

REFERENCES

1. EG&G Dynatrend and Crain & Associates, Inc., *Evaluating Transit Operations for Individuals with Disabilities*, Transit Cooperative Research Program, Transportation Research Board, Washington, D.C. (1995).
2. EG&G Dynatrend et al., "Implementation of the Complementary Paratransit Provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1994 (ADA), First Year Experience," Volpe National Transportation Systems Center, Cambridge, Massachusetts (Feb. 1993).
3. Norrbom, C. E. and Stahl, A. "Service Routes in Boras," Mobility and Transport for Elderly and Disabled Persons, 5th International Conference Proceedings, Gordon and Breach Science Publishers, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania (1991) pp. 721-730.
4. "Community Bus Experience in Metropolitan Toronto," Toronto Transit Commission, Service Planning Department (Feb. 1992).
5. "Introducing S.C.A.T. in the Park, Breaking Down the Barriers," Alberta Transportation and Utilities (Nov. 1992).
6. Regiec, A., "Accessible Community Bus Service," City of Winnipeg Transit System, City of Winnipeg, Canada (May 13, 1993).
7. "Small Buses and Service Routes," Madison County Transit, Granite City, Illinois (Apr. 1992) pp. 1-9.
8. McLary, J. J., Stahl, A. and Persich, S., "Implementation of Service Routes in the United States," *Transportation Research Record 1378*, Transportation Research Board, Washington, D.C. (Apr. 1993).
9. Starks, J. K., "Overview of the Transportation Demand of Mentally Retarded Persons," *Transportation Research Record 1098*, Transportation Research Board, Washington, D.C. (Jun. 11, 1993).
10. Thatcher, R. H. and Gaffney, J. K., *ADA Paratransit Handbook*, Federal Transit Administration, Washington, D.C. (Sep. 1991) pp. 6-8 and Appendix G.
11. 49 CFR Part 37, "Transportation for Individuals with Disabilities; Final Rule," *Federal Register* (Sep. 6, 1991).
12. "You Can Get There From Here," Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority, Boston, Massachusetts, undated service brochure.
13. Falcocchio, J.L. and Cantilli, E. J., *Transportation and the Disadvantaged*, D.C. Heath and Company, Lexington, Massachusetts (1974).
14. Multisystems, Inc., *General Community Paratransit Services in Urban Areas*, U.S. Department of Transportation, Washington, D.C. (Jan. 1982).
15. Harman, L. J. and Roblin, R. [Eds.], *Student Workbook, Rural and Small Urban Transit Manager's Workshop*, U.S. Department of Transportation, Washington, D.C. (Mar. 1981).
16. "Paratransit: State-of-the-Art Overview," U.S. Department of Transportation, Washington, D.C. (Mar. 1981).
17. 49 CFR Part 37, "Transportation for Individuals with Disabilities; Final Rule," *Federal Register* (Sep. 6, 1991) Appendix D, p. 45733.
18. "System Changes Fixed Routes to Variation of Demand-Response," *Metro Magazine*, (Jul./Aug. 1993).
19. "Feeder Service to Mass Transit Proposal," New York City Department of Transportation, internal memorandum (Jan. 10, 1991).
20. "ADA Complementary Paratransit Plan," Chelan-Douglas Public Transportation Benefit Area, Wenatchee, Washington (1992).
21. Fielding, G. J., and Shilling, D. R., "Dial-A-Ride: Opportunity for Managerial Control," *TRB Special Report 147*, National Research Council, Washington, D.C. (1974).
22. "ADA Complementary Paratransit Plan," Cape Cod Regional Transit Authority (Jan. 1993).
23. MANOP Services Ltd., "Paratransit in Canada—A Review," final report prepared for the Transportation Development Centre, Transport Canada, TP6015E (rev. May 1986).
24. Tidewater Regional Transit District, "Direct Transfer Paratransit Service," (Sep. 1992).
25. Wilson, N., "Automation in Dispatching Demand-Responsive Vehicles," *TRB Special Report 147*, National Research Council, Washington, D.C. (1974).
26. "Request-A-Stop Brings Newark Riders Closer to Destinations," *Passenger Transport*, APTA, Washington, D.C. (Dec. 14, 1992) p. 5.
27. Schneider, W. and Brechbuel, A., "Defining the Low-Floor Bus: Its Advantages and Disadvantages," Public Transport '91, Study of Buses, Report No. 5, International Union of Public Transport, 49th International Congress.
28. Giuliani, C. I., Francis, G. A. and King, R. D., "Status of Low-Floor Transit Bus Development," Battelle, Federal Transit Administration, Office of Technical Assistance and Safety, *Report No. FTA-OH-0060-92-1* (May 1992).
29. "Low Floor is Quickly Becoming the Only Way to Go," Canadian Urban Transit Association Forum (Oct. 1993).
30. von Rohr, J., "Low-Floor Light Rail Vehicle Development in Europe," *Transportation Research Record 1361*, Transportation Research Board, Washington, D.C. (1992).
31. "Portland's Tri-Met to Buy Low-Floor Light Rail Cars," *Passenger Transport*, APTA, Washington, D.C. (Jun. 7, 1993).
32. "Boston Moves on Purchase of 100 Low-Floor Streetcars," *Passenger Transport*, APTA, Washington, D.C. (Mar. 21, 1994).
33. "Chicago Focuses ADA Plan on Accessible Transportation Options," *Passenger Transport*, APTA, Washington, D.C. (Oct. 19, 1992).
34. Twaddle, J., "Calgary to Expand Accessibility with Low-Floor Buses," *Passenger Transport*, APTA, Washington, D.C. (Jun. 7, 1993).

35. Levine, J. C. and Tornig, G., "Dwell Time Effects of the Low Floor Bus Design," paper for presentation at the 1994 Annual Meeting of the Transportation Research Board.
36. ABT Associates of Canada, Ottawa Accessible Taxi Demonstration Project, Transportation Technology and Energy Branch, Ministry of Transportation of Ontario, Downsview, Ontario, Canada (Jun. 1992).
37. European Conference of Ministers of Transport, "Access to Taxis," Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, Paris, France (Jun. 1992).
38. Smith, T., "Lessons Learned from Canadian R & D and Demonstrations," Transportation Development Centre (1992).
39. Cerenio Management Group, "Description of Ramped Taxi Demonstration Project," (Jan. 1993).
40. "Evaluation of the Accessible Taxi Demonstration Program," Santa Cruz Transportation, Inc. (Oct. 5, 1988).
41. Coburn, N., Martin, C., Thompson, R., and Norstrom D., *Guidelines for Improvements to Transit Accessibility for People with Disabilities*, Federal Transit Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation, DOT-T-93-04 (Sep. 1992).
42. Schweiger, C., Kihl M., and Label, L., *Advanced Public Transportation Systems: The State of the Art, Update '94*, Volpe National Transportation Systems Center, Cambridge, Massachusetts (Jan. 1994).
43. Geehan, T., "Evaluation of HandyLine: Vancouver's Automated Paratransit Information System," prepared by TransVision Consultants for BC Transit and the Transportation Development Centre, TP 11656E (Mar. 1993).
44. Geehan, T., "User Acceptance of Advanced Traveller Information Systems for Elderly & Disabled Travellers in Canada." (No date).
45. "Montreal Metro Inaugurates Visual Communication Network," *Passenger Transport*, APTA, Washington, D.C. (Jun. 21, 1993) p. 8.
46. Hunter-Zaworski, K., "Audio-Visual Communication Systems to Improve Transit Accessibility," Transportation Research Institute of Oregon State University, Federal Transit Administration (Jan. 1, 1994).
47. Bettger, G. and Pearson, T., "Accommodating Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing Persons on Public Transportation Systems in Massachusetts," *Transportation Research Record 1209*, Transportation Research Board, Washington, D.C. (1989).
48. Chown, B. and Geehan, T., "The Canadian Approach to Transportation for Persons with Disabilities." (No date).
49. Velche, D., "Access to Signage Information and Use of Transportation Systems by Mentally Disabled People," *Mobility and Transport for Elderly and Disabled Persons*, Proceedings of the 6th International Conference, French National Institute for Transport and Safety Research (1992).
50. Hunter-Zaworski, K. and Hron, M., "Improving Bus Accessibility Systems for Persons with Sensory and Cognitive Impairments, Final Report," Transportation Research Institute of Oregon State University, Federal Transit Administration, *FTA-OR-11-0007-93-1* (Aug. 1993).
51. Block, W. and Hoyt, R., "Modifications Menu for System-Wide Map and Timetable Design," Kennedy Center, Inc., Bridgeport, Connecticut (Feb. 1992).
52. Simpson, C., "An Overview of Travel Training Models," Appendix G of *ADA Paratransit Handbook*, Federal Transit Administration (Sep. 1991).
53. Simpson, C., "Mobility Training, Disability Awareness and Sensitivity Training," paper for the 13th National Conference on Accessible Transportation and Mobility, Tampa, Florida (Oct. 1992).
54. Cerenio, V. and Soper, C., "Travel Training Avenue to Public Transit," *Transportation Research Record 1378*, Transportation Research Board, Washington, D.C. (Apr. 1993).
55. "San Andreas Regional Center Facilitated Transit," *PTI Journal* (Mar./Apr. 1993).
56. "Facilitated Transportation Pilot Program," undated staff paper from Santa Clara County Transportation Agency.
57. Bloch, W., "The Natural Helping Network—An Innovation in Travel Training," Project ACTION Update, Spring 1992.
58. Neubauer, J., "The Bus Buddy Program of the Handicapped Action Committee of Victoria, British Columbia, Canada," *Mobility and Transport for Elderly and Disabled Persons* (conference proceedings), Gordon and Breach (May 1989).
59. Project ACTION, "Demonstration Project Profile, Training for Transit Users with Disabilities," abstracts of projects in Salt Lake City, Bridgeport, Euclid (Ohio), Reno, and San Antonio, National Easter Seal Society, Washington, D.C. (No date).
60. "Parents Hesitant about Travel-Train Premise Programs," *TD Safety Report* (Jul. 28, 1993).
61. Project ACTION, *Combined Research Results*, National Easter Seal Society, Washington, D.C. (No date).
62. Chown, B., "The Canadian Approach to Transportation for Persons with Disabilities," *BC Transit*, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada (1993).
63. "ADA Complementary Paratransit Plan," Niagara Frontier Transit Authority, Buffalo, New York (1992).
64. "Tulsa Transit to Make All Routes Accessible This Month," *Passenger Transport*, APTA, Washington, D.C. (Oct. 19, 1992).
65. "Free Regular Houston Bus Service Is Available to MetroLift Riders," *Passenger Transport*, APTA, Washington, D.C. (Jan. 10, 1994).
66. Roberts, G. D. and Wong, J. D. E., "Assessment of the Potential Application of 'Smart Cards' in the Passenger Travel Industry," (Jan. 1988).
67. Gorham, P., "The Lift Lets Everyone Ride," Project ACTION Update, Project ACTION, National Easter Seal Society, Washington, D.C. (Spring 1992) p. 5.
68. Blymyer, R. W., "Successful Marketing Begins with Operations," California Transit Association, Sacramento, California (Aug. 1993) p. 49.
69. Simon, R., "A Lift to Freedom—A Model for Change," Project ACTION Update, Project ACTION, National Easter Seal Society, Washington, D.C. (Fall 1991) pp. 7-8.

70. "Cleveland Coalition for Disabled Riders Markets Lift-Equipped Buses and Trains Drivers," Project ACTION Update, Project ACTION, National Easter Seal Society, Washington, D.C. (Fall 1990) p. 4.
 71. Kihl, M., "Marketing Rural Transit Among Senior Populations," *Transportation Research Record 1338*, Transportation Research Board, Washington, D.C. (1992) pp. 60-64.
 72. Goldman, H. J., "Increasing Mobility-Impaired Ridership on Mainline Service," *Passenger Transport*, APTA, Washington, D.C. (Apr. 22, 1991) p. 5.
 73. "New York Intros Braille Maps," *Passenger Transport*, APTA, Washington, D.C. (May 24, 1993) p. 9.
 74. "ADA Helps Open Doors to Cincinnati's Metro Buses," *Passenger Transport*, APTA, Washington, D.C. (Nov. 2, 1992) p. 7.
 75. "E&D Newsletter," Greater Bridgeport Transit District (Apr. 1993).
 76. Appendix A, Section 10.2, 49 CFR Part 37, *Federal Register* (Sep. 6, 1991).
 77. CGA Consulting Services et. al., "Bus Stop Accessibility: A Guide for Virginia Transit Systems for Complying with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990," Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transit (Jul. 1, 1992).
 78. Section 35.150, 28 CFR Part 35, *Federal Register* (Jul. 26, 1991).
 79. Section 37.167(g), 49 CFR Part 37, *Federal Register* (Sep. 6, 1991) p. 45640.
 80. Community Council, Inc., "Bus Hailing System for Passengers with Vision Disabilities, A Survey of 16 Peer Cities," Regional Transportation Authority of Phoenix, Phoenix, Arizona (Apr. 1, 1992).
 81. "Chatham Offers Signaling Kit to Assist Riders with Disabilities," *Passenger Transport*, APTA, Washington, D.C. (Jul. 5, 1993).
-

ADDITIONAL SOURCES OF INFORMATION

The following additional sources of information, not cited above, were used to develop this report.

SERVICE ROUTES/COMMUNITY BUS

Hoey, W. F., "Dial-A-Ride in the Context of Demand-Responsive Transportation: A Critical Appraisal," *Transportation Research Record 608*, Transportation Research Board, Washington, D.C. (1976) pp. 11-15.

