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INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents a history and description of the Transportation Disadvantaged (TD) services coordinated by Senior Friendship Centers Transportation, Inc. as the community transportation coordinator (CTC) for Sarasota County. The chapter includes descriptions of the CTC operational characteristics as well as service parameters for the TD program. A detailed performance assessment comprised of trend and peer group analyses is provided for CTC services. In addition, discussion and results from a survey of CTC bus operators and an on-board passenger survey of CTC paratransit users are also provided.

DESCRIPTION AND HISTORY OF CTC COORDINATED SERVICES

This section provides an introduction to Senior Friendships Center's (SFC) role as the community transportation coordinator (CTC) for the Sarasota County TD program. The history of Sarasota County’s TD program is also provided. This section also summarizes the results of the performance evaluation of SFC’s paratransit program. The performance evaluation was conducted in two parts: a CTC trend analysis and a CTC peer review analysis. The CTC trend analysis was completed to compare the performance of the Sarasota County CTC over time. A CTC peer review analysis was also conducted to compare the performance of the Sarasota County CTC to other peer CTCs within Florida. Finally, results from surveys conducted with bus operators and paratransit users are provided.

Florida Transportation Disadvantaged Program

As discussed in Chapter One, the Florida Transportation Disadvantaged (TD) Program was created in 1979 with the enactment of Chapter 427, Florida Statutes, which defines transportation disadvantaged as:

"...those persons who because of physical or mental disability, income status, or age are unable to transport themselves or to purchase transportation and are, therefore, dependent upon others to obtain access to health care, employment, education, shopping, social activities, or children who are handicapped or high-risk or at-risk as defined in Section 411.202, Florida Statutes."
The statewide TD program was developed to better coordinate existing transportation disadvantaged services sponsored by social and human service agencies. The purpose of coordination is to reduce duplication of services and maximize the use of existing resources. The 1979 legislation created the Coordinating Council for the Transportation Disadvantaged in the Department of Transportation and gave it the responsibility to coordinate TD transportation services throughout the state.

Legislative revisions to Chapter 427 in 1989 created the Florida Commission for the Transportation Disadvantaged (FCTD) to accomplish the coordination of transportation services provided to the transportation disadvantaged in the State of Florida. The FCTD is an independent commission reporting directly to the Governor and the legislature. The 1989 revisions also assigned the Commission to the Department of Transportation for administrative and fiscal accountability purposes. The legislation also established the TD Trust Fund, which provided a dedicated funding source, and gave the Commission authority to allocate monies from the Trust Fund. The 1989 revisions to Chapter 427, F.S. established community transportation coordinators (CTCs) and local coordinating boards (LCBs) to administer and monitor the TD program at the local level. Therefore, CTCs and LCBs took over the roles and responsibilities of the Coordinated Community Transportation Provider and the Coordinated Community Transportation Provider Council that were provided for in the initial 1979 legislation. There are an estimated 5.4 million transportation disadvantaged individuals residing in Florida.

Florida's transportation disadvantaged program serves two populations groups: Potential Transportation Disadvantaged (also referred to as "TD Category I") and the Transportation Disadvantaged (also referred to as "TD Category II"). The Potential Transportation Disadvantaged population includes persons who are eligible for agency-sponsored trips. The Transportation Disadvantaged population group is a subset of the Potential Transportation Disadvantaged population group. While the individuals in this population group are eligible to receive agency-sponsored trips through the Florida coordinated system, they are also eligible to receive trips subsidized by the TD Trust Fund monies allocated to local CTCs by the Florida Commission for the Transportation Disadvantaged (FCTD).

**History of the Sarasota County Transportation Disadvantaged Program**

The Sarasota-Manatee Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) has been working to address the needs of the transportation disadvantaged population in Sarasota County for some time. In 1982 the MPO contracted with Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. to complete the Sarasota/Manatee Area Elderly and Handicapped Transportation Disadvantaged Transportation Needs Study. This document analyzed the needs of the transportation disadvantaged population within Sarasota and Manatee Counties. Several recommendations were made to
address the unmet needs of potential public transportation users. Within Sarasota County, the recommendation was made to designate the Senior Friendship Centers, Inc. (SFC) as the Coordinated Community Transportation Provider for Sarasota County. Figure 3-1 illustrates the organizational structure of the TD program.

SFC is a private, not-for-profit organization incorporated in 1973 to provide services to people over the age of sixty in Sarasota County. SFC has provided transportation services to seniors under the Older Americans Act since 1970. In 1983, SFC became the designated Provider of Coordinated Transportation for the Disadvantaged in Sarasota County. The Coordination Council for the Transportation Disadvantaged approved a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with SFC in 1986. Figure 3-2 presents the organizational structure of SFC, Inc.

The Florida Commission for the Transportation Disadvantaged (FCTD) formally recommended SFC as the CTC on July 13, 1990 along with the organization and establishment of the Sarasota County Local Coordinating Board (LCB). On July 23, 1990, the Sarasota/Manatee MPO officially endorsed SFC as the CTC for Sarasota County. SFC also executed a contract with the Sarasota County Board of County Commissioners in 1990 to provide Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA) complementary paratransit trips for Sarasota County Area Transit (SCAT).

SARASOTA COUNTY CTC COORDINATED SERVICES

The CTC in Sarasota County works very closely with the transit agency (SCAT). The CTC is housed within the SCAT administrative offices and all CTC vehicle maintenance is provided by SCAT. In addition, SCAT contracts with the CTC to provide ADA complementary paratransit service to eligible individuals and the agencies work together to determine eligibility for ADA paratransit services. Because of the unique relationship between the CTC and the transit agency in Sarasota County, all modes of public transportation in Sarasota County explicitly serve the transportation disadvantaged (TD) population. The following section will provide general information about the umbrella of coordinated transportation services currently available through the Sarasota County TD program.

Types, Hours, and Days of Service

The CTC provides ambulatory and wheelchair paratransit service to all eligible TD clients. In special circumstances, the CTC provides service to non-county residents. In addition, the CTC is responsible for the coordination of Medicaid stretcher service. The transportation service provided by the CTC is door-to-door, demand-responsive, paratransit service requiring 24 hour
advance reservations. It is the policy of the CTC to provide passenger assistance from the origin
door to the vehicle, in boarding, seating, and exiting the vehicle, and to the door of the
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destination. The CTC’s service area includes all of Sarasota County. Clients desiring out-of-service area transportation may call the CTC for special trip arrangements. Alternate areas served include Manatee, Pinellas, Hillsborough, DeSoto, Charlotte, and Lee Counties. Medicaid transportation is provided to Gainesville when necessary.

TD service is available 24 hours per day, seven days per week. Regular operational hours are Monday through Saturday, from 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. Private providers under contract with the CTC provide TD service for the CTC after regular business hours, holidays, and on weekends with advance notification. The CTC also provides same-day service to passengers on a space-and vehicle-available basis.

The CTC provides individual reservation trips, group trips, and subscription service to clients. Group trips are provided at a reduced rate and are defined as three or more passengers traveling together either from one common origin or to one common destination. Subscription trips are trips that recur from week to week, at the same time with the same origin and destination. The CTC stores the information for these trips in a permanent computer file where the trips are automatically scheduled each service day prior to accepting individual reservation trip requests. The CTC’s computer software also allows for the service to be placed on hold temporarily without requiring the passenger to reestablish subscription service. Subscription trips currently comprise approximately 45 percent of all trips provided by the CTC.

Accessing Services

Clients typically request trip reservations one day in advance, thus providing the CTC an opportunity to schedule drivers and vehicles cost-effectively. Telephone reservations are accepted from 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. However, reservations for the next day of service are not accepted after 2:00 p.m. unless adequate capacity and vehicle availability exist. Same day reservations are accepted based on seating and schedule availability. The CTC accepts reservations for service up to two weeks in advance of the desired travel date. The CTC can be reached by calling (941) 926-0135 or toll free at 475-3390.

Trip cancellations are accepted up to ten minutes before the scheduled pick-up time. These cancellations are documented as late cancels. If a passenger demonstrates a history of late cancels, a letter is generated and delivered which outlines service policies and costs involved as a result of late cancellations. Cancellations at the door or cancellations received less than ten minutes before the scheduled pick-up time are considered no-shows. Clients are not charged for canceled trips or no-shows. However, in response to escalating occurrences of cancellations received at the door, the CTC has implemented a policy of suspending service for multiple no-
shows. After three no-shows, CTC staff advise the passenger that suspension is possibility with the next occurrence. The suspension of service policy for excessive no-shows is as follows:

- Fourth occurrence: 30 day suspension of service
- Fifth occurrence: 60 day suspension of service
- Sixth occurrence: 90 day suspension of service
- Seventh occurrence: 6 month suspension of service

Back-up service is available during all operational hours. Two vehicles are designated as back-up vehicles for the TD program. If vehicles from the regular fleet are out of service for repairs, a back-up vehicle is placed into service to maintain the same level service. In addition, several CTC administrative staff members maintain valid commercial driving licenses (CDLs), and CPR and first aid certification and are used as replacement drivers, as needed.

The CTC employs an Operational Supervisor who has the responsibility to coordinate repairs, preventive maintenance, and driver training activities. SFC has a Safety Review Committee that meets regularly to review all incidents and accidents, make recommendations or modify policy and/or training procedures.

After-hours transportation service is provided through special arrangements and/or advance notice. The CTC has eleven contract operators who provide TD door-to-door paratransit service 24 hours per day, seven days per week and assist the CTC in providing after-hours service. These providers have ambulatory, wheelchair and stretcher vehicles, received supervised driver training, meet all FDOT safety regulations, comply with drug and alcohol testing, vehicle inspections and passenger sensitivity/patient relations standards.

Five types of public transportation services are offered to meet the mobility needs of transportation disadvantaged individuals in Sarasota County. These services include: TD non-sponsored paratransit, Medicaid non-emergency transportation, Americans with Disabilities Act complementary paratransit, agency-sponsored paratransit, and traditional fixed route transit. Each is discussed in the following sections.

**TD Non-sponsored Door-to-Door Services**

SFC began to provide, as well as coordinate, TD non-sponsored trips in FY 1990. Although there are eleven transportation operators under contract to the CTC to provide TD trips within the coordinated system, SFC is currently the primary provider of TD non-sponsored trips in Sarasota County. TD non-sponsored trips are general purpose trips that are not subsidized by a governmental or social service agency. Non-sponsored trips are paid for with funding from the
State of Florida TD Trust Fund, which is administered by the FCTD. Individuals must be certified as TD eligible to receive these trips. These individuals are classified as Transportation Disadvantaged. The service is available to persons who, because of physical or mental disability, income status, age or for other reasons, are unable to transport themselves or purchase transportation.

TD eligible individuals whose trips are not subsidized by an agency or another funding source must request transportation at least 24 hours in advance and are provided door-to-door transportation service. TD clients pay $2.00 per one-way trip. The remainder of the trip costs are paid by the Florida Commission for the Transportation Disadvantaged (FCTD) according to a base plus mileage formula. Because the demand for TD non-sponsored, general purpose transportation service is greater than the funds available, a set of trip priorities have been established for the Sarasota County TD program. Trip purpose determines prioritization for non-sponsored trips. Medical, employment, education, and life-sustaining trip requests receive top priority. Trip requests for other purposes, such as shopping, nutritional, and recreational are scheduled as funding allows. Prioritization of trip purposes applies to TD non-sponsored trips only. To date, the CTC has not had to deny any trip requests due to limited funding.

**Medicaid Non-Emergency Medical Transportation**

Three forms of transportation are provided to Medicaid clients requiring transportation to Medicaid-approved medical appointments. Eligible Medicaid clients may be provided door-to-door paratransit service, fixed-route bus service, or stretcher service. Currently, door-to-door paratransit service is the primary mode of transportation provided to eligible Medicaid clients. The CTC uses a software program to validate Medicaid coverage for each client requesting transportation service and to determine if door-to-door service is appropriate for each client. A Medicaid transportation application is employed to determine each Medicaid client’s ability to use the fixed-route bus service available, the existence of physical and mental disabilities, as well as whether the client’s transportation needs can be met through the utilization of family, friends, or other community resources. Beginning in FY 1999, SFC and SCAT jointly established and implemented a Medicaid Bus Pass Program wherein eligible Medicaid clients are given a bus pass entitling them to unlimited SCAT fixed-route bus trips for one month, while relinquishing paratransit privileges during that month. Medicaid clients participating in the Bus Pass Program may use the fixed-route system in Sarasota County for all Medicaid-approved medical appointment trips, as well as any personal trips that clients wish to make on the fixed-route bus system. Finally, the CTC has also begun coordinating Medicaid-approved stretcher transportation, as needed.

**Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Complementary Paratransit Service**
The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990 requires that complementary paratransit services be provided by agencies that provide fixed-route bus service. The paratransit service must "shadow" the fixed-route service area and a comparable level of service must be provided for persons who cannot use the fixed-route service. Currently, the CTC is contracted by SCAT to coordinate the provision of complementary paratransit services to persons that are ADA-eligible. Complementary paratransit service in Sarasota County is provided for trips anywhere within the county during fixed route service hours, rather than being limited to the ADA service area to the ¾-mile buffer (see Figure 2-3). The demand for ADA complementary paratransit has been increasing each year in Sarasota County. As a result, SCAT and the CTC have developed a more thorough eligibility determination process for ADA complementary paratransit to help manage demand for this service. Currently, ADA-eligible passengers receive door-to-door transportation and pay a fare of $1.00 per one-way trip.

