

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

**August 23, 2011
2:00PM-3:45PM**

**Conference Room
TAMC, 55-B Plaza Circle
Salinas, 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 July 19, 2011, TAC meeting. (pg. 1)
4. Old Business
 - 4-1 Continue discussion on “long-distance deadhead” and weekend special fare proposals and provide comment to the Board. (pg. 7)
 - 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. (pg. 9)
5. New Business
 - 5-1 Consider Administrative Penalty Fines and provide comment to the Board. (pg. 15)
6. Correspondence
 - 6-1
7. Adjournment

MONTEREY REGIONAL TAXI AUTHORITY
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING
July 19, 2011
2:00 p.m.

Monterey Peninsula Airport
200 Fred Kane Dr. suite 200, Monterey, CA 93940

TAC Members:

Alma Almanza	Disability
Chris Sommers	Hospitality/Resort
Christine Erickson	Education
John Narigi	Hospitality/Lodging (arrived at 2:10 p.m.)
Kathi Krystal	Taxi/Driver (arrived at 2:15 p.m.)
Ken Griggs (alt)	Airport
Mike Cardinalli (alt)	Taxi/Company Owner (arrived at 2:09 p.m.)
Phil Penko	Law Enforcement
Roy G. Graham	Taxi/Independent (arrived at 2:17 p.m.)
Tom Hicks	Public Transit
Tom Mancini	Seniors

Absent: Eddie Estrada Hospitality/Restaurant

RTA Staff:

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

Public:	Alex Lorca	De Lay & Laredo
	Lance Atencio	MVT
	Greg Akins	Coastal Yellow Cab
	Ann Pagan	City of Monterey

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

None.

3. CONSENT AGENDA

Dr. Erickson motioned to approve the minutes of June 23, 2011 and was seconded by Mr. Mancini. The motion carried unanimously.

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

4. NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Narigi arrived at 2:10 p.m.

4-1 Review Proposed Taxi Fines and provide comment.

Mr. Harvath requested Committee input on the proposed fine schedule on pg. 7. He stated that the intent of the fine amount was to discourage taxi companies, drivers, and vehicle owners from operating within the RTA jurisdictions without a permit. Committee input will be sent to the RTA on July 25, 2011.

Mr. Mancini stated that taxis from outside the jurisdiction are imported to work the large events on the Monterey Peninsula. Mr. Harvath suggested that RTA staff and law enforcement should be notified and present at major events to cite those operating without permits.

Mr. Sommers stated that fine amounts should be higher than permit fees to effectively discourage non-compliance. Mr. Narigi concurred and suggested that the fines be set at double the associated permit fees. He also suggested that "for each incident" be added to the language.

Ms. Krystal arrived at 2:15 p.m.

Mr. Cardinalli asked how long it will take for a vehicle to be permitted once inspected. Chair Penko stated that so far it has depended on availability of an inspector. Mr. Harvath stated that ideally the permit should be issued immediately upon a vehicle passing its inspection. He also stated that if a vehicle was permitted on a Friday and cited during an event over the weekend, the citation could be overturned by the RTA upon proof of passing inspection. Chair Penko reminded the Committee that the Monterey Police Department is open 24 hours per day, and ideally a permit could be issued at any time upon providing proof of vehicle inspection.

Mr. Graham arrived at 2:17 p.m.

Mr. Griggs suggested that the fines be set at an amount that does not exceed misdemeanor limits.

Ms. Krystal stated that she is upset by a letter she received on July 13, 2011 stating that she must obtain an RTA permit. She stated that it was promised that those holding permits would be "grandfathered" in and allowed to operate throughout the RTA jurisdictions until December 31, 2011. She asked why someone operating without an RTA permit could be fined without being convicted by a court of law.

Mr. Harvath stated that this information might have been erroneously communicated to her by the City of Carmel and offered to help her sort through the matter. He confirmed that

grandfathered permits are good through December 2011. Mr. Penko explained that the fines were regulatory in nature and those in violation were not subject to criminal proceedings.

Public Comment-none.

Mr. Narigi made a motion to recommend that the fines for operating without a permit within the RTA jurisdiction be set at twice the amount of relative fees for taxi drivers, companies, and vehicles, with the language “per incident” added to each fine amount. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hicks. The motion carried unanimously.