ON-CALL ACCESSIBLE FIXED ROUTE BUS SERVICE

"Office of Transportation Access (OTA) Report," Minutes of the Access Advisory Committee to the Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA), Boston, Massachusetts (Sep. 23, 1993).

Jon Roth, Southeastern Pennsylvania Transportation Authority, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

FEEDER SERVICE

"Direct Transfer Paratransit Service," Tidewater Transit District, Norfolk, Virginia (Sep. 1992).

Jeff Becker, Tidewater Transit District, Norfolk, Virginia.

John Nelson, Prince George's County Department of Public Works and Transportation, Maryland.

"RVTD Valley Feeder Service," Rogue Valley Transportation District, Medford, Oregon, undated.

Doug Pilant, Rogue Valley Transportation District, Medford, Oregon.

Transport Canada, *Dial-a-Bus Manual*, Volume II (Mar. 1974).

ADA Complementary Paratransit Plan, Greater Cleveland Regional Transit Authority (Jan. 22, 1992).

Central Transportation Planning Staff, "Special Needs Transportation Evaluation: Analysis of the User Survey," Metropolitan Area Planning Council, Boston, Massachusetts (Jan. 1986).

"OC Transpo Strives to Meet the Needs of all Riders," *Passenger Transport*, APTA, Washington, D.C. (Nov. 18, 1991).

MANOP Services, Ltd., "Paratransit in Canada—A Review," Transportation Development Centre (May 1986).

Michael Davis, Manager of Victoria Planning, BC Transit, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada.

New Jersey Transit, "Vehicle to Vehicle Transfer Program," Project ACTION profile.

Henry Nicholson, Monmouth County Director of Transportation, Freehold, New Jersey.

Sheila Barberini, City of Phoenix Transportation Department, Phoenix, Arizona.

GENERAL PUBLIC DIAL-A-RIDE

"Previous Experience with Demand-Responsive Bus Service," Appendix B, Dial-A-Bus Project Report, Massachusetts Institute of Technology Urban Systems Laboratory, Cambridge, Massachusetts (May 1970).

Transport Canada, *Dial-a-Bus Manual*, Volume II (Mar. 1974).

"Demand-Responsive Transportation," *TRB Special Report 147*, National Research Council, Washington, D.C. (1974).

Multisystems, Inc., "Paratransit: Options for the Future — An Overview," U.S. Department of Transportation (Dec. 1982).

LOW-FLOOR BUSES

BC Transit and Coplan, *Transportation Needs of the Elderly and Disabled in the Victoria Region 1986-2001* (Sep. 1990).

BC Transit, "Accessibility — The Low Floor Bus Concept", undated.

Beck, W. T., "Low Floor Buses in Kitchener: Operations Perspective," paper presented at the Canadian Urban Transit Association Fall Conference, Laval, Quebec (Nov. 1992).

TransVision Consultants, "Accessible Transit Buses: Development & Implementation in Canada," technical memorandum prepared for Transportation Development Centre, Transport Canada (Jan. 1994).

Shanley, J., "Orion II Bus Demonstration, Final Report," Central New York Regional Transportation Authority, *Urban Mass Transportation Administration Report No. UMTA-NY-03-0182-89-1* (Feb. 1989).

Goodwin, B., "Low Floors and Improved Layouts: Trends in European Bus Design," *Urban Transport International*, Landor Publishing Limited, London (Jan. 1991).

"Low Floor Buses Enter Service in Ann Arbor," *Passenger Transport*, APTA, Washington, D.C. (Mar. 1, 1993).

ACCESSIBLE TAXIS

MANOP Services, Ltd., "Paratransit in Canada—A Review," Transportation Development Centre (rev. May 1986).

Rick Boxer, Nevada Taxi Board, Nevada, (702) 486-6532.

AUTOMATED INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION SYSTEMS

Besette, R. and Carter, D., *Directory of User Information Systems in Public Transit*, Direction des Communications, Ministère des Transports du Québec, Montréal, Québec (1992).

Deaton, J. and Parasuraman, R., "Sensory and Cognitive Vigilance: Effects of Age on Performance and Subjective Workload," *Human Performance*, Volume 6, Number 1 (1993) pp. 71-97.

Martin, M., Williges B., and Williges R., "Improving the Design of Telephone-Based Information Systems," in Proceedings of the Human Factors Society 34th Annual Meeting, Santa Monica, California (1990) pp. 198-202.

Moreyne, M., "Integrated Communication, Information and Security Systems (ICISS) for Visually and Hearing Impaired Persons," prepared by Télécité for the Transportation Development Centre, TP 11265E, Montreal, Quebec (Jan. 1992).

Richesin, C., Grace, G., Lantkow, M., and Gillies, T., "Access Needs of Blind and Visually Impaired Travellers in Transportation Terminals: A Study and Design Guidelines," a report by the Canadian National Institute for the Blind for the Transportation Development Centre, Montreal, Quebec (Dec. 1987).

Rutenberg, U., "Communicaid II: Development of a Prototype Information System for Sensory and Speech-Impaired Persons in Transportation Terminals," prepared by Rutenberg Design Inc. for the Transportation Development Centre, TP 11307E, Montreal, Quebec (Mar. 1992).

Rutenberg, U. and Heron, R., "Development of Information and Communication Devices for Sensory Impaired Travellers," Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Mobility and Transport for Elderly and Disabled Persons, Lyon, France (Jun. 1992) pp. 538-542.

Suen, L. and Geehan, T., "Transportation Technologies for Improving Independence in Canada," *Transportation Research Record 1378*, Transportation Research Board, Washington, D.C. (Apr. 1993).

TRAVEL TRAINING AND FACILITATED TRAVEL

"Shifting Gears Saves Money, Augments Service," *Community Transportation Reporter* (Jul. 1993).

Towner, C., "Training the Transportation Handicapped to Use Public Transit," Third International Conference on Mobility and Transport of Elderly and Handicapped Persons, Conference Proceedings, *USDOT Report # DOT-I-85-07* (Oct. 1984).

FARE INCENTIVE PROGRAMS

Mario Garcia, Metro-Dade County Transit, Miami, Florida.

FARE SIMPLIFICATION MECHANISMS

Suen, L. and Geehan, T., "Transportation Technologies for Improving Independence in Canada," *Transportation Research Record 1378*, Transportation Research Board, Washington, D.C. (Apr. 1993).

"Hands-Free Fare Payment—Even Smarter," *Community Transportation Reporter* (Jul. 1992).

Korach, R., "Southern California Pulls out all Stops to Serve Disabled Community," *Passenger Transport*, APTA, Washington, D.C. (Jul. 8, 1985).

Ognibene, P., "Role of Automated Identification and Fare Collection in Paratransit," *Passenger Transport*, APTA, Washington, D.C. (Jul. 13, 1992).

Schweiger, C. L., Kihl, M., and Labell, L. N., "Advanced Public Transportation Systems: The State of the Art, Update '94," *FTA-MA-Z6-0007-94-1* (Jan. 1994).

MARKETING PROGRAMS

"Local Demonstration Program, Phase I 1991-1992," Project Profiles, Project ACTION, National Easter Seal Society, Washington, D.C. (1992).

"Outreach and Marketing: Increasing Ridership on Fixed-Route Transportation," Project ACTION Update, Project ACTION, National Easter Seal Society, Washington, D.C. (Winter 1993) p. 2.

Pederson, C., "Parkrose Targeted Marketing Campaign Pass Incentive Program," *Transportation Research Record 1209*, Transportation Research Board, Washington, D.C. (1989) pp. 65-72.

BUS IDENTIFIER SYSTEMS

EG&G Dynatrend and Katherine McGuinness and Associates, Inc., ADA Resource Packet, prepared for the Washington State Department of Transportation (Mar. 6, 1992).

DESTINATION CARD PROGRAMS

EG&G Dynatrend and Katherine McGuinness and Associates, Inc., ADA Resource Packet, prepared for the Washington State Department of Transportation (Mar. 6, 1992).

Description of Service Options/Enhancements

"On-call" Accessible Fixed Route Bus Service: Also known as "Call-A-Lift-Bus", this service allows persons with disabilities to call in advance and request that an accessible **fixed route** bus be used on a route that they plan to use at a time when they will be traveling.

Feeder Service: Uses one mode of transportation to support and "feed" into another type of service. Typically, paratransit service is used to transport individuals with disabilities to the nearest fixed route that they are able to use and/or to take them from a fixed route stop/station to their destination.

Employee Training: Training in disability awareness, customer relations and "sensitivity", passenger assistance techniques, and other skills that enable employees to more appropriately assist and serve persons with disabilities.

Service Routes/Community Bus Service: Service routes, also known as community bus service, are fixed routes designed to reduce the distances that elderly persons and persons with disabilities must travel to get to and from bus stops. Typically, smaller vehicles are used, neighborhood streets rather than main arterials are served, and drivers provide more assistance than in conventional fixed route programs. While routes are designed to better meet the needs of persons with disabilities and elderly persons, they are open to the public. They can be operated as conventional fixed routes, as feeders to arterial routes, or can include a "route deviation" option.

Route Deviation: In route deviation systems, vehicles operate along a fixed route and follow a fixed schedule. Vehicles can deviate from the set schedule, however, if a request is made by a rider. After deviating from the route, vehicles return to the same point to continue their run.

Point Deviation: In point deviation systems, specific stops (pickup and drop-off "points") are established. Vehicles arrive at these designated points on a set schedule. There is no set route between these points, however, and vehicles operate in a door-to-door or curb-to-curb mode as required to meet passenger needs.

Marketing Programs: Programs targeted specifically to persons with disabilities to encourage or facilitate use of the fixed route system or to improve understanding of the appropriate use of paratransit versus fixed route service. Can include service brochures, "How to" guides, community access guides, or "micro-marketing" efforts that focus on particular user groups and utilize non-traditional media to better reach the target population.

Travel Training: Also known as Mobility Training, this alternative provides potential riders with the skills and information needed to use the fixed route service independently. Instruction can focus on use of the lift or other access features, route planning, landmark identification, street crossing safety, emergency procedures, stranger safety awareness, appropriate behavior, or any combination of these. Training can be specific to a particular route or trip or can be designed to develop more general system use skills. Training can be provided by "peers" (individuals with disabilities or elderly persons who know and use the system) or by human service agency or transit agency staff or contractors.

Facilitated Transportation: Facilitated transportation programs provide attendant(s) on vehicles or at transfer points to assist individuals in using the fixed route service. Typically, these programs assist individuals who are more developmentally disabled and cannot independently use the system even with travel training.

Fare Incentive Programs: These programs offer reduced fares on an ongoing basis or as special promotions to encourage individuals to use fixed route rather than paratransit service.

Accessible Taxis: Typically, ramp-equipped minivans or other accessible vehicles are operated as general public taxicabs. Accessible vehicles are not segregated from the rest of the fleet but serve persons with and without disabilities. Standard meter rates or zonal rates are used for all riders.

Low-Floor Fixed Route Buses: Ramp-equipped vehicles, typically with a finished floor height of fifteen inches (375 millimeters) or less used in conventional fixed route operation, route deviation service, or on service routes.

General Public Demand Responsive Service: Door-to-door or curb-to-curb service provided to the general public as well as to persons with disabilities.

Bus Identifier Kits: Highly visible cards that can be held by persons with disabilities to let drivers know that they are waiting for a bus and to identify the bus/route number that they need.

Destination Card Systems: Cards that are typically used by persons with hearing impairments or persons with developmental disabilities. The cards identify the desired destination, stop number, and connecting route numbers for a particular trip and are handed to drivers or other transit personnel so that appropriate assistance can be provided.

Audio/Visual Displays and Systems: On-board or wayside systems that provide audio and/or visual information to riders. Can include video monitors, LED displays, audio pathways, signage targeted to particular needs, "talking buses", "talking bus stops", or other systems.

Simplified Fare Collection: Includes vouchers, IDs, passes, and other fare collection programs targeted specifically to persons with disabilities who may have difficulty with the standard fare collection system.

Accessible Bus Stop Programs: Proactive programs which identify specific bus stops used by persons with disabilities and add needed accessibility features to enable individuals to more easily use the stops and the fixed route service.

APPENDIX B

SELECTED TRANSIT PROVIDERS PRESENTLY USING SERVICE OPTIONS/ENHANCEMENTS

This appendix contains detailed information about transit providers that reported that they are presently using various service options and enhancements. The information was obtained from a survey of transit providers in Canada and the United States using the survey instrument shown in Appendix A. For certain options, additional information was obtained through follow-up telephone calls to providers who responded to the survey.

Tables B-1 through B-9 provide detailed information for the options that were the focus of follow-up calls.