Agenciesponsored Paratransit Service

Paratransit service is purchased from the CTC by agencies to transport agency clients to and from agency services or to provide general purpose trips for clients. Agency-sponsored trips include such destinations as training centers, sheltered workshops, congregate meal sites, and adult day care. Any group sponsored (and paid for) by the county, a municipality, school board, senior citizen group, or social service agency may purchase transportation through the coordinated system. Agency-sponsored transportation may take the form of subscription trips (regular and recurring trips), reservation service (individual trip, not regularly scheduled or recurring), or specialized service (trips which serve clients on an individual basis and require special lift equipment, additional loading and unloading time, and/or trips out of the service area). Agencies that purchase transportation services from the CTC are charged a base fare and applicable zonal charges ($2.00 for each zone). These rates are included in Appendix H. Client fares vary according to the funding agency. Typically, agency clients pay a $1.00 fare per one-way trip.

Traditional Fixed Route Transit

Transportation disadvantaged individuals in Sarasota County can also use the fixed routes operated by SCAT. Currently, 20 routes are operating throughout the county and provide countywide geographic coverage. In general, the fixed route service focuses on the urbanized area within and near the City of Sarasota. However, bus routes also serve South Sarasota, including the Venice area, North Port, and Englewood. In addition, limited connection service with Manatee County Area Transit (MCAT) is also available in North Sarasota. The CTC currently has a Medicaid bus pass program wherein clients who have been determined to be able to use
the fixed-route bus system may purchase a monthly SCAT bus pass for $2.00. This pass can be used on the SCAT bus system for an unlimited number of trips. Clients who are given a bus pass may not use paratransit service for that month. In conjunction with the Medicaid bus pass program already in place, the CTC plans to implement an ADA bus pass program during fiscal year 2000. This program will target individuals who are unconditionally or conditionally eligible for ADA complementary paratransit services. These individuals will be given free monthly bus passes to encourage their use of the fixed-route system. In addition, TD clients are also encouraged to use the fixed-route bus system for travel. During FY 1998, 39,327 trips on the SCAT system were made by transportation disadvantaged persons in Sarasota County.

**Sarasota County CTC Paratransit Eligibility Requirements**

SFC paratransit services are available for individuals classified as transportation disadvantaged because they are unable to transport themselves or to purchase transportation due to physical or mental disability, age, income status, or because they are children at-risk. Paratransit services are also available to persons who have been certified as eligible to receive ADA complementary paratransit service because they are unable to use SCAT's fixed-route bus service. ADA complementary paratransit services are coordinated through the Sarasota County CTC. Finally, door-to-door paratransit service is provided to eligible Medicaid clients for non-emergency medical purposes. The processes used to determine eligibility for each of the programs are described below.

**TD Non-sponsored Paratransit Service**

The issue of eligibility for paratransit trips funded through TD non-sponsored funds has been a topic of much discussion throughout Florida for several years. The catalyst for these discussions has been the acknowledgment that the demand for TD service exceeds the available supply and/or funding for non-sponsored TD trips. The Florida Commission for the Transportation Disadvantaged (FCTD) has recently proposed changes to the TD Implementing Rule that include specific requirements for a TD non-sponsored paratransit eligibility process. The proposed rule changes include draft criteria designed for CTC use to determine eligibility for non-sponsored trips subsidized with TD Trust Fund dollars. The eight criteria that have been set forth by the FCTD include the following:

- No other funding is available to pay for the requested trip.
- No other means of transportation is available. Applicants must demonstrate that they cannot drive themselves or do not have ready access to family, friends, or neighbors who can transport them.
- If public transit is available, applicants must show why it cannot be used.
• Physical or mental disability, as outlined in the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA).
• Age. (As specified by the LCB and CTC.)
• Individual and household income status must be 150 percent of the federal poverty level or less.
• No self-declarations allowed. CTCs must use a formal eligibility process that substantiates applicants’ ability to meet eligibility criteria.
• Ability to pay. (As specified by the LCB and CTC.)

The CTC in Sarasota County currently determines eligibility for non-sponsored TD paratransit services through a written application process which address each of the eligibility criteria listed above. TD eligibility is awarded to those persons who are over the age of 60, have physical or mental disabilities that prevent the use of public transit, have income levels which do not exceed 1-½ times the poverty level, have no other means of transportation, cannot afford to purchase transportation or are children at risk.

Americans with Disabilities (ADA) Complementary Paratransit Service

Persons with disabilities in Sarasota County may be eligible to receive ADA complementary paratransit service. These individuals must be certified as ADA-eligible in order to receive paratransit service. Eligibility is conferred to persons with disabilities who are able to demonstrate that they are unable to use SCAT fixed-routes due to the nature and extent of their disability or because the fixed-route bus service is not fully accessible. ADA complementary paratransit services are only provided during the fixed-route days and hours of service.

ADA eligibility is determined through a written application process that requires certification by a licensed professional. Eligibility can be conferred as unconditional (status assigned to persons who are determined unable to ever independently navigate the public transit system, even with training) or conditional (status assigned to persons who are able to use public transit for some trips, but under certain circumstances, and for certain trips, are not able to use fixed-route bus service).

A committee composed of both SCAT and SFC staff reviews applications. If an applicant is determined to be unconditionally eligible, a Silver Card number is assigned to the individual and their eligibility status is noted in the CTC client database. Persons who are certified as unconditionally eligible may access ADA paratransit service at will. Persons who are certified as conditionally eligible may only use ADA paratransit service under specified circumstances and/or conditions.
If the committee is not able to determine an applicant’s eligibility, a functional assessment of
the applicant’s abilities is required. Functional assessments are provided by Easter Seals.
Transportation to and from the evaluation is provided by the CTC. A physical functional
assessment consists of a simulated bus travel experience, including boarding a bus, negotiating
a curb and curb cut, and crossing a street. Skills evaluated include balance, strength,
coordination and range of motion. Cognitive functional assessments consist of certain
standardized tests designed to measure skills such as memory, attention span and route-finding
ability. Variables in the environment, as well as the applicant’s ability to perform the tasks
required to use the bus, are also considered. Travel training is offered to persons who need
assistance in learning to negotiate the public transit system.

Because the demand for ADA paratransit services has been growing faster than available
funding, SCAT is now working with SFC to develop a more thorough approach to ADA eligibility
determination. The goal of the new eligibility determination process will be to ensure that only
individuals who meet the specific eligibility criteria outlined in the Americans with Disabilities Act
of 1990 are provided ADA complementary paratransit service.

Medicaid Non-Emergency Medical Transportation

Medicaid-sponsored transportation is only offered to clients who are eligible recipients, when the
trip is medically necessary and reasonable, and they are traveling to locations to receive
Medicaid-covered service. Currently, Medicaid clients who would like to request transportation
to medical appointments contact the CTC. The CTC verifies that the client is requesting
transportation for a Medicaid-eligible medical appointment, that the client does not have access
to family or friends that can provide a ride to the client, and that the client cannot utilize SCAT’s
fixed-route bus system to complete the trip. Those Medicaid clients who are unable to access
SCAT fixed-route bus service due to proximity to the route, availability of service, or because of
a physical or mental disability prevents use of fixed-route transit are provided door-to-door
paratransit service. Medicaid passengers who can use the public transit system are offered a
monthly Medicaid bus pass that is good for unlimited use of the system throughout that month.
However, purchase of the monthly pass prohibits the use of door-to-door paratransit services for
that month.

**Transportation Operators and Coordination Contractors**

Sarasota County’s CTC is the primary provider of coordinated, transportation disadvantaged,
door-to-door services. The CTC contracts with private providers to provide services if the CTC is
at capacity, as well as for after hours, weekend and holiday service. SFC, with the goal of achieving 100 percent coordination, remains receptive to all inquiries from potential operators and agencies interested in purchasing services. When approached, the CTC presents the potential operators with a complete packet of all requirements, regulations, safety and operating standards, a trip rate summary, and a copy of the standardized contract. If the provider can comply with all of the above, SFC then negotiates the contract with the provider. The CTC conducts annual on-site reviews of the contract providers to ensure compliance with adopted standards and regulations.

As of this date, the CTC has contracts with the following eleven (11) providers:

**Y-MED TRANSPORT**
2011 Cornell St
Sarasota, FL 34237
Contact: Dale Spencer
(941) 955-3341
24 Hrs., 7 Days
Amb, W/C, Stretcher

**MARY'S TAXI**
1157 McCall Road
Englewood, FL 34223
Contact: Linda Butler
(941) 475-8294
24 Hrs., 7 Days
Amb Only

**CITY CAB**
1881 Marbeth St
Sarasota, FL 34231
Contact: Tom Steele
(941) 780-3655
24 Hrs., 7 Days
Amb Only

**EMPIRE TRANSPORT**
4240 53rd Ave W. #2709
Bradenton, FL 34210
Contact: Dan McLoughlin
(941) 704-0710
24hrs., 7 Days
Amb, W/C, Stretcher

**AMBU-VAN**
1366 Roberts Bay Lane
Sarasota, FL 34242
Contact: Penny Goetlich
(941) 798-9023
24 Hrs., 7 Days
Amb, W/C, Stretcher

**CHILDRENS HAVEN**
4405 Desoto Road
Sarasota, FL 34235
Contact: Patti White
(941) 355-8808
7 AM To 7 PM
Amb, W/C

**WE CARE TRANSPORT**
6100-D Palmer Blvd
Sarasota, FL 34232
Contact: Chuck Williams
(941) 377-0204
24 Hrs., 7 Days
Amb, W/C, Stretcher

**ASTOR CAB COMPANY**
3596 Tamiami Trail S
Pt. Charlotte, FL 33949
Contact: Jay Holmes
(941) 624-3336
24 Hrs., 7 Days
Amb Only

**AMBITRANS**
P.O. Box 2444
Pt Charlotte, FL 33949
Contact: Larry Baumgardmer
(941) 629-2193
24hrs, 7 Days
Amb, W/C, Stretcher

**DOVE TRANSPORT**
6623 Proctor Road
Sarasota, FL 34241
Contact: Leon Spencer
(941) 923-0202
7 AM To 7 PM

**WINDWARD TRANSPORT**
3149 Bay Street
Sarasota, FL 34237
Contact: Michael Bruscoe
(941) 921-5122
24 Hrs, 7 Days
The CTC ensures that all providers comply with the following:

- Vehicles must meet all safety specifications for ADA and Rule 14-90, F.A.C.
- System Safety Program Plan
- Drug-Free Workplace Policy / Substance Abuse Policy
- Employee Training Program
- Providing mandatory reports to the CTC
- Certification of Compliance with Chapter 427, Florida Statutes

All trips are coordinated by the CTC with assignment to the providers. Providers must submit documentation of having performed the trip with times and odometer readings. The CTC reimburses the provider within 30 days. The CTC monitors all trips for accuracy and quality of service.

In addition, the CTC maintains coordinated agreements with six (6) private non-profit agencies that are recipients of publicly funded vehicles under the Section 5310 grant process. The CTC receives monthly reports from all agencies and conducts periodic on-site system safety reviews. Coordinated contractors provide service for their own agency clients in vehicles purchased through the Section 5310 program. These services are justified by the provision of relevant financial data during the application review process. Although these agencies cover joint use and cost provisions for transportation services in the contract, the CTC is not assigning trips to these contractors. These agencies have clients with unique transportation needs, occurring during peak operational hours or on off-days. The agencies absorb the costs of the services in their agency budgets.

The CTC currently has coordinated agreements with the following agencies:

**CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTERS**
4620 17th Street
Sarasota, FL 34235
Contact: Mary Lou Jackson
(941) 371-8820
Mon-Fri, 8 AM To 5 PM
Agency Clients Only

**UNITED CEREBRAL PALSY**
1227 S Tamiami Trail
Sarasota, FL 34236
Contact: John Byrd
(941) 957-3599
Mon-Fri, 8 AM To 5 PM
Agency Clients Only

**THE PINES OF SARASOTA**
1501 N Orange Avenue
Sarasota, FL 34234
Contact: Elaine Boyer
(941) 365-0250
Mon-Fri, 8 AM To 5 PM
Agency Clients Only

**J H FLOYD SUNSHINE MANOR**
1755 18th Street
Sarasota, FL 34234

**LOVELAND CENTER**
4002 S. Tamiami Trail
Venice, FL 34293

**FIRST STEP OF SARASOTA**
2800 Bahia Vista
Sarasota, FL 34239
The CTC maintains an ongoing interest in incorporating all transportation entities into the coordinated system. Both District 8 Medicaid and the Florida Department of Transportation direct inquiries to SFC for contract consideration.

**CTC Vehicle Inventory**

The fleet of vehicles used to serve the transportation disadvantaged population in Sarasota County consists of regular and lift-equipped vans and lift equipped minibuses. The CTC current vehicle inventory is contained in Table 3-1. The inventory includes information on vehicle type and make, the number of seats and securement positions for wheelchairs, current mileage, age of vehicle, and the anticipated replacement date. It is estimated that the CTC will need to replace 19 vehicles between 2000 and 2004 to maintain the current level of service.