5. OLD BUSINESS

5-1 Review proposed fuel surcharge and other possible special fares and provide comment.

Mr. Harvath presented the proposed surcharges and special fares for comment by the Committee.

Ms. Almanza asked if disabled passengers will be charged extra for their caregivers if there is an extra person surcharge.

Mr. Cardinalli stated that he would rather see meter rates go up if fuel costs rise substantially than impose surcharges and fees.

The Committee agreed that the primary concern is when a taxi is called to pick up out-of-area and drops off a couple of miles away. The cost to drive to the out-of-area location often does not cover their costs. Since the “area” will officially be the RTA jurisdiction, a mileage fee might be a better way to handle this issue.

After discussion, Chair Penko asked staff to draft language and suggest a surcharge for dealing with the out-of-area issue. He also asked staff to look into dealing with special event issues.

Public Comment-none.

Mr. Mancini made a motion that staff develop language for dealing with out-of-service issue, removing any language regarding charges for extra people, and for dealing with special events. Mr. Narigi amended the motion to include only the out-of-area service issue. Mr. Mancini accepted the amendment and was seconded by Ms. Almanza. The motion carried unanimously.

5-2 Discuss the amount of insurance to be required under the RTA and provide comment to the RTA Board of Directors.

Mr. Harvath presented a handout of Orange County insurance requirements as an additional reference. He asked for input from the Committee to accept the \$1 million dollar minimum liability requirements.

Chair Penko asked Legal Counsel for an opinion. Mr. Lorca stated that RTA Counsel David Laredo recommended keeping the \$1 million minimum.

Ms. Krystal stated that insurance premiums go down substantially when more than four (4) vehicles are covered. She believes the proposed minimum protects companies and drivers. Mr. Graham concurred, and stated that independent owner/operators will realize higher rates than larger companies.

Public Comment- none.

Ms. Almanza made a motion to approve staff's recommendation of requiring \$1 million in minimum liability coverage and was seconded by Ms. Krystal. The motion carried unanimously.

5-3 Receive update on proposed regional senior voucher program.

Mr. Harvath explained the details of the proposed Senior Voucher Program. Two zones are suggested: the first zone includes the municipalities of Del Rey Oaks, Monterey, Pacific Grove, Sand City, and Seaside; the other zone includes the City limits of the City of Salinas. Qualified Seniors/disabled persons would provide the taxi driver with the voucher and pay \$3.00 to the taxi driver upon boarding. Vouchers could then be redeemed by the driver/company for \$12 each. He stated that the zones were created to ensure that the driver received a total of equal to or more than the maximum possible fare.

Ms. Krystal stated that traveling from one end of Pacific Grove to the far end of Seaside does in fact result in a fare higher than \$15.00. Mr. Cardinalli agreed and stated that many seniors use the SCRIP to travel outside the area. He also asked if the seniors will also have to pay the \$3 Airport Fee.

Mr. Harvath stated that the intent of the Senior Voucher Program was to keep it simple and cover the real cost of fares. He stated that staff will rework the boundaries/zones and voucher value, and will create language to limit the SCRIP use to avoid abuse.

Public Comment

Ann Pagan with the City of Monterey believes the program should be simple and cover the real cost of fares. She stated that the program she supports should be used only for local service and should be affordable to cities, seniors, and taxi companies. She asked that a recommendation be sent to the RTA so the program is not delayed.

Close Public Comment

Mr. Narigi suggested that the language specifically include exclusions of usage.

Chair Penko asked if the Senior Voucher Program could be a pilot program and revisited three (3) to six (6) months after initiated. Mr. Harvath stated that it could be done. He will work

with staff to simplify the language, include exclusions of use, and rework the boundaries/zones and voucher value to ensure that maximum possible fares are reimbursed.

6. CORRESPONDENCE

6-1 Letter from Dave Laredo, Legal Counsel, regarding allergies to service animals.

Mr. Laredo's analysis stated that if a taxi driver has an allergy to a service animal that rises to the level of a disability, that driver may not be forced to provide transportation to a person using a service animal. He recommends such drivers obtain a doctor's note verifying their disability and that another driver be dispatched or another company recommended.

Ms. Krystal stated that she did not believe it was legal to require a person with a disability to provide a doctor's note.