Tables B-10 through B-15 summarize survey information about option/enhancements that were not the subject of follow-up calls. They provide a listing of transit agencies that reported using each option/enhancement. The tables are presented herein in the format provided by the research agency

Table B-1. Selected Transit Providers Presently Using Service Routes

Agency Name	City/State/Province	Total Population	Service Area (mi. ²)	Fixed Route Flows/Service	% FR Fleet Accessible	Paratransit Trips/Year	Service Effectiveness	Date Service Began/Discontin.	Peak/Off-Peak	% Regular PT Trips Served	Sett. Routes General Info
AJAX Transit	Ajax, Ontario	80000	N/A	27	0	27000	5	Sept. 1992	All lines	15% decrease	M-F 4:00-11:00; 82-86 passengers per day; supplements fixed route decreased paratransit trips by 15%; 100 passes/day; no deviation; can flag bus anywhere on route
Broward County Transit	Ft. Lauderdale, Florida	1200000	4.0	200	50	N/A	4	1991	N/A	N/A	small buses operated by 7 utilities in the county; local routes operate when schedule allows; local into regional routes
Central Transit	Corvallis, Oregon	48000	N/A	29	0	8000	4	Feb. 1991	N/A	0	several routes; shopping centers, central courts; 5-9 trips/week in general from local paratransit; 2-3; no deviation in PT trips observed
Lakeland Area Metro Transit District	Lakeland, Florida	110000	60	22	62	62000	3	April, 1991	N/A	N/A	specific service on Saturdays only; all sites require front seats; open to general public; "Road Carpet Service"
Mazon Park Transit	Greene City, Illinois	227000	390	78	83	81000	5	June, 1989	All lines	5000/trip	replaced as well as replacement prior fixed routes, coordinated w/ fixed training; paratransit decreased from 12000/trip to 7000/trip (42% decrease)
Madison Metro Transit System	Madison, Wisconsin	240000	100	170	25	150000	4	April, 1992	All lines	N/A	no deviation; systems in progress w/ travel banking; less than 10 paratransit trips per day allowed to service route
OC Transpo	Ottawa, Ontario	600000	225	321	1	700000	2	May, 1992	All lines	N/A	new route presently will be expanding; 1994, expansion will include route development; also de-level training; 20% of service route trips are registered for paratransit

Table B-1. Selected Transit Providers Presently Using Service Routes (Continued)

Agency Name	City/State/Province	Total Population	Service Area (mi. ²)	Fixed Route Fleet Size	% FR Fleet Accessible	Paratransit Trips/Year	Serv. Route Effectiveness	Date Serv. Routes Begun	Peak Off-Peak	# Former PT Trips Served	Serv. Routes General Info
Pecos Trails Transit	Remwell, New Mexico	45,000	29	9	100	12,000	5	1991	All times	10/100	4 service routes; very low and narrow; 300 riders/day who respond; would be on paratransit; also do travel; 10% of riders are persons with disabilities
Regional Transit Board	Minneapolis/St. Paul, Minnesota	2,035,000	1,100	900	9	150,000	N/A	1983	All times	N/A	2 circulation (one is new route, one replaced); 4 traditional fixed routes; sustained by shopping centers, city centers and senior housing; all buses; 1,500 trips/day; 5 10 wheelchair users per day
Richmond Hill Transit	Richmond Hill, Ontario	80,000	N/A	21	0	11,000	3	March, 1995	N/A	N/A	supplements fixed route, low-cost bus used; open to general public; costs are \$1.50 up paratransit, \$3.00 per route meter; 60% of paratransit trips switched but paratransit filled w/ higher demand

"Serv. Route Effectiveness" = effectiveness rating provided in survey
 "Date Serv. Routes Implem." = date the program was implemented
 "# Former PT Trips Served" = paratransit trips diverted to service routes
 "Peak/Off-Peak" = hours the service is provided (e.g., at all times, off-peak only, etc.)
 NA = not available

Table B-2. Selected Transit Providers Presently Using On-Call Accessible Fixed Route Bus Service

Agency Name	City/State/Province	Total Population	Service Area (sq. mi.)	Fixed Route Fleet Size	% FR Fleet Accessible	Paratransit Trips/Year	On-Call Effectiveness	Date On-Call Implemented	% FR Access when Implem.	Use-Call Requests Month	On-Call General Info
Ann Arbor Transportation Authority	Ann Arbor, Michigan	180000	71	37	NA	371000	7	1985	33	N/A	Trips requested day before are guaranteed, same day about 3 possible, used program to identify and designate fully accessible routes.
DeWald County Transit	DeWald, Florida Beach	1200000	410	200	50	N/A	3	Sept., 1993	30	N/A	call day ahead
Central Oklahoma Transportation & Parking Authority	Oklahoma City, Oklahoma	960000	500	89	10	34546	5	1992	10	4	24 hour notice required, usually used for express service
City Utilities of Springfield	Springfield, Missouri	90000	N/A	29	50	38000	4	April, 1997	50	30	call day before; 3-4 regular orders; use of fully accessible buses to route
Greenville Area System of Transit	Greenville, North Carolina	87000	47	34	50	N/A	6	1993	30	12	next day notice required
Greater Anchorage Transit Regional Authority	Anchorage, Massachusetts	310000	30	13	100	230000	3	March, 1991	30	7	now call need at least 7 days 100% accessible; used to require 1 day advance notice
Grays Harbor Transportation Authority	Huquma, Washington	65400	2000	28	28	89000	2	1993	28	8	24 hour notice requested with attempts to accommodate if less
Hennepin Area Regional Transit District	Dunbury, Connecticut	64000	N/A	21	50	66000	4	1989	67	15	
Jefferson Transit	Fort Teawassal, Washington	21000	2000	14	71	12000	4	1991	71	7	call's only requires hour in bus leaving no garage

Table B-2. Selected Transit Providers Presently Using On-Call Accessible Fixed Route Bus Service (Continued)

Agency Name	City/State/Province	Total Population	Service Area (mi. ²)	Fixed Route Fleet Size	% FR Fleet Accessible	Paratransit Trips/Year	On-Call Effectiveness	Date On-Call Implemented	% FR Access when Available	On-Call Requests/Month	On-Call General Info
Lowell Regional Transit Authority	Lowell, Massachusetts	200,000	67	33	80	90,000	3	1992	80	30	2 hour notice required
Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority	Boston, Massachusetts	2,179,000	891	3,171	50	400,000	NA	1986	30	500	calls required by 1 p.m. on day before; program operated out of K garage; calls received at central 407th office; word requested bus and next bus en route.
Merrimack Valley Regional Transit Authority	Everett, Massachusetts	281,000	325	43	91	130,000	NA	1987	91	NA	primarily to allow people to ensure that bus en route will be accessible; almost 100% accessible; can occasionally be an inaccessible bus in service.
Mid-Mon Valley Transit Authority	Charlton, Pennsylvania	68,000	NA	19	75	11	4	1983	20	10	24 hour advance notice required
Municipal Transit Administration	Easton, Iowa	29,000	NA	9	61	4000	5	1992	22	8	24 hr notice requested; call with 1 1/2 hour notice
Illinois Transit Authority	Urbana, Iowa	25,000	50	7	65	4200	2	1987	16	NA	600-700 call requests per month; use program to also have phone call to be sure lift is in state and working so buses are under (1987/1988)
Red Rut Transit Authority	Lancaster, Pennsylvania	250,000	NA	41	NA	28000	5	1990	7	23	24 hour notice required
Rogue Valley Transportation District	Medford, Oregon	111,000	138	26	74	48000	4	Oct. 1991	47	190	4 hours advance notice required

Table B-2. Selected Transit Providers Presently Using On-Call Accessible Fixed Route Bus Service (Continued)

Agency Name	City/State/Province	Total Population	Service Area (mi. ²)	Fixed Route Fleet Size	% FR Fleet Accessible	Transit Riders Trips/Year	On-Call Effectiveness	Date On-Call Implemented	% FR Access when Temporarily Temporarily	On-Call Requests/Month	On-Call General Info.
Seaboard Transit Authority	Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	4200000	1164	1400	15	NA	NA	NA	35	2100	"Suburban On-Call" used only in suburban areas; requests within 1-7 days in advance and bus requested as well as next bus on route. Use permit only on backup. Use program to identify routes for 100% accessibility
Transit Authority of North Kentucky	Ft. Wright, Kentucky	208000	14	91	50	13000	5	March, 1992	13	100	require 1 day advance notice; in beginning had to sometimes turn down requests (only 1-2% of buses accessible); Average \$ 5 each per day
Westminster Transit	Cincinnati, Pennsylvania	175000	NA	22	54	180	4	NA	NA	NA	use a time to call, validation. side call in advance in case side call on route is working (result of past problems with time); usually 30 min. prior.

"On-Call Effectiveness" = effectiveness rating provided in survey "Date On-Call Implemented" = date the program was implemented

"% FR Access when Implemented" = % of the fixed route fleet that was accessible when the program was started

"On-Call Requests/Month" = number of calls received per month for accessible vehicles

NA = not available

Table B-3. Selected Transit Providers Presently Operating Route Deviation Services

Agency Name	City, State/Province	Total Population	Service Area (mi. ²)	Fixed Route Fleet Size	% FR Fleet Accessible	Paratransit Trips/Year	Route Dev. Effectiveness	Date Route Dev. Begun	Deviate for Gen. Public?	# of Dev. Requests/Mo.	Route Dev. General Info.
BC Transit	Vancouver, British Columbia	1600000	1121	950	29	800000	NA	1993	NA	NA	1 hour headways, used in suburban community; very limited use; use 23 buses
CART Inc.	Idaho Falls, Idaho	69900	20000	NA	NA	710000	5	1986	Yes	6481	4 unconnected trip miles will deviate up to 3 blocks, coordinated with paratransit; 1 hour headways (36 min. w/ 22 minute layover to accommodate deviations)
City of Astoria Transit	Astoria, Oregon	9983	5.7	1	100	0	5	Feb. 1991	No	190	curricular route, will deviate up to 3/4 of a mile; only for individuals with disabilities; 5 trips per day; allowed by deviation
City/Linä Abilene	Abilene, Texas	108000	NA	11	100	25200	5	1991	Yes	252	deviate to specific area; deviate only if possible; calls accepted anyone before bus pickup; no terminal or paratransit will dispatch vans if no possible; 1 hour headways

Table B-3. Selected Transit Providers Presently Operating Route Deviation Services (Continued)

Agency Name	City/State/Province	Total Population	Service Area (Incl.?)	Placed Route This Year	% FR Fleet Accessible	Paratransit Trips/Year	Route Dev. Effectiveness	First Route Dev. Implem.	Deviate for Com. Public?	# of Dev. Requests/Mo.	Route Des. General Info.
Fairfax County Transit Authority	Fairfax, VA	43000	N/A	21	11	1300	3	1999	No	25	for ADA eligible persons: 24 hour notice, 1/4 hr. of less; deviate up to 1/4 mile, 30 min. holdways; deviations done for entire system (routes from 3-20 miles in length); ensure w/ paratransit (90% of fixed route thought)
Greater Allegheny-Trenton Regional Transit Authority	Allegheny, Massachusetts	100000	All	11	100	220000	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	wanted deviations into regular schedule as agency clients were travel trained for specific, not general deviation program
Greyhound Transportation Authority	Boston, Washington	65400	2000	58	24	60000	N/A	1974	N/A	100	newer over top miles of fixed route; provide five lines daily
Hartford Area Regional Transit District	Hartford, Connecticut	14000	N/A	21	50	66000	4	1983	Yes	N/A	predicated locations for deviations, schedule notes "on request only", 1-2 hrs. notice required, deviations in some locations only as remain lines, pulse system w/ 5 min layover
Indiana County Transit Authority	Indiana, Pennsylvania	90000	830	9	100	N/A	4	1982	Yes	220	deviate in rural areas only; deviate for general public; 50 mph max; 1 hour headways

Table B-3. Selected Transit Providers Presently Operating Route Deviation Services (Continued)

Agency Name	City/State/Province	Total Population	Service Area (mi. ²)	Fixed Route Fleet Size	% FR Fleet Accessible	Passenger Trips/Year	Route Dev. Effectiveness	Date Route Dev. Implm.	Deviate for Gen. Public?	# of Dev. Requests/Mo.	Route Dev. General Info.
Jefferson Transit	Port Townsend, Washington	21000	1400	34	31	12000	2	June, 1991	Yes	1	deviate over 200 miles of routes (1/3 of total system); only 2 requests in first 6 months
Lakeview Area Mass Transit District	Lakeview, Florida	110000	60	21	0.62	62000	3	April, 1998	Yes	N/A	Route deviation done in conjunction w/ Saturday service route program "Red Carpet Service" - dry up in 2 blocks, general public can request
Lane Transit District	Eugene, Oregon	140000	76	37	100	75000	N/A	1973	N/A	10	only privileged deviate; not on-call, started in 1976, 30 vehicles while deviate cars are allowed January on daily basis, try to accommodate groups if family near route
Madison County Transit	Greene City, Illinois	22000	100	18	81	85000	4	Sept., 1991	Yes	10	total community, 2 hr headway, deviate at scale of route; ask for day ahead notice, but will try same day; plan for pre-emptive deviate on other routes if possible

Table B-3. Selected Transit Providers Presently Operating Route Deviation Services (Continued)

Agency Name	City Name/Province	Total Population	Service Area (mi ²)	Fleet Size	% FR Fleet Accessible	Paratransit Trips/Year	Route Dev. Effectiveness	Date Route Dev. Implimented	Deviate for Com. Public?	# of Dev. Requests/Mo.	Route Dev. General Info
Marquette County Transit Authority	Marquette, Michigan	70000	1364	71	100	N/A	4	1985	Yes	NA	deviate in rural area in AM/PM only, vehicle operates as demand response i.e. AM and picks up passengers to take them to urban areas, makes designated stops in urban areas, returns same way
Marquette Valley Regional Transit Authority	Tracyton, Ohio	600000	413	156	100	12,000	1	April, 1993	NA	NA	deviate on two routes during designated hours, on 4 miles of routes, requires 24 hours notice, no sign-up over one to date
Municipal Transit Administration	Clinton, Iowa	25000	N/A	9	67	4300	3	NA	Yes	100	have always done, 1/2 hr busways; will deviate a few blocks, will deviate on all routes
Quincy Transit Authority	Quincy, Iowa	23000	30	7	86	4200	4	1984	No	NA	40 min. busways, deviate on all 4 local routes. Generally operate during mid-peak, typically deviate 2-3 blocks