**School Bus Utilization**

The CTC has investigated the possibility of utilizing the Local School Bus System to accomplish TD trips. However, it has been determined that this service is not cost effective with the present rate of $15.00 per hour, ten day lead time and the lack of available vehicles. Throughout the development of the STEP, considerable attention has been paid to the issue of utilizing school buses for community transportation. Future coordination of school bus resources may be accomplished through the implementation the STEP initiatives discussed in Chapter Nine. The CTC will continue to work with representatives in the community to facilitate and encourage maximization of existing transportation resources, including school buses.

**Intercounty Services**

The CTC does not currently have any written cooperative agreements with other CTC’s in the state. However, Senior Friendship Centers Transportation does have informal cooperative agreements with Charlotte, Manatee, DeSoto, Hillsborough and Pinellas counties. Under these informal agreements, if a trip request is received that can best be coordinated utilizing another CTC, SFC contacts the CTC and arranges the transportation. In many cases, this arrangement may only apply to the return portion of the trip or the continuation of the trip that is arranged relative to the CTC’s location and previously scheduled trips. In this way, the CTC strives to provide the most efficient and cost-effective service possible for clients.
### Table 3-1
CTC Vehicle Inventory

Senior Friendship Center Vehicle Inventory, as of May 1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bus</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Make</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Vin Number</th>
<th>FDOT#</th>
<th>Tag #</th>
<th>Amb</th>
<th>W/C</th>
<th>Current Mileage</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Anticipate Retire</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Dodge</td>
<td>Van</td>
<td>2B7KB3122VK59764</td>
<td>92152</td>
<td>X39114</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52,102</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>2007 UMTA Diesel</td>
<td>Diesel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Dodge</td>
<td>Van</td>
<td>2B7KB3126VK595749</td>
<td>92155</td>
<td>X39123</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27,903</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>2007 UMTA Diesel</td>
<td>Diesel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Dodge</td>
<td>Van</td>
<td>2B7KB3122ZZK598796</td>
<td>92156</td>
<td>X39113</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33,707</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>2007 UMTA Diesel</td>
<td>Diesel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>GMC</td>
<td>Van</td>
<td>1GTHG39YOTF506616</td>
<td>92138</td>
<td>X51989</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>64,944</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>2006 UMTA Diesel</td>
<td>Diesel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>BlueBird</td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>1BAGBSCAXSF063990</td>
<td>92104</td>
<td>X39342</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>137,258</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>2002 UMTA Diesel</td>
<td>Diesel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>BlueBird</td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>1BAGBSCAS3SF063992</td>
<td>92109</td>
<td>X38426</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>86,310</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>2002 UMTA Diesel</td>
<td>Diesel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>1FDK30G6SHA04952</td>
<td>88196</td>
<td>X51990</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>119,015</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>2003 UMTA Diesel</td>
<td>Gas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>International</td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>1HVBDZFK8RH561979</td>
<td>181034</td>
<td>X39106</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>126,111</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>2003 UMTA Diesel</td>
<td>Diesel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>International</td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>1HVBDZFK6RH561978</td>
<td>181033</td>
<td>X39105</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>110,843</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>2003 UMTA Diesel</td>
<td>Diesel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Chevy</td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>2GBHG31J6P4132236</td>
<td>88174</td>
<td>X43184</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>283,321</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2001 UMTA Diesel</td>
<td>Diesel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Chevy</td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>2GBHG31J2P4131908</td>
<td>88173</td>
<td>X39107</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>127,780</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>2002 UMTA Diesel</td>
<td>Diesel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>GMC</td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>2GDHG31J6K4523323</td>
<td>88139</td>
<td>X39108</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>210,409</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2001 UMTA Diesel</td>
<td>Diesel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>GMC</td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>2GDHG31J8K4523372</td>
<td>88140</td>
<td>X40391</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>208,245</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2001 UMTA Diesel</td>
<td>Diesel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>GMC</td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>2GDHG31J8P4132643</td>
<td>88175</td>
<td>X39109</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>185,038</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>2002 UMTA Diesel</td>
<td>Diesel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>GMC</td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>2GBHG31J9M4140105</td>
<td>181089</td>
<td>X43183</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>231,749</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2001 UMTA Diesel</td>
<td>Diesel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>GMC</td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>2GBHG31J9M4142075</td>
<td>88153</td>
<td>X43185</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>217,959</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2001 UMTA Diesel</td>
<td>Diesel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>GMC</td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>2GBHG31J1M4140773</td>
<td>181019</td>
<td>X43186</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>206,576</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2001 UMTA Diesel</td>
<td>Diesel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Dodge</td>
<td>Van</td>
<td>2BSWB35Z4NK167098</td>
<td>88157</td>
<td>X39113</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>164,496</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2000 UMTA Diesel</td>
<td>Gas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Dodge</td>
<td>Van</td>
<td>2BSWB35Z6NK167099</td>
<td>88158</td>
<td>X39119</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>129,227</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2000 UMTA Diesel</td>
<td>Gas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Dodge</td>
<td>Van</td>
<td>2BSWB35Z9NK167100</td>
<td>88159</td>
<td>X39122</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>138,105</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2000 UMTA Diesel</td>
<td>Gas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Dodge</td>
<td>Van</td>
<td>2BSWB35Z0NK167101</td>
<td>88160</td>
<td>X39118</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>125,920</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>2001 UMTA Diesel</td>
<td>Gas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Dodge</td>
<td>Van</td>
<td>2BSWB35Z2NK167102</td>
<td>88161</td>
<td>X39124</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>153,001</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>2001 UMTA Diesel</td>
<td>Gas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Dodge</td>
<td>Van</td>
<td>2BSWB35Z5NK145367</td>
<td>181023</td>
<td>X40394</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>70,990</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>2003 UMTA Diesel</td>
<td>Gas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>1FDK30F3XSHA08543</td>
<td>92105</td>
<td>X40395</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>107,078</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>2005 UMTA Diesel</td>
<td>Diesel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>1FDK30F9SHA12342</td>
<td>92106</td>
<td>X40390</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>130,027</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>2005 UMTA Diesel</td>
<td>Diesel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>1FDK30F2SHA12177</td>
<td>92108</td>
<td>X40389</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>107,042</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>2005 UMTA Diesel</td>
<td>Diesel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>1FDK30F3XSHA02127</td>
<td>92107</td>
<td>X40392</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>112,204</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>2005 UMTA Diesel</td>
<td>Diesel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>1FDK30F3PSHA12116</td>
<td>92110</td>
<td>X38424</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>106,152</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>2005 UMTA Diesel</td>
<td>Diesel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>1FDK30F2SHA02123</td>
<td>92111</td>
<td>X38425</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>103,785</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>2005 UMTA Diesel</td>
<td>Diesel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>1FDK30F4SHA02124</td>
<td>92103</td>
<td>X38429</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>119,217</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>2005 UMTA Diesel</td>
<td>Diesel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Senior Friendship Center Vehicle Inventory, as of May 1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bus</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Make</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Vin Number</th>
<th>FDOT#</th>
<th>Tag #</th>
<th>Amb</th>
<th>W/C</th>
<th>Current Mileage</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Anticipate Retire</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>1FDKE30F7SHA12341</td>
<td>181040</td>
<td>X38427</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>142,721</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>UMTA Diesel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>1FDKE30F2SHA12120</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>X38428</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>115,127</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>CTD Diesel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>1FDLE40F9THB57389</td>
<td>92135</td>
<td>X42771</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>59,499</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>UMTA Gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>1FDLE40F7THB57425</td>
<td>92133</td>
<td>X42770</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>61,930</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>UMTA Diesel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>1FDLE40F7THB57424</td>
<td>92134</td>
<td>X42769</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>59,313</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>UMTA Diesel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>1FDLE40FPVHB88713</td>
<td>92157</td>
<td>X39110</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40,208</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>UMTA Diesel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>1FDLE40F2VHB88714</td>
<td>92158</td>
<td>X39111</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45,978</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>UMTA Diesel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>1FDXE40F5WHB72350</td>
<td>92184</td>
<td>X53761</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12,737</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>UMTA Diesel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>1FDXE40F5WHB72351</td>
<td>92185</td>
<td>X53762</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16,219</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>UMTA Diesel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>1FDLE4055VHB88705</td>
<td>92164</td>
<td>X51987</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22,198</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>UMTA Diesel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>1FDXE40SWHA88455</td>
<td>92175</td>
<td>X51988</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36,021</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>UMTA Diesel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>1GDXE40F9XHA66632</td>
<td>92195</td>
<td>Temp</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.272</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>UMTA Diesel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Barriers to cooperative agreements have included farebox collection (10% match for TD funds), client eligibility determination issues, and trip prioritization structures. The need for intercounty travel has also been identified through the STEP process (see Chapter Seven). Several recommendations included in Chapter Nine have been designed to provide intercounty connectivity for all residents and visitors in Sarasota County, including the transportation disadvantaged population.

**Natural Disaster/Emergency Preparedness**

FEMA involvement and SFC’s designated role, Senior Friendship Centers serves as both a staging area and vehicle for evacuation of persons with special needs under the leadership of the Department of Emergency Management, Sarasota County Government. The County anticipates the needs of persons requiring special medical sheltering and/or transportation during a declared State of Emergency through the People with Special Needs program, as stipulated in Florida State Statute 252.355. As of October 1993, there were approximately 1500 registered people. One of the most important aspects in evacuating the special needs population segment is determining and securing the appropriate types of vehicles to use. County vehicle resources that have been committed to augment the Program are buses, lift gate vehicles, school buses and ambulances. Both Sarasota County Area Transit and Senior Friendship Centers will provide buses to transport able-bodied people without their own means of transportation to the area shelters. Run sheets with information are created from the database and assigned to transportation resources for advanced planning.

In the event of a natural disaster, the Transportation Department of Senior Friendship Centers will enact the following procedures:

a. All personnel will be notified in advance that they will be paid for driving during an evacuation, but it is voluntary.

b. A list of volunteers, if any, will be maintained with methods to contact them.

c. Vehicles will be fueled and marked as mechanically available.

d. Keys will be left in vehicles and odometer readings recorded.

e. Warnings will be posted at least 48 hours prior to evacuation

f. Transportation Director will be notified by Sarasota County Disaster Preparedness, if evacuation is necessary.

g. Transportation Director will notify SFC Senior Staff and key transportation personnel, including all supervisors.

h. Supervisors will notify volunteer drivers.
i. Transportation Director will keep Disaster Preparedness advised as to readiness status of SFC Main Center and vehicles, to include drivers, vehicle capabilities and capacities.

j. Transportation Director will be stationed in the transportation office and will maintain contact with Sarasota and Venice based vehicles via radio and the main SFC center via telephone and/or radio depending on availability of communication.

k. Senior supervisor will assume the duties outlined above for director is out of town or for some reason cannot assume these duties.

l. An update of volunteer drivers and other key staff will be conducted annually. A telephone tree will be maintained with Transportation Emergency Management Procedures.

**Marketing**

Senior Friendship Centers utilizes several market media. A brochure which defines service and explains service delivery is available on the SFC vehicles and is distributed to agencies whose clients use the service. An infomercial is installed on the telephone system, which educates callers about the TD program, operating hours, how to make a reservation, the one-hour window, and the costs of transportation. SFC publishes a quarterly newspaper, "TODAY'S SENIOR" which features articles about transportation. The local newspaper includes this publication in the Sunday edition twice per year. Outreach efforts are ongoing. Transportation staff speak at nursing homes, congregate living facilities, and to agencies whose clients use the service.

**Acceptable Alternatives**

Currently, no economically feasible transportation alternatives to the coordinated system have been identified. However, the STEP is recommending the formation of a Community Transportation Pool (see Chapter Eight for a full description) designed to accomplish the coordination of existing transportation resources that are not required, under F.S. 427, to participate in the Florida coordinated system. Formation of this pool may result in a mechanism that increases the mobility of the transportation disadvantaged population in Sarasota County at a lower cost than the coordinated TD system.

**CTC Quality Assurance**

The CTC and Local Coordinating Board have developed a thorough quality assurance program to ensure that the TD program in Sarasota County provides quality, safe, and efficient service for
TD clients. The following sections describe two components of the quality assurance program for the Sarasota County TD program—adopted service standards and the adopted grievance procedures.

Service Standards

The Community Transportation Coordinator and any Transportation Operator from whom service is purchased or arranged by the CTC shall adhere to Commission approved standards. These standards, as outlined in Rule 41-2.006 (4), Florida Administrative Code, include:

1. **Drug and Alcohol Testing** - All safety sensitive job positions shall comply with the pre-employment, randomization, post-accident and reasonable suspicion testing requirements of the Federal Transit Administration.

2. **Transport of Escorts and Dependent Children** - Children under age 16 and individuals requiring special loading assistance will be required to be accompanied by an escort. Escorts must be provided by the passenger. The escorts must be able to provide the necessary assistance to the passenger. Escorts shall be transported with Medicaid and Title III passengers at no cost. All other sponsored trips requiring escorts are billed at one-half the cost of the trip.

3. **Use, Responsibility and Cost of Child Restraint Devices** - All passengers under the age of 4 and/or under 45 pounds shall be required to use a child restraint device. This device shall be provided by the passenger.

4. **Passenger Property** - Passengers shall be allowed to have unlimited pieces of personal property which they can stow in the rear of the vehicle. Passengers must be able to independently carry all items brought onto the vehicle. Drivers shall be allowed to carry packages as individually needed by the passenger. Passenger property does not include wheelchairs, child seats, secured oxygen, personal assistance devices, or intravenous devices. Groceries shall be limited to 4 plastic bags or 2 paper bags.

