred this proposed policy to the Technical Advisory Committee for discussion and recommendations.

Based on the input received at the May 17, and August 23, 2011 TAC meetings, staff has prepared a revised version of the draft policy and presented it here (Attachment 1) for discussion. Since that meeting, staff has received direction from the RTA board to solicit input from the TAC one last time on the ESSOP and then bring back the revised document to the Board for adoption at its September 26, 2011, meeting.

SUBMITTED BY: 
Hunter Harvath

Attachment 1: Draft Equipment, Safety, Security and Operational Policy - as edited by staff 9/9/11

MONTEREY COUNTY REGIONAL TAXI AUTHORITY (RTA)

EQUIPMENT, SAFETY, SECURITY AND OPERATIONAL POLICY

1. Purpose. The EQUIPMENT, SAFETY, SECURITY AND OPERATIONAL POLICY addresses many aspects of taxicab operations. The Policy gives the RTA the authority to ensure that taxicabs, taxicab owners, and taxicab operators provide safe, clean, and reliable transportation to the community. Violations of the policy may result in the suspension or termination of a vehicle, or driver permit to operate taxi cab service in within the jurisdictions of the RTA.
2. Safety Requirements. Any Vehicle which fails to meet the requirements of the California Vehicle Code or this policy after inspections shall be immediately ordered out-of-service by an RTA inspector or Peace Officer if it is unsafe for service. Ordering a vehicle out-of-service does not constitute a suspension or revocation of the permit. A vehicle is deemed unsafe for service when any of the following conditions exists, including but not limited to:
 - a. Tires fail to meet the requirements of the California Vehicle Code;
 - b. Headlights, taillights or signal lights are inoperable during hours of darkness, or when otherwise required to operate by the California Vehicle Code;
 - c. Windshield wipers are inoperable;
 - d. Meter is not working or the seal is broken;
 - e. Brakes, brake lights or brake systems are inoperable or otherwise fail to meet the requirements of the California Vehicle Code;
 - f. Excessive play in steering wheel exceeding three (3) inches;
 - g. Windshield glass contains cracks or chips that interfere with driver's vision;
 - h. Any door latch is inoperable from either the interior or exterior of the vehicle;
 - i. Any seat is not securely fastened to the floor;
 - j. Seatbelts, , fail to meet requirements of the California Vehicle Code;
 - ~~k. Either side or review mirrors are missing or defective; and Vehicle does not have either operable left side and rear view mirrors or both left and right side mirrors.~~
 - ~~l.k.~~ Any other condition which reasonably and rationally pertains to the operating safety of the vehicle or passenger or pedestrian safety.
3. Maintenance Standards. The interior and exterior of the for-hire vehicles shall be maintained in a safe and efficient operating condition, and meet California Vehicle Code requirements. The following minimum standards must be maintained:
 - a. Body Condition. There shall be no tears or rust holes in the vehicle body and no loose pieces hanging from the vehicle body. Fenders, bumpers, and light trim shall be securely fixed to the vehicle. No extensive unrepaired body damage shall be allowed. The vehicle shall be equipped with front and rear bumpers. The exterior of the vehicle shall be maintained in a reasonably clean condition so as not obscure the vehicle markings.
 - b. Color Scheme. The color scheme of for-hire vehicles for new taxicab companies permitted by the RTA are subject to the approval of the RTA and shall be sufficiently

distinctive so as not to cause confusion with other for-hire vehicles already operating within the RTA. [\[ADDITIONAL INPUT IS REQUESTED ON THIS ITEM\]](#)