Table B-3. Selected Transit Providers Presently Operating Route Deviation Services (Continued)

Agency Name	City/State/Province	Total Population	Service Area (mi. ²)	Fixed Route Fleet Size	% FR Fleet Accessible	Paratransit Trips/Year	Route Dev. Effectiveness	Date Route Dev. Implem.	Deviate for Gen. Public?	# of Dev. Requests/Mo.	Route Dev. General Info.
Piedmont, Va. & Criviana, Inc., also Buchanan Express	Kingwood, West Virginia	30000	654	7	100	12000	4	1991	Yes	NA	Deviation over entire FR system; will deviate 1/4 mile; can call ahead to arrange; for general public; not used frequently (no. 60)
Hopland Transit System	Rapid City, South Dakota	60000	35	5	100	60000	4	1992	Yes	90	will deviate to certain locations; prompted by problems in winter at certain areas; maximum 20 minutes; 1 vehicle
Richmond Hill Transit	Richmond Hill, Ontario	65000	NA	21	0	11000	NA	NA	NA	NA	Done in conjunction with service matrix; minimize pre-scheduled deviations (language for groups or depart. info. disks, each request evaluated; if min possible, will consider when routes changed; contractual w/ guarantee)
The T	Fort Worth, Texas	500000	286	150	35	681000	NA	1989	No	300	Done in conjunction with service matrix; minimize pre-scheduled deviations (language for groups or depart. info. disks, each request evaluated; if min possible, will consider when routes changed; contractual w/ guarantee)
York County Transportation Authority	York, Pennsylvania	100000	NA	22	93	401000	4	1990	Yes	1700	local routes only; city routes offer adequate coverage; can call one hour in advance; allow waiting under 15 mins; 1st service not guaranteed; 2nd service guaranteed

"Route Dev. Effectiveness" = effectiveness rating provided in survey
 "Date Route Dev. Implem." = date when the service was implemented
 "Deviate for Gen Public?" = indicates if deviation requests are accepted from the general public
 "# of Dev. Requests/Mo." = number of requests for deviations per month
 NA = not available

Table B-4. Selected Transit Providers Presently Operating Point Deviation Services

Agency Name	City/State/Province	Total Population	Service Area (sq. ft)	Fixed Route Fleet Size	% of Fleet Accessible	Paid/Annual Trip/Year	Point Dev. Effectiveness	Date Point Dev. System Implemented	# of Points in System	General Public Served?	Point Dev. General Info.
Alachua County Transportation System	Alachua, Fla.	99,021	723	3	100	5,000	NA	July, 1990	20	Yes	1 hr. headways; fare prices without which they deviate; if beyond will use paratransit. 2% costs charge to deviate
Greater Mass Transit Authority	Aquino, Guam	133,153	214	23	311	40,000	4	March, 1993	NA	NA	one hr. headways; does not arise a substantial number of persons with disabilities
Transit Management of Hamilton, Inc. (MTA The Bus Co.)	Stamilton, Ohio	NA	NA	10	NA	5,000	NA	1995	NA	NA	several stop folded into 6 stops. via "routes" serviced by vehicles which arrive at designated checkpoints in each sector. "pulse" system with general location, required adjustment of 4000 route systems, have seen increase in ridership

"Point Dev. Effectiveness" = effectiveness rating provided in survey

"# of Points in System" = the number of checkpoints designated in the system

"Date Point Dev. Implem." = date the program was implemented

"General Public Served" = indicates if all riders can request pick-up/drop-off at places other than checkpoints

NA = not available

Table B-5. Selected Transit Providers Presently Providing Feeder Service

Agency Name	City/State/Province	Total Population	Service Area (mi. ²)	Fixed Route/Transit Stop Accessible	Percentage of Fixed Route/Transit Stop Accessible	Paratransit Trips/Year	Feeder Effectiveness	Date Feeder Implem.	Transfer Required?	# of Transfers/Month	Feeder General Info.
Broward County Transit	Pompano Beach, Florida	120,000	410	200	50	NA	2	1991	NA	NA	service trips or local commuters feed into regional routes
Fairmont-Marion County Transit Authority	Fairmont, West Virginia	40,000	NA	21	14	1,500	1	NA	No	5	thinking of expanding transfers; feeder service done in conjunction with route deviation
Greater Attleboro-Taunton Regional Transit Authority	Attleboro, Massachusetts	100,000	80	12	100	220,000	NA	April, 1992	NA	50	use paratransit to take individuals who work at local workplace from downtown-based routes to workplaces, coordinated with transit financing program
Island Transit	Coequille, Washington	40,000	NA	4	100/100	20,000	5	March, 1992	Yes	1000	Started feeder at same time started paratransit trips no fixed route can be 40 mi. long; currently do double feeders, half of all paratransit trips feed into fixed route
Lane Transit District	Eugene, Oregon	300,000	75	37	100	30,000	4	1991	Depends on situation	100	focus on connectivity; ADA paratransit eligible riders for inbound trips; find return trips to help to re-estimate both required & volunteer based on situation
Laysan Rural Bus System	Susanville, California	12,000	6	6	100	6,050	5	1992	No	90	use on rural route coming thru Susanville, buses also will derive from route of more requests than feeder; ridership has been increasing
L.A. CTA	Los Angeles, California	4,400,000	3,14	9250	93	500,000	NA	1994	NA	NA	Primarily general feeder trips from San Bernardino to downtown
MTA of Black Hawk County	Waterloo/Cedar Falls, Iowa	105,000	NA	14	28	12,500	NA	July, 1993	Yes	300	for trips between urban, fixed route period of trip typically 10-15 miles; newly riders with developmental disabilities going to churches, work-stops

Table B-5. Selected Transit Providers Presently Providing Feeder Service (Continued)

Agency Name	City/State/Province	Total Population	Service Area (mi.²)	Fixed Fleet Size	% of Fleet Accessible	Population Trips/Year	Feeder Effectiveness	Date Feeder Implem.	Transfer Required?	# of Transfers/Month	Feeder General Info.
Madison County Transit	Groves City, Illinois	227000	590	78	88	85000	5	1990	Yes	200	Hub & spoke line transfer system, phasing out in fixed route as well as service route to fixed route feeders employed. feed quality, non-hubs, will feed along route, but difficult.
Pioneer Valley Transit Authority	Springfield, Massachusetts	531000	115	178	14	275000	N/A	1991	Yes	10	large service area (2 counties), feed into lines made for trips from outlying areas, need better data and scheduling system for scheduling in order to expand use of feeder
Regional Public Transportation Authority	Phoenix, Arizona	2100000	400	160	60	900000	N/A	1985	No	1500	non feeder trips over 2 zones (> 5 miles); feeder at both ends used rarely
King's Valley Transportation District	Madison, Oregon	111000	138	26	74	40000	3	1993	No	675	eliminated inefficient fixed route buses in rural areas; offer direct paratransit service for \$1.50 w/ feeder for \$1.25; contract w/ taxi for feeder; 60% savings in rural areas
Linnwater Transportation District, Connecticut	Meriden, Virginia	95000	1000	135	50	160000	4	1979	No	100	started as feeder for general public, dual role service, now expanding to ADA paratransit service; several transfer points local system with one transfer point in each zone; transfer centers serve fixed route as well as demand responsive vehicles.
Transit Authority of North Kentucky	St. Wright, Kentucky	200000	84	97	90	32000	5	1992	Yes	100	2 people regularly every day, trips usually 5 miles on paratransit and 10-15 miles on fixed route

"Feeder Effectiveness" = effectiveness rating provided in survey

"Date Feeder Implem." = date the program was implemented

"Transfer Required?" = indicates if riders are required to use the feeder service

"# of Transfers/Mo." = the number of trips on the feeder service per month

NA = not available

Table B-6. Selected Transit Providers Presently Using Low-Floor Buses

Agency Name	City/State/Province	Total Population	Service Area (sq. mi.)	Fixed Route Fleet Size	% FR Fleet Accountable	Estimated Trips/Year	Low-Floor Bus Electrified	Date Low Floor Equipped	# of LF Buses % of Fleet	Low-Floor Bus General Information
AJAX Transit	Ajax, Ontario	60000	NA	27	11	27000	NA	Sept., 1991	2 buses	Low floor equipped bus program 1 City Government; permits waiting for 18, 3 way, and have 1 LF for Paratransit (12 Amb., 3 way)
Allegheny Metro Transit	Allentown, Pennsylvania	53000	NA	21	37	10200	3	June, 1992	3/10%	Orion II's, plus use in FR deviation service in Spring of 1994
Ann Arbor Transportation Authority	Ann Arbor, Michigan	140000	71	37	92	337000	3	1985	18-22%	10 New Flyers, 16 Orions (of which 8 are used in fixed route); customer reaction very positive. AATA sees numerous additional benefits
BC Transit	Vancouver, British Columbia	302200	250	163	15	144000	5	1992	25-15%	200 trips by wheelchair users monthly, most started from paratransit. New Flyer buses
Calgary Transit	Calgary, Alberta	NA	NA	590	NA	NA	NA	1993	500%	40-foot New Flyer buses
Chippiquit Urban Mass Transit Council	Chippiquit, Ontario, Ontario	115,000	NA	79	NA	NA	NA	1993	100%	40-foot New Flyers. Use at request prices
Coast Transit Authority	Gulfport, Mississippi	250000	NA	40	74	NA	4	1989	4/11%	Orion II's in 29 operation; need to major buses, had to make substantial changes to buses to make work on FR but public reaction has been very positive
Edmonton Transit	Edmonton, Alberta	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	4/NA	
Jefferson Transit	Fort Tomerand, Washington	21000	3000	14	71	12000	3	1987	2/14%	Orion II's; "passengers love them, drivers hate them"
Kitchener Transit	Kitchener, Ontario	250000	NA	108	NA	NA	NA	1992	14/11%	Primarily 40-foot New Flyer buses

Table B-6. Selected Transit Providers Presently Using Low-Floor Buses (Continued)

Agency Name	City/State/Province	Total Population	Service Area (sq. mi.)	Fixed Route Fleet Size	% Fr. Fleet Accessible	Transmit Trips/Year	Low-Floor Bus Effectiveness	Date Low Floor Equipped	# of LF Buses/% of Fleet	Low-Floor Bus General Info
Metropolitan North Dearborn County	Waterloo/Cedar Falls, Iowa	10-000	N/A	14	23	72000	NA	Oct., 1992	3/21%	4 Orion II ramp-equipped low-floor buses
Moultrie County Transit	Lincoln, Illinois	227000	390	78	81	89400	5	1989	20/26%	Orion III, great from customer perspective and for operators; high maintenance cost and capital cost
Municipal Transit Administration	Chatham, Iowa	29000	N/A	9	67	4900	NA	1993	2/22%	Orion II's in fixed route service
Richmond Hill Transit	Richmond Hill, Ontario	20300	N/A	21	0	11000	NA	1989	2/10%	170 service buses and para-transit, Orion II's
St. Albert Transit	St. Albert, Alberta	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Sonoma County Transit	Santa Rosa, California	N/A	N/A	31	N/A	N/A	NA	N/A	N/A	Orion II's in fixed route service
Winipeg Transit System	Winipeg, Manitoba	540000	N/A	281	7	310000	NA	Feb., 1995	9/2%	EIF buses, 20 passenger; 6 in fixed route, 5 in para-transit; rough ride, small ramp, also buying Super Flyers

"Date Low-Fr. Implem" = date the program was implemented

NA = not available

"Low-Floor Bus Effectiveness" = effectiveness rating provided in the survey

"# of LF Buses/% of Fleet" = the number of low-floor buses in the fleet and the percentage of the fleet that is low-floor

Table B-7. Selected Transit Providers Presently Using Accessible Taxis

Agency Name	City/State/Province	Total Population	Service Area (sq. mi.)	Fixed Route Fleet Size	% FR Fleet Accessible	Paratransit Trips/Year	Access Tax Effectiveness	Date Access Tax Implem.	# of Accessible Taxis	Integrated w/ Jit Public?	Access Tax General Info
AJAX Transit	Ajax, Ontario	60000	NA	3 ¹	41	37000	NA	April, 1992	3	NA	no paratransit; purchase service four and Saturday; purchase service four daily
City of Brea	Brea, California	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	3	Yes	Operated by Brea Yellow Cab. Used for both City-subsidized service and general public
BC Transit	Vancouver, British Columbia	1600000	1123	980	29	600000	NA	June, 1991	NA	NA	fraternal subsidy service, 30% local sale subsidy, immediate response, also offers alternate reservation 5 min. in advance w/ 92% subsidy; latest on about 10,000 trips per year
Capital Area Transit	Wright, North Carolina	250000	88	76	200	18000	NA	1989	1	Yes	1 accessible taxi; actual no. 2 companies; 7000; agency uses user-ride subsidy program to provide paratransit service; currently 5-10 wheelchair users per day
Greater Attleboro-Taunton Regional Transit Authority	Attleboro, Massachusetts	100000	80	13	300	23000	3	Sept. 1992	2	Yes	no subsidy provided for operator; transit bought cars and leases to local bus company; used as general public cabs
Lane Transit District	Eugene, Oregon	110000	76	73	100	7000	NA	1991	3	Yes	not day scheduling; no operating subsidy; 430 trips by wheelchair users in 1991; attractive for contracted services

Table B-7. Selected Transit Providers Presently Using Accessible Taxis (Continued)

Agency Name	City/State/Province	Total Population	Service Area (mi. ²)	Fixed Route Fleet Size	% PR Fleet Accessible	Paratransit Trips/Year	Access Taxi Effectiveness	Date Access Taxi Implem.	# of Accessible Taxis	Integrated w/ Gen Public?	Access Taxi General Info
LACMTA	Los Angeles, California	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	5	NA	Leased to two cab companies used primarily for subsidized contract services.
Metrolink	Fontana, New Jersey	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	4	1990	1	Yes	Local taxi company, purchased 1 accessible taxi; used separate from work done for transit agency.
MTC	San Francisco, California	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	4	Yes	Accessible number leased to one local cab company (individual taxi SCRP program through MURS)
City of Napa	Napa, California	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	3	Yes	Operated by one local cab company. City does provide some subsidy for riders.
Pioneer Valley Transit Authority	Springfield, Massachusetts	55000	115	178	14	27500	NA	1991	3	Yes	have had problems w/ vehicle reliability, accessible minivans bought by transit agency and leased to 3 local companies
Red Knot Transit Authority	LAKESIDE, Pennsylvania	25000	NA	41	NA	3800	3	1977	13	Yes	lease vehicles to taxi companies; substitute ADA paratransit taxis but vehicles used for general public service as well
Richmond Hill Transit	Richmond Hill, Ontario	82000	NA	21	0	11000	3	1989	3	NA	purchase some paratransit trips through local accessible taxi service, subsidy provided, under paratransit program 7 day notice, 640 treatments provided by taxis
Santa Cruz Transportation	Santa Cruz, California	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	3	Yes	Operated by Yellow Cab. Used for both publicly subsidized service and general public.