5. **Vehicle Transfer Points** - Vehicle transfer points shall be located in a safe, and secure place that provides shelter.

6. **Local Toll Free Telephone Number** - A local toll free telephone number shall be posted in all vehicles within the transportation system. This telephone number shall be included in the complaint process.

7. **Out-of-Service Area Trips** - The CTC will provide out-of-service area trips Monday - Friday based on availability and capacity.

8. **Vehicle Cleanliness** - Interior of all vehicles shall be free of dirt, oil, trash, torn upholstery, damaged or broken seats, protruding metal or other objects or
materials which could soil items placed in the vehicle or provide discomfort for the passenger. All vehicles shall be cleaned (interior and exterior) on a regular schedule.

9. **Billing Requirements** - The CTC shall pay all bills within 15 days to subcontractors after receipt of said payment by the CTC.

10. **Passenger/Trip Database** - The CTC shall collect and maintain the name, telephone number, address, funding source eligibility and special requirements in a database on each passenger.

11. **Adequate Seating** - Vehicle seating shall not exceed the manufacturer's recommended capacity.

12. **Driver Identification** - Drivers for the CTC shall be attired in uniforms with their names and the CTC logo displayed on the uniform. Contracted operators shall be required to announce and identify themselves by name and company in a manner that is conducive to communications with the specific passenger upon pickup. Contracted operators shall wear a name tag with the CTC logo and a picture ID. at all times when transporting passengers.

13. **Passenger Assistance** - All drivers shall assist all passengers on and off the vehicles, if necessary or requested to the seating area of vehicles. This assistance shall include: opening the vehicle door, fastening the seat belt or wheelchair securement devices, storage of mobility devices and closing the door. Drivers may not assist wheelchairs up or down more than one (1) step.

14. **Smoking, Drinking and Eating** - There shall be no smoking or the use of tobacco products on any vehicle in the transportation system. Eating and drinking on board the vehicle will not be allowed. Stops will be made to accommodate the needs of the passengers as determined by the dispatcher. Comfort stops will be determined by the driver.

15. **Passenger No-Shows** - Passenger no-shows are defined as trips not canceled prior to dispatch of the vehicle. The CTC will enforce the Medicaid No-Show Policy for all passengers. Third occurrence: letter from the CTC, fourth occurrence: 30 day suspension, fifth occurrence: 60 day suspension, sixth occurrence: 90 day suspension.

16. **Two-Way Communications** - All vehicles shall be equipped with two-way radios in good working order and be audible to drivers at all times to the base.

17. **Air Conditioning / Heating** - All vehicles in the coordinated system shall have working air conditioning and heating. Vehicles that do not have a working air conditioner or heater shall be scheduled for repair or replacement as soon as possible.

18. **CPR / First Aid** - All drivers shall be certified in CPR and Community First Aid.

19. **Driver Criminal Background Screening** - All drivers in the coordinated system must have a criminal background screening prior to employment.
20. **Service Effectiveness** - Service effectiveness shall be evaluated based on the following information: percentage of TD passengers transported, passenger trips/vehicle mile, cost/vehicle mile, cost/passenger trip, vehicle miles/passenger and a customer satisfaction survey and client focus groups.

21. **Public Transit Ridership** – The number of TD trips provided by the public transit system is growing; approximately, 39,000 trips were reported during the last MOA year.

22. **Contract Monitoring** - The CTC shall perform an annual evaluation of the contracted operators using applicable portions of the TDCB evaluation process and the FDOT System Safety Program Plan Inspection.

23. **Pick-up Window** - There is a one hour pick-up window in place for all trips within the service area. Out-of-service area trips may require additional time.

24. **On-time Performance** - The CTC shall have an 95% on-time performance rate for all completed trips.

25. **Advance Reservation Requirement** - There shall be a 24 hour notice requirement for all trips scheduled within the coordinated system, except under special circumstances.

26. **Accidents** - 1.2 accidents per 100,000 miles shall be the maximum allowable number of accidents for the evaluation period.

27. **Roadcalls** - There should be no less than 10,000 miles between each roadcall.

28. **Call Hold Time** - Hold time shall not exceed two (2) minutes for any caller.

29. **Standard for Written Complaints** - The CTC sets 20 written complaints as the standard of measure for annual performance.

Local Grievance Procedure

The following bullet points outline the adopted grievance process that is followed in the Sarasota County TD program in order to facilitate the quick resolution of passenger and client complaints related to service.

- The grievance rights of the user shall be posted in a location that is generally visible to sighted clients and be made available, upon request, in a format accessible to persons with disabilities.

- Complaints which emanate from continued lateness, driver behavior, passenger discomfort, irregularities in the system of delivery or decisions made to deny, reduce or terminate services constitute grievances for users or funding agencies. Complaints about charges or billing constitute grievances by a funding agency or transportation operator. Other complaints can be heard at the discretion of the Grievance Board. The
CTC will record, maintain and report all complaints and problems to the Coordinating Board.

- A letter stating the problem shall be sent to the Community Transportation Coordinator (CTC) outlining the nature of the alleged grievance, and where applicable the date, time and place of the incident constituting the grievance. The Community Transportation Coordinator (CTC) will make every effort to resolve the grievance following the procedures of his/her agency.

- If this effort is not successful, the grievant may present their grievance to the chairman of the Grievance Committee by written notice.

- Upon receipt of the grievance form, the chairperson shall have ten (10) working days to contact Grievance Committee members and set a grievance hearing date. The hearing date must be within twenty (20) days of receipt of written grievance.

- The grievant and all parties involved shall be notified at least seven (7) working days prior to the hearing date by certified mail, return receipt requested. The Grievance Committee shall review the material presented and issue a decision to all parties involved within ten (10) working days. The said notice shall be sent to all parties by certified mail, return receipt requested.

- If the grievance cannot be resolved by the Grievance Committee, the grievant may notify the Coordinating Board.

- If the grievance is not resolved at the level of the Local Coordinating Board, the grievant may notify the full body of the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO).

CTC Evaluation Process

A copy of the most recent evaluation of the Sarasota County CTC is contained in Appendix I.
PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF CTC COORDINATED SERVICES

Performance Review Data

The substantial amount of data available from the Annual Operating Reports (AORs) submitted to the FCTD by each CTC in the state of Florida provide an opportunity to develop a large assortment of measures for CTC service. Sets of performance, effectiveness, and efficiency measures that have been known to provide a good representation of overall CTC system performance have been selected and included in the following performance evaluations of the CTC for Sarasota County. Table 3-2 lists the measures used in this section. The tables and figures provided throughout the following trend and peer group analyses present selected performance, effectiveness, and efficiency measures that are available from AORs submitted by CTCs throughout Florida. These figures may be overstated or understated, due to various accounting practices at SFC, contract providers, the agencies that have entered into coordination agreements with the CTC, as well as the other CTCs included in the peer group analysis. Results from the CTC trend analysis performed for the Sarasota County CTC are provided in the following paragraphs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measures</th>
<th>Effectiveness Measures</th>
<th>Efficiency Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County Population</td>
<td>Vehicle Miles per TD Capita</td>
<td>Operating Expense per Passenger Trip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential TD Population</td>
<td>Passenger Trips per TD Capita</td>
<td>Operating Exp per Paratransit Pass Trip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Trips</td>
<td>Paratransit Pass Trips per TD Capita</td>
<td>Operating Expense per Vehicle Mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paratransit Pass Trips</td>
<td>Passenger Trips per Vehicle Mile</td>
<td>Farebox Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Miles</td>
<td>Average Age of Fleet (in years)</td>
<td>Local Government Revenue Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Miles</td>
<td>Accidents per 100,000 Vehicle Miles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expense</td>
<td>Vehicle Miles Between Roadcalls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Fleet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to completely understand the data used in a performance evaluation of this type, it is important to have an understanding of the definitions of the terms. In many instances, these definitions differ from initial perceptions and, therefore, may be contingent upon subjective interpretation. Appendix B provides a detailed list of definitions for the terms used in the trend and peer analyses. Despite these definitions and continuous efforts to refine them, some discrepancies remain as to how terms are defined and how information is collected.
Consequently, some caution should be exercised when interpreting the findings, especially for those variables that are more likely to be subject to variation in definition.

**Sarasota County CTC Trend Analysis**

In addition to the SCAT fixed-route trend analysis presented in an earlier section of this report, CUTR conducted a CTC trend analysis for FY 1992 through FY 1998 to examine the performance of the Sarasota County TD paratransit program, operated by Senior Friendship Centers, Inc (SFC), over time. SFC serves as the Community Transportation Coordinator (CTC) for all transportation services provided through the County’s TD program, as well as providing and coordinating ADA complementary paratransit service in Sarasota County under contract to SCAT. This trend analysis represents a combined set of statistics for all TD transportation services coordinated through the CTC, including ADA, TD and Medicaid paratransit, fixed-route (unless otherwise specified), and agency-sponsored services. Service statistics are included for all providers of service, including SFC, eight CTC contract providers, and seven agencies that have coordination agreements with the CTC. The tables and figures provided throughout the trend analysis present selected performance, effectiveness, and efficiency measures that are available from SFC’s AORs.

**Performance Measures**

Shown in Table 3-3 and Figures 3-3 through 3-16 are 14 performance measures for SFC in its capacity of CTC for Sarasota County. The results of the trend analysis indicate that the Sarasota County CTC has experienced significant growth over the past seven years. During the seven-year period covered by the trend analysis, the CTC increased the size of the available vehicle fleet for the TD program by 218.5 percent, from 27 vehicles to 86 vehicles. The CTC has also consistently increased the number of passenger trips delivered to TD customers, with a 73.4 percent growth over the past seven years. However, growth has slowed somewhat during recent years with an 8.4 percent increase in total passenger trips between FY 1997 and FY 1998. Total paratransit trips also experienced an overall increase of 75.5 percent during the seven-year period, as well as a 3.1 percent increase between FY 1997 and FY 1998. SFC has successfully increased the number of TD trips that are provided on the SCAT fixed-route system. Between FY 1997 and FY 1998, the number of fixed-route trips provided to TD passengers increased by 46.7 percent.
Table 3-3
Sarasota County CTC Trend Analysis - Performance Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service Area Population</td>
<td>291,556</td>
<td>298,667</td>
<td>305,996</td>
<td>301,202</td>
<td>306,709</td>
<td>312,320</td>
<td>311,043</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>-0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential TD Population</td>
<td>140,760</td>
<td>142,030</td>
<td>142,146</td>
<td>139,473</td>
<td>143,755</td>
<td>145,947</td>
<td>145,947</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Passenger Trips</td>
<td>138,416</td>
<td>144,785</td>
<td>148,384</td>
<td>161,722</td>
<td>204,447</td>
<td>221,512</td>
<td>240,060</td>
<td>73.4%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed-Route Passenger Trips</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,052</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25,185</td>
<td>26,800</td>
<td>39,327</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paratransit Passenger Trips</td>
<td>114,403</td>
<td>144,785</td>
<td>146,332</td>
<td>161,722</td>
<td>179,262</td>
<td>194,712</td>
<td>200,733</td>
<td>75.5%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Vehicle Miles</td>
<td>657,995</td>
<td>636,677</td>
<td>663,267</td>
<td>915,515</td>
<td>1,019,090</td>
<td>1,135,819</td>
<td>1,081,061</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>-4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenue Miles</td>
<td>619,447</td>
<td>585,062</td>
<td>630,000</td>
<td>842,274</td>
<td>937,563</td>
<td>843,391</td>
<td>935,806</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expense (in US dollars)</td>
<td>1,055,030</td>
<td>1,153,151</td>
<td>1,263,206</td>
<td>1,380,331</td>
<td>2,076,006</td>
<td>2,536,946</td>
<td>3,010,010</td>
<td>185.3%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Revenue (in US dollars)</td>
<td>1,055,030</td>
<td>1,153,151</td>
<td>1,167,206</td>
<td>1,380,331</td>
<td>1,826,985</td>
<td>2,597,879</td>
<td>2,888,210</td>
<td>173.8%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Fleet</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>218.5%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farebox Revenue</td>
<td>27,931</td>
<td>89,801</td>
<td>5,216</td>
<td>27,824</td>
<td>65,153</td>
<td>118,769</td>
<td>n/r</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Gov’t Revenue</td>
<td>263,050</td>
<td>343,203</td>
<td>377,707</td>
<td>569,354</td>
<td>585,633</td>
<td>735,930</td>
<td>739,921</td>
<td>181.3%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accidents</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>-70.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadcalls</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>-85.2%</td>
<td>208.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


During the seven-year period covered by the trend analysis, the CTC has increased total vehicle miles by 64.3 percent and total revenue miles by 51.1 percent. However, during the period between FY 1997 and FY 1998, the CTC reported a 4.8 percent reduction in vehicle miles along with a 11.0 percent increase in revenue miles. This increase in revenue miles coupled with a decrease in total vehicle miles provides an indication of greater efficiencies being achieved in the provision of TD transportation in Sarasota County because a greater percentage of vehicle miles are traveling in revenue service.

