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Executive Summary

Introduction

On July 26, 1990, groundbreaking federal legislation was approved prohibiting discrimination against individuals with disabilities. This legislation was entitled the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). Today, twenty years after ADA was enacted, the effects can be seen across the country in curb access ramps, lifts on buses, designated parking areas, and many other roadway and transportation features. Because the public right of way is typically associated with roadways, ADA addresses pedestrian facilities, such as sidewalks, located within the roadway right of way. In addition, pedestrian facilities that are not associated or included in roadway rights of way, e.g., pedestrian routes and shared use paths across public lands, are also subject to ADA. The legislation requires Departments of Transportation and others to prepare and implement Transition Plans to bring their facilities into compliance with the ADA requirements.

In the publication Special Report: Accessible Public Rights-of-Way / Planning and Designing for Alterations (July 2007) by the Public Rights-of-Way Access Advisory Committee, the following statements are contained in the Introduction.

The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990 is a civil rights statute that prohibits discrimination against people with disabilities. ADA implementing regulations for Title II prohibit discrimination in the provision of services, programs, and activities by state and local governments. Designing and constructing pedestrian facilities in the public right-of-way that are not usable by people with disabilities may constitute discrimination. Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (504) includes similar prohibitions in the conduct of federally-funded programs.

In the mid-1990s, Pima County made its first attempt to formally address ADA issues related to roadway pedestrian facilities within the unincorporated area. A consultant was contracted by the Pima County Department of Transportation (PCDOT) to conduct a study and prepare a Transition Plan, which was entitled ADA Roadway Compliance Plan. According to the ADA regulations contained in the Code of Federal Regulations, 28 CFR 35.150 (d), a Transition Plan “shall, at a minimum,

1. Identify physical obstacles in the public entity’s facilities that limit the accessibility of its programs or activities to individuals with disabilities;
2. Describe in detail the methods that will be used to make the facilities accessible;
3. Specify the schedule for taking the steps necessary to achieve compliance with this section and, if the time period of the transition plan is longer than one year, identify steps that will be taken during each year of the transition period; and
4. Indicate the official responsible for implementation of the plan.”

In addition to the above federal regulations, it may be necessary to change government programs, services, and activities to better support ADA compliance. These changes to programs, services, and activities should also be included in the Transition Plan.

Curtis Lueck & Associates
Tucson, Arizona
Since the completion of the PCDOT ADA Roadway Compliance Plan approximately 15 years ago, some work has been done to address ADA needs in unincorporated Pima County. The completed includes specific sidewalk retrofit improvements to satisfy ADA requirements, construction of new sidewalks, and roadway reconstruction and intersection improvement projects that include new sidewalks and ADA facilities. A wide variety of funding sources have been used to finance these improvements. In 2008, the PCDOT senior management staff made the decision to both update the ADA Transition Plan and develop an ongoing program to address ADA needs on Pima County roadways.

The PCDOT administrators and staff are committed to evaluating and upgrading Pima County transportation facilities to better comply with ADA and any associated regulations for pedestrian facilities within the public rights-of-way. In order to achieve this, a new program will need to be created and implemented by PCDOT. Accordingly, the PCDOT staff retained Curtis Lueck & Associates (CLA) to develop an ongoing program and to update the Transition Plan. In the summer of 2009, CLA commenced work on this assignment, which was divided into two phases. The first phase, which addresses the development of the ongoing program, was completed in the summer of 2010. The second phase, which will address monitoring existing pedestrian facilities and the selection, prioritizing, scheduling, and funding of ADA improvement projects, will commence in late 2010 or early 2011.

Project Description

The primary goal of the Phase 1 effort was the development of an ongoing program to address pedestrian facility ADA needs in unincorporated Pima County within the public rights of way maintained by PCDOT. The Project Manager and the CLA staff worked with an ad hoc committee, the Advisory/Oversight Committee (AOC), to develop this program. This Phase 1 project:

- Established the AOC, which will be composed of 1) representatives from various advocacy organizations serving individuals with disabilities and 2) representatives from the Pima Association of Governments (PAG) and several departments of Pima County government, to assist in the development of the program
- Established a framework for the program that includes goals/objectives, guiding principles, standards/requirements, and methodologies to achieve ADA compliance
- Evaluated all potential funding sources for ADA improvements
- Evaluated existing databases that can be incorporated into the program
- Integrated information about the preparation of Transition Plans from the federal government and other units of government
- Developed program methodologies that are realistic, simple, user-friendly, and cost-effective to create and use while still complying with federal guidelines

Project Work Tasks

The Phase 1 effort included the following work tasks.
Work Task 1.1: Develop Project Management Plan

Project Management Plans have been used on past Pima County projects in order to better guarantee that the project will be completed on schedule/on budget and that the deliverable products will satisfy the needs of the client. The Project Management Plan that CLA prepared for this effort established a refined scope of work, defined the work assignments and responsibilities, and set the project schedule for all participants. The project schedule is included as Exhibit 3-1.

Work Task 1.2: Perform a Literature Search

The objective of this work task was to prepare a technical memorandum documenting the review of relevant documents and information sources. The documents reviewed were prepared by various agencies of the federal government, state Departments of Transportation, units of local government, and organizations involved with transportation facility design or accessibility as it relates to transportation facilities. Other information sources evaluated included the websites of some of the agencies and organizations that were the sources of the aforementioned relevant documents. About the time that CLA began Phase 1, a new document on ADA Transition Plans was released by the National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP). It is entitled, *ADA Transition Plans: A Guide to Best Management Practices*. This document provided very helpful information.

Work Task 1.3: Establish an Advisory/Oversight Committee

The PCDOT Project Manager and CLA sought input and guidance from a number of sources. However, the major source of guidance and input/feedback was provided by the members of an ongoing committee developed exclusively for this effort. The committee was named the Advisory/Oversight Committee (AOC). The AOC members have helped to assure that the outcome of the program will be meaningful, realistic, feasible, and worthy of spending limited financial resources.

The members of the AOC included several representatives from disability advocacy organizations (Pima Council on Aging, Southern Arizona Association for the Visually Impaired, and the Tucson Commission on Disability Issues), representatives from PAG and Pima County government who regularly address ADA issues as part of their job responsibilities, and representatives from PCDOT (Operation & Maintenance Division, Traffic Engineering Division, Transportation Engineering Division, and Transportation Systems Division). Several of the members of the AOC currently have hands-on experience with individuals with disabilities and some of the members are disabled themselves.

Work Task 1.4: Review Existing Relevant Databases

There are currently several sources of readily available information for eastern Pima County relevant to this effort. These sources include PCDOT Geographic Information Systems (GIS) Division databases, PAG databases and documentation, and the previous Pima County ADA Transition Plan (*ADA Roadway Compliance Plan*) documentation.
Work Task 1.5: Determine Existing Potential Funding Sources
The CLA staff evaluated all of the potential funding sources; however, the number of sources is limited. Several of the potential funding sources have existed for many years, but some new sources have been introduced in recent years to better address safety problems, infrastructure deficiencies, and to stimulate the economy. Currently, Pima County is dedicating only $50,000 of its HURF funding to addressing ADA retrofit needs. The remainder of the funds being used to address pedestrian facility ADA needs come from regional or federal funding sources. A potential source of new funding could be a general obligation bond. The City of Phoenix is currently using $2.4 million in bond funds approved by the voters in 2006 to finance many improvements to address ADA needs on its roadway pedestrian facilities.

Work Task 1.6: Develop Framework for Program
Unlike the previous ADA Transition Plan effort in the mid-1990s, which produced an ADA Transition Plan and limited ADA improvements, the PCDOT staff now wishes to address ADA deficiencies each year so that progress is continually made. The emphasis of this work task was to develop a framework for an ongoing program. The ongoing program should include monitoring the transportation facilities in unincorporated Pima County for ADA improvements and implementing improvement projects every year. This work task was considered critical.

The framework for this effort consists of the following four elements.
- Goals and objectives
- Guiding principles
- Standards and requirements
- Typical methods to achieve compliance

The outcome from these items should be forward thinking, but realistic, feasible, and achievable. There may be circumstances where it may be very difficult or impossible to satisfy the federal requirements. As a result, the program should allow a certain degree of flexibility and creatively in order to make progress.

In order for the AOC to assist CLA on this work task, PAG was requested to conduct a ThinkTank session. ThinkTank is a computer software program for rapidly collecting large amounts of information from diverse groups of individuals. The information collected allowed the consultant to prepare a comprehensive compilation of goals, objectives, strategies, and relevant guiding statements for the ongoing program.

Work Task 1.7: Develop Methodologies for Program
The CLA staff presented various methodologies related to data collection, databases, public participation opportunities, training, and monitoring for the successful implementation of the ongoing program. The methodologies developed are considered comprehensive, but easily implemented.
Work Task 1.8: Prepare Final Report

At the conclusion of each work task, a technical memorandum was prepared to document the information collected and the work performed. During this work task, the individual technical memorandums for Work Tasks 1.2 through 1.7 were complied into a single, final report for the Phase 1 effort.

Conclusion

Based on the work performed in Phase 1, addressing ADA needs within unincorporated Pima County will be a multiyear effort and will require a more significant commitment of resources, both staff and funding, for progress to be made at a faster rate than previous improvement efforts. PAG will likely see more ADA-related projects in the near future as the Transition Plan update is completed and its implementation commences. This will be reflected in future PAG Transportation Improvement Programs (TIPs).
1. Introduction

Background

On July 26, 1990, approximately 20 years ago, groundbreaking federal legislation was approved prohibiting discrimination against individuals with disabilities. This legislation was entitled the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). In the publication *Special Report: Accessible Public Rights-of-Way / Planning and Designing for Alterations* (July 2007) by the Public Rights-of-Way Access Advisory Committee, the following statements are contained in the Introduction.

*The American with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990 is a civil rights statute that prohibits discrimination against people with disabilities. ADA implementing regulations for Title II prohibit discrimination in the provision of services, programs, and activities by state and local governments. Designing and constructing pedestrian facilities in the public right-of-way that are not usable by people with disabilities may constitute discrimination. Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (504) includes similar prohibitions in the conduct of federally-funded programs.*

Today, twenty years after the ADA was enacted, the effects can be seen across the country in curb cuts, lifts on buses, designated parking areas, and many other features. Because the public right of way is typically associated with roadways, ADA addresses pedestrian facilities, e.g., sidewalks, within roadway rights of way as well as pedestrian facilities that are not associated or included in roadway rights of way, e.g. pedestrian routes and shared use paths across public lands.

In the mid-1990s, Pima County Department of Transportation (PCDOT) began to formally address ADA within the unincorporated area. A consultant was retained by PCDOT to conduct a study and prepare a Transition Plan, which was entitled *ADA Roadway Compliance Plan*. According to the ADA regulations contained in the Code of Federal Regulations, 28 CFR 35.150 (d), a Transition Plan “shall, at a minimum,

i. Identify physical obstacles in the public entity’s facilities that limit the accessibility of its programs or activities to individuals with disabilities;

ii. Describe in detail the methods that will be used to make the facilities accessible;

iii. Specify the schedule for taking the steps necessary to achieve compliance with this section and, if the time period of the transition plan is longer than one year, identify steps that will be taken during each year of the transition period; and

iv. Indicate the official responsible for implementation of the plan.”

Briefly, an ADA Transition Plan is a document prepared for a unit of government that identifies by location various existing pedestrian facility physical barriers and other ADA needs that limit accessibility. In addition, it describes how and when the unit of government intends to eliminate these barriers and address ADA needs. Based on ADA regulations, the corrections or improvements are prioritized. Finally, it may be necessary to change government programs, services, and activities to better support ADA compliance. These changes to programs, services, and activities should also be included in the Transition Plan.
Since the completion of the *ADA Roadway Compliance Plan*, limited work has been done to address ADA needs in unincorporated Pima County due to a lack of funding. To date, ADA needs have primarily been addressed as part of the reconstruction of arterial and collector roadways, the spot improvement of individual intersections, and the implementation of federal Transportation Enhancement (TE) pedestrian projects and local Regional Transportation Authority (RTA) projects. Pima County government administrators understand that more needs to be done to address ADA needs on existing pedestrian facilities within their control.

PCDOT administrators and staff are committed to evaluating and upgrading County transportation facilities to better comply with ADA and any associated regulations for pedestrian facilities within the public rights-of-way. In order to achieve this, a new program will need to be created and implemented by PCDOT. Accordingly, the PCDOT staff retained Curtis Lueck & Associates (CLA) to develop a program and to update the Transition Plan in two phases. Phase 1, which is the subject of this report, addresses the development of the program. Phase 2, which addresses monitoring existing pedestrian facilities and the selection, prioritizing, scheduling, and funding of ADA improvement projects, will be underway within the coming months. Reports from the two phases will be consolidated into a final plan document.

**Project Description**

The primary goal of the Phase 1 project was the development of an ongoing program to address pedestrian facility ADA needs in unincorporated Pima County within the public rights of way maintained by PCDOT. The Project Manager and the CLA staff worked with an ad hoc committee, named the Advisory/Oversight Committee (AOC), to develop this program. This Phase 1 project accomplished the following:

- Established the AOC, which was composed of 1) representatives of various advocacy organizations serving individuals with disabilities, 2) a representative of the Pima Association of Governments, and 3) representatives of several departments of Pima County government, to assist in the development of the program
- Established a framework for the program that included goals/objectives, guiding principles, standards/requirements, and methodologies to achieve ADA compliance
- Evaluated all potential funding sources for ADA improvements
- Evaluated existing databases that could be incorporated into the program
- Integrated information about the preparation of Transition Plans from the federal government and other units of government into the Phase 1 documentation
- Developed program methodologies that are realistic, simple, user-friendly, and cost-effective to create and use while still complying with federal guidelines

**Project Management Plan**

In order to expedite the completion of the work tasks of the Phase 1 effort, a Project Management Plan was prepared. The purposes of this Project Management Plan are:

1. To identify the roles of the project participants,
2. To describe the major work tasks, and
3. To establish a viable project schedule.

The Project Management Plan document can be viewed online at:

www.pagnet.org/documents/transportation/ada/pcadaplan02-04-10.pdf

**Project Schedule**

The project schedule is an integral part of the Project Management Plan. It is also included later in this document as Exhibit 3-1. The schedule includes the approximate work task start/completion dates, report submittal dates, and the review periods.
2. Literature Search

Introduction

The Americans with Disability Act, Public Law No. 101-336, (ADA) was enacted on July 26, 1990, “to provide clear, strong, consistent, enforceable standards addressing discrimination against individuals with disabilities.” [Section 2(b)(2), 42 U.S.C. 12101(b)(2)].

Title II of the ADA applies to the programs and services provided by public entities,” a term that includes State and local governments and “any department, agency, special purpose district, or other instrumentality of a State...or local government.”

The purpose of this document is to discuss the review of relevant ADA documents and information sources to help Pima County develop the updated Transition Plan. The documents may have been prepared by various agencies of the federal government, state Departments of Transportation, units of local government, and organizations involved with transportation facility design or accessibility as it relates to transportation facilities. Other information sources include the websites of some of the agencies and organizations that are the sources of the aforementioned relevant documents.

This literature review is a critical work task of this assignment. The consultant and the other participants need to know the appropriate requirements and guidelines. In addition, there are numerous sources of useful information. Finally, it will be helpful to review documentation prepared by other agencies who have addressed this subject.

Sources of Information

A number of relevant documents and information sources are available that document ADA requirements, guidelines, and concepts for the design and modification or alteration of pedestrian facilities. As part of this effort, the project team reviewed a wide variety of documents and websites. The documents included here are by no means a complete set of available resources. Rather, they represent a sample of available resources for decision makers, engineers and planners to use. In fact, many other resources are listed within reference lists of these provided resource documents.

The primary sources of information include:

- U.S. Department of Justice
- U.S. Access Board (Access Board)
- U.S. Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration
- The American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO)
- The Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE)
- Regional and Local Transportation Agencies
National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP)

Other Sources

Documents from these sources also contain the internet addresses of websites that will be equally useful for the development of this program.

U.S. Department of Justice

The Department of Justice maintains the ADA website, www.ada.gov, a clearinghouse of information containing the legislation and relevant ADA materials. The website is updated regularly to ensure that current legislation is available to website browsers.

The following documents are found by accessing the website:

  - www.ada.gov/reg2.html

  - www.ada.gov/stdspdf.htm

- Title II Technical Assistance Manual (1993) and Yearly Supplements. A 56-page manual that explains in lay terms what state and local governments must do to ensure that their services, programs, and activities are provided to the public in a nondiscriminatory manner. Many examples are provided for practical guidance:
  - www.ada.gov/taman2.html

- Title II Highlights. An 8-page outline of the key requirements of the ADA for State and local governments. This publication provides detailed information in bullet format for quick reference:
  - www.ada.gov/t2hlt95.htm

- ADA Guide for Small Towns. A 21-page guide that presents an informal overview of some basic ADA requirements and provides cost-effective tips on how small towns can comply with the ADA.
  - ADA Guide for Small Towns (HTML):
    - www.ada.gov/smtown.htm
  - ADA Guide for Small Towns (PDF):
    - www.ada.gov/smtown.pdf

- The ADA and City Governments: Common Problems. A 9-page document that contains a sampling of common problems shared by city governments of all sizes,
provides examples of common deficiencies and explains how these problems affect persons with disabilities.