Table B-7. Selected Transit Providers Presently Using Accessible Taxis (Continued)

Agency Name	City/State/Province	Total Population	Service Area (mi. ²)	Fixed Route Fleet Size	% FR Fleet Accessible	Passenger Trips/Year	Access Taxi Effectiveness	Date Accessible Taxis Implem.	# of Accessible Taxis	Integrated w/ Gen Public?	Access Taxi Details of Info
Saskatoon Transit System	Saskatoon, Saskatchewan	183000	NA	110	0	120000	4	1992	2	NA	Local taxi company brought accessible vehicle on-site, no capitol, or operating subsidy provided; charges standard fare for all trips.
System of Barts, B.A.C.T.S.	Barts, Ontario	66000	271	21	0	26400	5	April, 1992	1	Yes	2 taxi companies, fixed rate negotiated for contract work, supplements payments on Saturdays, evenings, and during peak hours. Companies use for general public; local 10% of transit agency for transit agency.
Winnipeg Transit System	Winnipeg, Manitoba	470000	NA	160	2	710000	5	Nov., 1992	13	Yes	2 local companies brought on-site on a voluntary, transit bus time period. Trips from their "corridor" (DND) including, also open to general public.

"Access Taxi Effectiveness" = effectiveness rating provided in the survey

"Date Access Taxi Implem." = date that accessible taxis were introduced in service

"# of Accessible Taxis" = the number of accessible taxis in use

"Integrated w/ Gen Public?" = indicates if accessible taxis provide general public taxi service

NA = not available

Table B-8. Selected Transit Providers Presently Using Travel Training

Agency Name	City/State/Province	Total Population	Service Area (sq. mi.)	Fleet Size	% of Fleet Accessible	Paratransit Trips/Year	Trans. Trng. Employees	Date Trav. Trng. Begun	Integrated with ETC?	# of People Trained	Travel Training General Info
Aiken Area Council on Aging, Inc.	Aiken, South Carolina	140000	N/A	9	100	N/A	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	Bus stops at local agencies and schools
Augusta Public Transit	Augusta, Georgia	198000	26	30	85	12000	N/A	1992	No	2000	for state-impaired mobility-impaired, elderly, hearing-impaired; provide bus passes in local human service agencies to allow them to do additional training
RCT Transit	Victoria, British Columbia	300000	250	163	15	144000	2.5	1992	Yes	N/A	various populations; little response; advertised via application form and a brochure
Metropolitan Transit	Richmond, Washington	175000	119	54	32	130000	4	1982	No	300	paratransit applicants determined and eligible are referred to transit authority; others referred for referral, 90% success rate in training; mainly developmentally disabled; some sensory impaired
Capital District Transportation Authority	Albany, New York	700000	2261	229	N/A	66000	5	1990	N/A	12-month	training by independent living center; w/ full-time instructor; utilize lists from agencies to offset cost; for visually impaired, developmentally disabled, mobility impaired; hard hat bus buddy program is 1993
Central Ohio Transit Authority	Columbus, Ohio	960000	543	342	31	\$5200	5	1991	N/A	640	in roundabout ACCITION; hold 72 "Mobility Trng." demonstrating accessible vehicles to bus people; monthly bus trips have increased from 200 to 1250
Central Oklahoma Transportation & Parking Authority	Oklahoma City, Oklahoma	900000	900	89	10	24346	3	1992	No	750	program involves local demonstrations at agencies and schools with one-on-one rider training; notably educational though promotional

Table B-8. Selected Transit Providers Presently Using Travel Training (Continued)

Agency Name	City/State/Province	Total Population	Service Area (mi. ²)	Fund House Fleet Size	% FR Fleet Accessible	Passen./Trng./Year	Trav. Trng. Effectiveness	Date Trav. Trng. Begun	Integrated with Elig?	# of People Trained	Travel Training General Info.
City Council of Springfield	Springfield, Missouri	90000	N/A	29	100	10000	4	1992	No	500	do group demonstrations and training as well as train the trainer for local staff. agency staff who can train do one-on-one training. 1 groupings, about 500 people total trained to date
City of Jackson Transportation Authority	Jackson, Mississippi	140000	2500	19	100	N/A	2	June, 1992	No	170	train authority using bus and service agency staff to train riders; have trained 20 staff who have trained 170 clients. train for both fixed route and paratransit primarily seniors
City of Santa Rosa	Santa Rosa, California	300000	1000	99	100	42726	N/A	1991	Yes	4	paratransit training, work with local Training Center and public schools, train person with developmental disabilities and address w/ disabilities for developmentally disabled and mobility impaired populations
City of Waukegan Transit System Utility	Waukegan, Wisconsin	62000	N/A	11	0	2000	5	1983	N/A	100/year	paratransit training, work with local Training Center and public schools, train person with developmental disabilities and address w/ disabilities for developmentally disabled and mobility impaired populations
Coast Transit Authority	Gulfport, Mississippi	250000	N/A	30	73	N/A	N/A	1991	No	100	for developmentally disabled and mobility impaired populations
Cobb Community Transit (CCT)	Maricopa, Georgia	480000	N/A	26	100	0	3	1990	No	N/A	train bus and service agency staff (train the trainer); training is in house to use system; trainers provided on free fare; clients include vision-impaired, developmentally disabled, and mobility-impaired. trained 200 staff to date
DeWitt Co Mass Transit	DeWitt, Louisiana	70000	15	9	100	1500	3	1992	No	10	offered paratransit before travel training. generally have trained persons with mobility impairments

Table B-8. Selected Transit Providers Presently Using Travel Training (Continued)

Agency Name	City/State/Province	Total Population	Service Area (mi ²)	Fixed Route Fleet Size	% FR Fleet Accessible	Perceived Trips/Year	Trans. Trng. Effectiveness	Date Trav. Trng. Implem.	Integrated with Eling?	# of People Trained	Travel Training General Info.
Eric Metropolitan Transit Authority	Eric, Pennsylvania	150,000	74	62	40	192,000	1	1991	Yes	N/A	KITA does presentations on using buses to local groups. Local agencies do on-site training.
Greater Allegheny-Beaver Regional Transit Authority	Allegheny, Massachusetts	100,000	80	13	100	324,000	5	April, 1991	Yes	85	Full time trainer on staff. Trainer works with ADA eligibility coordinator; gets agency referrals as well; various groups (developmentally disabled, seniors).
Island Transit	Couperville, Washington	40,000	N/A	8	100	72,000	5	1989	Yes	30	ask applicants if they "Would like to learn to use fixed route" on applications; various populations trained
Jacksonville Transit System	Jacksonville, Washington	53,000	225	23	100	1400	4	1979	N/A	50/year	started by working with local blind school. Ex: vision impaired. System is now a model for the State of Washington; training done on demand as requested.
Lane Transit District	Eugene, Oregon	180,000	76	17	100	72,000	4	1981	Yes	25/mo.	for vision impaired, mobility impaired, post-stroke work with developmentally disabled; 2 drivers trained as trainers, take bus to person's home.
Logan Transit District	Logan, Utah	20,000	N/A	12	81	5400	4	1992	N/A	N/A	use in-house staff, mainly group training. Senior centers, etc. J: also offer trip planning; will do for anyone (geners. public).
MVA of Iowa (Iowa County)	Waterloo/Codeo Falls, Iowa	104,000	N/A	14	28	73700	5	1991	Yes	10/year	last 7 trained 50 buses to date, mainly developmentally disabled and visually impaired; training by local agencies, transit provides bus passes.

Table B-8. Selected Transit Providers Presently Using Travel Training (Continued)

Agency Name	City/State/Province	Total Population	Serviced Area (mi. ²)	Fixed Route Fleet Size	% FR Fleet Accessible	Paralyzed Trips/Year	Trav. Imp. Effectiveness	Start Year of Program Implem.	Integrated with Elig.?	# of People Trained	Travel Training (General Infr.)
Madison County Transit	Urbana, Ill.	27,000	500	78	81	85,000	5	1990	NA	180	for developmentally disabled and mobility-impaired; in-home as well as by local agencies; local mental health agency trains 100 clients, recently a school for developmentally disabled spouses serving clients out on FR; train about 20 individuals/year
Madison Metro Transit System	Madison, Wisconsin	240,000	100	170	25	150,000	4	1994	NA	N/A	"very positive results"
Marguerite Valley Transit Authority	Marguerite, N.J.	70,000	254	27	100	NA	N/A	1983	No	35/year	travel training is part of intermediate education program for persons with disabilities
Memphis Area Transit Authority	Memphis, Tennessee	710,000	441	161	2	130,000	4	1981	No	100/year	work with 4 local human service agencies, provide ride supports by trainers; mainly trip developmentally disabled and vision impaired
Metropolitan Valley Regional Transit Authority	Haverhill, Massachusetts	281,000	125	45	91	130,000	4	1992	Yes	20/year	have questions in generalist eligibility focus re. access to receiving training, need vision-impaired, developmentally disabled, some mobility impaired riders, visually trained drivers, cost 200/year
Metro-Dade Transit Agency	Miami, Florida	2,000,000	300	550	27	10,100,000	NA	1976	No	2000	various populations, training for bus, all people receive "theoretical" training; very successful

Table B-8. Selected Transit Providers Presently Using Travel Training (Continued)

Agency Name	City/State/Province	Total Population	Service Area (mi. ²)	Fixed Route Fleet Size	% FR Fleet Accessible	Fundable Trips/Year	First Time Effortiveness	Issue Date/Trng. Implem.	Integrated with Eqg?	# of People Trained	Travel Training General Info.
Mount Valley Regional Transit Authority	Dighton, Ohio	60000	458	258	100	12000	5	1991	No	183/year	blind person with disability to do bus on-ride and group training. 12 men/women with 10-15 people a week. Primarily for developmentally disabled, wheelchair, mobility impaired. 2004 schedule boardings/month (44% increase) on fixed route
Norwalk Transit District	Norwalk, Connecticut	98000	21	24	100	15000	5	NA	No	NA	provides free fixed route transportation for trainers and trainers. Training done by local agencies.
Odessa Transit Authority	Odessa, Iowa	25000	36	7	86	4700	4	1992	No	20/year	local agency issues tickets to agencies. also provide free tickets to agencies. 1400-14 population
Spots Trails (now)	Roanoke, New Mexico	45000	19	9	100	12000	4	Nov. 1992	No	100	primarily developmentally disabled
Potomac Transportation District Commission	Hampton/Neop on News, Virginia	200000	116	118	33	56000	4	1992	No	12	a one-time training conducted. both developmentally disabled and mobility impaired.
Peters Valley Transit Authority	Springfield, Massachusetts	55000	215	178	14	27000	5	1992	Yes	25/year	full-time in house trainer. primarily for developmentally disabled. training of vision impaired done by state reimbursement for the blind. open effort at statewide transit authority program
Pied Authority of Allegheny County	Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania	94000	129	817	35	202000	3	1992	No	111	primarily persons with mobility impairments

Table B-8. Selected Transit Providers Presently Using Travel Training (Continued)

Agency Name	City/State/Provider	Total Population	Service Area (sq. mi.)	Fixed Route Fleet Size	% FR Fleet Accessible	Paratransit Trips/Year	Trav. Trng. Effectiveness	Date Trav. Trng. Begun	Integrated w/pt. Prog.?	# of People Trained	Travel Training General Infn.
Regional Transportation District	Denver, Colorado	1,000,000	2406	713	92	0	N/A	1990	No	150	two different programs: (1) eight times per year conduct 2-day class w/ local rehabilitation center; (2) individual training as requested
SPAN, Inc.	Denison, Texas	60000	N/A	4	50	14000	5	1992	Yes	N/A	in busse only; one-on-one training for developmentally disabled, mobility impaired, elderly, also provide free internet to provide inquire persons desired ADA paratransit eligibility are contacted
Sacramento Regional Transit District	Sacramento, California	3100000	500	200	60	200000	4	N/A	Yes	400/year	offered free as part of eligibility, focuses primarily developmentally disabled and elderly; 80% of participants continue to ride fixed route buses
Sarasota County Area Transit (SCAT)	Sarasota, Florida	287000	620	25	30	37300	N/A	1991	No	100	work with local Easter Seal Society as part of project; ACCREDITED group; primarily developmentally disabled population
Suburban Transit System	Sacramento, Suburban	185000	N/A	130	0	120000	4	N/A	N/A	N/A	work w/ National Institute for the Blind; make vehicles available for training
Stovall Falls Transit/Thurman	Stovall Falls, South Dakota	300000	51	27	0	105000	3	1987	N/A	N/A	Transit agency trains tandem bicycle agency staff who then train clients; training focuses on use of system and systems information, not detailed mobility instruction
Societe de Transport de Ville de Laval	Laval, Quebec	120000	245	225	0	184000	4	1991	No	30/year	through local school for developmentally disabled children; travel provides free passes for 1 year to students and care for teachers; training in groups of 20-25