CTC operating expenses increased by 185.3 percent over the seven-year period included in the trend analysis. Additionally, operating expenses experienced an 18.6 percent increase between FY 1997 and FY 1998. Similarly, operating revenues increased by 173.8 percent during the seven-year period, with revenues increasing by 11.2 percent between FY 1997 and FY 1998.
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Effectiveness Measures

Table 3-4 and Figures 3-17 through 3-26 contain trend information for ten effectiveness measures calculated for the Sarasota County CTC. The data show significant growth over the seven-year period (58.5 percent) for the average number of vehicle miles traveled per Potential TD customer (from 4.67 miles to 7.41 miles). However, a review of the data contained in Table 3-4 and Figure 3-17 reveal that the number of vehicle miles traveled per TD customer actually decreased between FY 1997 and FY 1998 by 6.3 percent. The number of total passenger trips per Potential TD customers increased during the seven-year period by 67.3 percent, and the number of paratransit trips per Potential TD customers also increased by 69.2 percent. These relationships are illustrated in Figures 3-20 and 3-21. Both the number of passenger trips per TD customer and paratransit passenger trips per TD customer show increases (6.7 percent and 1.5 percent, respectively) between FY 1997 and FY 1998. Slow growth in terms of the number of paratransit trips per TD customer may be related to a steady increase in the number of TD trips provided on the SCAT fixed-route system (see Table 3-3 and Figure 3-6).

### Table 3-4
CTC Trend Analysis - Effectiveness Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Miles per TD Capita</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>6.56</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>7.90</td>
<td>7.41</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
<td>-6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Miles per Paratransit Passenger Trip</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>-6.4%</td>
<td>-7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Miles per Pass Trip</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>-5.3%</td>
<td>-12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass Trips per TD Capita</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>67.3%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paratransit Pass Trip per TD Capita</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass Trips per Vehicle Mile</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paratransit Pass Trips per Veh. Mile</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Age of Fleet</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>n/r</td>
<td>n/r</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accidents per 100,000 Vehicle miles</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>-29.7%</td>
<td>-69.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Miles between Roadcalls</td>
<td>2,632</td>
<td>45,477</td>
<td>19,508</td>
<td>29,533</td>
<td>72,792</td>
<td>94,652</td>
<td>29,218</td>
<td>1010.1%</td>
<td>-69.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As illustrated in Figure 3-22 and Figure 3-23, both total passenger trips per vehicle mile and total paratransit passenger trips per vehicle mile have increased over the seven-year period (5.6 percent and 6.8 percent, respectively). Between FY 1997 and FY 1998, total passenger trips per vehicle mile increased by 13.9 percent and total paratransit passenger trips per vehicle mile increased by 8.3 percent. The increases experienced in these measures have been rather significant and may be attributed, in part, to decreases in the average length of passenger trips in Sarasota County, increased use of the fixed-route system by TD customers, and increased multi-loading of paratransit trips. This is also suggested by the measures related to vehicle miles per total passenger trip and vehicle miles per paratransit passenger trip. As shown in Figures 3-19 and 3-18, these effectiveness measures decreased over the seven-year period (5.3 percent and 6.4 percent, respectively). Between FY 1997 and FY 1998, vehicle miles per passenger trip decreased by 12.2 percent and vehicle miles per paratransit passenger trip declined by 7.7 percent.

The average number of vehicle miles traveled between roadcalls experienced a significant increase of 1010.1 percent over the seven-year period, as shown in Figure 3-26. However, this measure decreased by nearly 70 percent between FY 1997 and FY 1998. The CTC reports that this measure is being reported more accurately now than in the past. The change in reporting suggested by the CTC is consistent with the experiences of CTCs throughout the state that have reported differing interpretations of what is considered a roadcall by CTCs and the Florida Commission for the Transportation Disadvantaged (FCTD). However, this measure does suggest the need for further analysis to definitively determine the cause(s) for the decrease in the number of miles traveled between roadcalls in the last fiscal year. The CTC has experienced a significant decrease of 29.7 percent in the number of accidents per 100,000 vehicle miles traveled between FY 1992 and FY 1998 (see Figure 3-25). This measure also decreased by 69.7 percent between FY 1997 and FY 1998. The cause of this dramatic decrease in accident occurrences is most likely the result of clarification regarding the type of incident the FCTD defines as an accident. SFC has indicated that all incidents have been reported as accidents in the past. According to FCTD Annual Operating Report definitions, only accidents resulting in over $1000.00 damages should be reported as an accident. Given this definition, the number of accidents experienced by the CTC in FY 1998 experienced a dramatic decline from previous years.

Efficiency Measures

The final area examined in the trend analysis for the CTC is the area of system efficiency. The measures included in Table 3-5 and illustrated graphically in Figures 3-27 through 3-31 are intended to provide a picture of how efficiently SFC, in its role as CTC, is providing service to the
TD population in Sarasota County. Most of the efficiency measures related to operating expenses show modest increases during the analysis period. As shown in Figure 3-27, operating expenses per total passenger trips increased by 64.5 percent during the seven-year period and by 9.5 percent between FY 1997 and FY 1998. The data pertaining to operating expense per paratransit passenger trip (see Figure 3-28) show a similar increase of 62.6 percent between FY 1992 and FY 1998. This measure increased by 15.1 percent between FY 1997 and FY 1998. Finally, operating expense per vehicle mile traveled grew by nearly 74 percent over the seven-year period included in the trend analysis. More significantly, this measure increased by 24.7 percent between FY 1997 and FY 1998. This relationship is illustrated in Figure 3-29.

### Table 3-5
CTC Trend Analysis - Efficiency Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Op Expense per Pass Trip</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>7.96</td>
<td>8.51</td>
<td>8.54</td>
<td>10.15</td>
<td>11.45</td>
<td>12.54</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Op Expense per Paratransit Pass Trip</td>
<td>9.22</td>
<td>7.96</td>
<td>8.63</td>
<td>8.54</td>
<td>11.58</td>
<td>13.03</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>62.6%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Op Expense per Vehicle Mile</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farebox Ratio</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government Revenue Ratio</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>-1.4%</td>
<td>-15.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The increases in operating expenses experienced by the CTC may be partially explained by several operational changes that have occurred as a result of the growth and centralization of Senior Friendship Center, Inc. in its role as the Sarasota County CTC. The CTC recently moved into the SCAT operations building in order to increase the level of integration between fixed-route bus service and paratransit services in terms of planning, scheduling, and service delivery. However, the CTC’s operational costs have risen as a result of increased expenses associated with the move. In addition, the CTC reports that more TD trips were purchased through contract providers during the past fiscal year than in previous years. Trips purchased through contract providers, rather than provided in SFC vehicles, have raised operational costs because most of the contract providers do not have large vehicles capable of multi-loading passengers. As a result, more individual trips than group trips were provided to TD customers. In addition, the CTC began providing stretcher trips during the last fiscal year, which tend to be particularly
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expensive due to the high level of care required in the provision of service. Finally, the increase in operational costs illustrated in Table 3-5 and Figures 3-27 through 3-29 may be related to inaccurate reporting by contract providers and agencies with coordination agreements with the CTC. These data represent system-wide data and may be skewed by agencies that are unable to accurately delineate transportation costs from overall agency operational costs.

The final measures evaluated in the CTC trend analysis relate to revenue sources for the Sarasota TD program. The CTC has increased the amount of revenue collected in the form of passenger fares. As illustrated in Figure 3-30, the portion of operating expenses recovered from the collection of passenger fares increased by 325.2 percent between FY 1992 and FY 1997 (this measure was not reported for FY 1998). The percentage of operating expenses covered by revenues collected from local government contributions to the system decreased by 1.4 percent over the seven-year trend analysis period, as shown in Figure 3-31. However, that percentage decreased by a full 15.3 percent between FY 1997 and FY 1998. As illustrated in Table 3-5, although the amount of revenue contributed to the Sarasota TD program by local government sources increased by only 0.5 percent between FY 1997 and FY 1998, CTC operating expenses increased by a full 18.6 percent during the same reporting period.

Conclusions

This concluding section summarizes the results of the CTC trend analysis for SFC. A summary of SFC’s performance strengths and weaknesses based on effectiveness and efficiency measures are provided in Table 3-6. The intent of showing this information is not to suggest the extent of the strength or weakness but to identify those performance areas where SFC’s performance has improved or declined from FY 1992 through FY 1998. With regard to the trend analysis, a performance strength is defined as any performance area that improved or was maintained over the trend analysis time period and a performance weakness is defined as a trend that declined over the trend analysis time period.

Table 3-6
SFC Performance Strengths and Weaknesses, Trend Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Strengths</th>
<th>Performance Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Miles per TD Capita</td>
<td>Vehicle Miles between Roadcalls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger trips per TD Capita</td>
<td>Operating Expense per Passenger Trip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paratransit Passenger Trips per TD Capita</td>
<td>Operating Expense per Paratransit Pass. Trip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operating Expense per Vehicle Mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Trips per Vehicle Mile</td>
<td>Local Government Revenue Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paratransit Passenger Trips per Vehicle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As illustrated in Table 3-6, SFC has experienced significant improvements in most effectiveness measures related to the number of trips provided through the Sarasota TD program. The CTC has consistently increased the number of trips provided to TD customers, as well as improving efficiencies through effective multi-loading of paratransit trips. However, the cost of providing TD trips has consistently increased over the past seven fiscal years. Escalating costs may be partially related to operational changes experienced by the CTC during previous fiscal years. In addition, reporting inconsistencies among agencies that have coordination agreements with the CTC may contribute to the appearance of inflated operating costs. However, the CTC should continue to monitor expenses, while also pursuing strategies that will help encourage more accurate reporting practices among agencies. Finally, the CTC should conduct further analysis into the areas of vehicle miles traveled between roadcalls. The data for these performance measures suggest that the CTC’s system safety and reliability may be declining.

This section has presented a trend analysis of the Sarasota County CTC covering fiscal years 1992 through 1998. A CTC peer group analysis was also completed as part of the performance evaluation of the Sarasota County CTC in order to compare SFC’s performance with the performances of similar CTCs throughout the State. The CTC peer group analysis is presented in the following sections.

**CTC Peer Group Analysis**

In addition to the required fixed-route peer review performed as part of the Sarasota Transportation Enhancement Plan (STEP), a paratransit service peer review analysis for FY 1998 was also conducted to compare the performance of Sarasota’s TD paratransit program against that of similar CTCs in Florida. A paratransit peer group analysis is important because it provides a comparison of how well the CTC in Sarasota County (Senior Friendship Centers, Inc.) is performing relative to similar CTCs within Florida and, second, it helps to establish realistic performance standards for the evaluation process. The five Florida peer CTCs included in the analysis are shown in Table 3-7 and include Charlotte, Escambia, Lee, Manatee, and Pasco counties. Each system is described in further detail in the following section. The five systems were chosen because they are somewhat similar to the Sarasota County CTC\(^1\) in terms of the

\(^1\) The Charlotte County CTC does not represent a typical peer CTC for Sarasota County. Both total county population (131,307) and Potential TD population (74,813) are significantly smaller than Sarasota County. In addition, the Charlotte County CTC provided over 100,000 fewer TD trips in FY 1998 than the CTC in Sarasota.
following five key elements: demographic characteristics, system size (measured in terms of annual TD ridership), operating environment (urban or rural service area designation), organization type (transit agency, government, private non-profit, or private for-profit), and network type (sole provider, partial brokerage, or complete brokerage).

The charts presented in this section summarize selected performance measures, effectiveness measures, and efficiency measures for the various CTCs considered for this review. Each performance measure is depicted in a bar chart to enhance the overall comparison. Detailed information for each of the peer CTCs is included in Appendix K. All performance statistics for the CTC peer group systems were obtained from the FCTD's 1998 DRAFT Annual Performance Report, which contains a compilation of the Annual Operating Reports submitted to the FCTD for FY 1998 by each local CTC.

According to the Evaluation Workbook for Community Transportation Coordinators and Providers in Florida, prepared by CUTR, the Sarasota County CTC is categorized as a "size 5" system (200,000 - 749,999 annual one-way passenger trips) that operates in an urban service area (contains an urbanized area, with a population of more than 50,000), is organized as a private non-profit entity, and coordinates TD trips as a partial brokerage (provides some TD trips and brokers out the remainder to contract providers within the coordinated system).

### Table 3-7
Sarasota County CTC System Peers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Area</th>
<th>Community Transportation Coordinator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte County</td>
<td>Charlotte County Transit Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escambia County</td>
<td>Intelitran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee County</td>
<td>COMSIS Mobility Services, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manatee County</td>
<td>Manatee Board of County Commissioners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasco County</td>
<td>Pasco County Public Transportation Department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Descriptions of CTC Peer Systems

**Charlotte County**

Charlotte County is located in West Central Florida, south of adjacent to Sarasota County, and has a population of 131,307. The 1998 Potential TD Population was estimated to be 74,813. The Charlotte County Transit Department serves as the CTC for this urban operating
environment. The CTC is a government entity and acts as a partial broker of TD transportation. The CTC provided 124,745 trips during FY 1998.

**Escambia County**

Escambia County is located in the far western coastal area of Florida’s Panhandle. This urban operating environment has a total population of 291,135 persons and a 1998 Potential TD Population of 105,277. Intelitran, Inc. serves as the CTC for Escambia County. The CTC is a private for-profit agency and acts as a complete brokerage of TD transportation. The CTC provided 495,676 trips during FY 1998.