- ADA and City Government: Common Problems (HTML):
  - www.ada.gov/comprob.htm
- ADA and City Government: Common Problems (PDF):
  - www.ada.gov/comprob.pdf

- An ADA Guide for Local Governments: Making Community Emergency Preparedness and Response Programs Accessible to People with Disabilities. A publication that provides guidance on preparing for and carrying out emergency response programs in a manner that results in the services being accessible to people with disabilities:
  - www.ada.gov/emergencyprep.htm

- US Department of Justice Technical Assistance Letters.
  - Covers state and local government’s responsibilities for complying with provisions in the ADA, Title II regulations. Compliance topics include:
    - Sidewalks, transition plans, alterations, new constructions:
      - www.usdoj.gov/crt/foia/ltr205.htm
    - Obligations to follow design standards for sidewalks:
      - www.usdoj.gov/crt/foia/tal680.txt
    - Snow removal on sidewalks:
      - www.usdoj.gov/crt/foia/tal684.txt
    - Roadway resurfacing and the need to provide curb ramps in alterations:
      - www.usdoj.gov/crt/foia/tal679.txt

- US DOJ Settlement Agreements. Involve public rights of-way, State of Delaware, Voluntary Agreement with terms and conditions to bring certain roads under the jurisdiction of the state into further compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990:
  - www.usdoj.gov/crt/ada/deldot.htm

- Other Case Law Examples on ADA Requirements
  - Board of Trustees of the Univ. of Alabama v. Garrett, 531 U.S. 356 (2001)
    - The Supreme Court held that Congress had not acted sufficiently to abrogate the States’ Eleventh Amendment rights so as to subject States to suit in Federal courts for violation of Title I, the employment title of the ADA. The Court made clear that the federal government may continue to sue States for injunctive relief and money damages under Title I, and that private individuals may sue state officials in their official capacities as long as the plaintiffs do not seek money damages. Also, the Garrett decision only prohibited Title I suits by private individuals against state governments, not cities or counties, because sovereign immunity as embodied in the Eleventh Amendment does not apply to local governments. Moreover, the Court left open the question whether private individuals may sue States under Title II, as opposed to Title I.
- **Tennessee v. Lane, 541 U.S. 509, 72 U.S.L.W. 4371 (May 17, 2004)**
  - The Supreme Court concluded that in cases implicating the fundamental right of access to courts, Congress validly exercised its authority to extend ADA’s Title II requirements to States. The Supreme Court issued a decision in Tennessee v. Lane, holding that individuals may sue States directly to require States to make their courts and judicial services accessible under the ADA. The Court held that Title II is an appropriate response by Congress to prevent denial of the right of access to state courts in light of the history of unconstitutional treatment by States of people with disabilities.

  - Plaintiffs sued claiming that on various dates they were unable to access certain City of Carlsbad’s buildings or use certain streets, ramps and parking facilities because the City failed to comply with the ADA. The District Court held for the City by focusing on the details and implementation of the City’s plan to install curb ramps. The plan was in place by 1995 and identified funding for its implementation. With respect to the alleged failure to comply with ADAAG standards, the Court found the Plaintiffs’ failure to identify any specific non-compliant curb ramp fatal to their argument.

  - The City of Philadelphia had engaged in an extensive program of resurfacing its streets. The contracts, many of which were entered into after the January 26, 1992 effective date of Title II, required the laying of at least 1½ inches of new asphalt. The City did not include installation of curb cuts in its milling and resurfacing contracts except in those instances when the curb in question was independently intended to be altered within the scope of the contract. The district court granted plaintiffs' motion, ordering the City to "install curb ramps or slopes on every City street, at any intersection having curbs or other barriers to access, where bids for resurfacing were let after January 26, 1992." In affirming the District Court’s decision for the Plaintiffs, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit held that since the resurfacing affected the usability of the street for ambulatory persons, the resurfacing constituted an alteration that triggered an obligation to make the streets usable to individuals with disabilities. Consequently, the Court of Appeals found that the City was required as part of the resurfacing project to install ADA-compliant curb cuts.

- **Deck v. City of Toledo, 56 F. Supp. 2d 886 (N.D. Ohio 1999)**
  - The Plaintiffs challenged the City of Toledo’s non-compliant construction of curb ramps after the January 26, 1992 ADA compliance date. In addition, the Plaintiffs provided evidence that the City of Toledo failed to install ADA-compliant curb ramps on at least 302 separate
occasions between May 1996 and November 1999. After finding no factual dispute that the City violated the ADA’s curb cut requirements on at least 302 occasions between 1996 and 1998, the District Court granted the Plaintiffs’ motion for summary judgment.

- **Barden, et.al. v. City of Sacramento, Case No. CIV-S-99-497 MCE/JFM**
  - Suit filed in March 1999 as a class action. The allegations were that:
    - City did not install curb cuts when overlaying
    - City did not create curb cut transition plan
    - City had obligation to make sidewalks (as “programs”) accessible

  City settlement in 2001 included dedication of an amount equal to 20 percent of its transportation funds to remedying obstacles in “pedestrian rights of way.” New settlement agreement provision effective January 1, 2004 included continued dedication of 20 percent of transportation funds annually to installation of curb ramps, to barrier removal, and to other accessibility work.

- **Project Civic Access.** A Title II compliance program that includes:
  - Settlement agreements with over 150 towns, cities, counties, and States (See “Sidewalks” in each for those that include public right-of-way issues:
    - [www.ada.gov/civicac.htm](http://www.ada.gov/civicac.htm)
  - Fact sheets:
    - [www.ada.gov/civicfac.htm](http://www.ada.gov/civicfac.htm)
  - Tool Kit for State and Local Governments (Chapter 6 covers curb ramps):
    - [www.ada.gov/pcatoolkit/chap6toolkit.htm](http://www.ada.gov/pcatoolkit/chap6toolkit.htm)

**The U.S. Access Board (Access Board)**

The Access Board is an independent federal agency that promotes accessibility for people with disabilities. The Board develops and maintains design criteria for the built environment, transit vehicles, telecommunications equipment, and for electronic and information technology. It also provides technical assistance and training on these requirements and on accessible design and continues to enforce accessibility standards that cover federally funded facilities.

The Public Rights of Way Access Advisory Committee (PROWAAC) is a U.S. Access Board chartered committee comprised of representatives from disability organizations, public works departments, transportation and traffic engineering groups, the design and civil engineering professions, government agencies, and standards-setting bodies. In 2002, the PROWAAC produced a draft set of public right-of-way accessibility guidelines. In November 2005, this draft document was revised, but remained as a draft document subject to further review. The draft will be subject to the federal rulemaking process in order for it to become a set of federal design standards for federally fundable facilities. The Access Board’s guidelines become enforceable
when they are adopted by the standard setting agencies for the ADA. The agencies responsible for standards under the ADA are the Department of Justice (DOJ) and the Department of Transportation (DOT). The PROWAAC has also produced the Special Report, *Accessible Public Rights of Way – Planning and Designing Alterations*, as well as many other reports and resources (including DVDs) regarding the design of facilities within the public rights of way.

The Board’s website ([www.access-board.gov](http://www.access-board.gov)) includes a number of resources related to accessibility. The following documents are specifically related to accessibility within public rights-of-way:


A design guide developed in 1999 by the U.S. Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board (now, the Access Board) in collaboration with the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT)/Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). The design guide was developed to assist public works and transportation agencies covered by Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) in designing and constructing public sidewalks and street crossings. The recommendations in this publication are available on-line at the following address ([www.access-board.gov/prowac/guide/PROWGuide.htm](http://www.access-board.gov/prowac/guide/PROWGuide.htm)) and may be applied to shared-use paths that occupy a public right-of-way.

This design guide consists of two parts. Part I contains an overview of ADA title II obligations, including the regulation requiring a Transition Plan when structural modifications are necessary to achieve program accessibility. Part II is a compilation of the best practices in accessible rights-of-way design and construction.


The PROWAAC released the draft guidelines in 2002 for comment by the public. These guidelines were developed to address the constraints posed by sidewalk space limitations, roadway design practices, and slope and terrain issues within the right-of-way. Based on comments received, the guidelines were revised in 2005, still in draft format. The draft is a stand-alone document and its provisions are consistent with *Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices* (MUTCD) standards. To date, the 2005 draft document has not been finalized. This may occur sometime in 2010.

The document is formatted into four chapters:

1. Application and Administration – covers purpose, effect on existing facilities, equivalent facilitation, conventions, figures, units of measurement, referenced documents, and definitions
2. Scoping Requirements including
   a. Pedestrian Access Route
   b. Alternate Pedestrian Access Routes
   c. Pedestrian Crossings
   d. Curb Ramps and Blended Transitions
   e. Accessible Pedestrian Signals
   f. Protruding Objects
   g. Pedestrian Signs
   h. Street Furniture
i. Bus Stops
j. Stairways
k. Handrails
l. Vertical Access
m. On-street Parking
n. Passenger Loading Zones
o. Call Boxes
p. Transit Platforms
q. Escalators
r. Detectable Warning Surfaces
s. Doors, Doorways, and Gates


The revised guidelines are available at [www.access-board.gov/PROWAC/draft.htm](http://www.access-board.gov/PROWAC/draft.htm).


The focus of this special report is on improvement projects in the public right-of-way that are classified as alterations under the ADA. This report, published in 2007, compiles the recommendations of a subcommittee of PROWAAC that worked to develop and highlight model rights-of-way design alternatives, design processes for making alterations, design solutions to specific problems, and case studies demonstrating examples of accessible design practices from across the country. The report is available on-line at [www.access-board.gov/prowac/alterations/guide.htm](http://www.access-board.gov/prowac/alterations/guide.htm).

The Access Board has also produced additional documents and other information sources through its subcommittees. The following is a sample of these information sources.

- Common Problems Arising in the Installation of Accessible Pedestrian Signals ([www.access-board.gov/research/pedestrian-signals/bulletin.htm](http://www.access-board.gov/research/pedestrian-signals/bulletin.htm))
- ADAAG Requirements for Detectable Warnings ([www.access-board.gov/adaag/dws/update.htm](http://www.access-board.gov/adaag/dws/update.htm))
- Pedestrian Access to Modern Roundabouts ([www.access-board.gov/research/roundabouts/bulletin.htm](http://www.access-board.gov/research/roundabouts/bulletin.htm))
- Synthesis of Literature Relevant to Roundabout Signalization to Provide Pedestrian Access ([www.access-board.gov/research/roundabouts-signals/report.htm](http://www.access-board.gov/research/roundabouts-signals/report.htm))
- Accessible Sidewalks (Video Series) ([www.access-board.gov/prowac/video/index.htm](http://www.access-board.gov/prowac/video/index.htm))
The U.S. Department of Transportation (U.S. DOT) Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)

The U.S. DOT and the FHWA have produced or sponsored several ADA reports relevant to public rights-of-way. In addition, the FHWA’s Office of Civil Rights has prepared a set of Questions and Answers about ADA on its website: (www.fhwa.dot.gov/civilrights/ada_qa.htm#q1).

These questions and answers explain the FHWA’s position on the implementation of the ADA and Section 504. They have been reviewed and approved by the U.S. DOT General Counsel as consistent with applicable disability law.

The following set of questions and answers specifically pertain to ADA transition plans. (The numbering of the questions is from the order of the questions on the website):

**Transition plans**

10. **What authority requires public agencies to make transition plans?**

   The ADA requires public agencies with more than 50 employees to make a transition plan. (28 CFR §35.150(d). (9-12-06))

11. **What should a transition plan include?**

   The transition plan must include a schedule for providing access features, including curb ramps for walkways. (28 CFR §35.150(d)(2)). The schedule should first provide for pedestrian access upgrades to State and local government offices and facilities, transportation, places of public accommodation, and employers, followed by walkways serving other areas. (28 CFR §35.150(d)(2)). The transition plan should accomplish the following four tasks:

   a. identify physical obstacles in the public agency’s facilities that limit the accessibility of its programs or activities to individuals with disabilities;
   b. describe in detail the methods that will be used to make the facilities accessible;
   c. specify the schedule for taking the steps necessary to upgrade pedestrian access to meet ADA and Section 504 requirements in each year following the transition plan; and
   d. indicate the official responsible for implementation of the plan. (28 CFR §35.150(d)(3). (9-12-06))

12. **How does the transition plan relate to a public agency’s transportation planning process?**

   The ADA transition plan is intended to identify system needs and integrate them
with the State’s planning process. The transition plan and its identified needs should be fully integrated into the public agency’s Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). Agencies should incorporate accessibility improvements into the transportation program on an ongoing basis in a variety of ways:

a. Any construction project that is programmed must meet accessibility requirements when built.

b. Accessibility improvements identified in the transition plan that are not within the scope of an alteration project should be incorporated into the overall transportation planning process. This can be accomplished through the development of stand-alone accessibility projects.

c. As a means to identify ADA compliance needs, during scheduling maintenance activities, the agencies should identify ADA accessibility needs and incorporate them into the overall transportation planning process. (9-12-06)

13. **What public agencies must make a transition plan?**

The ADA requires any public agency with more than 50 employees to make a transition plan setting forth the steps necessary to make its facilities accessible to persons with disabilities. {28 CFR §35.150(d). (9-12-06)}

14. **When should the FHWA review an agency’s transition plan?**

DOT Section 504 regulation requires FHWA to monitor the compliance of the self-evaluation and transition plans of Federal-aid recipients (49 CFR §27.11). The FHWA Division offices should review pedestrian access compliance with the ADA and Section 504 as part of its routine oversight activities as defined in their stewardship plan. (9-12-06)

15. **When and how should a transition plan be updated?**

An agency’s transition plan should have been completed by January 26, 1992, and should be based on updates of the self-evaluation conducted to comply with the requirements of Section 504. {28 CFR §35.105.} The plan should be updated periodically to ensure the ongoing needs of the community continue to be met. The transition plan should be coordinated appropriately with the STIP and the TIP. Changes to the plan shall be made available to the public for comment. The public agency should specifically target any local community groups representing persons with disabilities for comment, to ensure that the agency is meeting the local priorities of the persons with disabilities in that community. If a public agency has never completed a transition plan, the Division should inform the public agency to complete a transition plan now and review that public agency’s completed transition plan.

The ADA deadline for completing the improvements listed in the transition plans
was January 26, 1995. For those State and localities that have not completed their self-evaluation and transition plans, it is critical that they complete this process.

(9-12-06)

Documents on ADA design produced by or sponsored by FHWA are provided below:

The document was produced following a large FHWA study entitled “Evaluation of Pedestrian Facilities.” The guide is the culmination of results from the research conducted as part of the large study. The purpose of the guide is to provide information on how to identify the safety and mobility needs of pedestrians within roadway rights-of-way. The guide provides useful information regarding walkable environments, pedestrian crashes and their countermeasures, and engineering improvements for pedestrians.


**Designing Sidewalks and Trails for Access, Parts I (1999) and II (2001)**
Part I is *Review of Existing Guidelines and Practices*. This includes a literature review of existing documents with guidelines and recommendations for developing sidewalks and trails. The reviewers also made site visits to select locations. Quantitative measurements of the sidewalk and trail characteristics were noted. Experts were also interviewed to obtain the most current information on sidewalk and trail access as it relates to people with disabilities.


Part II is *Best Practices Design Guide*, a compilation of guidelines for designing and retrofitting sidewalks, sidewalk corridors and trails. There is also a chapter on including pedestrians in the project planning process. A list of research recommendations is provided for further study of transportation facilities design and the impacts on pedestrians.

www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/sidewalk2/pdf.htm

**The American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO)**

AASHTO is the national roadway design advocacy group that produces and promotes transportation design standards for use in the United States. Several AASHTO documents specifically address accessibility within the public right of way. AASHTO documents are generally available for sale at [www.bookstore.transportation.org/](http://www.bookstore.transportation.org/).

Documents published by AASHTO that specifically address accessibility within the public right of way include the following:

The purpose of this guide is to provide guidance on the planning, design, and operation of pedestrian facilities along streets and highways. Specifically, the guide focuses on identifying
effective measures for accommodating pedestrians on public rights-of-way. Appropriate
methods for accommodating pedestrians, which vary among roadway and facility types, are
described in this guide. The primary audiences for this manual are planners, roadway designers,
and transportation engineers, whether at the state or local level. The majority of these
individuals make decisions on a daily basis that affect pedestrians. This guide also recognizes the
profound effect that land use planning and site design have on pedestrian mobility and
addresses these topics as well.

This AASHTO document, typically referred to as the AASHTO “Green Book”, includes roadway
design guidance for roadways in the United States. Although this guidance is typically adopted
for use by state agencies (such as ADOT), many non-state agencies apply the AASHTO standards
in their roadway design guidelines and policies. Design guidelines for sidewalk ramps within the
AASHTO document include references to U.S. Access Board design guidelines.

The Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE)
ITE is an association of transportation professionals that facilitates and promotes technical
principles in the development of transportation systems and facilities throughout the world.
There are several documents that ITE has sponsored or produced that specifically address
accessibility within the public right of way.

Pedestrian Mobility and Safety Audit Guide (2008)
The Pedestrian Safety and Mobility Audit Guide was developed by ITE with assistance from the
American Association of Retired Persons (AARP). This guide is a recommended plan for
identifying deficiencies at intersections and along roadways in a community.

The goal of a pedestrian mobility and safety audit is to evaluate a number of factors (including
pedestrian and vehicle traffic, crosswalk signage and the overall condition of sidewalks and
streets), to identify positive pedestrian aspects, and to recommend improvements at each
sample intersection. The transportation audit was initially conceived for older adults; however,
the results demonstrate that safe sidewalks and intersections are critical for all community
residents.

The guide can also be used to familiarize volunteers with technical, administrative, regulatory,
social and behavioral issues related to pedestrian safety and mobility at intersections and road
segments. An audit applying the guidelines was conducted at five intersections in Tucson,
Arizona in May 2008. Audit volunteers found many positive applications of intersection design
for pedestrian safety and accessibility. Some deficiencies were also discovered.

www.ite.org/PedAudits/AuditGuide.pdf
www.ite.org/PedAudits/AARPTucson.pdf

Context Sensitive Solutions in Designing Major Urban Thoroughfares for Walkable
**Communities (2006)**

The ITE Proposed Recommended Practice, Context Sensitive Solutions in Designing Major Urban Thoroughfares for Walkable Communities, advances the successful use of context sensitive solutions (CSS) in the planning and design of major urban thoroughfares for walkable communities. It provides guidance and demonstrates for practitioners how CSS concepts and principles may be applied in roadway improvement projects that are consistent with their physical settings. The report's chapters are focused on applying the principles of CSS in transportation planning and in the design of roadway improvement projects in places where community objectives support walkable communities, e.g., compact development, mixed land uses and support for pedestrians and bicyclists, whether it already exists or is a goal for the future.