Table B-8. Selected Transit Providers Presently Using Travel Training (Continued)

Agency Name	City/State/Province	Total Population	Service Area (mi ²)	Fixed Route Fleet Size	% FH Fleet Accessible	Paratransit Trips/Year	Travel Training Effectiveness	Date Trav. Training Begun	Integrated with Elig.	# of People Trained	Travel Training General Info.
The T	Fox Worth, Texas	500000	256	150	25	187000	5	1989	Yes	30 years	through local human service agency for vision impaired and independent connectors for vision-impaired, developmentally disabled, and mobility impaired. 25000 trips/year, 100000 combined eligibility and travel training wait. larger irregular riders various populations
TideWater Transportation Division	Norfolk, Virginia	900000	1000	175	50	168000	4	1992	N/A	N/A	
Topeka Metropolitan Transit Authority	Topeka, Kansas	120000	N/A	33	0	26000	5	1991	No	N/A	work w/ local human service agency, provide free passes to trainees who train clients, also make presentations on using fixed route to local agencies. "effective way in program"
Transit Authority of North Kentucky	N. Ky., Kentucky	200000	84	91	50	13000	9	1981	No	N/A	started in earnest in 1981. transit agency provided training 3 years in past year. other training done by local agencies
Vallejo City Coach	Vallejo, California	95000	23	12	100	16000	5	1991	No	N/A	regional mental health center buys monthly fixed route passes and travel training clients
Worcester Regional Transit Authority	Worcester, Massachusetts	200000	700	65	10	935000	4	1988	Yes	20 years	started primarily as developmentally disabled riders. now include elderly and mobility-impaired, including in-home training. will soon have 2nd training for trained riders as well as 1st year

Table B-8. Selected Transit Providers Presently Using Travel Training (Continued)

Agency Name	City/State/Province	Total Population	Service Area (sq. ft)	Hard of Hearing	% of Population with Disabilities	% of Population with Disabilities	Paratransit Trips/Year	Trav. Trng. Effectiveness	Date Trav. Trng. Implem.	Integrated with Elig?	# of People Trained	Travel Training General Info.
Yeni County Transportation Authority	York, Pennsylvania	140000	NA	22	94	94	492000	5	1982	No	400000	1980-1981 training program and provides bus passes; local agencies do training; trainees work with agencies serving developmentally disabled but also coordinate with program for blind, impaired, starting to work with agency serving mobility-impaired.

"Trav. Trng. Effectiveness" = effectiveness rating provided in the survey
 "Date Trav. Trng. Implem." = date the travel training program was implemented
 "Integrated with Elig?" = indicates if the provision of travel training is coordinated with determinations of paratransit eligibility
 "# of People Trained" = a measure of the number of riders trained (time period varies); if not otherwise indicated, the number is a total number since program inception NA = not available

Table B-9. Selected Transit Providers Presently Using Fare Incentives

Agency Name	City/State/Province	Total Population	Service Area (mi. ²)	Fixed Route Fleet Size	% FR Fleet Accessible	Paratransit Trips/Year	Fare Incent. Effectiveness	Basic Fare Incent. Program	Ongoing?	Fare Incent. General Info.
Austin-Capitol Metropolitan Transportation Authority	Austin, Texas	605,000	572	305	N/A	42,000	N/A	1981	Yes	Free fare for persons determined paratransit eligible; very successful; 5,000 wheelchair boardings on fixed route reported in July 1993
BC Transit	Vancouver, British Columbia	1,600,000	1,125	950	29	90,000	3	1990	Yes	initially offered free fare to persons with disabilities; after 1st year switched to 1/2 fare and free paratransit
Chicago Transit Authority (CTA)	Chicago, Illinois	3,700,000	220	2,175	4*	100,000	N/A	1993	Yes	allowing attendants to ride free as incentive for persons with disabilities to ride
City of Jackson Transportation Authority	Jackson, Mississippi	149,000	1500	19	100	N/A	4	N/A	Yes	1/2 fare extended on all routes
Eric Metropolitan Transit Authority	Leiz, Pennsylvania	170,000	39	62	40	39,200	4	1975	Yes	started as part of state lottery program in the 1970s; seniors ride free during off-peak; persons with disabilities pay half fare during off-peak
Grays Harbor Transportation Authority	Hogquim, Washington	65,400	2,000	98	28	6,000	5	N/A	N/A	25 cents for all riders
Greater Bridgeport Transit District	Bridgeport, Connecticut	282,000	90	51	75	56,000	5	May, 1993	N/A	introduced free fare as promotional program in May, 1993; continued through 1993 and 1994; also aggressive marketing effort and travel training; fixed route use by persons with disabilities increased from 300 in May to 5,000 in Sept., 1993

Table B-9. Selected Transit Providers Presently Using Fare Incentives (Continued)

Agency Name	City State/Province	Total Population	Service Area (mi. ²)	Fixed Route Fleet Size	% FR Fleet Accessible	Paratransit Trips/Year	Fare Incen. Effectiveness	Date Fare Incen. Implem.	Ongoing?	Fare Incen. General Info.
Indiana County Transit Authority	Indiana, Pennsylvania	90000	830	9	100	NA	4	1992	Yes	ADA paratransit eligible persons ride free on fixed route at all times; seniors free during off-peak; paratransit fare is twice fixed route
Livermore Amador Valley Transit	Livermore, California	140000	N/A	34	100	NA	5	1992	Yes	1/3 fare on fixed route; ticket booklets even greater discount; also free bus card for elders to travel 10am-2pm, has freed up paratransit capacity
Lowell Regional Transit Authority	Lowell, Massachusetts	200000	67	35	80	90000	5	NA	N/A	have extended half fare to all hours
Lynx Orange-Seminole-Osceola Transportation Authority	Orlando, Florida	1178000	2700	130	14	76000	5	1992	Yes	33% of base fare (\$.25 compared to \$.75 base fare)
Madison Metro Transit System	Madison, Wisconsin	240000	100	170	25	150000	5	1992	Yes	half fare for standard fixed route; 25% of fixed route fare charged for service route; has encouraged ridership on service routes; \$1 fixed routes, \$.50 paratransit, \$.25 service routes
Metro-Dade Transit Agency	Miami, Florida	2000000	300	550	27	1010000	NA	May, 1993	No	free pass for paratransit eligible individuals (pilot); have seen 47 people who make 30-40 trips/month transfer; also "Medical Metro" pass for medicaid eligible riders

Table B-9. Selected Transit Providers Presently Using Fare Incentives (Continued)

Agency Name	City/State/Province	Total Population	Service Area (mi. ²)	Fares Route/Year	% BK Fares Accessible	Paratransit Trips/Year	Fare Incent. Effectiveness	Date Fare Incent. Implem.	Ongoing?	Fare Incent. General Info.
Metropolitan Transit Authority of Harris County	Houston, Texas	3,523,000	1,235	1,100	33	NA	NA	April, 1993	Yes	Free fares on fixed route for ADA paratransit eligible persons
Metropolitan Tulsa Transit Authority	Tulsa, Oklahoma	380,000	175	86	NA	17,400	NA	NA	Yes	Free fare on fixed route for persons with disabilities
Miami Valley Regional Transit Authority	Dayton, Ohio	600,000	458	358	100	121,000	4	1975	Yes	been extended half fare program to all routes
Municipal Transit Administration	Clifton, Iowa	30,000	NA	9	67	4,800	4	July, 1982	NA	give free ride coupons as a service promotion. done for general public as well but target riders with disabilities
Pecos Trails Transit	Russell, New Mexico	45,000	29	9	100	14,000	5	NA	Yes	in addition to half fare, seniors and persons with disabilities can buy 9 ride tickets and get 10th free; 10% of fixed route fares made by persons with disabilities (also affects success of service routes)
People Mover - Municipality of Anchorage	Anchorage, Alaska	240,000	300	60	0	52,000	NA	March, 1992	Yes	base fare is \$3, fare for persons with disabilities is 25 cents, customers must get an ID for \$3, paratransit fare is \$1
Port Authority of Allegheny County	Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania	1,400,000	729	487	33	2012,000	3	July, 1993	NA	paratransit fares free, 1/3 fare all times, not just off peak; also promotion: elderly ride free off-peak; also offer 2 free trips to everyone as aro to program.
Regional Transportation District	Denver, Colorado	3,800,000	2,406	193	92	0	NA	NA	Yes	25 cents off-peak only. very often less than half fare given that base fares range from \$ 50 to \$2.50

Table B-9. Selected Transit Providers Presently Using Fare Incentives (Continued)

Agency Name	City/State/Province	Total Population	Service Area (sq. mi.)	Fixed Route Fleet Size	% of Fleet Accessible	Permitted Trips/Year	Fare Incentive Effectiveness	Date Fare Incentive Implem.	Ongoing?	Fare Incentive General Info.
Rogue Valley Transportation District	Medford, Oregon	111,000	158	16	74	48,000	3	1993	Yes	reduced fixed route fares for all riders from \$1.25 to \$1.00
Sacramento Regional Transit District	Sacramento, California	1,000,000	300	700	60	3,000,000	5	N/A	N/A	is less than half fare, but moving to half fare for financial reasons (agency w/ travel training is allowing agency to consider raising fares)
Fly T	Fort Worth, Texas	300,000		150	25	1,800,000	N/A	N/A	N/A	when riders agree to switch to premium, will trade permanent pass for fixed route pass (1 month of premium buys 5 months of fixed route service)
Utah Transit Authority	Salt Lake City, Utah	1,000,000	1,500	520	60	2,500,000	3	1991	No	as new accessible buses are added, fixed route passes are distributed as a promotion, good for 30 days of travel

"Fare Incentive Effectiveness" = effectiveness rating provided in the survey

"Ongoing?" = indicates if the fare incentive is provided on an ongoing basis or only as a promotion

"Date Fare Incentive Implem." = date the program was implemented

N/A = not available

Table B-10. Selected Transit Providers Presently Using Audio/Visual Systems

Agency Name	City	State/ Province	Contact Person	Phone #	A/V Systems Effectiveness
Ohio Valley Regional Transportation Authority	Wheeling	WV	Mr. Chester J. Sokol	(304)232-2190	5
Richmond Hill Transit	Richmond Hill	Ontario	A. Evans	(416)771-2419	5
Sonoma County Transit (Countywide Service)	Santa Rosa	CA	Ms. Priscilla Kays	(707)585-7516	4
Danville Mass Transit	Danville	IL	Mr. Karl Gnadt	(217)431-0653	2
Metropolitan Transit Systems	San Diego	CA	Mr. Thomas F. Larwin	(619)251-1466	2
North San Diego County Transit District	Oceanside	CA	Ms. Leslie Blanda	(619)967-2828	2
Wichita Metropolitan Transit Authority	Wichita	KS	Mr. Michael D. Vinson	(316)265-1450	2
Municipal Transit Administration	Clifton	IA	Ms. Cheryl Williams	(319)242-3721	1
Rogue Valley Transportation District	Medford	OR	Mr. Doug Plant	(503)779-5821	1
AJAX Transit	Ajax	Ontario	Terry Baruett	(416)427-5710	
Area Transportation Authority of NC PA	Johnsonburg	PA	Mr. Richard A. Vigliante	(814)965-3211	
Athens Transit System	Athens	GA	Mr. Tom Lett	(706)1613-3430	
Augusta Public Transit	Augusta	GA	Ms. Heather Jedia	(706)821-1819	
BC Transit	Vancouver	British Columbia	Mr. Bruce Chown	(604)264-5005	
Bi-State Development Agency	St. Louis	MO	Mr. Donald W. Maag	(314)982-1578	
Blue Water Area Transit	Port Huron	MI	Mr. Jim Wilson	(313)987-7373	
Brockton Area Transit Authority	Brockton	MA	R. Ledoux	(508)588-2240	
Central Oklahoma Transportation & Parking Authority	Oklahoma City	OK	Ms. Jeanette Sheets	(405)291-2056	
Chicago Transit Authority (CTA)	Chicago	IL	Ms. Nancy Isaac	(312)521-1427	

Table B-10. Selected Transit Providers Presently Using Audio/Visual Systems (Continued)