**Lee County**

Lee County is located in Southwest Florida, adjacent to Charlotte County. The County has a total population of 394,344 and a 1998 estimated Potential TD Population of 171,490. COMSIS Mobility Services, Inc., a private for-profit agency, serves as the CTC for this urban operating environment and acts as a complete brokerage of TD transportation. The CTC provided 205,483 trips in FY 1998.

**Manatee County**

Manatee County is located in West Central Florida, north of and adjacent to Sarasota County. The County has a total population of 241,422 persons and an estimated 1998 Potential TD population of 111,062. The Manatee Board of County Commissioners serves as the CTC for this urban operating environment and acts as a partial brokerage of TD transportation. The CTC provided 426,981 trips during FY 1998.

**Pasco County**

Pasco County is located in Central Florida and has a total population of 315,785 persons. The 1998 Potential TD Population was estimated to be 168,877 persons. Pasco County Public Transportation serves as the CTC for Pasco County. The government entity operates a partial brokerage of TD transportation in this urban operating environment. The CTC provided 255,330 trips during FY 1998.
Performance Measures

Table 3-8 and Figures 3-32 through 3-44 present information pertaining to thirteen performance measures for Senior Friendship Centers, Inc. (SFC) and the selected CTC peers. As discussed previously, performance measures provide general information related to overall system performance. When compared to its CTC peers, SFC is nearly 11 percent above the peer group mean for total service area population and 12.6 percent above the peer group mean of 129,578 Potential TD customers.

![Table 3-8](http://example.com/table3-8)

**Table 3-8**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Sarasota</th>
<th>Manatee</th>
<th>Charlotte</th>
<th>Lee</th>
<th>Pasco</th>
<th>Escambia</th>
<th>Peer Min</th>
<th>Peer Max</th>
<th>Peer Mean</th>
<th>Sarasota % From Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service Area Population</td>
<td>311,043</td>
<td>241,422</td>
<td>131,307</td>
<td>394,344</td>
<td>315,785</td>
<td>291,135</td>
<td>131,307</td>
<td>394,344</td>
<td>280,839</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential TD Population</td>
<td>145,947</td>
<td>111,062</td>
<td>74,813</td>
<td>171,490</td>
<td>168,877</td>
<td>105,277</td>
<td>74,813</td>
<td>171,490</td>
<td>129,578</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Passenger Trips</td>
<td>240,060</td>
<td>426,981</td>
<td>124,745</td>
<td>205,483</td>
<td>255,330</td>
<td>495,676</td>
<td>124,745</td>
<td>495,676</td>
<td>291,379</td>
<td>-17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed-Route Passenger Trips</td>
<td>39,327</td>
<td>95,306</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9,115</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>134,202</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>134,202</td>
<td>46,325</td>
<td>-15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paratransit Passenger Trips</td>
<td>200,733</td>
<td>329,160</td>
<td>101,000</td>
<td>196,368</td>
<td>252,922</td>
<td>345,611</td>
<td>101,000</td>
<td>345,611</td>
<td>237,632</td>
<td>-15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Vehicle Miles</td>
<td>1,081,061</td>
<td>908,279</td>
<td>541,774</td>
<td>1,778,738</td>
<td>927,285</td>
<td>1,751,730</td>
<td>541,774</td>
<td>1,778,738</td>
<td>1,164,811</td>
<td>-7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenue Miles</td>
<td>935,806</td>
<td>853,601</td>
<td>417,166</td>
<td>1,532,828</td>
<td>772,887</td>
<td>1,461,524</td>
<td>1,532,828</td>
<td>995,635</td>
<td>-6.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expense</td>
<td>3,010,010</td>
<td>1,842,504</td>
<td>745,764</td>
<td>2,158,006</td>
<td>1,900,626</td>
<td>2,726,752</td>
<td>745,764</td>
<td>3,010,010</td>
<td>2,063,944</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Revenue</td>
<td>2,888,210</td>
<td>1,606,395</td>
<td>745,764</td>
<td>2,229,137</td>
<td>1,989,082</td>
<td>2,955,999</td>
<td>745,764</td>
<td>2,955,999</td>
<td>2,069,098</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Fleet</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Gov't Revenue</td>
<td>739,921</td>
<td>403,630</td>
<td>147,705</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>275,311</td>
<td>14,400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>739,921</td>
<td>263,495</td>
<td>180.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accidents</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>-4.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadcalls</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>-47.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although SFC has a larger service area population and a larger number of Potential TD customers than the peer group mean, the CTC provided 17.6 percent fewer total passenger trips (240,060) during FY 1998 than the peer group mean (291,379), as illustrated in Figure 3-34. Figures 3-36 and 3-35 show that the Sarasota County CTC also provided 15.5 percent fewer paratransit passenger trips and 15.1 fewer fixed-route passenger trips than the peer group mean.

In terms of total vehicle miles and total revenue miles traveled, SFC performed very near the peer group mean. SFC traveled 7.2 percent fewer vehicle miles and 6.0 percent fewer revenue miles than the peer group average. These data are presented in Figures 3-37 and 3-38.
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Data related to operating expenses, operating revenues, and fleet size are shown Figures 3-39 through 3-41. These data reveal that although SFC reports a significantly lower number of passenger trips and paratransit passenger trips delivered than the peer group average, the CTC reported significantly higher operating expenses (45.8 percent higher than the peer group average of $2,063,944). Finally, the size of the CTC’s vehicle fleet is 27.7 percent larger than the peer group mean of 67 vehicles.

Effectiveness Measures

Effectiveness measures for FY 1998 were calculated for SFC and each of its peer CTCs and are shown in Table 3-9 and Figures 3-45 through 3-53. On average, SFC travels fewer vehicle miles per Potential TD customer than the peer group average, as shown in Figure 3-45. Specifically, SFC traveled 19.7 percent fewer vehicle miles per TD customer than the peer group mean of 9.22 miles. However, the range for this data is quite large and SFC was very close to the peer median for vehicle miles traveled per Potential TD customer, 7.41 miles compared to 7.80 miles. As illustrated in Figures 3-47 and 3-46, the average length of SFC’s total passenger trips and paratransit passenger trips are slightly longer (4.50 and 5.39 miles, respectively) than the peer group mean for these two measures (4.47 and 5.22 miles, respectively).

SFC provided somewhat fewer total passenger trips per TD customer and paratransit passenger trips per TD customer than the peer group average. In FY 1998, SFC provided 1.64 passenger trips per Potential TD customer compared to the peer group mean of 2.43 passenger trips per Potential TD customer. Similarly, SFC provided 1.38 paratransit passenger trips per Potential TD customer compared to an average of 1.94 paratransit trips for the peer group. These data are illustrated in Figures 3-48 and 3-49.
Table 3-9
CTC Peer Analysis - Effectiveness Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Sarasota</th>
<th>Manatee</th>
<th>Charlotte</th>
<th>Lee</th>
<th>Pasco</th>
<th>Escambia</th>
<th>Peer Min</th>
<th>Peer Max</th>
<th>Peer Mean</th>
<th>Sarasota % From Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Miles per TD Capita</td>
<td>7.41</td>
<td>8.18</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>10.37</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>16.64</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>16.64</td>
<td>9.22</td>
<td>-19.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Miles per Paratransit Pass Trip</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>9.06</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>9.06</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Miles per Pass Trip</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>8.66</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>8.66</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass Trips per TD Capita</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>-32.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paratransit Pass Trips per TD Capita</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>-29.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass Trips per Vehicle Mile</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>-16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paratransit Pass Trips per Vehicle Mile</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>-15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accidents per 100,000 Vehicle miles</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>-5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Miles between Roadcalls</td>
<td>29,218</td>
<td>6,179</td>
<td>77,396</td>
<td>22,797</td>
<td>12,703</td>
<td>20,854</td>
<td>6,179</td>
<td>77,396</td>
<td>28,191</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the areas of passenger trips per vehicle mile (0.22) and paratransit passenger trips per vehicle mile (0.19), SFC’s data was slightly lower than the means reported for the peer group, 0.27 and 0.22 trips, respectively. The relationship of SFC to its peers for these two effectiveness measures are illustrated in Figures 3-50 and 3-51.

The final two effectiveness measures compare SFC to its peer CTCs in terms of system safety and service quality, as shown in Figures 3-52 and Figure 3-53. SFC reports fewer accidents per 100,000 vehicle miles traveled than the mean for the CTC peer group, 0.64 as compared to the peer group average of 0.67. Finally, the number of miles traveled between roadcalls reported for the Sarasota County CTC is very close to the peer group average, 29,218 versus 28,191 miles respectively. These measures together suggest that the CTC in Sarasota County is performing adequately in the areas of system safety and reliability when compared with similar CTCs in the state of Florida. However, as noted in the CTC trend analysis, the number of miles traveled between roadcalls declined significantly over the past fiscal year, thus suggesting the need for additional monitoring and further analysis.
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CTC Performance Review
Efficiency Measures

The final area addressed in the CTC peer analysis is the area of system efficiency. Table 3-10 and Figures 3-54 through 3-57 contain the data collected in order to compare SFC's system efficiency with peer CTCs.

Table 3-10
CTC Peer Analysis - Efficiency Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Sarasota</th>
<th>Manatee</th>
<th>Charlotte</th>
<th>Lee</th>
<th>Pasco</th>
<th>Escambia</th>
<th>Peer Min</th>
<th>Peer Max</th>
<th>Peer Mean</th>
<th>Sarasota % From Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Op Expense per Pass Trip</td>
<td>12.54</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>7.44</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>12.54</td>
<td>7.71</td>
<td>62.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Op Expense per Paratransit Pass Trip</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>7.38</td>
<td>10.99</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>7.89</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>9.06</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Op Expense per Vehicle Mile</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>51.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government Revenue Ratio</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>81.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Efficiency measures related to operating expenses per passenger trip were calculated for paratransit trips, specifically, as well as total paratransit trips (includes fixed-route trips and van pool trips, where applicable). Figure 3-54 and 3-55 show that, with respect to operating expense per passenger trip and operating expense per paratransit passenger trip, SFC statistics are well above the peer group mean for these measures. Specifically, SFC reported the highest operating expense per passenger trip and per paratransit passenger trip during FY 1998 for the peer group. SFC's operating expense per passenger trip was 62.6 percent higher than the average for the CTC peer group ($12.54 compared to $7.71). Similarly, SFC's operating expense per paratransit passenger trip was $15.00, which is 65.5 percent higher than the peer group mean of $9.06 per paratransit trip. Additionally, SFC's operating expense per vehicle mile was 51.7 percent higher, at $2.78, than the peer group mean of $1.83 per vehicle mile (see Figure 3-56). These data suggest cause for concern related to system costs for the Sarasota County TD program and will be discussed in more detail in the concluding section of the peer group analysis.

The final efficiency measure examined in the peer group analysis of the CTC in Sarasota County is the amount of revenue contributed to the TD program in FY 1998 by the local government. As discussed in the CTC trend analysis previously, the amount of revenue contributed by the local government in Sarasota County increased only slightly over the last fiscal year, while CTC operating expenses have witnessed a steady increase. However, as illustrated in Figure 3-57,
SFC ranks the highest among its CTC peers in terms of the ratio of total revenue contributed by the local government. During FY 1998, the amount of revenue contributed by the local government in Sarasota County was 81.4 percent higher than the peer group mean. A majority of these revenues are the County’s contribution toward the purchase of ADA complementary paratransit trips from the CTC.

Table 3-11
SFC CTC Performance Strengths and Weaknesses, Peer Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Strengths</th>
<th>Performance Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Government Revenue Ratio</td>
<td>Passenger Trips per TD Capita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paratransit Passenger Trips per TD Capita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operating Expense per Vehicle Mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operating Expense per Passenger Trip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operating Expense per Paratransit Pass. Trip</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusions

This concluding section summarizes the results of the CTC peer review analysis for SFC. For the CTC peer review analysis, a performance strength is defined as a performance area that is more than 10 percent better than the peer group average, while a performance weakness is defined as a performance area that is more than 10 percent worse than the peer group average. Overall, as shown in Table 3-11, the CTC peer comparison reveals that SFC is performing below the peer group mean in many important effectiveness and efficiency measures. However, these data must be considered within the unique context of the Sarasota County TD program.

For example, the data presented in the SFC’s AOR represent system-wide data. Included in these data are information from agencies that provided transportation to their own clients in vehicles procured through the FDOT Section 16 program. Transportation is not the primary business of these agencies and the CTC reports that many of these agencies have difficulty separating transportation costs from overall agency costs. Therefore, the operating costs reported to the CTC for several agencies likely include total agency costs, rather than only those costs incurred in the delivery of transportation services for clients. As a result, overall operating expenses for the TD program are inflated. The CTC has made strides toward resolving this problem by developing point-by-point instructions for agencies to use to calculate transportation costs as a portion of overall agency costs. The CTC should continue working with agencies to ensure that the most accurate data is collected.
Figure 3-54 Operating Expense per Passenger Trip

Figure 3-55 Operating Expense per Paratransit Passenger Trip

Figure 3-56 Operating Expense per Vehicle Mile

Figure 3-57 Local Government Revenue Ratio
In addition, the Sarasota County TD program has not yet instituted a bus pass program that will facilitate greater use of the fixed-route bus system by TD passengers. This type of program has been very successfully implemented in most of the peer group TD programs resulting in much lower operating expenses. Within the next year, the CTC in Sarasota County plans to implement a bus pass program that will make the fixed-route bus system the transportation mode of first consideration for TD trips. Paratransit service will be reserved for TD customers who are able to demonstrate that they cannot use the fixed-route bus service for needed trips. This program, when fully implemented, should help to reduce and stabilize system costs. In addition, the implementation of paratransit feeder service in the future could result in a reduction of operating costs and increased system efficiencies by helping paratransit passengers to use the less costly fixed-route bus service. This also would result in increased capacity on paratransit vehicles for individuals who are not able to use fixed route services. Given these system particularities, the reader should note that although all of the comparisons presented in this section do provide insight into how well the CTC for Sarasota County appears to be performing statistically, they should not be used as the sole measures to make inferences about the quality of SFC’s TD services.
CTC OPERATOR SURVEY

This section of the paratransit evaluation portion of the STEP summarizes the results of a survey of CTC bus operators. Since bus operators are in direct contact with passengers on a daily basis, they are a valuable resource for information concerning CTC operations, particularly from the rider’s perspective. The surveys were distributed to 35 bus operators on July 21, 1999, by SFC staff. The surveys were placed in the operator’s mailbox and operators were given until July 23, 1999, to complete and return the surveys to the SFC office. A total of 29 surveys were completed and returned by the bus operators. For reference, a copy of the actual operator survey is contained in Appendix L.