This document was produced in cooperation with the Federal Highway Administration, the Environmental Protection Agency and in partnership with the Congress for the New Urbanism.


The Urban Street Geometric Design Handbook provides comprehensive, practice-oriented guidance that focuses on the operational and safety aspects specifically related to the geometric design of all classifications of urban surface streets (local streets, collector streets, arterial streets and their intersections). It identifies techniques, procedures and guidelines that have been applied to a wide variety of newly constructed or reconstructed street projects. The handbook recognizes the range of transportation modes and the integration of vehicles, pedestrians and bicycles for urban roadways.

In addition to ADA recommendations associated with pedestrian safety on urban streets, there are several recommendations for ADA accessibility design for transit facilities found in the handbook.

**National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP)**

The National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP) conducts research in subject areas that affect highway planning, design, construction, operation, and maintenance nationwide. There are several documents relevant to this effort.


This document provides guidance for the planning, design and use of accessible pedestrian signals (APS). This web-only document is associated with NCHRP Project 3-62, Guidelines for Accessible Pedestrian Signals. It contains information regarding the history of use, the changes in design applications based on input from users and current recommended uses. The appendix contains recent changes to the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) regarding the design of APS at intersections. The following report is available at www.walkinginfo.org/aps/.

This NCHRP document report addresses the requirement for agencies to develop and implement an ADA Transition Plan based on ADA Title II requirements. The guide includes a description of the steps necessary in creating a Transition Plan. These steps are:

1. Designating an ADA Coordinator
2. Providing Notice About the ADA Requirements
3. Establishing a Grievance Procedure
4. Development of Internal Standards, Specifications, and Design Details
5. The ADA Transition Plan
6. Schedule and Budget for Improvements
7. Monitoring the Progress

Step 5, The ADA Transition Plan, includes the following elements:

a. A List of Physical Barriers in the Department’s Facilities that Limit Accessibility of Individuals with Disabilities (the Self-Evaluation),
b. A Detailed Description of the Methods to Remove these Barriers and Make the Facilities Accessible,
c. A Schedule for Taking the Necessary Steps,
d. The Name of the Official Responsible for Implementation,
e. A Schedule for Providing Curb Ramps, and
f. A Record of the Opportunity Given to the Disability Community and Other Interested Parties to Participate in the Development of the Plan.

The purpose of this guide is to assist jurisdictions (such as Pima County) develop their own ADA transition plan. A summary of responses from State DOTs that have developed ADA transition plans provide guidance on best practices, successes and pitfalls in the development, processing and implementation of transition plans.


Pima County

ADA Roadway Compliance Plan (Mid-1990s)

In the mid-1990s, Pima County attempted to formally address ADA within the unincorporated area. A consultant was contracted by the Pima County Department of Transportation (PCDOT) to conduct a study and prepare a Transition Plan, which was entitled ADA Roadway Compliance Plan.

The ADA Roadway Compliance Plan included a methodology for prioritizing roadways for improved ADA facilities. The roadways and pedestrian facilities were prioritized for
recommended ADA improvements based on a ranking system that included factors such as daily volumes, sidewalk and curb ramp availability, geometry and condition, the proximity of the facility to a residential area and land uses adjacent to the roadway.

Since the completion of the ADA Roadway Compliance Plan, minimal work has been done to address ADA deficiencies in unincorporated Pima County. To date, ADA deficiencies have primarily been corrected as part of the reconstruction of arterial roadways and the spot improvement of individual intersections. Pima County government administrators understand that much more needs to be done to address ADA deficiencies on existing pedestrian facilities within their control.

The *Pima County Roadway Design Manual* requires compliance with ADA regulations in the design of roadways. Typical urban roadway cross sections include the provision of a sidewalk as a required element.

**Pima County Subdivision and Development Street Standards (2005)**
The *Pima County Subdivision and Development Street Standards* include guidance on the design of parking spaces for handicapped accessible spacing based on the *ADA Standards for Accessible Design*.

**Pima Association of Governments (PAG)**

**Tucson Region Sidewalk Inventory Project Report (Jan. 2005)**
The Sidewalk Inventory Project assessed sidewalk connectivity and accessibility along the major roadway network within the Tucson Metropolitan Area. This inventory was conducted to identify and prioritize new sidewalk improvement projects in order to begin building an interconnected network of pedestrian accessible transportation corridors.

A key objective of this project was to identify the deficiencies in the existing sidewalk network to indicate where barriers exist. Removing these deficiencies is the first step in making the network accessible, especially for persons with disabilities.

Another objective was to analyze the design characteristics of existing sidewalks to determine if they meet the basic standards for accessibility set by the ADA. Features such as sidewalk width, slope and alignment were analyzed to assess the ADA accessibility of each sidewalk segment.

**Regional Pedestrian Plan (July 2000)**
In 2000, PAG prepared the *Regional Pedestrian Plan*, a policy document that promotes the need for a fully realized plan to provide pedestrian facilities in the Tucson region. This Plan focuses...
primarily on urban and suburban pedestrian elements: 1) sidewalks and other suitable pedestrian facilities; 2) paved and unpaved shared use paths for pedestrians, bicyclists, rollerbladers and others; and 3) pedestrian crossings of roadways leading to activity centers. An important recommendation from this plan was to develop a regional inventory of pedestrian facilities in order to provide a complete description of the region's pedestrian system, its condition, needs and priorities. From this plan, the Tucson Region Sidewalk Inventory Project Report was developed in 2005.

**Other**

There are several other sources of information regarding ADA pedestrian facility planning and design. The following provide a small sample of the available information.

*Easter Seals’ Project ACTION (Accessible Community Transportation in Our Nation)*

From the Easter Seals website, “Easter Seals provides exceptional services, education, outreach, and advocacy so that people living with autism and other disabilities can live, learn, work and play in our communities…. Easter Seals has been helping individuals with disabilities and special needs, and their families, live better lives for nearly 90 years. From child development centers to physical rehabilitation and job training for people with disabilities, Easter Seals offers a variety of services to help people with disabilities address life's challenges and achieve personal goals.”

The Easter Seals’ Project ACTION is a program intended to “promote universal access to transportation for people with disabilities under federal law and beyond by partnering with transportation providers, the disability community and others through the provision of training, technical assistance, applied research, outreach and communication.” Information regarding this program is available at:

www.projectaction.easterseals.com/site/PageServer?pagename=ESPA_homepage

*Senior Walking Environmental Audit Tool (SWEAT)*

SWEAT is a component of a research project out of the Oregon Health & Science University. The purpose of this project is to identify the community-level factors that enhance health and independent living for older persons in Portland, Oregon.

The researchers have indicated that “very little work has been done to understand the elements of neighborhood context and urban form that allow successful aging in place. There is significant information available to planners about how to meet the needs of older people with regards to building requirements, site access, and transportation. However, research used to inform policy-makers has focused on single elements of the built environment (e.g., transportation, housing), excluding the importance of neighborhood social environment, and rarely considering how neighborhood factors and the built environment work in concert to encourage seniors’ adaptation to changing physical demands.”
The research project includes an assessment of various neighborhoods in Portland, Oregon, utilizing the input of older adults living in those neighborhoods, the researchers examined the relationship between health, neighborhood, and the built environment. The SWEAT is a set of survey items to be observed during a field review of neighborhood streets. Facility items to be addressed during the survey include types and effectiveness of existing roadway crossings, traffic control systems, curb cuts (including geometry, and locations of), land uses along the survey route, and presence and continuity of sidewalk systems.

Information on this project is found on the website:
www.ohsu.edu/public-health/employees/faculty/michael.shtml

Disability.gov

Disability.gov is a website that contains comprehensive information for individuals with disabilities. The information provided includes benefits, civil rights, community life, transportation, employment, health and housing. www.disability.gov
3. Advisory/Oversight Committee

Introduction

The implementation of an ADA Transition Plan Update effort is a relatively new undertaking by the Pima County Department of Transportation (PCDOT). This statement is made because it has been nearly 15 years since the previous PCDOT ADA Transition Plan effort. In the mid-1990s, the ADA Roadway Compliance Plan was prepared for PCDOT. This publication could be considered the original PCDOT ADA Transition Plan. Since that time, there have been no efforts to update the original publication. However, since 2004, $50,000 per year has been dedicated to ADA retrofit improvement projects. Ongoing roadway, bikeway, and pedestrian facility improvement projects have also been constructed in compliance with ADA. In addition to updating its ADA Transition Plan, the PCDOT staff wants to strengthen the existing ADA program.

In 2009, the PCDOT staff decided to be more proactive in the way it addresses ADA requirement compliance related to pedestrian facilities. In addition to updating its Transition Plan, the PCDOT staff wanted to establish an ongoing program. An element of this new effort was the establishment of a small committee that would provide input and guidance. The name of the committee formed is the Advisory/Oversight Committee (AOC) and it has fewer than 15 members. Since its formation, this committee has helped to assure that the outcomes of the ADA Transition Plan Update effort and the ongoing program would be meaningful, realistic, feasible, and worthy of spending limited financial resources.

Committee Composition

The AOC is composed of two uniquely different groups of individuals who have a common goal. This goal is to address pedestrian facility ADA needs in unincorporated Pima County within the public rights of way maintained by PCDOT. One of the two groups consists of representatives from organizations that advocate for members of the community who have disabilities, e.g., sight, hearing, and mobility. These advocacy organizations are included in the following list.

- Pima Council on Aging (PCOA).
- Pima County Facilities Management Department.
- Pima County Human Resources Department.
- Southern Arizona Association for the Visually Impaired (SAAVI).
- Tucson Commission on Disability Issues (CODI).

In some cases, the organizations included in the above list are units, commissions, or task forces of municipal, county, regional, or state governments. The individuals who serve on the committee have meaningful hands-on experience with individuals with disabilities. Some of the members have disabilities themselves. The two representatives from the Pima County Facilities
Management and Human Resources Departments both have substantial experience with ADA and disability issues.

The second of the two groups is composed of members of the PCDOT staff responsible for the design, operation, and maintenance of roadways within unincorporated Pima County. These responsibilities include the design, operation, and maintenance of pedestrian facilities, both within roadway rights of way and on public lands maintained by PCDOT. The specific PCDOT divisions that will be represented include the Operations & Maintenance Division, the Traffic Engineering Division, and the Transportation Engineering Division.

Although not a member of the AOC, the PCDOT Project Manager of this project/effort is the Bicycle and Pedestrian Program Manager for his department and is a member of the Transportation Systems Division. As a result, this individual is well informed about numerous ADA requirements as they relate to pedestrians.

**Number and Purposes of the AOC Meetings**

At the onset of the effort, it was anticipated that the AOC would meet four times during the Phase 1 effort to provide useful input and feedback to the Project Manager and the consultant. Please refer to Exhibit 3-1 for the Project Schedule, which notes the approximate weeks when the four scheduled meetings were to be held. Also, it was speculated that additional meetings might be needed. The meetings were held in convenient central locations; typically, either the City-County Public Works Building or the building where the PAG offices are located. Both of these buildings are located in Downtown Tucson.

The “Kick-Off” Meeting was scheduled to be held as soon as draft documents had been prepared for the Project Management Plan and the Literature Search Technical Memorandum. The goals of this meeting were:

1. To introduce the members of the AOC to each other and to the Project Manager and consultant staff;
2. To provide an overview of the Phase 1 effort;
3. To discuss the role of the AOC;
4. To discuss the two draft documents; and
5. To answer any questions that the AOC members might have about this effort.

The second meeting was scheduled to be held prior to Work Task 1.6 (Develop Framework for Program). The goal of this meeting was to conduct a field trip for the committee members to inspect various locations with examples of both satisfactory and unsatisfactory ADA compliance.

The third meeting was scheduled to be held during Work Task 1.6. The goal of this meeting was to discuss the development of a program framework. This was an important meeting because the following significant program elements would be addressed.

- Goals and objectives
- Guiding principles
Standards and requirements
Typical methods to achieve compliance

Initially, it was anticipated that a fourth meeting might be required and it was included in the Project Schedule. However, a decision was made late in the Phase 1 effort that the fourth meeting was unnecessary.

All documents to be discussed at the various meetings were transmitted via the internet to the members of the AOC prior to each meeting. Typically, the committee members had approximately one week to review the documentation before the meeting.

First or “Kick-Off” Meeting

The first or “Kick-Off” meeting was held on November 19, 2009. A total of 13 individuals attended the meeting, including the Project Manager and the members of the CLA staff. The goals of the meeting were as stated in the previous report section.

The outcomes of this meeting were as follows.

- The members of the AOC who attended the meeting became more familiar with the intent of the Phase 1 effort, the composition and role of the committee, and the Project Management Plan and Project Schedule for the Phase 1 effort.
- The committee members were briefed about the Literature Search being performed.
- The committee members were informed about the objectives of the second and third committee meetings.
- The committee members were given an opportunity to express their concerns about a variety of ADA deficiencies in the community that will need to be addressed.
- The committee members provided the CLA staff with additional sources of useful information.
- A decision was made to create a website for this effort.

It appeared that the attendees of the meeting were very interested in the Pima County ADA Transition Plan Update effort and were looking forward to participating in it.

Second or “Virtual Tour” Meeting

The second or “Virtual Tour” meeting was held on January 13, 2010. A total of 14 individuals attended the meeting, including the Project Manager, a representative of the Tucson Information Technology Department (who facilitated the “Virtual Tour”), two guests from PAG, and two members of the CLA staff.

Early in the planning stages of the second meeting, it was decided that actually taking the members of the committee to several segments of roadway in unincorporated Pima County might be very time consuming and problematic. Fortunately, the actual tour could be replaced
by a “virtual tour” conducted for the committee members in a Downtown Tucson office conference room.

In recent years, PAG has financed the development and use of a specially equipped van that can take photographs of roadways and the adjacent right of way beyond the roadway cross-section. These photographs are taken every 26 feet that the van travels. The photographs can be viewed as a slide show at travel speeds between 5 mph and 55 mph. These photographs can also be viewed one by one and the viewer has the opportunity to stop and proceed in reverse. The specially equipped van also has a variety of sensors for evaluating the condition of the roadway pavement. The City of Tucson, the surrounding municipalities, and Pima County have all utilized the van. The photographs and pavement condition information is located on the City of Tucson TransView.org website. Refer to Exhibit 3-2 for instructions about locating and using the TransView.org website and the part of the website where the photographs are stored, which is entitled, Virtual Ride.

The CLA staff, with the assistance of a member of the City staff, presented “virtual tours” of two roadway segments within unincorporated Pima County for ADA compliance or needs. The two roadway segments were Country Club Road from Ajo Way to 45th Street (Northbound Direction) and Ruthrauff Road/Wetmore Road from I-10 to Fairview Avenue (Eastbound Direction).

Some of the issues discussed during the “virtual tour” of the two roadway segments included the following.

- The pedestrian push button stations at traffic signals or pedestrian flashers need to be logically located with respect to the crosswalks.
- The poles of traffic signal or pedestrian flasher installations should not obstruct sidewalk pathways.
- Bus stops need to be more carefully designed (including the signing) in order to better accommodate the visually impaired and the mobility impaired (as they attempt to board/depart from the bus or travel past the bus stop).
- The opportunities for pedestrians to cross arterial roadways need to be increased to reduce the distances between signed or signalized pedestrian crossings.
- The corner radii of the local streets on some recently completed roadway reconstruction projects are extremely large (approximately 50 ft.), which increases the time (and exposure) that the pedestrian is on the pavement and mixing with vehicular traffic.
- The provision of some type of physical cue to assist the visually impaired to cross medium and large expanses of pavement needs to be considered.
- The pedestrian pathways across traffic islands need to be designed to better accommodate the visually impaired.
- The design of driveways as they cross sidewalks should minimize the changes in the vertical alignment of the pedestrian walking along the sidewalk.
- The horizontal alignment of meandering sidewalks should not include tight curves with small radii.
- The typical width of sidewalks, i.e., 5 ft., may need to be increased to 6 ft. to better accommodate the mobility impaired.
• The unit cost of constructing individual curb access ramps as part of retrofit projects is extremely high.
• All roadway users need to be reasonably accommodated.

The AOC members, the Project Manager, and the CLA staff who attended this meeting were very impressed with how effective and efficient the meeting was using TransView Virtual Ride. This meeting allowed a number of attendees to see in action a very useful tool that could be used in their own workplace activities. As a result, a detailed set of instructions were created and sent to the AOC members for their use. Refer to Exhibit 3-2.

**Third Meeting or ThinkTank Session**

The third meeting or ThinkTank session was held on March 4, 2010. A total of 10 individuals attended the meeting, including the Project Manager, a representative of PAG (who facilitated the ThinkTank session), and two members of the CLA staff.

The primary purpose of this meeting was to gather information from the committee members that will be useful in the development of the ongoing program. In order to expedite this information gathering effort, the Project Manager and the CLA staff arranged to have the PAG staff conduct a ThinkTank session. The ThinkTank software facilitates the generation of a significant amount of very useful information in a relatively short period of time. In addition, it prevents a small number of individuals from dominating the discussion. Several years ago, PAG acquired the ThinkTank software and has already conducted information gathering sessions for the City of Tucson, Pima County, PAG/Regional Transportation Authority, and the Town of Marana.

The goal of the meeting was to obtain information to develop the following important program elements.

• Goals and objectives
  • Guiding principles
  • Standards and requirements
  • Typical methods to achieve compliance

In order to obtain the required information, 10 open ended or leading questions were prepared in advance of the meeting to expedite the information gathering. An eleventh question was added towards the end of the March 4th session. The following 11 questions were asked.