Agency Name	City	State/ Province	Contact Person	Phone #	A/V Systems Effectiveness
Chillicothe Transit System	Chillicothe	OH	NA	(614)773-1569	
City of East Grand Forks	East Grand Forks	MN	Kerry Knuff	(218)773-2371	
City of Regina, Transit Department	Regina	Saskatchewan	Ms. Beverly DeJong	(306)777-7815	
City of Saginaw Transit System	Saginaw	MI	Mr. Sylvester Payne	(517)759-1679	
DTOP/AMA/ACT - Metropolitan Bus Authority	San Juan	PR	Ms. Adaline Torres	(809)767-7979	
Dallas Area Rapid Transit	Dallas	TX	L. G. Fuller	(214)749-2770	
DuBois, Falls Creek, Sandy TWP Joint Transp. Authority	DuBois	PA	Ms. Edith E. Swisher	(814)371-3940	
Five Seasons Transportation	Cedar Rapids	IA	Mr. William Hoekstra	(319)398-5367	
Golden Empire Transit District	Bakersfield	CA	Ms. Jill Smith	(805)324-9874	
Lake Charles Transit System	Lake Charles	LA	Mr. Michael McCauley	(318)491-1240	
Lane Transit District	Eugene	OR	Micki Kaplan	(503) 741-6100	
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transp. Authority	Los Angeles	CA	Mr. Richard DeRook	(213)244-6524	
Metro RTA	Akron	OH	Avon R. Smith	(216)762-7267	
Metro Transit Division, Metropolitan Authority	Halifax-Dartmouth	Nova Scotia	Ms. Len Patterson	(902)421-6609	
Metro Dade Transit Agency	Miami	FL	Mr. Mario G Garcia	(305)637-3756	
Metropolitan Evansville Transit System	Evansville	IN	Ms. Rose M. Zigenfus	(812)426-5230	
Mtd-County Transit Authority	Kittanning	PA	Mr. James McFarland	(412)548-8696	

Table B-10. Selected Transit Providers Presently Using Audio/Visual Systems (Continued)

Agency Name	City	State/ Province	Contact Person	Phone #	A/V Systems Effectiveness
Monterey Salinas Transit	Monterey	CA	Mr. Thomas Hiltner	(408)899-2558	
OMNITRANS	San Bernardino	CA	Mr. Daniel Brogan	(909)889-0811	
S.T.C.U.M.	Montreal	Quebec	Mr. Richard D. Daneau	(514)280-6307	
Transit Authority of River City (TARC)	Louisville	KY	Tina Morris	(502)561-5117	
Venango County Transportation	Franklin	PA	Ms. Denise Pickens	(814)437-6871	
Wilson Transit System	Wilson	NC	NA	(919)399-2488	

Table B-11. Selected Transit Providers Presently Using Fare Simplification Mechanisms

Agency Name	City	State/ Province	Contact Person	Phone #	Simpl. Fare Effectiveness
Albany Transit System	Albany	GA	Mr. Mike Crittenden	(912)430-5182	5
Bay Metro Transit	Bay City	MI	Mr. Michael Stoner	(517)894-2900	5
Corwall Transit	Corwall	Ontario	Mr. Gerry Godard	(613)930-2636	5
Logan Transit District	Logan	UT	Mr. Michael L. Nouchester	(801)750-7100	5
Memphis Area Transit Authority	Memphis	TN	Ms. Lynn Everett	(901)722-7145	5
Metropolitan Transit System	San Diego	CA	Mr. Thomas F. Larwin	(619)231-1466	5
Pecos Trails Transit	Roswell	NM	Mr. Dave McKay	(505)624-6769	5
Ashland Bus System	Ashland	KY	Mr. Michael Rogers	(606)327-2025	4
Danville Mass Transit	Danville	IL	Mr. Karl Goadt	(217)431-0651	4
Eureka Transit Service	Eureka	CA	Ms. Marie Lissom	(707)441-4117	4
Lassen Rural Bus System	Susanville	CA	Mr. John Shouu	(916)257-8311	4
Marquette County Transit Authority	Marquette	MI	Mr. Howard Schweppe	1906)225-1283	4
Municipal Transit Administration	Clinton	IA	Ms. Cheryl Williams	(319)242-3721	4
Norwalk Transit District	Norwalk	CT	Ms. Nancy Carroll	(203)853-3338	4
TALTRAN	Tallahassee	FL	Ms. Donna Peacock	(904)891-5200	4
The Metro	Cincinnati	OH	Mr. Douglas Herke	(513)632-7590	4
Wichita Metropolitan Transit Authority	Wichita	KS	Mr. Michael D. Vinson	(316)265-1450	4
Winnipeg Transit System	Winnipeg	Manitoba	Mr. Jarvis Kohut	(204)986-5726	4
Sonoma County Transit (Countywide Service)	Santa Rosa	CA	Ms. Priscilla Kays	(707)585-7516	3.5
Canton Regional Transit Authority	Canton	OH	Ms. Sharon A. Kasunic	(216)454-6132	3

Table B-11. Selected Transit Providers Presently Using Fare Simplification Mechanisms (Continued)

Agency Name	City	State/ Province	Contact Person	Phone #	Simpl. Fare Effectiveness
City of Jackson Transportation Authority	Jackson	MI	Mr. Garrett Erb	(517)787-8363	3
Corvallis Transit System	Corvallis	OR	Ms. Bernadette D. Barrett	(503)757-6916	3
Janesville Transit System	Janesville	WI	Mr. David J. Mumma	(608)755-3150	3
Miami Valley Regional Transit Authority	Dayton	OH	Mr. Wayne Barnett	NA	3
North San Diego County Transit District	Oceanside	CA	Ms. Leslie Blanda	(619)967-2828	3
Pinellas Suncoast Transit Authority	Clearwater	FL	Mr. Michael J. Siebel	(813)530-9921	3
VOTRAN, Volusia Transit Management, Inc.	South Daytona	FL	Mr. David Hope	(904)761-7600	3
Worcester Regional Transit Authority	Worcester	MA	Mr. Robert E. Ojala	(508)791-2389	3
BC Transit	Victoria	British Columbia	Mr. Ron Drolet	(604)385-2551	2.5
Duluth Transit Authority	Duluth	MN	Mr. Dennis Jensen	(218)722-4426	2
Sioux Falls Transit/Paratransit	Sioux Falls	SD	Mr. John Roberts	(605)339-7130	2

Table B-12. Selected Transit Providers Presently Using Marketing Programs

Agency Name	City	State/ Province	Contact Person	Phone #	Marketing Effectiveness
Central Oklahoma Transportation & Parking Authority	Oklahoma City	OK	Ms. Jeanette Shuets	(405)297-2056	5
City of East Grand Forks	East Grand Forks	MN	Kerry Knoll	(218)773-2371	5
Duluth Transit Authority	Duluth	MN	Mr. Dennis Jensen	(218)722-4426	5
Marquette County Transit Authority	Marquette	MI	Mr. Howard Schroepfe	(906)225-1283	5
Muskegon Area Transit System	Muskegon	MI	P. Varona	(616)724-6420	5
Richmond Hill Transit	Richmond Hill	Ontario	A. Evans	(416)771-2419	5
Santa Rosa County Transit (Countywide Service)	Santa Rosa	CA	Ms. Priscilla Kays	(707)585-7516	4.5
BC Transit	Victoria	British Columbia	Mr. Ron Drolet	(604)385-2551	4
Basin Transit Service	Klamath Falls	OR	Ms. Cynthia Thompson	(503)883-2877	4
City of Astoria Transit	Astoria	OR	Ms. Cindy L. Howe	(503)325-5821	4
Cornwall Transit	Cornwall	Ontario	Mr. Gerry Godard	(613)930-2636	4
Durham Area Transit Authority	Durham	NC	Mr. John Gardner	(919)688-2611	4
GATRA	Attleboro	MA	Mr. Frank Gay	(508)226-1102	4
Madison Metro Transit System	Madison	WI	Mr. Paul J Larousse	(608)267-8777	4
Metropolitan Transit System	San Diego	CA	Mr. Thomas F. Larwin	(619)231-1466	4
North San Diego County Transit District	Oceanside	CA	Ms. Leslie Blanda	(619)967-2828	4
Piedmont Wagon Transit System	Hickory	NC	Mr. John C. Tippett	(704)322-9191	4
Prince George's County Dept. of Public Works & Transp.	Landover	MD	Mr. James E. Roszewski	NA	4
Riverside Transit Agency	Riverside	CA	Cla Seroy	(909)684-0850	4

Table B-12. Selected Transit Providers Presently Using Marketing Programs (Continued)

Agency Name	City	State/ Province	Contact Person	Phone #	Marketing Effectiveness
Stevens Point Transit	Stevens Point	WI	Ms. Joanne Cummings	(715)341-4490	4
Aiken Area Council on Aging, Inc.	Aiken	SC	Ms. Lynnda C. Bassham	NA	3
Altoona Metro Transit	Altoona	PA	Mr. Thomas W. Klevan	(814)944-4074	3
BC Transit	Vancouver	British Columbia	Mr. Bruce Chown	(604)264-5005	3
Bay Metro Transit	Bay City	MI	Mr. Michael Stoner	(517)894-2900	3
Central Ohio Transit Authority	Columbus	OH	Lynn Rathke	(614)275-5800	3
City of Jackson Transportation Authority	Jackson	MI	Mr. Garrett Erb	(517)787-8363	3
CityLink Abilene	Abilene	TX	Ms. Martha Outiveros Castillo	(915)676-6403	3
Community Transit	Lynnwood/ Everett	WA	Ms. Gretchen Weber-Schlobahn	(206)348-7196	3
Fayetteville Area System of Transit	Fayetteville	NC	Ms. Kimberly Sledge	(919)433-1748	3
Housatonic Area Regional Transit District	Danbury	CT	Mr. Lewis May	NA	3
Indiana County Transit Authority	Indiana	PA	Mr. Gerald L. Blair	(412)465-2140	3
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transp Authority	Los Angeles	CA	Mr. Richard DeRock	(213)244-6524	3
Merrimack Valley Regional Transit Authority	Haverhill	MA	Ms. Patricia Monahan	(508)372-2427	3
Norwalk Transit District	Norwalk	CT	Ms. Nancy Caeroll	(203)853-3338	3
OC Transpo	Ottawa	Ontario	Ms. Helen Gault	(613)741-6440	3
Ottawa Transit Authority	Ottawa	IA	Ms. Pam Ward	(515)683-0695	3
Pecos Trails Transit	Roswell	NM	Mr. Dave McKay	(505)624-6769	3
Peninsula Transportation District Commission	Hampton/ Newport News	VA	Ms. Karen Burnette	(804)722-2837	3

Table B-12. Selected Transit Providers Presently Using Marketing Programs (Continued)

Agency Name	City	State/ Province	Contact Person	Phone #	Marketing Effectiveness
Pima County Rural Transit	Tucson	AZ	Mr. Ben Goff	(602)740-6407	3
Piellas Suncoast Transit Authority	Clearwater	FL	Mr. Michael J. Siebel	(813)570-9921	3
Sarasota County Area Transit (SCAT)	Sarasota	FL	Mr. Jay Goodwill	(813)951-5850	3
The Metro	Cincinnati	OH	Mr. Douglas Herkes	(513)672-7590	3
Toronto Transit Commission	Toronto	Ontario	Ms. Katherine Riggart	(416)393-4501	3
VOFRAN, Volusia Transit Management, Inc.	South Daytona	FL	Mr. David Hope	(904)761-7600	3
Worcester Regional Transit Authority	Worcester	MA	Mr. Robert E. Ojala	(508)791-2389	3
Capital District Transportation Authority	Albany	NY	Ms. Cary Roessel	(518)482-4199	2
City of Pullman Transit Service	Pullman	WA	Mr. Jim Hudak	(509)334-4555	2
Danville Mass Transit	Danville	IL	Mr. Karl Gnad	(217)431-0653	2
Guam Mass Transit Authority	Agana	Guam	Mr. Mack N. Ezzell	(671)475-4682	2
James City County Transit	Williamsburg	VA	Mr. Richard Drumwright	(804)220-1621	2
Municipal Transit Administration	Clinton	IA	Ms. Cheryl Williams	(319)242-3721	2
Portage Area Regional Transportation Authority	Akron	OH	Mr. Charles A. Nelson	(216)836-2672	2
Rapid Transit System	Rapid City	SD	Mr. Rich Sageu	(605)394-6631	2
Rockland County Dept. of Public Transportation (T.R.I.P.S.)	Rockland	NY	Mr. William Chase	(914)364-2064	2
Rogue Valley Transportation District	Medford	OR	Mr. Doug Pilant	(503)779-5821	2
San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority	San Luis Obispo	CA	Mr. Alan Cantrell	(805)781-4465	2

Table B-13. Selected Transit Providers with Accessible Bus Stop Programs

Agency Name	City	State/ Province	Contact Person	Phone #	Access. Bus Stop Effect-
Albany Transit System	Albany	GA	Mr. Mike Crittenden	(912)430-5182	5
BC Transit	Vancouver	British Columbia	Mr. Bruce Chown	(604)264-5005	5
Miami Valley Regional Transit Authority	Dayton	OH	Mr. Wayne Karnett	NA	5
BC Transit	Victoria	British Columbia	Mr. Ron Drotet	(604)385-2551	4
Pecos Trails Transit	Roswell	NM	Mr. Dave McKay	(505)624-6769	4
Sarasota County Area Transit (SCAT)	Sarasota	FL	Mr. Jay Goodwill	(813)951-5850	4
Capital District Transportation Authority	Albany	NY	Ms. Cary Roessel	(518)482-4199	3
Central Ohio Transit Authority	Columbus	OH	Lynn Ratlike	(614)275-5800	3
Community Transit	Lynnwood/ Everett	WA	Ms. Gretchen Weber-Schlobohm	(206)348-7196	3
Grays Harbor Transportation Authority	Hoquiam	WA	Mr. Dave Rostedt	(206)532-2770	3
Metropolitan Transit System	San Diego	CA	Mr. Thomas F Larwin	(619)231-1466	3
Municipality of Metropolitan Seattle (Seattle Metro)	Seattle	WA	Ms. Karen Rosenzweig	(206)689-3103	3
Puellas Statecast Transit Authority	Clearwater	FL	Mr. Michael J. Siebel	(813)530-9921	3
Santa Barbara Metropolitan Transit District	Santa Barbara	CA	Mr. John Murdoch	(805)963-9571	3
Santa Cruz Metro	Santa Cruz	CA	Mr. Mark Dorfman	(408)426-6080	3
Simi Valley Transit	Simi Valley	CA	Hibbie Hayslett	(805)527-2141	3
James City County Transit	Williamsburg	VA	Mr. Richard Drumwright	(804)220-1621	2
Rogue Valley Transportation District	Medford	OR	Mr. Doug Filant	(503)779-5821	2