- c. Paint. Paint and markings may not be faded or deteriorated in such a manner as to preclude immediate recognition of the vehicle.
 - d. Lights. Headlights shall be operable on both high and low beam. Taillights, flashing hazard lights, parking lights, signal lights, and interior lights shall all be operable.
 - e. Wipers. Each vehicle shall be equipped with adequate windshield wipers maintained in good operating condition.
 - f. Brakes. Both the parking and hydraulic or other brake systems must be operable.
 - g. Steering. Excessive play in the steering mechanism shall not exceed three (3) inches free play in turning the steering wheel from side to side.
 - h. Engine. The engine compartment shall be reasonably clean and free of uncontained combustible materials.
 - i. Mufflers. Mufflers shall be in good operating condition.
 - j. Windows. The windshield shall be without cracks or chips that could interfere with the driver's vision. All other windows shall be intact and able to be opened and closed as intended by the manufacturer. The windows and windshield shall be maintained in a reasonably clean condition so as not to obstruct visibility.
 - k. Door latches. All door latches shall be operable from both the interior and exterior of the vehicle.
 - l. Suspension. The vehicle's suspension system shall be maintained so that there are no sags because of weak or broken springs or excessive motion when the vehicle is in operation because of weak or defective shock absorbers.
 - m. Seats. All seats shall be securely fastened. Seat belts, when required by the California Vehicle Code, shall be installed. The upholstery shall be [in relatively good repair free of grease, holes, rips, torn seams, and burns](#).
 - n. Interior. The interior of each vehicle and the trunk or luggage area shall be maintained in a reasonably clean condition, free of foreign matter, offensive odors and litter. The seats shall be kept reasonably clean and without large wear spots. The door handles and doors shall be intact and clean. To allow maximum space for passenger luggage and belongings, the trunk or luggage area shall be kept empty except for spare tire and a personal container for the driver not exceeding two (2) cubic feet in volume and emergency equipment.
 - o. Window Tinting. No taxicab may be operated with window tinting shades or markings that could interfere with a clear view of the cab interior from outside as defined by the California Vehicle Code.
4. Posted Information Standards. The following information shall be posted clearly in view of the customer.
- a. Each vehicle licensed to operate within the RTA jurisdiction shall have located in the driver's compartment, in full view of the passengers, an RTA issued taxi vehicle permit and a taxi driver permit card provided by the RTA that bears the number of the taxi permit of the driver; the name and [business company](#) address of the driver; the name of the owner of the vehicle; and a photograph of the driver.

- ~~a.~~b. The rates of fare charged for for-hire vehicles shall be clearly displayed in the passenger compartment in compliance with Monterey County Weights and Measures regulations.
5. Operating Procedures. The following rules shall be followed by all drivers permitted by the RTA in provision of for-hire vehicle services and their customers:
- a. Upon request by the passenger, ~~t~~The driver shall offer ~~each passenger~~ a receipt upon payment of the fare. The receipt shall accurately show the date, the amount of the fare, the permit number, the trade name, and name and signature of the driver.
 - b. All immediate disputes to fare shall be determined by a peace officer; anyone reporting a fare dispute after the fact shall be referred to an ~~or~~ RTA staff member ~~most readily available where the dispute is had.~~ It shall be unlawful for any person to fail or refuse to comply with such determination by the peace officer or RTA staff member.
 - c. It is unlawful for any person to refuse to pay the lawful fare of a for-hire vehicle after employing or hiring the same.
 - d. ~~The driver of any for hire vehicle shall promptly obey all lawful orders or instructions of any peace officer, fire fighter, or RTA staff member.~~ Taxicab company owners, the driver of any taxi vehicle and taxi owner/operators shall promptly obey all lawful orders or instructions of any peace officer, fire fighter, or RTA staff member.
 - e. No driver of any for-hire vehicle shall transport any greater number of persons, including the driver, than the manufacturer's rated seating capacity for the vehicle.
 - f. While driving or operating a for-hire vehicle, drivers shall maintain a state of personal hygiene, body cleanliness and absence of offensive body odor normally associated with bathing or showering on a regular basis. Recognizing that they have no control over lingering scents from passengers, drivers **should** refrain from wearing overpowering fragrances that could impair passengers with chemical sensitivity to ingredients in perfumes and colognes.
 - g.
 - ~~h.~~ For-hire vehicles shall be operated in a manner that complies with the California Vehicle Code, ~~–~~
 - ~~i.~~h. Any driver employed to transport passengers shall take the most direct route possible that will carry the passenger to their destination safely and expeditiously, unless otherwise directed by a passenger.
 - ~~j.~~i. Between the hours of midnight and 3:00 a.m. only, taxicab drivers shall have the right to refuse passenger requests to make intermediate stops (including, but not limited to, fast-food restaurants/pick-up windows, convenience stores, supermarkets, etc.) between the point of origin of the trip and the passenger's final destination.
 - ~~k.~~j. It shall be unlawful for the driver or operator of any taxicab to refuse a prospective or actual fare or to take any action to actively discourage a prospective or actual fare on the basis race, age, gender, national origin, sexual orientation, disability or other legally protected characteristic. Rude or abusive language or behavior including gestures, ethnic slurs, jokes, or other forms of harassment directed towards a customer or any physical action that a reasonable person would construe as threatening or intimidating shall be considered a violation of this portion of the policy.
 - ~~l.~~k. It is a violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) for owners and operators of taxis to discriminate against or refuse a passenger because that passenger has a

service animal assisting them. A service animal includes guide dogs, signal dogs, or other animals providing assistance to disabled individuals. However, where a taxicab operator has a physical or mental impairment regarding service animals (including, but not limited to, allergies) that substantially limits one or more major life activities, that driver may not be forced to provide transportation to a person using a service animal. In this situation, taxi company owners must provide a reasonable accommodation to this class of drivers by sending another taxicab operated by a driver without a physical or mental impairment regarding service animals.