1. What should be the goals and objectives of the Pima County ADA Transition Plan Update Program?
2. How can Pima County do a better job of identifying physical barriers and other ADA needs on its pedestrian facilities?
3. How can Pima County do a better job of eliminating physical barriers and addressing other ADA needs on its pedestrian facilities?
4. How should the Pima County DOT address physical barriers on pedestrian facilities when the Federal requirements cannot be satisfied?
5. How should the Pima County DOT modify its approach to designing and constructing improvements to minimize the potential to create new physical barriers on pedestrian facilities?
6. How should the Pima County DOT obtain the political and financial support of the Pima County Board of Supervisors?
7. How should the Pima County DOT make the public aware of the program and seek its input?
8. How should access provisions be incorporated into the land planning and land development processes?
9. How can the goals/objectives, policies/guiding principles, and requirements of the program be integrated into modal planning, such as transit service?
10. How should Pima County coordinate this program with similar efforts by the local municipalities and the Arizona Department of Transportation?
11. What are possible funding sources for ADA needs, including larger allocations of existing sources?

In approximately 90 minutes, the seven ThinkTank session participants had generated a total of 119 responses to the 11 questions. In addition, the responses to two of the questions were prioritized. The participants, as well as the Project Manager and the consultant, were very pleased with the accomplishments of the session. Based on the information collected during the ThinkTank session, it was also anticipated that the preparation of the Program Framework Technical Memorandum would be expedited.

In order to examine the ThinkTank session output documentation, please use the following link.

### PHASE I REPORT - ADVISORY/OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE:

**Curtis Lueck & Associates**  
Tucson, Arizona

**Exhibit 3-1  Project Schedule**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK TASK</th>
<th>Oktober</th>
<th>November</th>
<th>Dezember</th>
<th>Januar 2010</th>
<th>Februar</th>
<th>März</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>Mai</th>
<th>Juni</th>
<th>Juli</th>
<th>August</th>
<th>September</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work Task 1.1: Develop Project Management Plan (DP 1.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1: Prepare a draft Project Management Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2: Review the draft Project Management Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.3: Prepare a final Project Management Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Task 1.2: Perform a Literature Search (DP 1.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.1: Review sources of information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.2: Prepare a draft technical memorandum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3: Review the draft technical memorandum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.4: Prepare a final technical memorandum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Task 1.3: Establish an Advisory/Oversight Committee (DP 1.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.1: Prepare invitations to join AOC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.2: Organize AOC meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.3: Prepare a draft technical memorandum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.4: Review the draft technical memorandum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.5: Prepare a final technical memorandum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Task 1.4: Review Existing Relevant Databases (DP 1.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4.1: Evaluate existing PAG and Rite County relevant documentation and databases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4.2: Prepare a draft technical memorandum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4.3: Review the draft technical memorandum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4.4: Prepare a final technical memorandum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Task 1.5: Determine Existing Potential Funding Sources (DP 1.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5.1: Evaluate existing potential funding sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5.2: Other ways to fund and implement ADA improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5.3: Prepare a draft technical memorandum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5.4: Review the draft technical memorandum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5.5: Prepare a final technical memorandum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Task 1.6: Develop Framework for Program (DP 1.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6.1: Elements of the program framework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6.2: Achieving consensus on the elements of the program framework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6.3: Prepare a draft technical memorandum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6.4: Review the draft technical memorandum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6.5: Prepare a final technical memorandum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Task 1.7: Develop Methodologies for Program (DP 1.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7.1: Develop draft proposals for program methodologies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7.2: Achieving consensus on the draft proposals for program methodologies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7.3: Prepare a draft technical memorandum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7.4: Review the draft technical memorandum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7.5: Prepare a final technical memorandum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Task 1.8: Prepare Inventory Databases (DP 1.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8.1: Prepare inventory databases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8.2: Prepare a draft technical memorandum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8.3: Review the draft technical memorandum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8.4: Prepare a final technical memorandum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Task 1.9: Prepare Final Report (DP 1.9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9.1: Prepare a draft final Phase 1 report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9.2: Review the draft final Phase 1 report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9.3: Prepare a final Phase 1 report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9.4: Reproduction of the draft final Phase 1 report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEGEND: M refers to a meeting of the AOC**
**Exhibit 3-2 How to Use the Tucson Department of Transportation TransView “Virtual Ride”**

Use the following instructions to access the Tucson Department of Transportation (TDOT) TransView “Virtual Ride” slide show video. According to a member of the PAG staff familiar with “Virtual Ride”, it appears to work only with Internet Explorer. He has had problems using Firefox and other browsers. You might have to download the MapGuide Viewer to see the TDOT maps. Please refer to No. 3.

1. Go to TDOT page @ http://dot.ci.tucson.az.us/

2. Select TDOT Map Center option, which is located on left side of your monitor screen.

3. Select Transportation Department Maps option, which is the top left choice in the center part of the monitor screen.
   
   a. After the next screen opens, if you do not have the MapGuide Viewer, click on “MapGuide Tips & Help and follow the instructions for installing the Viewer on your computer.

4. Press “ok” for the disclaimer. You are now looking at a general map of Pima County.

5. Now you need to use your cursor to zoom-in to the approximate area of the city/county that you are interested in. The zoom-in button is in the upper left corner of the monitor screen. After you have zoomed-in, you will see a small portion of the city/county roadway map.

6. On the left side of the city/county roadway map, you will see the names of the various information layers. Look for the layer named "VIRTUAL RIDE". If you do not see it, you need to zoom-in further.

7. Using your cursor, check "ARAN Van '09" to select the most recent year of the slide show information. There is also an "ARAN Van '07" version. After about one minute, the roadway segments should show bands of various colors, which indicate pavement condition.

8. Now change from the zoom-in tool to the arrow tool. The arrow tool is located in the upper left part of the monitor screen.

9. Using the arrow tool, select the roadway segment that you want to view the slide show. Double left click the roadway segment in the general area where you want to start the slide show.

10. You show now be looking at a screen with two photographs. The operating controls are above and below the photographs.
11. Select the speed setting that you want to travel at. It is in the lower right portion of the monitor screen.

12. Using your cursor, hit the “GO” button below the photographs. You may need to advance the slide show to see a street name sign or some familiar landmark to know where you are.

13. The slide show can be stopped by hitting the “STOP” button with your cursor.

14. You can advance the slide show frame by frame using the “STEP” button. The frames are separated by 26 feet. If you are already in motion, stop the motion first using the “STOP” button.

15. The “REVERSE DIRECTION” button changes the direction of movement. If you are going forward, you will back up. If you are going backward, you will go forward. The caption below the photographs will describe what you are doing. If you are already in motion, stop the motion first using the “STOP” button. To restart the movement, hit the “GO” button with your cursor.

16. To travel in the opposing lanes of travel, hit the “TURN AROUND” button with your cursor. If you are already in motion, stop the motion first using the “STOP” button. To restart the movement in the opposing lanes, hit the “GO” button with your cursor.
4. Existing Relevant Databases

**Purpose**

The purpose of this chapter is to discuss the review of existing databases that provide: 1) the information relevant to pedestrian facilities in unincorporated Pima County and 2) the information that will be helpful in the development of the updated Americans with Disabilities (ADA) Transition Plan. The databases are generally from local sources such as the Pima Association of Governments (PAG), Pima County and the City of Tucson. The CLA staff has also reviewed available map websites such as Google Maps.

**Sources of Information**

The primary sources of information in this effort include:

- **Pima Association of Governments**
  - PAG Regional Pedestrian Plan (2000)
  - Tucson Region Sidewalk Inventory Project Report (2005)

- **City of Tucson**
  - TransView Database
  - Sun Tran Database

- **Pima County**
  - Orthophoto MapGuide Maps
  - Main MapGuide Maps
  - Department of Transportation Division Databases
  - ADA Roadway Compliance Plan

- **Pima Association of Governments**

  - **PAG Regional Pedestrian Plan (2000)**
    
    This plan is available on-line at [www.pagnet.org/documents/Pedestrian/PedPlan2000.pdf](http://www.pagnet.org/documents/Pedestrian/PedPlan2000.pdf)

This document was prepared by PAG to emphasize the need for a more accessible and safer pedestrian environment in the Tucson Region. It was intended to be a policy document that would be used to help develop and improve the pedestrian facility system within the Tucson Metropolitan Area. The plan was prepared in 2000 and does not include an inventory of the pedestrian facilities within the Tucson area. However, the plan does guide decision makers to prepare an inventory of important and relevant pedestrian routes. This plan describes the needs of such a system, the population groups that such a system serves, recommends operating policies and describes how such a system is and could be funded and implemented. The plan
laid the foundation for the development of the Tucson Region Sidewalk Inventory Project in 2005.

**Tucson Region Sidewalk Inventory Project Report (2005)**

This Tucson Region Sidewalk Inventory report is available on-line at [www.pagnet.org/documents/Pedestrian/SidewalkInventory2005.pdf](http://www.pagnet.org/documents/Pedestrian/SidewalkInventory2005.pdf)

The Tucson Region Sidewalk Inventory is a comprehensive assessment of sidewalks and ADA access along all major roadways in the Tucson region. PAG planned to use the inventory to identify gaps and prioritize the sidewalk projects necessary to complete a regional network of pedestrian-accessible transportation corridors.

The inventory focused specifically on the major roadway grid network, which consisted of approximately 4,000 directional miles of arterials and collectors. This assessment identified many barriers to accessibility, such as missing or poorly maintained sidewalks and wheelchair ramps, utility poles and signs obstructing pedestrian pathways, old railroad crossings and underpasses with steep sidewalks, steep-sloped driveways, sandwich signs, and vehicle parking encroachment.

Once the inventory was complete, planners and advocates created a rational process to guide local officials in identifying priority sidewalk projects. A 100-point ranking system using nine criteria was developed with input from local jurisdictional staff, pedestrian planners, and individuals with disabilities. These criteria are:

- Traffic Volumes (10 points max)
- Transit Ridership (10 points max)
- Population Density (10 points max)
- Commercial Land Use Density (15 points max)
- Proximity to Schools (15 points max)
- Proximity to Parks (10 points max)
- Proximity to Medical Facilities (10 points max)
- Paratransit Ridership Locations (10 points max)
- Local Priorities/Safety Concerns (10 points max)

Available data was used to determine population density, average daily traffic, transit route ridership, and proximity to business districts, schools, parks, and medical facilities.

The list of high-priority projects served as the foundation for the pedestrian element of the $2.1 billion, 20-year Regional Transportation Authority (RTA) plan, approved by voters in 2006. The RTA plan allocates approximately $30 million for construction of sidewalks, ramps, and signalized crosswalks. The RTA map showing sidewalk projects is provided as Exhibit 4-1.

---

1 Speedway Boulevard between Alvernon Way and Swan Road is one mile in length. However, if sidewalks on each side of Speedway are inventoried, then one mile of eastbound Speedway and one mile of westbound Speedway equals two directional miles.
**City of Tucson**

*Department of Transportation TransView Internet Site*

The City of Tucson TransView internet site includes GIS data and a MapGuide map. Information on this site assists public works staff and the public with identifying features within the City of Tucson area. The information provided in TransView is similar to the Pima County GIS MapGuide site, but is primarily for features within the City of Tucson. TransView also includes segments of arterials and collectors within unincorporated Pima County.

The “virtual ride” function in TransView is very useful in evaluating the pedestrian facilities along the routes. The virtual ride feature includes photographs of City and County streets taken every 26 feet. A slide show for these routes is created with these photographs. There are two types of photographs provided in the slide show. One is taken from the driver’s view looking straight ahead and the other is taken looking to the right at the right side of the right-of-way. A virtual ride screen from the slide show of a route is provided as Exhibit 4-2. TransView is available at [www.transview.org/](http://www.transview.org/).

**Sun Tran and Sun Van**

Sun Tran is the regional fixed-route transit service operation in the Tucson metropolitan area. Relevant data provided by Sun Tran for this project include route maps, schedules, and locations of stops (sheltered and unsheltered). The review of ADA accessible facilities to transit services throughout Pima County is of special concern in the development of the transition plan.

Sun Van, Tucson’s paratransit agency since 1987, provides door-to-door transportation service to those individuals unable to use Sun Tran’s fixed route service due to their disability. An increasing number of individuals ride Sun Van, with more than 400,000 passenger trips provided each year. Sun Van is available to individuals with disabilities with a current ADA Eligibility Card issued by the City of Tucson.

The websites for Sun Tran and Sun Van are found at [www.suntran.com](http://www.suntran.com) and [www.sunvan.com/](http://www.sunvan.com/).

**Pima County Department of Transportation (PCDOT)**

*Geographic Information Services (GIS) Division*

Pima County’s GIS Division created and maintains a map of Pima County with various features. This map is useful to policy makers, engineers, planners and the public. The data included in the map is provided through “metadata” layers which can be turned on or off while viewing the map. Orthophotos are provided through contracts with aerial photo providers. The most recent aerial photography available on the Pima County website is from 2008. The website for the Pima County orthophotos is [www.dot.pima.gov/gis/maps/mapguide/](http://www.dot.pima.gov/gis/maps/mapguide/).
The Pima County MapGuide map includes several layers of metadata that are useful to this project:

- Sidewalks
- Location of Hospitals, Libraries, Police Stations, Post Offices and Schools
- School crosswalks
- Bus Routes
- Construction Plans
- Street Classification (Federal)
- Street Maintenance Status
- Trails (Location and Type)
- Handicar Service Area
- Parks
- Zoning (to indicate employment centers)

**Traffic Engineering Division**

The Traffic Engineering Division maintains as-built plans for roadway and traffic signal designs. These plans show the design and locations of traffic signal installations, HAWK and PELICAN pedestrian signals, sidewalks, ramps, and other infrastructure relevant to this project.

**Transportation Systems Division**

The Transportation Systems Division manages the Safe Routes to School (SRTS) program within Pima County. This program provides resources to local schools to encourage walking and biking to and from schools. The Transportation Systems Division and area school districts have information regarding the location of SRTS routes.

**Regional Transportation Authority (RTA)**

RTA provides fixed route transit service to residents living in rural areas of Pima County via the Sun Shuttle program. The system is designed to transport residents to jobs, major shopping centers, and medical facilities within the Tucson metro area by connecting with the Sun Tran system at major transfer centers. See [www.rtamobility.com](http://www.rtamobility.com)

**Other Sources**

Google Earth includes an aerial orthophoto database of land in many locations around the world. It is similar in function to the aerial photography available on the TransView and Pima

---

These signals have been installed on many Tucson and Pima County streets. They are pedestrian-activated signals and are typically located on major streets at mid-block locations. They utilize typical traffic signal equipment to assist pedestrians in crossing the streets.
County GIS Orthophoto websites. One limitation to Google Earth is that the available data is usually older than what is found on the Tucson and Pima County websites.
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5. Funding Sources

Introduction

Over the past 15 years, the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) improvements to pedestrian facilities within unincorporated Pima County have primarily been made by the Pima County Department of Transportation (PCDOT) as part of other transportation improvements. During this period, a significant number of miles of arterial and collector roadways were totally reconstructed using typical transportation funding sources. There were no designated ADA funds used to finance ADA improvements on these projects. At the time of reconstruction, these roadways complied with the then-current ADA requirements. Spot improvements were made at numerous intersections during this same period. As individual intersections were reconstructed and improved, short segments of curbing and sidewalk were constructed with curb access ramps. Similarly, no designated ADA funds were used to finance these ADA improvements. Pima County has also required developers of residential, commercial, and industrial properties to make on-site and off-site roadway and ADA pedestrian facility improvements. Importantly, some of the improvements constructed over the past 15 years may no longer be in compliance due to changing ADA requirements. In recent years, Pima County has used a small source of funds allocated annually to implement a limited number of specific ADA spot improvements, i.e., the construction of curb access ramps and short segments of sidewalk.

The PCDOT efforts of the past 15 years are commendable; however, the funding has been inadequate. There is a backlog of pedestrian facility needs in unincorporated Pima County. Many Pima County roadways may never be totally reconstructed or if they are reconstructed, it will be in the very distant future. As a result, a program needs to be developed to address ADA needs as spot improvements. Funds need to be found to finance these ADA improvements.

Currently, there are several potential federal, state, regional, and local funding sources for constructing ADA improvements in unincorporated Pima County. However, in the current era of limited funds for any type of improvement (transportation and non-transportation), the competition for these funds is fierce. Requests for transportation related funds for ADA pedestrian facility improvements are primarily competing against requests for transportation safety and roadway/intersection capacity improvements. It is recognized that solving traffic safety and capacity problems is important; however, the failure to properly address ADA needs in a timely fashion is equally important, impacts safety, and could be considered discrimination. Depending on circumstances, there may be a violation of the civil rights of those individuals with disabilities. This is due to the fact that the 1990 Americans with Disabilities Act is a civil rights statute. Because of all of these considerations, the importance of efforts to address ADA needs should be reasonably prioritized when funding allocations are programmed. Doing less would also be counterproductive to a “complete streets” approach to transportation planning. (A complete streets policy ensures that transportation planners and engineers consistently design and operate the entire roadway with all users in mind. In addition to motorists, the users...
include bicyclists, public transportation vehicles and riders, and pedestrians of all ages and abilities.)

The situation described in the previous paragraph is not unique to either Pima County or southern Arizona. In 2006, the voters of the City of Phoenix approved a comprehensive bond program that included funds to address the problem of financing ADA improvements within the boundaries of the City. The bond program included funds for a three year citywide effort to finance small street improvements to eliminate ADA deficiencies. The three year implementation period began in Fiscal Year 08/09. Approximately $3.4 million will be spent during the three year period. Approximately $2.4 million will be provided by General Obligation bonds, which will be repaid using property tax revenues. The remaining $1 million is a reallocation of the City General Funds.

The purpose of this project work task is to document the majority of the potential sources of funding for addressing ADA pedestrian facility needs. General categories of funding include: 1) public financing from federal, state, regional, and local agencies, and 2) private funding from institutions/charities and land developer exactions. In some cases, larger amounts of existing funding sources than previously allocated could be programmed for this purpose by Pima County in the future. Larger amounts of funding will allow Pima County to more aggressively address ADA needs within its jurisdiction and avoid or minimize accusations of discrimination by advocates of individuals with disabilities. This report includes an initial funding forecast to address ADA needs on pedestrian facilities in unincorporated Pima County for a 5-10 year planning period. This is challenging because of the nature of the funding sources and the uncertainty of the current economic times. In addition, totally new sources of funding may be created by the federal government in order to address ADA needs or to help stimulate the economy.