Mr. Penko stated that the language was only a recommendation to protect the driver. It is not mandatory. Mr. Lorca agreed.

There being no further comments, Chair Penko adjourned the meeting at 3:31 p.m.

Prepared by: 
Deanna Smith, Deputy Secretary

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

RECOMMENDATION:

Review “long-distance deadhead” fares and weekend surcharges 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 as well as during weekends. 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 “long-distance deadhead” trips. Staff will continue to do research regarding this matter and report to the TAC the results. With regard to a separate fare structure for weekends, it appears that modern taximeters can accommodate more than one fare structure. In

that regard, the Board has requested that the TAC consider the pros and cons of a higher fare structure for weekends when demand for taxi services can be higher.

SUBMITTED BY:



Hunter Harvath

To: Board of Directors
From: Hunter Harvath, Assistant General Manager – Finance & Administration
Subject: Equipment, Safety, and Operational Policy

RECOMMENDATION:

Review second 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, 2011 TAC meeting, staff has prepared a revised version of the draft policy and presented it here (Attachment 1) for discussion. Since that meeting, staff has received additional input from legal counsel regarding guidance for language about drivers with allergies to service animals utilized under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).

Because consensus was not reached at the TAC regarding vehicle paint schemes, staff would also like to give the TAC an opportunity to provide any additional input on this item before it is referred for consideration by the RTA Board. And, recent events regarding alleged denials of service to several hotels would indicate the need for additional language in Section 5, Operating Procedures of the ESSOP, to insure demands for taxi service are met in a fair and equitable manner by taxi dispatching company owners in the RTA jurisdiction.

Based on any additional input and comments from the TAC, staff would make further revisions to the proposed ESSOP policy and bring a final draft to the RTA Board for consideration at its August 29, 2011, meeting.

SUBMITTED BY: 
Hunter Harvath

Attachment 1: Draft Equipment, Safety, Security and Operational Policy - as edited by staff 8/16/11

Attachment 1

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 one or more side or review mirrors are missing or defective; and
 - l. 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 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. .
 - p. 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.
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 address of the driver; the name of the owner of the vehicle; and a photograph of the driver.

- b. The rates of fare charged for for-hire vehicles shall be clearly displayed in the passenger compartment
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, 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 disputes to fare shall be determined by a peace officer 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.
 - e. Taxicab company owners and owner/operators shall promptly obey all lawful orders or instructions of any peace officer, fire fighter, or RTA staff member.
 - f. 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.
 - g. 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 shall refrain from wearing overpowering fragrances that could impair passengers with chemical sensitivity to ingredients in perfumes and colognes.
 - h.
 - i. For-hire vehicles shall be operated in a manner that complies with the California Vehicle Code 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. 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. 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. 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. 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.
- n. Taxicab drivers may not refuse or discourage a prospective or actual fare based upon shortness of trip within the jurisdictions of the RTA.
- o. 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. Taxicab drivers may not, having parked and left a taxicab; solicit patronage among pedestrians on the sidewalk, or at other locations of public gathering.
- q. 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 (ESOP) 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 August 29, 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

Proposed Administrative Penalti 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	Either one or more side/review mirrors missing/defective	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*
3p	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	Refuse to comply with lawful order	10-Day Permit Suspension	Permit Revocation
5f	More passengers than manufacturer rating	Field Report Warning	3-Day Permit Suspension
5g	Improper hygiene, cleanliness, odor	Field Report Warning	3-Day Permit Suspension
5h	Traffic violation of CA Vehicle Code (i.e., parking in red zone)	Field Report Warning	3-Day Permit Suspension
5i	Taking indirect route to increase fare on meter	5-Day Permit Suspension	Permit Revocation
5k	Discourage passenger	3-day Permit Suspension	5-Day Permits Suspension
5k	Refusal to transport legally protected classes	5-Day Permit Suspension	Permit Revocation
5l	Noncompliance with Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)	Field report Warning	Permit Revocation
5n	Refuse or discourage passenger due to shortness of trip	Field Report Warning	3-Day Permit Suspension
5o	Deny service to place of public accommodations	Warning Letter from RTA staff	10-Day Permit Suspension
5p	Driver soliciting passengers	Field Report Warning	3-Day Permit Suspension
5q	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 passenger	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 .