The first question on the survey asked CTC operators to read over a list of common complaints that riders often voice and rank, from 1 to 5, the complaints that they hear most frequently from TD riders with 1 being the most frequent complaint and 5 being the least frequent. A total of 12 possible complaints were listed on the survey for bus operators to read over and select from including an “other” category. This particular category required bus operators to write-out their response if it was not represented among the list of common complaints.

The most frequent rider complaints expressed to the bus operators by CTC clients are presented in Table 3-12. According to the results of the survey, the most frequent complaint expressed by CTC clients is the vehicle is late in picking me up. In addition to late pick-ups, clients similarly complained that CTC vehicles are late in delivering riders to their destinations. For the most part, the results from the survey indicate that bus operators feel that the complaints are valid or some of the passengers’ complaints were valid, as shown in Figure 3-58.
Table 3-12
Most Frequent Client Complaints About SFC
Identified by Bus Operators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most Frequently Heard Complaints</th>
<th>Composite Score</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SFC vehicle is late in picking me up</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFC vehicle is late in delivering me to my destination</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pick up window is too long</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFC vehicle is not comfortable</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need Sunday service</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passengers cannot get information</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need night/evening service</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not feel safe on vehicle</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFC vehicle doesn’t go where I want</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fare is too high</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus is not clean</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The composite score was calculated by assigning eleven points for each first priority ranking and one point for each eleventh priority ranking.

Table 3-13 shows the results from survey Question 3. This question asked bus operators to read over a list of possible improvements and to select and rank those improvements that would be most helpful to the CTC. Almost all of the bus operators that responded to this survey question expressed a need to improve scheduling and to provide more time in driver schedules. Finally, the results of the survey indicated that CTC consider using new, smaller buses (ranked 3rd), maintain buses more frequently (ranked 4th), and provide better system information.
Table 3-13

Improvement Areas for SFC
Identified by Bus Operators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Improvement</th>
<th>Composite¹ Score</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve scheduling</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give more time to schedules</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operate new, smaller vehicles</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain buses more frequently</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide better system information</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operate Sunday service</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operate night/evening service</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operate new, larger vehicles</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower the fares</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ The composite score was calculated by assigning eleven points for each first priority ranking and one point for each eleventh priority ranking.

Question 4 of the bus operator survey asked bus operators to indicate potential safety problems with the CTC transportation service. The question required bus operators to write-out their comments. The potential safety problems/hazards noted by bus operators are listed below:

- Pick-ups and drop-offs at the main entrance of Sarasota Memorial Hospital would be safer than current location
- Contact with clients with contagious diseases is unsafe
- Due to bus radios poor quality, drivers sometimes cannot contact dispatch
- Drivers need to hurry from point to point in order to maintain schedule
- Lack of proper driver training
- Drivers are familiar with the vehicle that they normally drive which causes problems when they are assigned to a different vehicle
- Nursing home clients that are unable to communicate
- Drop-off area at 5741 Bee Ridge Road
- The need to look for street signs and house numbers in the dark
- Some drivers do not use turn signals when changing lanes

Question 5 on the bus operator survey queried bus operators about modifications that should be made to the scheduling process. The question required bus operators to write-out their comments. The following is a complete list of comments offered by bus operators.
The only way to solve the window problem is to increase the number of drivers and vehicles
Schedule pick-ups and drop-offs in a circle
Decrease deadheading
Have schedulers ride with drivers to get a better understanding of time needed
Lunch hours are left out of schedules many times
All schedules should be reviewed by someone other than the person producing them to ensure accuracy
Give drivers more time between pick-ups and drop-offs
Allow drivers to work areas they are familiar with
Allow more load time for wheelchairs
Use a different computer scheduling program
Computer scheduled routes will never work due to bridges, road repairs and unforeseen accidents

Finally, question 6 on the bus operator survey asked bus operators to indicate any other comments that would be helpful to improve CTC transportation service. The question required bus operators to write-out their comments. The following is a complete list of comments made by bus operators.

Better scheduling will improve SFC and will reduce the amount of late arrival/departures
We provide a very beneficial service to the community, elderly, homebound, and institutionalized
The service is a good value for the fare charged
If a vehicle is not dispatched for a single individual, clients will always have complaints
Institute a decision making process from the supervisors to drivers
Install a dependable radio system
Fine tune schedules
Too many clients, not enough buses
Outside of scheduling, SFC runs fairly well
Schedules are quite busy, we need more drivers
Prioritize clients
Have someone knowledgeable proofread manifests
Have a drivers meeting every six weeks to discuss problems/solutions
Input from drivers should be taken seriously
Don’t schedule pick-ups at the same time on opposite ends of town
New radio system is a must
Improve radio system
Poor radio system is downright unsafe
Include customer phone number on manifests
SENIOR FRIENDSHIP CENTER ON-BOARD SURVEY

This section summarizes the results of an on-board survey of Senior Friendship Center (SFC) paratransit riders conducted on July 21, 1999. The purpose of this survey was to obtain data about rider demographics, travel behavior, satisfaction with specific aspects of Senior Friendship Center’s services, and the use or potential use of Sarasota County Area Transit (SCAT) services by SFC riders.

Survey Methodology

The paratransit on-board survey was designed to elicit descriptive information regarding the demographic traits and travel behavior of SFC riders as well as their satisfaction with specific aspects of SFC paratransit service. This information will enable SFC to focus on relevant needs and issues. In addition, information about SFC riders’ perception and use of SCAT will help to determine ways of encouraging paratransit riders to use fixed-route transit for some or all of their trips.

The on-board survey was conducted on Wednesday, July 21, 1999. Surveys were distributed by the drivers of all CTC vehicles on that date. Passengers filled out the survey while riding the vehicle and returned the survey to the driver before exiting the vehicle. If passengers were not able to complete the survey before the end of their trip, they were asked to return the completed survey on their next trip. Riders were asked to complete only one survey regardless of whether they used the system multiple times during the survey period. For reference, a copy of the survey instrument is included in Appendix M.

SFC On-Board Survey Analysis

The on-board survey analysis is composed of five sections: demographics, travel behavior, rider satisfaction with specific aspects of SFC paratransit service, ridership of SFC clients on SCAT, and rider comments and suggestions. Each section provides information that will be useful in improving the performance and service offered by the CTC.

Demographic data consists of such information as rider age, gender, ethnicity, annual household income, and the number of working vehicles in the rider’s household. This information is useful for comparison of the demographic characteristics of SFC riders to the characteristics of all persons in Sarasota County.

Travel behavior included data such as frequency of use, length of use, trip purpose, fare payment and fare category, alternative transportation, and assistance requirements. This
information can assist SFC in effective scheduling and general policy-decisions regarding overall SFC service.

A series of questions were asked to evaluate quality of service and user satisfaction. The questions asked include information concerning comfort of vehicles, on-time performance, driver assistance, driver courtesy, telephone agent courtesy, and overall quality of service. Identified weaknesses may potentially be addressed through changes in the system. By distinguishing rider sensitivities regarding specific characteristics of the system, the CTC will be better able to prioritize improvements to the service.

Three questions were also included in the on-board survey regarding the use of SCAT bus services by users of SFC Transportation. These questions were asked to establish what percentage of SFC clients have ever ridden SCAT, the reason(s) they haven’t tried SCAT, and under what conditions would they consider using SCAT bus services.

Finally, respondents were given the opportunity to provide open-ended comments regarding SFC service.

A total of 141 surveys were returned by riders. This represents a 44 percent coverage of all persons riding SFC on the day of the survey. (This assumes that all of the 642 trips paratransit trips provided in this day were roundtrips. Therefore, 321 people were transported.) Each survey question was analyzed independently and the results for each question are provided in either tables or figures. The tables and figures are accompanied by brief narratives that explain the relevance of the findings being reported. All questions were included in the analysis regardless of whether or not the survey was completed entirely.

**SFC Rider Demographic Information**

A number of questions were asked in order to establish a demographic profile of the typical SFC paratransit rider. Demographic-related questions included age (Question 17), gender (Question 18), ethnicity (Question 19), annual household income (Question 20), and auto ownership (Question 21). Where information is available the demographics of SFC riders was compared to the demographics of all residents of Sarasota County (as derived from the 1990 and 1997 US Census data), as shown in Table 3-14.

**Age** - The on-board survey results indicate that more than 72 percent of SFC riders are 60 years or older. Another 12 percent of the riders are between the age of 45 and 59 years old.
Gender - Results from the on-board survey show that many more women currently use SFC service than men. As Table 3-14 indicates, 74 percent of the riders are female and 26 percent are male. This finding related to gender is typical of overall paratransit ridership.

Ethnicity - For the entire system, according to the results from the on-board survey, 82 percent of riders are white, while 17 percent are black. Only 1 percent of riders indicated their ethnicity to be Hispanic.

Annual Household Income - The on-board survey results indicate that 55 percent of riders have an annual household income that is less than $10,000, and another 29 percent have an annual household income between $10,000 and $19,999. Of all the riders surveyed, only 7 percent have an annual household income of $30,000 or greater.

Vehicle Ownership - The on-board survey results indicate that 61 percent of riders do not have a vehicle available to them in their household. Another 29 percent indicated that they have only one vehicle available at their household.

SFC Rider Travel Behavior Information

A number of questions were included in the on-board survey to obtain information about the travel behavior of SFC riders. This information includes frequency of use, length of use, trip purpose, fare payment and fare category, alternative transportation, and assistance requirements. The results of these questions are shown in Figures 3-59 through 3-65.

Frequency of Use - The majority of respondents reported that they use SFC three days per week (30 percent), as illustrated in Figure 3-59. The second most common response to this question was five days per week (25 percent). Fewer than 2 percent of respondents ride more than five days per week.
Table 3-14
Rider Demographic Comparisons of the SFC and SCAT On-Board Surveys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>SFC</th>
<th>Sarasota</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Auto Ownership</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three or more</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual Household Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $10,000</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 to $19,999</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 to $29,999</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000 or more</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnic Origin</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 years or under</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 to 24</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 34</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 44</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 54</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 to 59</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 years or older</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21990 U.S. Census Data.
31997 data from Caliper Corporation.
n/a = data not available in compatible format.

Note: Percents may be slightly greater or less than 100 due to rounding.

Length of Use - As revealed by the on-board survey results shown in Figure 3-60, 54 percent of riders have been using SFC for 2 years or more. These riders may be characterized as the long time users of the system.

Trip Purpose - The results from the on-board survey show that most riders are traveling to a doctor/dentist or to a senior center, with response rates of 31 percent for both options. The response rates for this question are illustrated in Figure 3-61.

Fare Payment - In Question 2 respondents were asked whether they pay a fare to ride on SFC
vehicles and if they do pay, what the amount of the fare was. As shown in Figure 3-62, approximately 73 percent of respondents paid a fare, with the majority paying $1.00 for each trip (see Figure 3-63).

**Trip Type**  Riders were also asked whether their trip was sponsored by an organization. The largest group of respondents indicated that they were Silver Card riders (36 percent), as shown in Figure 3-64. Silver Card paratransit trips are sponsored through the ADA complementary paratransit service and are open to individuals who are not able to use the fixed-route bus service because of a disability. The next most common trip type was Medicaid-sponsored trips (22 percent).

**Alternative Transportation**  To find out how people would travel to their destinations if they could not travel by a SFC vehicle, the survey included Question 15. SFC riders were asked to indicate from eight discrete choices how they would make their trip if SFC were not available; the results are presented in Figure 3-65. If the SFC transportation services were not available, 41 percent of riders wouldn’t make the trip, 30 percent would ride with someone, 11 percent would use a taxi service, 7 percent would take a SCAT bus, 3 percent would drive themselves, 1 percent would walk, and 8 percent would use other means of making their trip.