**Public Funding Sources**

**Federal Funding Sources**

There are numerous sources of federal financial assistance and many of these sources can be used to finance ADA improvements. In a search of the Federal Highway Administration website, a funding matrix was discovered on the portion of the website maintained by the Office of Civil Rights. The website where the matrix is located is:

http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/civilrights/programs/ada_sect504qa.htm#q30

The matrix is included in this document as Exhibit 5-1. It appears that the matrix is current since this portion of the website was last updated on June 3, 2009. Following the matrix is Exhibit 5-2, which is a table that was prepared in 2006. This table describes how the various funds can be used. It is unknown if there have been subsequent requirement changes for using these funds; however, it is believed that the information is still reasonably useful. It should be noted that some of the funding sources included in the table are no longer available and others cannot be used in Pima County.
In general, in order to obtain federal funding, an agency needs to complete a detailed application associated with a particular program following the associated guidelines. Typically, the application prepared is competing against other applications of a similar nature submitted by other agencies within the region/state or competing against other applications of a similar nature submitted by the same agency. Finally, and very importantly, a local match or contribution is required to obtain these federal funds.

Although there are numerous sources of federal financial assistance, local agencies have become somewhat reluctant about submitting funding applications. This is due to the fact that there are numerous federal regulations that must be adhered to. Furthermore, the process followed is more complicated, more expensive, and slower than it should be, particularly for federally funded pedestrian facility improvement projects.

PCDOT has successfully obtained federal funds for pedestrian facility improvements in the past. The primary federal funding source used has been Transportation Enhancement funds. In past years, PCDOT has typically obtained approximately $200,000 annually for pedestrian facilities and ADA needs; however, the funds are restricted to the construction of new facilities and cannot be used on ADA retrofit improvements. In the future, it is anticipated that the annual funding level will decrease. A conservative estimate of the annual funding level may be approximately $100,000. Recently, PCDOT also received a one-time award of $250,000 in Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) funds for pedestrian improvements. It can reasonably be anticipated that the County will receive $400,000 in HSIP funds for pedestrian safety projects within the next 10 years. Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds have also been obtained and used for pedestrian facility improvements. In 2009, Congress approved the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) in order to stimulate the economy, which included ARRA STP funds. Recently, PCDOT obtained $300,000 in ARRA STP funds for a pedestrian project. However, this source is not anticipated to be available in the future.

State Funding Sources

Within Arizona, the primary sources of state transportation funds are the Highway User Revenue Fund (HURF) and the Vehicle License Tax (VLT). The following information appears on the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) website about HURF and VLT funding.

**HURF:** The State of Arizona taxes motor fuels and collects a variety of fees and charges relating to the registration and operation of motor vehicles on the public highways of the state. These collections include gasoline and use fuel taxes, motor carrier taxes, vehicle license taxes, motor vehicle registration fees, and other miscellaneous fees. These revenues are deposited in the Arizona Highway User Revenue Fund (HURF) and are then distributed to the cities, towns and counties and to the State Highway Fund. These taxes represent the primary source of revenues available to the state for highway construction and improvements and other related expenses.
VLT: Owners of vehicles that are registered for operation on the highways of Arizona pay the Vehicle License Tax (VLT). It is an ad valorem tax based on the assessed value of the vehicle. The VLT revenues are distributed to the HURF, State Highway Fund; State General Fund, Cities/Towns, Counties, and Local Transportation Assistance Fund (LTAF II).

The use of HURF is greatly restricted by Article 9, Section 14 of the Arizona Constitution. HURF can be used for roadway-related purposes, but not for transit. VLT, however, can be used for any transportation expense. In Fiscal Year 2010, which ended on June 30, 2010, Pima County received approximately $49.7 million in HURF and VLT funding for transportation purposes within unincorporated Pima County. For FY 2011, the County is projecting a reduction in HURF/VLT funding to $48.1 million. These funds are used for planning, design, operations, maintenance, and capital improvements. These funds are also used to pay off the debt of previously voter approved bond issues.

Although $48 million is a significant amount of funding, there is intense competition for these funds for many worthy transportation uses. Of these funds, only $50,000 (approximately 1/10 of 1 percent of the total HURF/VLT funds received) is dedicated annually to addressing specific ADA retrofit improvement projects. Currently, the costs of bond issue debt retirement, operations and maintenance activities, transportation safety improvements, and roadway/intersection capacity improvements use a very high percentage of the total annual HURF funds received by Pima County. The use of these funds for ADA pedestrian facility improvements cannot be dismissed, especially in light of U.S. Department of Justice civil rights findings and Supreme Court case law.

A second, but much smaller and restricted, source of state transportation funding is entitled Local Transportation Assistance Fund II (LTAF II). These funds are used for public transportation purposes. Statewide, approximately $9 million is currently available. The funds for LTAF II are derived from the state general fund and Powerball lottery revenues. These funds may be used for the local contribution for federal financial assistance. The funds can be used for ADA pedestrian facility improvements at bus stops and transit facilities. The use of these funds would need to be coordinated through the PCDOT staff responsible for public transportation as well as the Pima Association of Governments (PAG) staff. Very recently, this funding source, along with many others, was eliminated by the Arizona State Legislature so that the funds could be used for other purposes during the current dismal economic period. This so-called “funding sweep” may occur again in the coming fiscal years. As a result, the viability of LTAF II is uncertain.

Currently, there are no state funding programs specifically dedicated for ADA pedestrian facility improvements. All of the transportation agencies within the state, including ADOT, are significantly dependent on HURF funding as the primary source to finance improvements to address ADA needs. In Pima County, the percentage of the HURF funds programmed annually to address ADA needs is determined by the senior management of PCDOT and the County Administration with the concurrence of the Board of Supervisors. As previously stated, this percentage of HURF is currently extremely small.
Regional Funding Sources

There are no regional funds at this time from PAG or the Regional Transportation Authority (RTA) specifically earmarked for ADA pedestrian facility improvements. However, PCDOT has received and been using RTA funds for the past three years to address ADA needs. On average, PCDOT has received approximately $100,000 annually for sidewalk construction and other ADA needs. This source can be used for new facilities as well as ADA retrofit improvements. The two RTA funding categories are:

- PAG Sidewalk Improvement RTA Funds
- PAG Elderly and Pedestrian Safety RTA Funds

The PAG Sidewalk Improvement RTA Funds have been used on Safe Routes to School alignments in the vicinity of Fruchthendler Elementary School and Laguna Elementary School. The PAG Elderly and Pedestrian Safety RTA Funds have been approved for use to build sidewalks and ramps on Camino del Sol in Green Valley, which has a significant elderly population.

The PAG staff is also assisting Pima County in a totally different way. This Transition Plan Update Phase 1 effort is being financed using Project Development Assistance Funds (PDAF).

County Funding Sources

Currently, there are a small number of County funding programs to finance ADA pedestrian facility improvements. The programs include the following.

- Pima County ADA Funding Program
- Pima County Neighborhood Reinvestment Program

The Pima County ADA funding program annually provides $50,000 of HURF funds to address ADA needs. All or a portion of the annual allocation can be banked for multiple years in order to implement a large project. These funds are typically used to construct small ADA improvement projects involving new or reconstructed curb access ramps and possibly very short segments of sidewalk. Since it was initiated, possibly in 2004, the magnitude of this funding allocation has never been increased.

The Pima County Neighborhood Reinvestment Program has existed for more than 10 years. The sources of these funds are voter approved General Obligation bonds, which will be repaid using property tax revenues. To date, the voters have approved this program twice. In 1997, $5 million was approved and in 2004, $20 million was approved for projects. Based on past successes, it is now hoped that an additional $30 million will be sought in a future bond election, possibly in 2011 or 2013. Some of the types of improvements financed using these funds include the construction or installation of street traffic calming devices, sidewalks, walking paths, street lights, park improvements, and playgrounds. The criteria for evaluating proposals for this program include: 1) Community Need, 2) Impact to Neighborhood, and 3) Matching Funds. It is not unusual for this program to contribute $500,000 to implement a single neighborhood proposal. It is reasonable to state that all sidewalk construction projects will have a positive
impact on addressing ADA pedestrian facility needs within residential neighborhoods and possibly on the collector and arterial streets that bound these neighborhoods.

**Other Methods to Publicly Construct ADA Improvements**

Every year, the capital Improvement program for PCDOT includes the reconstruction of segments of arterial and collector roadways and the reconstruction or improvement of various individual intersections. These improvement projects are being made to enhance the traffic safety and/or the capacity of these roadway segments and intersections. Many of these projects include the construction of curbing, sidewalks, and curb access ramps. PCDOT constructs these pedestrian related elements to current ADA requirements when pedestrian facilities are included in the projects.

**City of Phoenix ADA Compliance Improvement Bond Program**

As previously stated, the voters of the City of Phoenix approved a comprehensive bond program in 2006 that included funds to address the problem of financing ADA pedestrian facility improvements within the City boundaries. According to several members of the Phoenix Street Transportation Department, the bond program included a three year citywide effort to finance small street improvements to eliminate ADA deficiencies. Approximately $2.4 million will be provided by General Obligation bonds, which will be repaid using property tax revenues. This amount will be supplemented with an additional $1 million, which is a reallocation of the City General Funds. The combined amount, $3.4 million, is to be spent during the three year period, beginning in Fiscal Year 08/09.

The City of Phoenix chose this course of action (to establish a bond issue funded program) to address ADA pedestrian facility deficiencies for the following reasons.

1. The use of federal funds involves satisfying an excessive number of requirements and requires following a cumbersome and time consuming application and implementation process.
2. The use of state funds involves using HURF funds, the magnitude of which is inadequate to pay for other transportation-related improvements deemed more important by the City.

These bond funds and the reallocated General Funds are used to implement programmed ADA pedestrian facility improvements as well as unplanned improvements utilizing a “rapid response” procedure. A single contractor is retained for both of these efforts. The “rapid response” effort was established to address deficiencies with minimum delay when brought to the attention of the City staff. The typical annual work program involves addressing a significant number of planned deficiencies during a one year period. To date, the City staff is pleased with the progress being made to address their ADA needs.
Private Funding Sources

Land Development Exactions

Regardless of the economic conditions, there is always some residential, commercial, or industrial development underway in unincorporated Pima County. When the public works infrastructure for residential development is constructed, the streets typically include sidewalks and curb access ramps that satisfy ADA requirements. If the residential development abuts an arterial or collector roadway, Pima County may require off-site improvements that may include the construction of sidewalks and curb access ramps along these roadways as well. In addition, entire intersections along these arterial and collector roadways may be totally reconstructed with turn lanes and signalization. Similarly, commercial and industrial developments approved by Pima County may include both on-site and off-site pedestrian access improvements that satisfy ADA requirements.

Institution/Charity Funding Sources

There may be limited private funds provided by institution and charity funding sources. A good example of this is the Easter Seals Project ACTION. The Easter Seals charity is a nonprofit, community-based health agency dedicated to helping children and adults with disabilities attain greater independence. The word “ACTION” in Project ACTION is an acronym for Accessible Community Transportation In Our Nation. In the past, Project ACTION has partnered with the Community Transportation Association of America (CTAA) to provide planning grants for communities to create effective means to expand transportation services for individuals with disabilities. CTAA consists of organizations and individuals who support creating mobility for all Americans regardless of where they live or work. Previous planning grants have been used to:

- Support communities in evaluating the current state of transportation for people with disabilities,
- Recognize barriers to mobility that people with disabilities encounter in their communities,
- Identify future transportation needs of individuals with disabilities within those communities, and
- Establish strategies to meet the transportation needs of people with disabilities.

These grants are targeted towards planning efforts. As a result, they may be utilized to fund the Phase 2 effort of this project or to fund future Pima County planning efforts once the ADA Transition Plan Update program has been established.

Forecasting Funds
Based on the information contained in the Public Funding Sources subsections of this document, a cursory forecast of funding was made for the period Fiscal Year 2011 through Fiscal Year 2020. The forecast is documented in Exhibit 5-3. In summary, it appears that $3,150,000 may be available during this 10 year period. This assumes that recent funding awards from the RTA and Federal sources will continue, but at reduced levels and that the Pima County ADA Funding Program will continue at approximately the same level. Of the $3,150,000, $2,650,000 is being provided by the U.S. Department of Transportation and the Regional Transportation Authority. It is important to note that a significant percentage of these funds will be used to build new pedestrian facilities rather than to fund ADA retrofit improvement projects.

**Recommendations**

PCDOT senior management should give serious consideration when the current economic conditions improve to increase the level of funding dedicated to pedestrian facilities and ADA needs. The consultant has prepared a small number of recommendations for consideration.

1. **Maintain the annual PCDOT ADA Funding Program allocation of $50,000 per year.** Although this is a small amount of funding, it has few restrictions for its use to address ADA needs on PCDOT pedestrian facilities.

2. **Apply for Neighborhood Reinvestment Program funds.** The funds from this program are already being used for sidewalk construction in specific neighborhoods. Consideration should be given to allowing PCDOT to apply for the funds for sidewalk improvements on the arterial and collector roadways bounding the neighborhoods. For example, the Flowing Wells area of unincorporated Pima County has an urban appearance. There are curbed arterial and collector roadways that lack curb access ramps and have missing segments of sidewalks. These funds could be used to improve the existing conditions for both individuals with disabilities and able bodied pedestrians.

3. **Continue to apply for regional and federal funds.** The PCDOT staff should continue to apply for RTA and FHWA funds. One example of previously sought FHWA funding is FHWA Transportation Enhancement funding. In the past, the PCDOT staff has been very successful in obtaining these funds.
SECTION 5 - EXHIBITS
### Exhibit 5-1

**Federal Funding Opportunities for Pedestrian Projects and Programs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>NHS</th>
<th>STP</th>
<th>HSIP</th>
<th>RHC</th>
<th>TE</th>
<th>CMAQ*</th>
<th>RTP</th>
<th>FTA</th>
<th>TrE</th>
<th>BRI</th>
<th>402</th>
<th>PLA</th>
<th>TCSP*</th>
<th>FLH</th>
<th>BYW</th>
<th>SRTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paved Shoulders</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared-Use Path/Trail</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Trail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spot Improvement Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail/Highway Intersection</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks: New or Retrofit</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crosswalks: New or Retrofit</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal Improvements</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curb Cuts and Ramps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Calming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Brochure/Book</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Abbreviations:**

- NHS: National Highway System
- STP: Surface Transportation Program
- HSIP: Highway Safety Improvement Program
- RHC: Railway-Highway Crossing Program
- TE: Transportation Enhancement Activities
- CMAQ: Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality Program
- RTP: Recreational Trails Program
- FTA: Federal Transit Capital, Urban & Rural Funds
- TrE: Transit Enhancements
- BRI: Bridge (HBRRP)
- 402: State and Community Traffic Safety Program
- PLA: State/Metropolitan Planning Funds
- TCSP: Transportation and Community and System Preservation Program (*FUNDS NO LONGER AVAILABLE)
- FLH: Federal Lands Highways Program
- BYW: Scenic Byways
- SRTS: Safe Routes to School
### Exhibit 5-2
FHWA and FTA Funds That May be Used for Bicycle and Pedestrian Activities
(Last updated April 18, 2006)

**Federal Highway Administration Programs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program/Primary Purpose</th>
<th>Eligible Pedestrian and Bicycle Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Metropolitan Planning (23 USC 104(f))</strong></td>
<td>Bicycle and pedestrian planning as part of the metropolitan planning process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation planning in urbanized areas in accordance with 23 USC 134 and 49 USC 5303.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Statewide Planning (23 USC 505)</strong></td>
<td>Bicycle and pedestrian planning as part of the statewide planning process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide transportation planning in accordance with 23 USC 135 and 49 USC 5304.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Highway System (NHS) (23 USC 103)</strong></td>
<td>Construction of pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities on land adjacent to any highway on the NHS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements to rural and urban roads that are part of the NHS or that are NHS Intermodal connectors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surface Transportation Program (STP) (23 USC 133)</strong></td>
<td>Construction of pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities; nonconstruction projects for safe bicycle use; modify public sidewalks to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act. Projects do not have to be within the right-of-way of a Federal-aid highway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation, resurfacing, restoration, and operational improvements for highways and bridges including construction or reconstruction necessary to accommodate other transportation modes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surface Transportation Program Transportation Enhancements Set-aside (TE) (23 USC 133(d)(2))</strong></td>
<td>3 of the 12 eligible categories are pedestrian and bicycle facilities, safety and education for pedestrians and bicyclists, and rail-trails.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 specific activities included in the definition of Transportation Enhancement Activities in 23 USC 101(a)(35).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interstate Maintenance (IM) (23 USC 119)</strong></td>
<td>No specific eligibility, but funds may be used to resurface, restore, rehabilitate, and reconstruct pedestrian and bicycle facilities over, under, or along Interstate routes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resurfacing, restoring, rehabilitating, and reconstructing most routes on the Interstate system.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Highway Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation (HBRRP) (23 USC 144)

- Replace and rehabilitate deficient highway bridges and to seismically retrofit bridges located on any public road.
- Pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities on highway bridges. If a highway bridge deck is replaced or rehabilitated, and bicycles are permitted at each end, then the bridge project must include safe bicycle accommodations (within reasonable cost). (23 USC 217(e))

### Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) (23 USC 148)

- To achieve a significant reduction in traffic fatalities and serious injuries on public roads.
- Improvements for pedestrian or bicyclist safety. Construction and yellow-green signs at pedestrian-bicycle crossings and in school zones. Identification of and correction of hazardous locations, sections, and elements (including roadside obstacles, railway-highway crossing needs, and unmarked or poorly marked roads) that constitute a danger to bicyclists and pedestrians. Highway safety improvement projects on publicly owned bicycle or pedestrian pathways or trails.

### Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ) (23 USC 149)

- Funds projects in nonattainment and maintenance areas that reduce transportation related emissions.
- Construction of pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities; nonconstruction projects for safe bicycle use. Projects do not have to be within the right-of-way of a Federal-aid highway, but must demonstrate an air quality benefit.

### National Scenic Byways Program (NSBP) (23 USC 162)

- 8 specific activities for roads designated as National Scenic Byways, All-American Roads, State scenic byways, or Indian tribe scenic byways. The activities are described in 23 USC 162(c). This is a discretionary program; all projects are selected by the US Secretary of Transportation.
- Construction along a scenic byway of a facility for pedestrians and bicyclists and improvements to a scenic byway that will enhance access to an area for the purpose of recreation. 23 USC 162(c)(4-5). Construction includes the development of the environmental documents, design, engineering, purchase of right-of-way, land, or property, as well as supervising, inspecting, and actual construction. [Note: Construction of the recreation facility is not eligible.]

### Federal Lands Highways Program (FLHP) (23 USC 204)

- Coordinated program of public roads and transit facilities serving Federal and Indian lands. Funding is broken into 4
- Construction of pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities.
**Discrete Sources:**

- Indian Reservation Roads (IRR)
- Public Lands Highway - Discretionary & Forest Highways
- Parkways & Park Roads
- Refuge Roads

**Recreational Trails Program (23 USC 206)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop and maintain recreational trails and trail-related facilities for both nonmotorized and motorized recreational trail uses.</td>
<td>Nonmotorized or mixed use (motorized and nonmotorized) trails. Eligible categories are trail maintenance and rehabilitation, trailside or trailhead facilities, construction and maintenance equipment, trail construction, trail assessments, and trail safety and environmental protection education.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transportation, Community, and System Preservation Program (TCSP) (S-LU Sec. 1117, formerly TEA-21 Sec. 1221)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provides funding for a comprehensive program including planning grants, implementation grants, and research to investigate and address the relationships among transportation and community and system preservation plans and practices and examine private sector based initiatives.</td>
<td>Pedestrian and bicycle projects meet several TCSP goals, are generally eligible for the TCSP program and are included in many TCSP projects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Coordinated Border Infrastructure Program (S-LU Section 1303)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To improve the safe movement of motor vehicles at or across the border between the United States and Canada and the border between the United States and Mexico.</td>
<td>Eligible as part of an overall project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Safe Routes to School (SRTS) (S-LU Sec. 1404)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To enable and encourage children, including those with disabilities, to walk and bicycle to school; 2. To make bicycling and walking to school a safer and more appealing transportation alternative, thereby encouraging a healthy and active lifestyle from an early age; and</td>
<td>Eligible Infrastructure Projects are planning, design, and construction of infrastructure-related projects that will substantially improve the ability of students to walk and bicycle to school, including sidewalk improvements, traffic calming and speed reduction improvements,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. To facilitate the planning, development, and implementation of projects and activities that will improve safety and reduce traffic, fuel consumption, and air pollution in the vicinity of schools

- pedestrian and bicycle crossing improvements,
- on-street bicycle facilities,
- off-street bicycle and pedestrian facilities,
- secure bicycle parking facilities, and
- traffic diversion improvements in the vicinity of schools.

Eligible Noninfrastructure activities to encourage walking & bicycling to school, including

- public awareness campaigns and outreach to press and community leaders,
- traffic education and enforcement in the vicinity of schools,
- student sessions on bicycle and pedestrian safety, health, and environment; and
- funding for training, volunteers, and managers of safe routes to school programs.

**Nonmotorized Transportation Pilot Program (NTPP) (S-LU Sec. 1807)**

To demonstrate the extent to which bicycling and walking can carry a significant part of the transportation load, and represent a major portion of the transportation solution, within 4 identified communities (Marin County, CA; Sheboygan County, WI; Columbia, MO; and Minneapolis-St Paul, MN).

Construction of nonmotorized transportation infrastructure facilities, including sidewalks, bicycle lanes, and pedestrian and bicycle trails, that connect directly with transit stations, schools, residences, businesses, recreation areas, and other community activity centers. Educational programs; promotion; network and project planning; data collection, analysis, evaluation, and reporting of results.

**Federal Transit Administration Programs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program/Primary Purpose</th>
<th>Eligible Pedestrian and Bicycle Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Metropolitan Planning Program (MPP) (49 USC 5305(d))</strong></td>
<td>Bicycle and pedestrian planning as part of the metropolitan planning process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To carry out the metropolitan transportation planning process under 49 USC 5303.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To carry out the provisions of 49 USC sections 5304, 5306, 5315, and 5322. | Bicycle and pedestrian planning as part of the statewide planning process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Urbanized Area Formula Grants (49 USC 5307)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Transit capital and planning assistance to urbanized areas with populations over 50,000 and operating assistance to areas with populations of 50,000 - 200,000. | Improve bicycle and pedestrian access to transit facilities and vehicles, including bike stations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Urbanized Area Formula Grants Transportation Enhancements Set-aside (49 USC 5307(k))</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1% setaside of section 5307 funds for areas with population over 200,000 population for 9 specific activities included in the definition of Transit Enhancement Activities in 49 USC 5302(a)(15). | Pedestrian and bicycle access, bicycle storage facilities, and installing equipment to transport bicycles on mass transportation vehicles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Job Access and Reverse Commute Program (49 USC 5316)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| To provide transportation to connect welfare recipients and low income persons to jobs and employment support services such as child care and training. | To provide transportation to connect welfare recipients and low income persons to jobs and employment support services such as child care and training.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Alternative Transportation in Parks and Public Lands (49 USC 5320)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To enhance the protection of national parks and public lands and increase the enjoyment of those visiting the parks and public lands.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cursory Funding Forecast for 10 Year Period (Fiscal Year 2011 through Fiscal Year 2020)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Funding</th>
<th>Forecasted Funding by Fiscal Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Safety</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement Program (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTA Authorizations</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Development Assistance Funds</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA Funding Program</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:**
1. Funding authorizations from this program has been inconsistent. As a result, funds are forecasted to be approved twice in 10 years.
6. Program Framework

Introduction

The previous work tasks of this project allowed the participants to become better informed about the subject of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), including the development of a standard ADA Transition Plan. Information has been provided about ADA requirements, available sources of useful ADA information, Pima County and the Pima Association of Government (PAG) databases that could be used for the ongoing program, and potential sources of funding to support the ongoing program and finance approved ADA improvements.

The purpose of this chapter is to discuss a framework for an ongoing program to: 1) monitor pedestrian facilities in unincorporated Pima County for ADA improvements and 2) implement improvement efforts on a continuous basis to provide ADA compliant sidewalks, curb access ramps, and pedestrian push button stations at traffic signals and pedestrian flasher installations. This is a critical element of this project because it will define how the ADA needs on pedestrian facilities will be addressed. Unlike the previous effort in the mid-1990s, which produced an ADA Transition Plan and limited ADA improvements, the Pima County Department of Transportation (PCDOT) staff now wishes to programmatically address ADA deficiencies each year so that progress is continually made.

ADA compliant sidewalks need to satisfy requirements related to the surface, the width, the cross slope and the longitudinal grade. In addition, there should not be any physical obstructions. ADA compliant curb access ramps need to satisfy requirements related to the surface, the longitudinal grade, the cross slope, the dimensions of the ramp itself and the associated landing, and the flare design, just to identify a few requirements. ADA compliant pedestrian push button stations need to satisfy requirements related to the design of the button, its height above the sidewalk, and its accessibility for all individuals attempting to use it.

Although the proposed ongoing program will be limited to improvements on pedestrian facilities maintained by PCDOT in the unincorporated areas, it is envisioned that the municipalities within Pima County will develop similar programs, if they do not already have them. Ultimately, regional coordination could be achieved. This could result in ADA pedestrian facility improvements on roadways crossing the boundary between the unincorporated area and a municipality or between two municipalities. These ADA improvements would allow individuals with disabilities to traverse over ADA compliant sidewalks unimpeded, regardless of the jurisdiction. In order for this to occur, the PCDOT staff should be prepared to: 1) commit adequate funding and staffing to the ongoing program efforts and 2) address the physical barriers and other ADA needs on pedestrian facilities more aggressively than it has in the past.

At a minimum, the framework for this effort will consist of the following four general elements.

- Goals and objectives
- Guiding principles
- Standards and requirements
- Typical methods to achieve compliance
These four elements should be forward thinking, realistic, feasible, and achievable. There may be circumstances where it is relatively simple to bring a location up to current ADA requirements. However, there may be other circumstances where it may be very difficult or impossible to satisfy some or all of the requirements. As a result, the program should allow a certain degree of flexibility and creativity in order to make progress.

To assist in the development of a framework for the ongoing program, the consultant arranged for the PAG staff to conduct an information gathering session utilizing specialized computer software named ThinkTank. PAG acquired this software several years ago and has used it extensively to deal with very complex issues. In addition to the PAG staff using it for their own activities, they have assisted the City of Tucson, Pima County, the Town of Marana, and the University of Arizona to gather information from diverse groups of individuals. In addition to preventing any individuals from dominating the discussion, the software facilitates the generation of a significant amount of very useful information in a relatively short period of time.

The ThinkTank session for the Advisory/Oversight Committee (AOC) took place in March 2010 at the PAG offices. In advance of the session, the consultant and the PAG staff prepared 10 questions to expedite the gathering of relevant information for this work task. An eleventh question was added and answered during the session. The 11 questions asked at the ThinkTank session are included as Exhibit 6-1. The answers to the 11 questions provided the basis for much of the information contained in this document. Additional information from ADA documents discussed in the Literature Search Technical Memorandum supplement the ThinkTank session information. In addition to providing information to address the four elements previously stated, information was provided on a limited number of other issues that will be used in the development of the program.

**Goals and Objectives**

The ongoing ADA Transition Plan program requires a set of goals and objectives in order for the PCDOT staff to maintain focus and make progress each year to increase accessibility for individuals with disabilities using pedestrian facilities in unincorporated Pima County. The following goals are broad in scope and will require ongoing staff, elected official, and community efforts to accomplish the desired end results. The objectives are more detailed than the goals with defined outcomes to be accomplished within specified timeframes.

During the ThinkTank session, the members of the AOC provided input for the development of the program goals and objectives by the consultant. The goals and objectives provided in this report section are revised statements of the information provided by the AOC during the ThinkTank session. The consultant used the AOC input as the basis for determining additional objectives and strategies for the goals. In Exhibit 6-2, the consultant proposes a measurable action for each objective and strategy to be accomplished within a specified time period. In addition, each objective has typically been assigned to a designated lead PCDOT Division or person. Both the specified time periods and the designated lead divisions are considered tentative and subject to the approval of the PCDOT Director.
Goals

1. All individuals with disabilities, either permanent or temporary, should be provided with reasonable and safe access to the most common public destinations when using existing public sidewalks and crosswalks in unincorporated Pima County.
2. Pima County should develop a program that brings existing pedestrian facilities in unincorporated Pima County into ADA compliance.
3. Pima County should provide sustained funding and staffing within its operating budget to maintain a continuing program to address pedestrian facility ADA needs in unincorporated Pima County.
4. Pima County and the municipalities within the PAG Region should collaborate to consistently enhance travel for those who have mobility and vision impairments.

Objectives and Strategies

The objectives and accompanying strategies provide measurable actions that PCDOT can take to achieve the goals of the ADA Transition Plan program. The strategies often provide more specific direction than the objectives; however, some objectives are stand-alone activities. Exhibit 6-2 is a table of the objectives and strategies with timeframes, designated lead parties, and proposed funding sources. This supplementary information is provided to assist the PCDOT staff in achieving the goals and objectives. Each objective is identified by a unique numbering system. The first objective of Goal 1 will be identified as G1/O1. The strategies are designated similarly, e.g., S1, S2, and so forth.

Guiding Principles

In addition to a set of goals and objectives, it is believed that PCDOT should be provided with a set of principles to guide the ongoing ADA Transition Plan program. These principles will assist the PCDOT staff to develop the ongoing program and also help the staff to explain the program to the elected officials and the public at the appropriate time. These guiding principles center around: 1) the commitment of the PCDOT staff, 2) the importance of addressing pedestrian facility ADA needs in unincorporated Pima County, 3) the regional application of established standards and specifications, and 4) the need to pursue additional funding to address the ADA needs. Several suggestions for modifying how ADA is perceived and addressed are also included.

1. PCDOT should continue to commit funding and staffing for addressing ADA needs on pedestrian facilities in unincorporated Pima County within its funding constraints.
2. PCDOT should develop an aggressive ongoing program to eliminate physical barriers and address other ADA needs on pedestrian facilities in unincorporated Pima County that encourages regional collaboration and proactive involvement of people with disabilities and their families/caregivers.
3. PCDOT and the Pima County Development Services Department should continue to imbed ADA compliance into all transportation planning and land use planning and development efforts, including the preparation and review of plans.
4. PCDOT should address ADA needs on pedestrian facilities within unincorporated Pima County through its efforts in roadway planning, design, and operations and through its
resource allocations. The PCDOT Director, with assistance provided by the Bicycle and Pedestrian Program Manager, should be responsible for advancing the ongoing ADA Transition Plan program.

5. PCDOT should seek out the best practices from other parts of the state and nation to use on pedestrian facilities in unincorporated Pima County. Based on recent activities by the Phoenix Street Transportation Department to address this issue, the PCDOT staff should seek guidance for its ongoing program from the Phoenix staff.

6. PCDOT should develop on its own or collaborate with other transportation agencies within the PAG Region to develop the best standards and specifications to use on pedestrian facilities in unincorporated Pima County. The basis for these standards and specifications should include *Accessible Rights of Way: A Design Guide – Part II: Best Practices in Accessible Rights of Way Design and Construction* (November 1999), *Revised Draft Guidelines for Accessible Public Rights-of-Way* (November 2005) and *Accessible Public Rights-of-Way/Planning and Designing for Alterations* (July 2007). All of these publications were prepared by the U.S. Access Board.

7. PCDOT should seek to partner with the other local jurisdictions, PAG, the Regional Transportation Authority (RTA), and Sun Tran to better address ADA needs on pedestrian facilities.

8. PCDOT should encourage the community to become involved in the identification of physical barriers and other ADA needs on pedestrian facilities in unincorporated Pima County.

**Standards/Requirements and Design Exceptions**

It is not the intent of the consultant to document in this report section specific standards and detailed requirements for use by the PCDOT staff to address ADA needs on pedestrian facilities in unincorporated Pima County. At some point in the future, the PCDOT staff may choose to develop a design manual and refine standard details and specifications for addressing ADA issues. The purpose of this report section is: 1) to document broad statements about the need for and the development of standards and requirements and 2) to provide sources of information to develop them. This report section also includes information about design exceptions.

**Standards/Requirements**

1. PCDOT should develop and adhere to the best standards and specifications related to ADA improvements to use on pedestrian facilities in unincorporated Pima County. The basis for these standards and specifications should include *Accessible Rights of Way: A Design Guide – Part II: Best Practices in Accessible Rights of Way Design and Construction* (November 1999), *Revised Draft Guidelines for Accessible Public Rights-of-Way* (November 2005) and *Accessible Public Rights-of-Way/Planning and Designing for Alterations* (July 2007). All of these publications were prepared by the U.S. Access Board.

2. PCDOT should seek out the best practices from other parts of the state and nation to use on pedestrian facilities in unincorporated Pima County. It would also be beneficial to determine what has been tried in other parts of the state and nation that has not
worked. The Phoenix Street Transportation Department may be an excellent source of information.

3. PCDOT design teams should address the needs of individuals with disabilities with some oversight provided by representatives of organizations that are advocates of these individuals.

4. PCDOT field inspectors should carefully examine aspects of roadway construction that have a direct impact on the mobility of individuals with disabilities and strive to assure that what is built satisfies ADA standards. This may require additional specialized training.

5. PCDOT should acquire sufficient amounts of right of way to properly construct ADA compliant pedestrian facility improvements on new facilities or totally reconstructed facilities in unincorporated Pima County. Paved shoulders may be a reasonable alternative depending on the roadway conditions.

6. PCDOT should collaborate with other local transportation agencies in the PAG Region to determine low cost alternatives for improving pedestrian facility locations where ADA needs currently exist.

7. PCDOT should consider developing, on its own or with other PAG members, consistent standardized applications of ADA treatments on pedestrian facilities throughout the PAG Region. This will require the preparation of new or the revision of existing standard specifications and standard details. Standardized treatments tend to make travel and navigation easier for individuals with disabilities.

**Design Exceptions to ADA Requirements**

1. PCDOT should strive to satisfy all of the federal ADA requirements on its pedestrian facilities.

2. PCDOT should not include design exceptions for ADA improvements where roadway and pedestrian facilities are being newly constructed or totally reconstructed. The use of design exceptions should be limited to those projects focusing on rehabilitating existing pedestrian facilities.

3. PCDOT should document previously approved pedestrian facility design exceptions with supplementary information discussing how the design exception functioned at the site after it was constructed.

4. PCDOT should seek general guidance from the U.S. Access Board to determine general principles to use to evaluate proposed exceptions. This could occur at a meeting when a representative of the U.S. Access Board is in Tucson to conduct a future regional ADA training session.

**Typical Methods to Achieve Compliance**

In order to achieve ADA compliance and satisfy the stated program goals, a multi-component course of action will be required. This effort will include components involving funding, education, problem identification, and problem elimination. This will be no small task and will take years of continuous effort to accomplish. The following information will be helpful for developing the required course of action.
Identifying Physical Barriers and Other ADA Needs on Pedestrian Facilities

1. The community, i.e., residents, businesses, the service organizations and advocacy groups for individuals with disabilities, and the Pima County government staff, needs to be encouraged to identify and report physical barriers and ADA needs on pedestrian facilities in unincorporated Pima County.