~~m.l.~~ A driver is not obligated to transport any person who is verbally or otherwise abusive to the driver, or whose behavior may be considered by a reasonable person to be a threat or hazard to the driver. A driver is not obligated to transport any persons who emit foul odors including but are not limited to scents related to unlaundered clothing, lack of bathing, or animal related odors and which are considered to be seriously disruptive to the driver.

~~m.m.~~ Taxicab drivers may not refuse or discourage a prospective or actual fare based upon shortness of trip within the jurisdictions of the RTA.

~~n.~~ A taxicab dispatching company owner or its staff shall not deny service when requested to a specific location of public accommodations within the RTA jurisdictions without prior approval by the RTA Board of Directors or the local law enforcement department having jurisdiction over the location of the public accommodation to be denied taxicab service.

~~p.o.~~ Taxicab drivers may not, having parked and left a taxicab; solicit patronage among pedestrians on the sidewalk, or at other locations of public gathering.

~~p.p.~~ Only paying passengers, taxicab company trainers, and persons specifically authorized by the RTA may occupy a taxicab that is already occupied by a paying passenger. No driver, once a paying passenger has occupied their taxicab shall permit any other nonpaying passenger to occupy or ride in the taxicab.

To: Technical Advisory Committee
From: Hunter Harvath, Assistant General Manager – Finance & Administration
Subject: RTA Administrative Penalties/Fines

RECOMMENDATION:

Review proposed administrative penalties/fines and provide comment to the RTA Board of Directors.

DISCUSSION:

At the June 29, 2011, meeting of the RTA Board of Directors, a referral to the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was made seeking input on proposed penalties and fines for violations of operating taxicabs in the RTA jurisdictions. At the July 19, 2011, TAC meeting, input was submitted to the RTA Board regarding fines for operating taxi dispatching companies, vehicles and driving taxis without permits. With the Equipment, Safety, Security and Operational Policy (ESSOP) now under consideration, staff is seeking input from the TAC regarding proposed penalties and fines that would be associated with violating regulations of that policy (Attachment 1). In addition, input on proposed administrative penalties based on other violations of the RTA Program Regulations, adopted by the RTA Board through ordinance 2011-001, is also sought from the TAC (Attachment 2).

Comments that TAC members have regarding these proposed administrative violations will be forwarded to the full RTA Board of Directors at their next meeting, currently scheduled for September 26, 2011.

Attachment 1: Proposed Administrative Penalties Based on RTA Equipment, Safety and Operational Policy (ESSOP)

Attachment 2: Proposed Administrative Penalties Based on RTA Program Regulations

SUBMITTED BY:


Hunter Harvath

This page left intentionally blank

Proposed Administrative Penalty Guidelines
Based on RTA Equipment, Safety, Security and Operational Policy (ESSOP)