Table B-13. Selected Transit Providers with Accessible Bus Stop Programs (Continued)

Agency Name	City	State/ Province	Contact Person	Phone #	Access. Bus Stop Effect.
Madison Metro Transit System	Madison	WI	Mr. Paul J. Larrousse	(608)267-8777	;
Athens Transit System	Athens	GA	Mr. Tom Lett	(706)613-3430	
Augusta Public Transit	Augusta	GA	Ms. Heather Jenia	(706)821-1819	
Basin Transit Service	Klamath Falls	OR	Ms. Cynthia Thompson	(503)883-2877	
C-Train	Vancouver	WA	Mr. Barry Cavanaugh	(206)695-9893	
Calgary Transit	Calgary	Alberta	Mr. Dave Colquhoun	(403)277-9794	
Capital Area Transit	Raleigh	NC	Mr. Robert Olason	(919)890-3440	
Chapel Hill Transit	Chapel Hill	NC	Mr. Robert Godding	(919)968-2755	
City of Greeley "The Bus"	Greeley	CO	Mr. John Lee	(303)350-9280	
City of Rochester	Rochester	MN	Mr. Anthony Knauer	(507)287-1976	
City of Santa Rosa	Santa Rosa	CA	Mr. Bruce Eisert	(707)524-5121	
City of South Portland Bus Service	South Portland	ME	Mr. Leroy Beaver, Jr.	(207)767-5556	
City of St. Albert Transit	Edmonton	Alberta	R. Fiddlay	(403)463-7520	
CMTA	Austin	Texas	Ms. Nancy Crowther	(512)389-7583	
Cobb Community Transit (CCT)	Marietta	GA	Ms. Lyttac Christian	(404)528-1610	
Columbus Transit	Columbus	IN	Ms. Sue Chapple	(612)376-3506	
Dallas Area Rapid Transit	Dallas	TX	L. G. Fuller	(214)749-2770	
Eastern Contra Costa Transit Authority	Pittsburg & Antioch	CA	Ms. Anne Muzzini	NA	
Escambia County Transit System	Pensacola	FL	Mr. Kenneth Westbrook	(904)436-9386	
Fairfield/Suisun Transit	Fairfield	CA	Mr. Kevin S. Daughton	(707)428-7590	

Table B-13. Selected Transit Providers with Accessible Bus Stop Programs (Continued)

Agency Name	City	State/ Province	Contact Person	Phone #	Access. Bus Stop Effect.
Farmville Area Bus	Farmville	VA	Mr. Michael J. Sacha	(804)392-7433	
Five Seasons Transportation	Cedar Rapids	IA	Mr. William Hoekstra	(319)398-5367	
GATRA	Attleboro	MA	Mr. Frank Gay	(508)226-1100	
Greater Portland Transit District	Portland	ME	Mr. John Tibbets	(207)774-0351	
Honolulu Public Transit Authority	Honolulu	HI	Mr. James L. O'Sullivan	(808)527-6890	
Kansas City Area Transportation Authority	Kansas City	MO	Ms. Donna Brown	(816)346-0311	
La Crosse Municipal Transit Utility (MTU)	La Crosse	WI	Mr. Tim Schick	(608)789-7375	
Lane Transit District	Eugene	OR	Micki Kaplan	(503)741-6100	
Metro-Dade Transit Agency	Miami	FL	Mr. Mario G. Garcia	(305)637-3756	
Monterey Salinas Transit	Monterey	CA	Mr. Thomas Hilmer	(408)899-2558	
MUNI	San Francisco	CA	Mr. Paul Fishera	(415)923-6142	
OC Transpo	Ottawa	Ontario	Ms. Helen Gault	(613)741-6440	
OMNITRANS	San Bernardino	CA	Mr. Daniel Bragan	(909)889-0811	
Park City Transit - Park City Municipal Corporation	Park City	UT	Ms. Kae Draper	(801)645-5129	
People Mover Municipality of Anchorage	Anchorage	AK	Ms. Brenda Berglund	(907)786-8209	
Peterborough Transit	Peterborough	Ontario	J. N. Kinable	(705)748-8895	
Port Arthur Transit (PAT)	Port Arthur	TX	Mr. Charles Airiauddin	(409)983-8140	
Regional Transit Board	Minneapolis/ St. Paul	MN	Ms. Debra Sorenson Nelles	(612)229-2716	
Regional Transportation District	Denver	CO	Mr. Dave Shelley	(303)299-2408	

Table B-13. Selected Transit Providers with Accessible Bus Stop Programs (Continued)

Agency Name	City	State/ Province	Contact Person	Phone #	Access. Bus Stop Effect.
San Mateo County Transit District	San Carlos	CA	Mr. Mark Whitefield	(415)508-6247	
St. Albert Transit	St. Albert	Alberta	W. D. Liggett	(403)459-1589	
Star Trak	Lincoln	NE	Mr. Larry Worth	(402)441-8600	
Sun Line Transit Agency	Thousand Palms	CA	Mr. Donna Guinaw	(619)343-3456	
The University of Iowa - Campus	Iowa City	IA	Mr. Brian McClatchey	(319)335-8632	
Transit Authority of River City (TARC)	Louisville	KY	Tina Morris	(502)561-5117	
Transit Management of Hamilton, Inc. (AKA The Bus Co.)	Hamilton	OH	Mr. Michael McLaughly	(513)867-1660	

Table B-14. Selected Transit Providers Presently Using Bus Identifier Kits

Agency Name	City	State/ Province	Contact Person	Phone #	Bus ID Effectiveness
Municipality of Metropolitan Seattle (Seattle Metro)	Seattle	WA	Ms. Karen Rosenzweig	(206)689-5103	5
CityLink Abilene	Abilene	TX	Ms. Marba Ontiveros Castillo	(915)676-6403	4
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transp. Authority	Los Angeles	CA	Mr. Richard DeRouk	(213)244-6524	4
OC Transpo	Ottawa	Ontario	Ms. Helen Gault	(613)741-6440	4
Sheboygan Transit System	Sheboygan	WI	Mr. Steven Billings	(414)459-3285	4
Westmoreland Transit	Greensburg	PA	Executive Director	(412)834-9282	4
Ben Franklin Transit	Richmond	VA	Ed Frost	(509)735-4131	3
C-Train	Vancouver	WA	Mr. Barry Cavanaugh	(206)695-9893	2
Grand Rapids Area Transit Authority	Grand Rapids	MI	Mr. Steve Kantz	(616)456-7514	2
Mid-Mon Valley Transit Authority	Charlottesville	PA	Mr. David N. Lant	(412)489-0880	2
GO Transit	Toronto	Ontario	Jan Calc	(416)665-9211	1
Richmond Hill Transit	Richmond Hill	Ontario	A. Evans	(416)771-2419	1
Capital District Transportation Authority	Albany	NY	Ms. Cary Roessel	(518)482-4199	
City of Tucson Mass Transit System	Tucson	AZ	NA	NA	
DART	Wilmington	DE	Mr. Robert Taylor	(302)658-8960	
Five Seasons Transportation	Cedar Rapids	IA	Mr. William Heckstrm	(319)398-5367	
Fort Wayne Public Transportation Corporation	Fort Wayne	IN	Mr. Robert E. Morton	(219)432-4977	
Indianapolis Public Transportation Corp.	Indianapolis	IN	Mr. Jim Maslanka	(317)635-2100	
Lane Transit District	Eugene	OR	Mucki Kaplan	(503)741-6100	
Metro Transit Division, Metropolitan Authority	Halifax-Dartmouth	Nova Scotia	Ms. Loni Patterson	(902)421-6609	

Table B-14. Selected Transit Providers Presently Using Bus Identifier Kits (Continued)

Agency Name	City	State/ Province	Contact Person	Phone #	Bus ID Effectiveness
Sonoma County Transit (Countywide Service)	Santa Rosa	CA	Ms. Priscilla Kays	(707)585-7516	
Suburban Mobility Authority for Regional Transp. (SMART)	Detroit	MI	Mr. Dan Dirks	(313)362-0924	
The Metro	Cincinnati	OH	Mr. Douglas Herkes	(513)632-7590	
The T	Fort Worth	TX	Ms. Carla Forman	(817)871-6219	
Topeka Metropolitan Transit Authority	Topeka	KS	Mr. Craig Cole	(913)233-2011	
Utah Transit Authority	Salt Lake City	UT	Ms. Kathy McCune	(801)262-5626	

Table B-15. Selected Transit Providers Presently Using Destination Cards

Agency Name	City	State/ Province	Contact Person	Phone #	Dest. Card Effectiveness
CityLink Abilene	Abilene	TX	Ms. Martha Ortiz-Castillo	(915)676-4403	4
Municipality of Metropolitan Seattle (Seattle Metro)	Seattle	WA	Ms. Karen Rosenzweig	(206)689-1103	4
Portage Area Regional Transportation Authority	Akron	OH	Mr. Charles A. Nelson	(216)876-2672	4
Grand Rapids Area Transit Authority	Grand Rapids	MI	Mr. Steve Kaatz	(616)456-7514	2
VOTRAN, Volusia Transit Management, Inc.	South Daytona	FL	Mr. David Hope	(904)761-7600	2
Ames Transit Agency	Ames	IA	Mr. Bob Bourne	(515)292-1105	
Beloit Transit System	Beloit	WI	Mr. Kevin Davico	(608)364-2870	
Bettendorf Transit	Bettendorf	IA	Ms. Margaret Lake	(319)344-4085	
Central Ohio Transit Authority	Columbus	OH	Lynn Rathke	(614)275-5800	
Chapel Hill Transit	Chapel Hill	NC	Mr. Robert Goddard	(919)968-2755	
City of St. Albert Transit	Edmonton	Alberta	R. Findlay	(403)463-7520	
Farmville Area Bus	Farmville	VA	Mr. Michael J. Socia	(804)392-7433	
Five Seasons Transportation	Cedar Rapids	IA	Mr. William Hoekstra	(319)398-5367	
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transp. Authority	Los Angeles	CA	Mr. Richard DeRock	(213)244-6524	
Metro RTA	Akron	OH	Avon R. Smith	(216)762-7267	
Red Deer Transit	Red Deer	Alberta	Grant Benthie	(403)342-8225	
The Metro	Cincinnati	OH	Mr. Douglas Herkes	(513)632-7590	
The T	Fort Worth	TX	Ms. Carla Forman	(817)871-6219	

THE TRANSPORTATION RESEARCH BOARD is a unit of the National Research Council, which serves the National Academy of Sciences and the National Academy of Engineering. It evolved in 1974 from the Highway Research Board which was established in 1920. The TRB incorporates all former HRB activities and also performs additional functions under a broader scope involving all modes of transportation and the interactions of transportation with society. The Board's purpose is to stimulate research concerning the nature and performance of transportation systems, to disseminate information that the research produces, and to encourage the application of appropriate research findings. The Board's program is carried out by more than 270 committees, task forces, and panels composed of more than 3,300 administrators, engineers, social scientists, attorneys, educators, and others concerned with transportation; they serve without compensation. The program is supported by state transportation and highway departments, the modal administrations of the U.S. Department of Transportation, the Association of American Railroads, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, and other organizations and individuals interested in the development of transportation.

The National Academy of Sciences is a private, nonprofit, self-perpetuating society of distinguished scholars engaged in scientific and engineering research, dedicated to the furtherance of science and technology and to their use for the general welfare. Upon the authority of the charter granted to it by the Congress in 1863, the Academy has a mandate that requires it to advise the federal government on scientific and technical matters. Dr. Bruce M. Alberts is president of the National Academy of Sciences.

The National Academy of Engineering was established in 1964, under the charter of the National Academy of Sciences, as a parallel organization of outstanding engineers. It is autonomous in its administration and in the selection of its members, sharing with the National Academy of Sciences the responsibility for advising the federal government. The National Academy of Engineering also sponsors engineering programs aimed at meeting national needs, encourages education and research and recognizes the superior achievements of engineers. Dr. Harold Liebowitz is president of the National Academy of Engineering.

The Institute of Medicine was established in 1970 by the National Academy of Sciences to secure the services of eminent members of appropriate professions in the examination of policy matters pertaining to the health of the public. The Institute acts under the responsibility given to the National Academy of Sciences by its congressional charter to be an adviser to the federal government and, upon its own initiative, to identify issues of medical care, research, and education. Dr. Kenneth I. Shine is president of the Institute of Medicine.

The National Research Council was organized by the National Academy of Sciences in 1916 to associate the broad community of science and technology with the Academy's purpose of furthering knowledge and advising the federal government. Functioning in accordance with general policies determined by the Academy, the Council has become the principal operating agency of both the National Academy of Sciences and the National Academy of Engineering in providing services to the government, the public, and the scientific and engineering communities. The Council is administered jointly by both Academies and the Institute of Medicine. Dr. Bruce M. Alberts and Dr. Harold Liebowitz are chairman and vice chairman, respectively, of the National Research Council.