2. PCDOT should attempt to centralize within its organization the efforts associated with receiving and processing telephone calls and correspondence related to pedestrian facility ADA needs. This effort could involve the staff of the Community Relations Division.

3. PCDOT should be seeking more feedback about its pedestrian facilities, especially on newly reconstructed roadways, from individuals with disabilities. Basically, PCDOT needs to know whether its ADA compliance goals are being achieved or not. This could be done using the Tucson TransView Virtual Ride technology or by conducting conventional site inspections.

4. PCDOT should investigate using the Tucson TransView Virtual Ride technology for identifying pedestrian facility locations with physical barriers or ADA needs in unincorporated Pima County.

5. PCDOT should consider developing a program similar to the Tucson “SeeClickFix” issue program for identifying the locations of pedestrian facility ADA needs in unincorporated Pima County. This involves partnering with the SeeClickFix.com organization. Citizens can post notes about various problems, e.g., potholes, graffiti, and malfunctioning traffic signals, and the notes are directed to the appropriate government department. To see the Tucson “SeeClickFix” website, click on www.seeclickfix.com/tucson.

6. PCDOT needs to be cognizant about changing technologies, techniques, and tools that may affect this subject.

7. PCDOT should consider photo logging, for inclusion in its database, any ADA deficient pedestrian facility location reported in unincorporated Pima County.

Eliminating Physical Barriers and Other ADA Needs on Pedestrian Facilities

1. Consideration should be given to developing regional standards that address pedestrian facility ADA needs.

2. Consideration should be given to developing regional standard intersection designs for various intersection configurations, e.g., intersection of two four-lane divided roadways or the intersection of a local street with an arterial roadway. The design of each intersection could incorporate features that eliminate as many pedestrian related problems as possible and better address ADA issues than current designs.

3. Consideration should be given to developing regional standard roadway design features that better address the needs of those with disabilities.

4. The elimination of physical barriers and addressing ADA needs on pedestrian facilities in unincorporated Pima County should be categorized into several subject areas that can be prioritized. Then, the highest priority subject areas can be addressed first. Priorities can be based on proximity to critical pedestrian trip generation locations, need, cost,
construction scheduling/programming, funding availability, and whether the ADA need will be eliminated in the near future by a larger reconstruction project.

**Funding**

1. PCDOT needs to establish a dedicated, recurring funding source and a reasonable annual budget for this program. This dedicated funding source may be a defined percentage of the HURF funds received from the state each year or determined in some other way. The funds should be used for grant matching, wherever feasible, to multiply their usefulness. For the present time, the level of financial commitment using HURF funds will remain at $50,000 per year.

2. In addition to having funds for planning, designing, and constructing pedestrian facility ADA related improvements and for their maintenance, funds need to be provided for administrative costs, e.g., publicizing the program, educating the public, and processing requests for corrective action.

3. PCDOT should assess if it is applying for all potential funds from the federal and state governments and apply for all funds that it is eligible for.

4. PCDOT should continue to determine the extent that RTA transit funds are being used for specific ADA improvements along transit routes in the vicinity of bus stops in unincorporated Pima County.

**Informing the Public and Seeking Its Input**

The public needs to be informed about the importance of this program and asked to participate. Informing the public of the program may be the easier of the two efforts. Responding to requests for action is much more difficult. The PCDOT staff must be ready to address ADA needs as the public identifies them. If the ADA improvements are delayed for long periods of time without proper justification, the public may lose respect for PCDOT and the program. As a result, the program needs to be well organized and properly staffed and funded.

1. PCDOT should consider including ADA displays and Request for Action cards at its various project open houses. This would be a low cost means of emphasizing ADA and collecting information on the locations of ADA needs on PCDOT pedestrian facilities in unincorporated Pima County. It would also highlight the effort by PCDOT to better address pedestrian facility ADA needs.

2. PCDOT should develop an outreach program of some type to publicize the ADA effort. This may involve meetings with the staffs of agencies working directly with individuals with disabilities, e.g., Beacon Group (provides employment opportunities to those with disabilities), Easter Seals Blake Foundation (provides services to children and adults with disabilities), Pima Council on Aging, and the DIRECT Center for Independence. The development of a website is encouraged.

3. PCDOT should annually publicize the improvements and other accomplishments of the ongoing program that were made during the previous fiscal year.
4. PCDOT should consider requesting advocacy organizations for individuals with disabilities to participate in the planning and design activities of roadway, sidewalk, trail, and shared use pathway projects in unincorporated Pima County.

5. PCDOT should update an existing Pima County procedure for resolving grievances under Title II of the ADA when there are complaints of disability discrimination.

Coordination with the Local Jurisdictions and the Arizona DOT

Representatives of individuals with disabilities on the AOC believe that it would be very desirable to have regional methodologies, treatments, and design standards to address ADA needs. Considering the small number of jurisdictions in the PAG Region, this appears to be achievable. PCDOT and TDOT already prepare joint documentation related to roadway design/construction and traffic operations. In addition, some of the other jurisdictions use several of the documents jointly prepared by PCDOT and TDOT.

1. It would be very desirable for individuals with disabilities if there was consistent application of ADA treatments on pedestrian facilities throughout the PAG Region.

2. PCDOT and TDOT already have joint standard details and specifications for roadway construction projects. The two agencies also have several joint design manuals. It would be relatively straightforward for the two agencies to develop joint standard details, specifications, and a design manual to address pedestrian facility ADA improvements for their own use. The staffs of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Programs within each agency should be directly involved in these efforts. The other local jurisdictions may also use these documents once they are completed or jurisdictional representatives could participate in the development of the documents.

3. If the Arizona Department of Transportation has or is developing documentation related to ADA and its impact on pedestrian facilities, it is certainly possible for PCDOT and TDOT to adopt those documents for their own use, with or without revision.

4. Now that the RTA has existed for several years, consideration should be given to developing regional standard details, specifications, and design manuals. Perhaps the development of pedestrian facility ADA standard details, specifications, and a design manual could serve as a pilot program for regional documentation within the PAG Region. The effort could be guided and managed by the RTA Technical Management Committee.

5. Consideration should be given to making presentations on the Pima County ADA Transition Plan Update effort to the appropriate PAG and RTA committees. Such a presentation could be given to committees of the jurisdictions of the PAG Region in order to share information.

6. Representatives of the other local jurisdictions should be encouraged to attend the Advisory/Oversight Committee (AOC) meetings during the Phase 2 effort as observers. These representatives could also attend other project gatherings, e.g., workshops and training sessions.

7. Information from the regularly scheduled updates of the Pima County ADA Transition Plan could be shared with other jurisdictions within the PAG Region.
**Intermodal Planning**

In many cases, individuals with disabilities are very dependent on public transportation for their travel needs. As a result, the service provider, Sun Tran, should be working with the PCDOT staff to assure that the linkage between the roadway and the transit vehicle complies with ADA. Currently, the primary linkages include Sun Tran bus stops and Sun Van drop-off locations.

**Coordination with Sun Tran and RTA Transit Services**

1. PCDOT should share the completed Pima County ADA Transition Plan Update document with the Sun Tran staff because fixed route buses or on-demand Sun Van paratransit service vans are major trip making elements for individuals with disabilities. This effort may encourage the Sun Tran staff to be an active partner with PCDOT to more effectively address the needs of individuals with disabilities in unincorporated Pima County. It would be helpful if the Sun Tran staff identified problems and suggested potential solutions.

2. Numerous pedestrian facility ADA improvements could be made along Sun Tran transit routes at the bus stops or at some of the destinations of users of fixed route service and on-demand Sun Van paratransit service. The staffs of PCDOT and Sun Tran should be working together on these efforts by assisting in the identification of potential improvement locations and participating in the funding of the improvements, depending on the nature of the improvement.

3. PCDOT should encourage Sun Tran and Sun Van drivers to report problems encountered by individuals with disabilities that they observe along roadways in unincorporated Pima County.

**Land Use Planning and Land Development Processes**

Changes in Pima County land use planning and the land development processes can help to improve the mobility of individuals with disabilities in unincorporated Pima County. Some of the potential changes could significantly reduce the number of potential conflicts between individuals with disabilities and vehicles in parking lots. These changes would also reduce the number of locations that would require some form of ADA treatment to accommodate an individual with a disability. It is far less expensive to address issues related to individuals with disabilities in the planning and design stages than it is after the development has been constructed.

**Land Use Planning**

1. Pima County should regularly evaluate its zoning code and development standards to determine if they properly address ADA issues on pedestrian facilities in unincorporated Pima County, based on the most up-to-date ADA requirements.
2. Greater emphasis should be given to assure that developers and their consultants are properly addressing ADA issues on pedestrian facilities during the planning, design, and construction of their developments within unincorporated Pima County.

3. A new concept in planning is entitled the Complete Streets Concept. Complete streets are designed and operated to enable safe access for all users. Pedestrians, bicyclists, motorists, and public transportation users of all ages and abilities are able to safely move along and across a complete street. PCDOT may be able to utilize this concept to address ADA needs on pedestrian facilities in unincorporated Pima County.

Land Development Processes

1. Pima County should consider requiring a multimodal accessibility plan as a supplement to each required land use plan.

2. As currently designed, the buildings of many shopping malls and shopping plazas are hundreds of feet from the closest street. The areas between the buildings and the streets are typically devoted to parking lots. New development designs should better accommodate pedestrian movements from the adjacent streets (where the transit stops are located) to the buildings within the commercial developments. Similar problems exist at many drug stores and other retail facilities being built at the intersection of two major streets.
SECTION 6 - EXHIBITS
EXHIBIT 6-1
ThinkTank Session Questions

Open/Leading Questions:

1. What should be the goals and objectives of the Pima County ADA Transition Plan Update Program?
2. How can Pima County do a better job of identifying physical barriers and other ADA needs on its pedestrian facilities?
3. How can Pima County do a better job of eliminating physical barriers and addressing other ADA needs on its pedestrian facilities?
4. How should the Pima County DOT address physical barriers on pedestrian facilities when the Federal requirements cannot be satisfied?
5. How should the Pima County DOT modify its approach to designing and constructing improvements to minimize the potential to create new physical barriers on pedestrian facilities?
6. How should the Pima County DOT obtain the political and financial support of the Board of Supervisors?
7. How should the Pima County DOT make the public aware of the ADA program and seek its input?
8. How should access provisions be incorporated into the land planning and land development processes?
9. How can the goals/objectives, policies/guiding principles, and requirements of the program be integrated into modal planning, such as transit service?
10. How should Pima County coordinate this program with similar efforts by the local municipalities and the Arizona Department of Transportation?
11. What are possible funding sources for ADA needs, including larger allocations of existing sources?
EXHIBIT 6-2
Program Objectives and Supplementary Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Objective/Strategy Statement</th>
<th>Lead Agency, Unit or Person</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G1/O1</td>
<td>Pima County residents within unincorporated Pima County should be able to walk or wheel in a wheelchair on an ADA compliant pathway to government offices (health facilities, community centers, and social service offices serving recipients of DES and WIC assistance), schools, and libraries from the closest bus stop.</td>
<td>PCDOT Operations &amp; Maintenance Division</td>
<td>FY 2010/2011 to FY 2012/2013</td>
<td>PCDOT operating budget plus Pima County ADA Funding Program and other available funding sources</td>
<td>Assumes that sidewalks already exist along the access roadways involved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1/O1</td>
<td>All roadways on the Pima County Major Streets and Scenic Routes Plan where sidewalks already exist should be made ADA compliant.</td>
<td>PCDOT Operations &amp; Maintenance Division</td>
<td>FY 2010/2011 to 2014/2015</td>
<td>PCDOT operating budget plus Pima County ADA Funding Program and other available funding sources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>All pathways along Safe Routes to Schools alignments in unincorporated Pima County where sidewalks already exist should be ADA compliant.</td>
<td>PCDOT Operations &amp; Maintenance Division</td>
<td>FY 2010/2011 to 2012/2013</td>
<td>PCDOT operating budget plus Pima County ADA Funding Program and other available funding sources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>All Sun Tran bus stops in unincorporated Pima County where sidewalks already exist should be ADA compliant.</td>
<td>PCDOT Operations &amp; Maintenance Division</td>
<td>FY 2010/2011 to FY 2014/2015</td>
<td>PCDOT operating budget plus Pima County ADA Funding Program and other available funding sources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Objective/Strategy Statement</td>
<td>Lead Agency, Unit or Person</td>
<td>Timeframe</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1/O1</td>
<td>All PCDOT traffic signal pedestrian push button stations in unincorporated Pima County where sidewalks already exist should be ADA compliant.</td>
<td>PCDOT Traffic Engineering Division</td>
<td>FY 2010/2011 to FY 2014/2015</td>
<td>PCDOT operating budget plus Pima County ADA Funding Program and other available funding sources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1/O2</td>
<td>PCDOT should partner with Sun Tran and RTA to address ADA needs at bus stops in unincorporated Pima County.</td>
<td>PCDOT Deputy Director responsible for Transportation Systems and Operations</td>
<td>Beginning in FY 2010/2011</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1/O3</td>
<td>Pima County should evaluate its land use planning and land development processes to determine ways to improve travel opportunities for individuals with disabilities and other pedestrians.</td>
<td>PCDOT Transportation Systems Division</td>
<td>Beginning in FY 2010/2011</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2/O1</td>
<td>The lead agency for addressing ADA needs on pedestrian facilities within unincorporated Pima County will be PCDOT. However, a single representative of PCDOT must be selected as the official ADA coordinator responsible for implementation of the ADA Transition Plan transportation related projects in order to satisfy federal requirements.</td>
<td>PCDOT Director</td>
<td>FY 2010/2011</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>The ADA coordinator may be the PCDOT Director.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2/O2</td>
<td>The goals and objectives contained in this document need to be evaluated by the PCDOT Director and the senior management of the Department.</td>
<td>PCDOT Director and the PCDOT senior management</td>
<td>FY 2010/2011</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Based on existing staffing and available funding, revisions may be required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Objective/Strategy Statement</td>
<td>Lead Agency, Unit or Person</td>
<td>Timeframe</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2/O2</td>
<td>The PCDOT approved objectives must be measurable and be accompanied by reasonable staffing levels, schedules, timeframes, and funding.</td>
<td>PCDOT Director and the PCDOT senior management</td>
<td>FY 2010/2011</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Based on existing staffing and available funding, revisions may be required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2/O2</td>
<td>The PCDOT approved objectives need to be assigned to the appropriate staff for implementation.</td>
<td>PCDOT Director and the PCDOT senior management</td>
<td>FY 2010/2011</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2/O3</td>
<td>PCDOT will prepare its first ADA Transition Plan Update document, which discusses an ongoing program.</td>
<td>PCDOT Transportation Systems Division</td>
<td>Beginning in FY 2010/2011</td>
<td>PCDOT operating budget plus other available funding sources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2/O4</td>
<td>An ongoing pedestrian facility ADA compliance program for unincorporated Pima County will be initiated.</td>
<td>PCDOT Transportation Systems Division</td>
<td>Beginning in FY 2011/2012</td>
<td>PCDOT operating budget plus other available funding sources</td>
<td>The work plan for this program will be based on the program goals and objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2/O4</td>
<td>An in-house evaluation of the ongoing pedestrian facility ADA compliance program will be performed to determine its effectiveness.</td>
<td>PCDOT Transportation Systems Division</td>
<td>In the 2nd Quarter of FY 2012/2013</td>
<td>PCDOT operating budget plus other available funding sources</td>
<td>A similar in-house evaluation should be performed once every two years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2/O4</td>
<td>Revisions, if necessary, will be made to the ongoing pedestrian facility ADA compliance program based on the in-house evaluation.</td>
<td>A multi-division effort lead by the Deputy Director responsible for Transportation Systems and Operations</td>
<td>In the 3rd and 4th Quarters of FY 2012/2013</td>
<td>PCDOT operating budget plus other available funding sources</td>
<td>These revisions will be implemented in the 1st Quarter of FY 2013/2014.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Objective/Strategy Statement</td>
<td>Lead Agency, Unit or Person</td>
<td>Timeframe</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2/O6</td>
<td>PCDOT should document and prioritize locations in unincorporated Pima County where pedestrian facility ADA needs exist once they are identified.</td>
<td>PCDOT Transportation Systems Division and the Community Relations Division</td>
<td>Beginning in FY 2010/2011</td>
<td>PCDOT operating budget plus other available funding sources</td>
<td>This multi-division effort will be lead by the Deputy Director responsible for Transportation Systems and Operations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2/O6</td>
<td>All members of the PCDOT staff should be encouraged to report to the appropriate Division any pedestrian facility ADA needs on roadways with sidewalks within unincorporated Pima County discovered in the course of their work-related or off-duty travel.</td>
<td>All PCDOT Divisions</td>
<td>Beginning in FY 2011/2012</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2/O6</td>
<td>The community should be involved in the identification of physical barriers and other ADA needs on pedestrian facilities in unincorporated Pima County.</td>
<td>PCDOT Transportation Systems Division and the Community Relations Division</td>
<td>Beginning in FY 2011/2012</td>
<td>PCDOT operating budget plus other available funding sources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2/O6</td>
<td>A database of identified pedestrian facility locations in unincorporated Pima County where ADA needs exist will be established and maintained by either the PCDOT Transportation Systems Division or the Community Relations Division.</td>
<td>PCDOT Transportation Systems Division and the Community Relations Division</td>
<td>Beginning in FY 2010/2011</td>
<td>PCDOT operating budget plus other available funding sources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Objective/Strategy Statement</td>
<td>Lead Agency, Unit or Person</td>
<td>Timeframe</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2/O6 S5</td>
<td>A prioritization effort will be performed for correcting identified pedestrian facility ADA needs contained in the newly established database.</td>
<td>PCDOT Transportation Systems Division and the Operations &amp; Maintenance Division</td>
<td>Beginning in FY 2010/2011</td>
<td>PCDOT operating budget plus other available funding sources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2/O7 S1</td>
<td>PCDOT should ask the U.S. Access Board to send a representative to Tucson to conduct an annual one-day or multi-day regional training session.</td>
<td>Bicycle and Pedestrian Program Manager</td>
<td>Beginning in FY 2010/2011</td>
<td>PCDOT operating budget plus other available funding sources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2/O8</td>
<td>PCDOT should regularly evaluate its standards and specifications for ADA compliance and develop new ones if necessary.</td>
<td>PCDOT Operations &amp; Maintenance Division, Traffic Engineering Division, and Transportation Engineering Division</td>
<td>Beginning in FY 2010/2011</td>
<td>PCDOT operating budget plus other available funding sources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Objective/Strategy Statement</td>
<td>Lead Agency, Unit or Person</td>
<td>Timeframe</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2/O8 S1</td>
<td>PCDOT should regularly evaluate its existing design standards and specifications for compliance with ADA requirements.</td>
<td>PCDOT Operations &amp; Maintenance Division, Traffic Engineering Division, and Transportation Engineering Division</td>
<td>Beginning in FY 2010/2011</td>
<td>PCDOT operating budget plus other available funding sources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2/O8 S2</td>
<td>PCDOT should begin to regularly develop new strategies, standards, and specifications to aggressively address pedestrian facility ADA needs and achieve better ADA compliance in unincorporated Pima County.</td>
<td>PCDOT Operations &amp; Maintenance Division, Traffic Engineering Division, and Transportation Engineering Division</td>
<td>Beginning in FY 2010/2011</td>
<td>PCDOT operating budget plus other available funding sources</td>
<td>This multi-division effort will be lead by the Deputy Director responsible for Transportation Systems and Operations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2/O8 S3</td>
<td>PCDOT should develop guidelines or a procedure for allowing design exceptions on ADA improvement projects involving the rehabilitation or retrofit of existing sidewalks and crosswalks.</td>
<td>PCDOT Operations &amp; Maintenance Division, Traffic Engineering Division, and Transportation Engineering Division</td>
<td>Beginning in FY 2010/2011</td>
<td>PCDOT operating budget plus other available funding sources</td>
<td>This multi-division effort will be lead by the Deputy Director responsible for Transportation Systems and Operations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2/O9 S1</td>
<td>Individuals with disabilities and their advocacy groups should be given a larger role in assisting PCDOT to address ADA compliance issues.</td>
<td>Bicycle and Pedestrian Program Manager</td>
<td>FY 2010/2011</td>
<td>PCDOT operating budget plus other available funding sources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2/O9 S1</td>
<td>The non-PCDOT members of the AOC should serve as the interface between PCDOT and individuals with disabilities and their advocacy groups on a permanent basis.</td>
<td>Bicycle and Pedestrian Program Manager</td>
<td>FY 2010/2011</td>
<td>PCDOT operating budget plus other available funding sources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Objective/Strategy Statement</td>
<td>Lead Agency, Unit or Person</td>
<td>Timeframe</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2/O9</td>
<td>Individuals with disabilities and their advocacy groups should be given an opportunity to provide input on draft ADA Transition Plans and other ADA technical documentation prepared by PCDOT or its consultants.</td>
<td>PCDOT Transportation Systems Division</td>
<td>Beginning in FY 2010/2011</td>
<td>PCDOT operating budget plus other available funding sources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2/O9</td>
<td>Individuals with disabilities and their advocacy groups should be given an opportunity to provide input in the design, construction, and monitoring the condition and effectiveness of PCDOT pedestrian facilities.</td>
<td>PCDOT Transportation Systems Division</td>
<td>Beginning in FY 2010/2011</td>
<td>PCDOT operating budget plus other available funding sources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2/O10</td>
<td>A grievance procedure should be put in place for addressing any complaint of disability discrimination under Title II.</td>
<td>PCDOT Community Relations Division, the Department of Finance and Risk Management, and the County Attorney’s Office</td>
<td>Beginning in FY 2011/2012</td>
<td>PCDOT operating budget plus other available funding sources</td>
<td>This multi-department effort will be lead by a representative of the County Attorney’s Office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Objective/Strategy Statement</td>
<td>Lead Agency, Unit or Person</td>
<td>Timeframe</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3/O2</td>
<td>A senior PCDOT staff member should be directly involved when transportation funds are allocated to the various funding programs or projects to assure that ADA issues are properly addressed and funded.</td>
<td>PCDOT Director</td>
<td>Beginning in FY 2010/2011</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3/O4</td>
<td>PCDOT should consider applying for Neighborhood Reinvestment Program funding.</td>
<td>PCDOT Transportation Systems Division</td>
<td>FY 2010/2011</td>
<td>PCDOT operating budget plus other available funding sources</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G4/O1</td>
<td>PCDOT should request that either PAG or the Regional Transportation Authority (RTA) establish and fund a new technical subcommittee to address pedestrian facility ADA issues and encourage coordination by the member units of government.</td>
<td>PCDOT Director</td>
<td>At the beginning of FY 2010/2011</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G4/O1</td>
<td>The new PAG or RTA technical subcommittee described in the previous objective should be operational by the beginning of FY 2011/2012, assuming that PAG/RTA support this effort.</td>
<td>PAG/RTA</td>
<td>FY 2010/2011</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Consideration should be given to having quarterly committee meetings. This assumes that there is interest by the other member units of government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Objective/Strategy Statement</td>
<td>Lead Agency, Unit or Person</td>
<td>Timeframe</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G4/O1</td>
<td>If there is insufficient interest in the establishment of the previously discussed technical subcommittee, then consideration should be given to having a joint effort involving Pima County, the City of Tucson, and other jurisdictions that wish to participate.</td>
<td>PCDOT Director</td>
<td>FY 2010/2011</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Consideration should be given to having quarterly committee meetings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Program Methodologies