<u>ESSOP Section/Description</u>		<u>1st Offense</u>	<u>2nd Offense</u>
Section 2 - Violations of Safety Requirements Based on CA Vehicle Code			
2a	Tires fail to meet CA Vehicle Code	RUC*	3-Day Permit Suspension
2b	Lights fail to meet CA Vehicle Code	RUC*	3-Day Permit Suspension
2c	Windshield wipers inoperable	RUC*	3-Day Permit Suspension
2d	Meter not working or seal is broken	RUC*	3-Day Permit Suspension
2e	Brakes fail to meet CA Vehicle Code	RUC*	3-Day Permit Suspension
2f	Play in steering wheel exceeding 3 ins.	RUC*	3-Day Permit Suspension
2g	Windshield cracks interfering with driver vision	RUC*	3-Day Permit Suspension
2h	Inoperable door latch from either interior or exterior	RUC*	3-Day Permit Suspension
2i	Any seat not securely fastened to floor	RUC*	3-Day Permit Suspension
2j	Seatbelts fail to meet CA Vehicle Code	RUC*	3-Day Permit Suspension
2k	Missing/defective mirrors in violation of CA Vehicle Code	RUC*	3-Day Permit Suspension
2l	Unsafe vehicle endangering passenger/pedestrian safety	RUC*	3-Day Permit Suspension
Section 3 - Violations of Maintenance Standards Based on RTA policy and/or CA Vehicle Code			
3a	Unsafe vehicle body condition	RUC*	3-Day Permit Suspension
3b	Color scheme	Field Report Warning	RUC*
3c	Paint faded/deteriorated	Field Report Warning	RUC*
3h	Engine compartment clean and free of combustibles	RUC*	3-Day Permit Suspension
3i	Muffler in good operating condition	Field Report Warning	RUC*
3j	Windows intact and open/close as intended by manufacturer	Field Report Warning	RUC*
3l	Suspension in good working condition	Field Report Warning	RUC*
3m	Seats free of grease, holes, rips, torn seams, burns	Field Report Warning	RUC*
3n	Interior, trunk, luggage areas clean, litter- and odor-free	Field Report Warning	RUC*
3o	Window tinting too dark	RUC*	3-Day Permit Suspension
Section 4 - Violations of Posted Information Requirements			
4a	Vehicle permit and/or driver permit posted	Field Report Warning	RUC*
4b	Meter rates posted in passenger compartment	Field Report Warning	RUC*
Section 5 - Violations of Operating Procedures			
5a	Receipt on request	Field Report Warning	3-Day Permit Suspension
5b & 5d	Refuse to comply with lawful order	10-Day Permit Suspension	Permit Revocation
5e	More passengers than manufacturer rating	Field Report Warning	3-Day Permit Suspension
5f	Improper hygiene, cleanliness, odor	Field Report Warning	3-Day Permit Suspension
5g	Traffic violation of CA Vehicle Code (i.e., parking in red zone)	Field Report Warning	3-Day Permit Suspension
5h	Taking indirect route to increase fare on meter	5-Day Permit Suspension	Permit Revocation
5j	Discourage passenger	3-day Permit Suspension	5-Day Permits Suspension
5j	Refusal to transport legally protected classes	5-Day Permit Suspension	Permit Revocation
5k	Noncompliance with Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)	Field report Warning	Permit Revocation
5m	Refuse or discourage passenger due to shortness of trip	Field Report Warning	3-Day Permit Suspension
5n	Deny service to place of public accommodations	Warning Letter from RTA staff	10-Day Permit Suspension
5o	Driver soliciting passengers	Field Report Warning	3-Day Permit Suspension
5p	Only authorized passengers in vehicle	Field Report Warning	3-Day Permit Suspension

***RUC – Remove Until Corrected:** This penalty shall require the temporary removal of the medallion of vehicle or the temporary suspension of a driver's identification card until the violation is corrected. Vehicles under the effect of this penalty may not be placed in service until they have passed re-inspection or the driver has provide proof that the violation has been corrected. All re-inspections or re-instatements may be subject to applicable administrative fees.

Penalties may be adjusted up to including revocation of permit at the sole discretion of the RTA based on severity and frequency of violations .

Proposed Administrative Penalty Guidelines
Based on RTA Program Regulations

<u>RTA Regulation Section / Description</u>		<u>1st Offense</u>	<u>2nd Offense</u>	<u>3rd Offense</u>
6	Inadequate proof of insurance	RUC*	3-day permit suspension	10-day permit suspension
6	Lapse of insurance coverage	RUC*	Permit Revocation	
7	Overcharge of meter rate filed with RTA	5-Day Permit Suspension plus restitution to passen	Permit Revocation	
9	Exterior signage required	Field Report Warning	RUC*	5-day permit suspension
16.1	Inappropriate driver conduct	Field Report Warning	5-day permit suspension	permit revocation
16.2	Driver smoking in taxicab	Field Report Warning	5-day permit suspension	permit revocation
27.5	Meter not engaged	5-Day Permit Suspension	Permit Revocation	
22.6, 23.8.3	Unlawful transference of permits	Permit Revocation		

***RUC – Remove Until Corrected:** This penalty shall require the temporary removal of the medallion of vehicle or the temporary suspension of a driver’s identification card until the violation is corrected. Vehicles under the effect of this penalty may not be placed in service until they have passed re-inspection or the driver has provide proof that the violation has been corrected. All re-inspections or re-instatements may be subject to applicable administrative fees.

Penalties may be adjusted up to including revocation of permit at the sole discretion of the RTA based on severity and frequency of violations .