**Assistance Requirements**  In Question 8, respondents were asked whether they require assistance from a SFC driver to board the vehicle. Of the respondents, 55 percent indicated that they do not require assistance, 45 percent require assistance from the driver.
Figure 3-59
Question 1: Frequency of Use (Days/Week), SFC Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More than 5</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3-60
Question 7: Length of Use, SFC Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Use</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 2 yrs</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 2 yrs.</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 mo. - 1 yr.</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 6 months</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3-61
Question 16: Trip Purpose, SFC Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doctor/Dentist</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Center</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec/Visit</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3-62
Question 2: Did you pay a fare?, SFC Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3-63
Question 3: Fare Payment, SFC Survey

$1.00 1.3%
$1.50 3.8%
$2.00 15.7%
$4.00 40.5%
$10.00 12.7%
$24.00 1.3%

0.0% 10.0% 20.0% 30.0% 40.0% 50.0% 60.0%

Figure 3-64
Question 3: Trip Type, SFC Survey

Silver Card 35.8%
Medicaid 21.6%
SFC Spons. 15.7%
Don't Know 14.2%
Nonspons. 12.7%

0.0% 10.0% 20.0% 30.0% 40.0%

Figure 3-65
Question 15: Alternative Transportation, SFC Survey

Wouldn't Make Trip 40.9%
Ride w/ Someone 30.3%
Taxi 10.6%
Other 7.6%
Take SCAT Bus 6.8%
Drive 3.0%
Walk 0.8%

0.0% 10.0% 20.0% 30.0% 40.0% 50.0%
CTC Rider Satisfaction Information

A series of questions were asked in the CTC paratransit on-board survey to evaluate quality of service and user satisfaction with CTC trips. The questions asked include information concerning comfort of vehicles, on-time performance, driver assistance, driver courtesy, telephone agent courtesy, and overall quality of service. Results are included in the discussion below and are displayed in Figures 3-66 through 3-71.

**Comfort of Vehicles**  Respondents were asked to rate the comfort of SFC vehicles. As contained in Figure 3-66, 76 percent of respondents rated the comfort of the vehicles as good or excellent. Only 2 percent of respondents rated the comfort below fair.

**On-Time Performance**  In Question 6, respondents were asked how often they arrive on-time to their appointments. Illustrated in Figure 3-67, 35 percent of respondents stated that they always arrive at their appointments on time, and 49 percent arrive on time most of the time.

**Driver Assistance** - All of the respondents who indicated that they required driver assistance to board a SFC vehicle, were also asked to rate the quality of that assistance. An overwhelming majority of respondents answered that the quality of the driver assistance was good or excellent (92 percent). None of the respondents rated the driver assistance as poor. The results from this question are contained in Figure 3-68.

**Driver and Telephone Agent Courtesy**  Two questions were asked in the on-board survey about the courtesy and helpfulness of SFC employees. Respondents were asked to rate the drivers in Question 9 and the telephone agents in Question 10. As shown in Figure 3-69, the majority (94 percent) of respondents rated driver courtesy and helpfulness as excellent or good. Also illustrated in Figure 3-70, telephone agent courtesy and helpfulness was rated by 78 percent of the respondents as excellent or good.

**Overall Quality of Service**  Finally, in Question 4, respondents were asked to rate the overall quality of SFC’s paratransit service. The results of this question are illustrated in Figure 3-71. Respondents rated the service as excellent, good, average, fair, or poor; and 31 percent rated overall quality of service as excellent, 45 percent rated it as good, and 12 percent as average. Only 13 percent rated the overall service as fair or poor.
Figure 3-66
Question 5: Vehicle Comfort, SFC Survey

- Excellent: 30.9%
- Good: 44.6%
- Average: 11.5%
- Fair: 10.8%
- Poor: 2.2%

Figure 3-67
Question 6: On Time?, SFC Survey

- Always: 34.6%
- Most of the time: 49.3%
- Sometimes: 16.2%
- Never: 0.0%

Figure 3-68
Question 8b: Driver Assistance, SFC Survey

- Excellent: 61.7%
- Good: 30.0%
- Average: 6.7%
- Fair: 1.7%
- Poor: 0.0%
Figure 3-69
Question 9: Driver Courtesy, SFC Survey

- Excellent: 65.0%
- Good: 28.6%
- Average: 4.3%
- Fair: 2.1%
- Poor: 0.0%

Figure 3-70
Question 10: Telephone Agent Courtesy, SFC Survey

- Excellent: 43.4%
- Good: 35.3%
- Average: 9.6%
- Fair: 11.0%
- Poor: 0.7%

Figure 3-71
Question 4: Overall Quality, SFC Survey

- Excellent: 36.8%
- Good: 45.0%
- Average: 5.7%
- Fair: 11.4%
- Poor: 1.4%
Ridership of CTC Clients on Sarasota County Area Transit

Three questions were included in the on-board survey regarding the use of SCAT bus services by SFC clients. These questions were asked to establish what percentage of SFC clients have ever ridden SCAT; if they haven’t tried SCAT, what is the reason; and under what conditions would they consider using SCAT.

Question 12 asked respondents whether they have ever ridden SCAT bus routes for any of their travel needs. As shown in Figure 3-72, 44 percent of respondents indicated that they have tried SCAT bus routes at least once. Of the 44 percent that have tried SCAT bus service, the majority are either Silver Card riders (36 percent) or Medicaid clients (27 percent).

As a follow up question to Question 12, Question 13 asked respondents who answered No to Question 12 to give a reason why they have not used SCAT bus routes. The most frequently cited reason for not riding SCAT was that it does not run in their neighborhood (30 percent). The second most common reason, other than other, was that the bus route is not accessible (27 percent). Other reasons respondents noted for not using SCAT bus service were already having transportation and problems with accessing vehicles due to a disability. These results are shown in Figure 3-73.

The final question about the use of SCAT service asked respondents about conditions that might make them consider using SCAT. The majority of respondents, 79 percent, stated that they would consider using SCAT if they could get to a bus stop or if SFC could take them to a safe SCAT bus stop. These responses and all other responses to this question (Question 14) are displayed in Figure 3-74.
Figure 3-72
Question 12: Used SCAT?, SFC Survey

Yes 58.4%
No 43.6%

Figure 3-73
Question 13: Why haven’t used SCAT?, SFC Survey

Doesn’t Run in My Neighborhood 30.2%
Not Accessible 26.7%
Doesn’t go where I am going. 9.3%
Other 32.6%

Figure 3-74
Question 14: Under what conditions would you use SCAT?, SFC Survey

If I could get to bus stop 63.4%
If SFC took me to safe SCAT stop 15.9%
If rides on SCAT cheaper than SFC 11.0%
If rides were free 9.8%
Rider Comments and Suggestions

The last three question of the SFC on-board survey gave riders the opportunity to provide open-ended comments regarding SFC service. In these three questions respondents were asked to list the one thing they like the most about SFC service, the one thing they like the least, and how they feel SFC could improve the quality of service or serve transportation needs better. Numerous riders took the time to provide comments in the space provided on the survey.

Question 22 asked respondents to list the one thing they like the most about riding Senior Friendship Centers Transportation. Eighty-nine percent of respondents gave answers to this question. The most common one thing that people liked the most about SFC included:

- the courteous staff (especially the drivers),
- SFC being dependable/convenient transportation,
- the ability to get out and go somewhere,
- the social aspect of riding on SFC, and
- the fact that the service is door-to-door.

The opposite of Question 22, Question 23 asked respondents to report the one thing they liked the least about SFC transportation. For this question, 68 percent of the respondents included comments. The following are the most common comments by respondents.

- on-time performance (i.e., often late)
- long waiting time (especially for return trips)
- scheduling problems
- quality of ride (vehicles are uncomfortable)

Finally, respondents, in Question 24, were asked to comment on how SFC could improve the quality of their service or serve transportation needs better. Of those who responded to this question (67 percent), the most common response was that no changes were needed. Many respondents stated that they are very happy with the service and it can’t get any better. However, other responses to this question included comments on: improved scheduling, on-time performance, the need for additional service (more buses, more hours/days of service), waiting time, and the quality of vehicles.
Conclusions

The objective of the Senior Friendship Center paratransit on-board survey was to collect rider demographic information, travel behavior, satisfaction with specific aspects of SFC paratransit service, and the use of SCAT bus service by SFC clients. A typical 1999 SFC rider profile was developed through the compilation of responses to demographic and travel behavior-related questions, as shown in Table 3-15. This rider profile is also compared to the rider profile of the typical SCAT rider, as taken from the latest SCAT on-board survey. As shown in Table 3-15, the typical SFC and SCAT rider have many characteristics in common. The main difference, however, is age; the typical SCAT rider is 25 to 44 years old; and the typical SFC rider is 60 years or older.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>SFC Typical Rider Profile</th>
<th>SCAT Typical Rider Profile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>60 or older</td>
<td>25 to 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Origin</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Household Income</td>
<td>Less than $10,000</td>
<td>Less than $15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Use</td>
<td>2 years or longer</td>
<td>5 years or longer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of Use</td>
<td>3 or more days per week</td>
<td>4 or more days per week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Ownership</td>
<td>No autos</td>
<td>No autos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trip Type</td>
<td>Silver Card</td>
<td>Cash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Transportation</td>
<td>Wouldn’t make trip</td>
<td>Ride with someone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The bullet points below summarize the findings from the on-board survey analysis.

- Most SFC riders use the service 3 or more days per week.
- Most riders are long time users of the system.
- The most common destinations are doctor/dentist and senior centers.
- The majority of riders pay $1.00 for each trip.
- If SFC service was not available most riders wouldn’t make the trip or they would ride with someone else.

The majority of respondents are satisfied with the paratransit service they receive from Senior Friendship Centers. Of particular distinction, riders were overwhelmingly satisfied with driver courtesy, helpfulness, and assistance. As indicated from Question 6 and the open-ended questions, some respondents are not happy with the on-time performance of services.
However, overall, 31 percent of respondents rated quality of service as excellent and 45 percent rated it as good.

Areas that suggest the need for further examination and analysis include data indicating that many paratransit users may be able to use and/or have used the SCAT fixed-route bus service. According to the survey findings, 44 percent of survey respondents indicated that they have used SCAT bus services at least one time. Of further interest is the finding that 63 percent of these respondents are either Silver Card (ADA paratransit) riders or Medicaid clients. Both of these paratransit programs require that individuals use the fixed-route bus service if they are able. The survey results also suggest that lack of access to bus stops may be contributing to the use of paratransit services among these respondents. This is supported by the survey finding that 79 percent of respondents would consider using SCAT bus service if they could get to a bus stop or if SFC could transport them to a safe bus stop. The implementation of a stricter ADA paratransit eligibility determination process and/or paratransit feeder services may impact these findings in the future, as well as result in the delivery of more plentiful, cost effective and efficient services for individuals are not able to use fixed-route bus service.
Chapter Three has presented a performance review of TD paratransit services coordinated by Senior Friendship Centers, Inc. The performance review of CTC coordinated TD services was derived from Annual Operating Report (AOR) data submitted to the Florida Commission for the Transportation Disadvantaged (FCTD) on an annual basis, as well data collected from a survey of CTC bus operators and an on-board passenger survey of CTC paratransit users.

The trend and peer analyses of the TD services provided and coordinated by Senior Friendship Centers, Inc. as the CTC for Sarasota County had mixed results. The CTC trend analysis showed that the CTC experienced significant improvements in most measures related the number of trips provided through the Sarasota TD program. However, the cost of providing these trips has consistently increased over the past seven fiscal years. While this indicates some reason for concern, escalating costs may also be partially explained by operational changes experienced by the CTC during recent fiscal years and inaccurate reporting by agencies participating in the Sarasota TD program.

Similarly, the CTC peer comparison revealed that the CTC is statistically performing below the peer group mean in many important effectiveness and efficiency measures. Again, many of these deficiencies may be related to changes that have occurred recently within CTC operations and inaccurate data submitted to the CTC by participating agencies. An additional factor affecting the CTC analysis is the fact that TD services in Sarasota County are provided almost exclusively as door-to-door paratransit. The CTC has not yet maximized the use of existing SCAT fixed-route bus service. It is likely that the CTC will be able to both increase the amount of service provided to TD clients and reduce the costs associated with providing such service once a thorough TD Bus Pass Program has been established and implemented in Sarasota County. Given the current configuration of the TD program in Sarasota County, the CTC is doing a satisfactory job of providing very specialized transportation services (and therefore, relatively expensive service) to the transportation disadvantaged population in the county.

The results from the surveys of CTC bus operators and CTC paratransit passengers reveal that there is an overall high level of satisfaction with the paratransit services offered in Sarasota County. However, both groups of respondents made some recommendations regarding how to improve SCAT bus service in the future. Operators and passengers reported problems with on-time performance and the required wait time. Operators agreed with these comments and most commonly suggested that scheduling needs to be improved in the paratransit program. In addition, operators and passengers reported that Sunday service is both requested and needed by passengers. Finally, many paratransit passengers reported that lack of access to SCAT bus stops prohibits their use of the fixed-route bus system.
The performance reviews presented in this Chapters Two and Three are intended to provide a better understanding of the performance of the SCAT fixed-route bus services and SFC TD services currently available in Sarasota County. These reviews are also helpful in identifying target areas for additional attention and improvement. However, it is important to remember that performance reviews of this sort do not comprehensively cover all of the objectives of a public transportation system, nor do they necessarily consider the unique geographic, political, operating, and financial characteristics of such systems. Many system and community goals and objectives cannot be measured with this mechanism and require additional information or a more subjective evaluation. Nonetheless, the results of the trend and peer review analyses provide a useful introduction to and a full understanding of the performance of SCAT and SFC and will complement the other components of the Sarasota Transportation Enhancement Plan.