Introduction

The previous work tasks of this project allowed the participants to become better informed about the subject of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), including the development of a standard ADA Transition Plan. Information has been provided about ADA requirements, available sources of useful ADA information, Pima County and the Pima Association of Government (PAG) databases that could be used for the ongoing program, potential sources of funding to support the ongoing program and finance ADA improvements, and a general framework for an ongoing program to monitor pedestrian facilities in unincorporated Pima County for ADA improvements.

The purpose of this chapter is to propose methodologies for the implementation of the ongoing ADA Transition Plan program. The following subject areas will be addressed:

- Develop simple, inexpensive data collection strategies.
- Develop user-friendly information databases (text and photo) that can be easily updated (including a database for citizen/staff requests to address ADA needs).
- Develop public participation opportunities with the AOC that may involve presentations, workshops involving the public, and a website.
- Develop, organize, or schedule ADA training sessions for the Pima County Department of Transportation (PCDOT) staff.
- Develop processes for continually monitoring implemented ADA improvements.
- Develop a quarterly status report template that can be easily updated and understood by a diverse audience.

This chapter is intended to provide general recommendations for the participants in the study to consider in developing the actual transition plan and the ongoing program. The Program Framework chapter includes a section on methods to achieve compliance with the ADA requirements. Each of the subject areas listed above will be better defined in Phase II of the ADA Transition Plan following approval of the Phase I document.

While the ADA Transition Plan is required by federal law, the annual goals require some flexibility in the choice of the particular pedestrian facilities targeted each year or the particular improvement for an identified access problem. However, the pace of the elimination of the physical barriers should generally follow the approved schedule. Conditions that may warrant flexibility include:

- Inadequate funding/staffing for the ongoing program and improvement projects
- Rejected matching funding opportunities
- Changes in roadway use
- Changes in roadway improvement project location or schedule
- Changes in improvement project priority by the Pima County Board of Supervisors
• Major changes in pedestrian facility condition
• Changes in codes or other applicable regulations and laws.

**Data Collection Strategies**

*NCHRP Project 20-7 (232) ADA Transition Plans: A Guide to Best Management Practices* (May 2009) includes a recommendation to prepare a “self-evaluation checklist” of pedestrian facility ADA needs. Refer to Exhibit 7-1 for an example of a possible checklist subjects. This will be followed by an effort to inventory physical obstacles that limit the accessibility of individuals with disabilities.

Once a “self-evaluation checklist” has been prepared, the next work task involved in the effort to prepare an ADA Transition Plan is conducting an inventory of existing physical barriers that limit accessibility along the pedestrian facilities maintained by PCDOT. This is often referred to as the self-evaluation process. Possible inventory approaches include on-the-ground surveys, windshield surveys, and aerial photo reviews. In eastern Pima County, it is also possible to use the City of Tucson TransView website and view roadway photographs taken through the windshield of a specially equipped data collection van. These photographs are included in the “Virtual Ride” portion of the TransView website. Another inventory tool is Google Street View, which is an online service that provides street level photographs on major, collector, and local streets. The physical barrier or accessibility obstacles very likely to be found in an inventory of pedestrian facilities are included in Exhibit 7-1.

The checklist based on Exhibit 7-1 could easily be completed during an on-site or video inspection. As indicated in the Program Framework chapter, some of the barriers/obstacles listed in the checklist can be observed using video logs (lack of curb access ramps, sidewalk discontinuities, and sidewalk obstructions), while others require field review (sidewalk steepness and inoperable traffic signal pedestrian push button stations). The PCDOT staff needs to determine which factors should be considered in an initial or preliminary field inspection to establish a set of issues to examine and document in the inventory. This preliminary inventory can be conducted on a small set of roadway segments, e.g., five ½ mile sections, to determine the level of work, the estimated cost, and the efficiency of the data collection effort before a full inventory of all Pima County candidate roadways is initiated.

This preliminary inventory is important because the purpose of the ADA Transition Plan program is to ensure that Pima County provides reasonable ADA access to the public. However, limited resources (staff and funds) may constrain the effort to provide needed improvements. For example, curb access ramps should not exceed a particular grade, but the effort to measure each curb access ramp in unincorporated Pima County for unacceptable steepness may be cost prohibitive. As a result, the PCDOT staff must decide whether it is more important to provide curb access ramps where none exist, to replace those curb access ramps that may not meet ADA geometric design requirements, or to simply wait for requests or complaints from the public. Another possibility is to address those curb access ramps that are near government facilities, schools, hospitals and other high use public buildings that may not meet geometric criteria. These curb access ramps could be given a higher priority for ADA compliance mitigation.
EXHIBIT 7-1
Potential Self-Evaluation Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Possible Barriers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk and Pathway Clear Width</td>
<td>Narrow, Below Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk and Pathway Cross Slope</td>
<td>Steepness, Irregularity, Variability, Warping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landings Along Sidewalks and Pathways</td>
<td>Less Than 4 feet by 4 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk and Pathway Grade</td>
<td>Steepness, Angle Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials and Finishes</td>
<td>Deterioration of Surfaces, Deterioration of Markings, Appropriateness of material (ex. Cobblestones)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gratings</td>
<td>Grating Type, Grate Opening Orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discontinuities</td>
<td>Missing Sections, Gaps, Drops, Steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detectable Warning System</td>
<td>Missing, Inappropriate Materials, Inadequate Size, Wrong Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obstructions</td>
<td>Signs, Mail Boxes, Fire Hydrants, Benches, Telephones, Traffic Signal Poles, Traffic Signal Controller Boxes, Newspaper Boxes, Drainage Structures, Tree Grates, Pole Mounted Objects, Standing Water, Snow or Ice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Signal Systems</td>
<td>Lack of Provision for the Visually Impaired such as APS, Inadequate Time Allowed, Inoperable Buttons, Inaccessible Buttons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curb Access Ramps</td>
<td>Missing, Doesn’t Fall within Marked Crosswalk, Doesn’t Conform to Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curb Ramp Flares</td>
<td>Missing Where Required, Too Steep</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another important aspect that may not be initially evident is to identify the responsible agency department, division or even jurisdiction that would be responsible for addressing a deficient ADA pedestrian facility element. Although PCDOT may be the responsible department for the majority of the inventoried needs, some of the segments identified may be shared with other jurisdictions or departments such as the City of Tucson, Oro Valley, Marana, Sahuarita, Arizona Department of Transportation, the Pima County Department of Natural Resources, Parks and Recreation, or the Pima County Flood Control District. Although it may be useful to identify the responsible entity prior to the inventory, this should be verified following the inventory to assure that the identified deficiency will be reviewed by the correct entity. The Program Framework chapter preliminarily identified the Pima County department or PCDOT division responsible for various improvements.
Alternative activities for the data collection could include:

- Initial data collection: This effort could be expensive depending on how it is implemented because some activities require personnel to make field inspections.
- Windshield survey or video viewing data collection: The video viewing data collection method is the most cost-effective methodology followed by the windshield survey method.
- Non-video periodic data collection: This method may be used to update field data. It is labor intensive and should be used sparingly.

**Initial Data Collection**

A tentative set of suggestions for scheduling data collection activities was provided in the Program Framework chapter. However, the PCDOT staff may revise the tentative schedule depending on the availability of personnel and funding.

The first step in establishing a database of public right-of-way features or elements is to determine the required facilities to be included in the database. The USDOT requirements for a transition plan state that:

The transition plan must include a schedule for providing access features, including curb ramps for walkways. (28 CFR §35.150(d)(2)). The schedule should first provide for pedestrian access upgrades to State and local government offices and facilities, transportation, places of public accommodation, and employers, followed by walkways serving other areas. (28 CFR §35.150(d)(2)). The transition plan, at a minimum, should accomplish the following four tasks:

*Identify physical obstacles in the public agency’s facilities that limit the accessibility of its programs or activities to individuals with disabilities;*

*Describe in detail the methods that will be used to make the facilities accessible;*

*Specify the schedule for taking the steps necessary to achieve compliance with this section and, if the time period of the transition plan is longer than a year, identify steps that will be taken during each year of the transition period; and*

*Indicate the official responsible for implementation of the plan.*

Arterial and collector roadways are generally the main conduits for accessibility to and from the trip generation facilities previously described. Therefore, it can be assumed that these arterial and collector roadways should be included in the roadways to be inventoried within unincorporated Pima County. A logical starting point may be to use the Pima County Major Streets and Scenic Routes Plan. Some of these roadways are currently constructed to be ADA-
compliant, some are partially compliant, and others may require significant improvements to become compliant. Not all roads must be compliant, such as Kinney Road and Gates Pass Road. Some of these roads are low-volume roads that have few ADA compliant features, but also have few land uses either adjacent to or in the vicinity of them that would be trip generators for mobility impaired individuals.

The PAG 2005 Tucson Sidewalk Inventory identified roadways within the City of Tucson and the metropolitan area that are functionally classified as collectors or higher that have or should have ADA compliant sidewalks. This inventory effort established a priority system to rank these roadways for potential improvements. The inventory assessment identified many barriers to accessibility, such as missing or poorly maintained sidewalks or curb access ramps and utility poles or signs obstructing pedestrian pathways. This information is generally provided in Existing Relevant Databases chapter. A similar set of criteria is presented in this report.

For the ongoing ADA Transition Plan program, the following should be considered for establishing priority guidelines in assessing roadway improvements for ADA compliance within the public right-of-way:

- Assess only those roadways in unincorporated Pima County that are functionally classified as a collector or higher classification. A logical starting point may be to use the Pima County Major Streets and Scenic Routes Plan. Exceptions to this guideline may be local roadways in urbanized areas with high pedestrian traffic and areas near facilities that are commonly used by pedestrians with disabilities, such as government buildings, transit stops, hospitals, and schools.
- Identify relevant infrastructure (sidewalks, curb access ramps, transit stops, pedestrian signal hardware or lack of) to be considered in the initial inventory.
- Determine data collection methodology for the initial data collection effort. This could include on-the-ground field surveys, windshield field surveys, aerial photo reviews and reviews of the previously mentioned “Virtual Ride” portion of the Tucson TransView website.

Subsequent Data Collection

Every year following the first data collection effort, PCDOT should identify a set of roadways to be reassessed based on public requests or complaints, or the roadways’ status in an improvement prioritization plan. Criteria will need to be established for selecting the order of reassessment. A simple method may be to make the selection by land area. The subsequent data collection should not require the same level of effort as the initial data collection effort. The PCDOT staff, its interns, or its consultants can perform the data collection under the guidance of the Program Manager. Data collection of a portion of the targeted roadway system in unincorporated Pima County could be budgeted each year. The portion could be one-third or one-fourth of the entire targeted roadway system.
Periodic Data Collection

Based on the guidance in the NCHRP document *ADA Transition Plans: A Guide to Best Management Practices*, “The Transition Plan should be viewed as a ‘living document’ and updated regularly to reflect changes in real world conditions and to address any possible new areas of noncompliance. Changes to a sidewalk such as the installation of a newspaper vending machine or the relocation of a light pole, can create new access problems that were not evident when the plan was drafted. Regular updates to the plan will also result in monitoring compliance and the effectiveness of priorities set in the Plan itself.”

Various members of the PCDOT staff, particularly from the Operations & Maintenance Division or the Traffic Engineering Division, should be available to conduct field reviews of reported deficiencies on roadways within the inventory list or even on roadways that may not be on the list (but could be added). This activity could result in the expansion or modification of the roadway network reviewed as part of the ADA Transition Plan program.

User-Friendly Database System

PCDOT and the consultant will develop an inventory database that is easy to update. This inventory database should be readable by responsible agencies, Pima County departments, and PCDOT divisions. However, it should not be modified by anyone other than the PCDOT division(s) responsible for its upkeep. The specific architecture of the inventory database will be discussed and developed during Phase II of the Transition Plan Update effort. It is assumed that the PCDOT Geographic Information Systems (GIS) Division will be deeply involved in the development of the inventory database.

Public Participation Opportunities

Public participation in the ADA Transition Plan program should commence at the beginning of the ADA Transition Plan Update development. The public should have input in the development of the updated Transition Plan document and be active in the ongoing program activities.

The collection of relevant information with the help of the public can be achieved in numerous ways for this program. The following strategies can be employed by the public as a whole or through advocates for the disabled community, such as representatives from the Southern Arizona Association for the Visually Impaired (SAAVI) or the Tucson Commission on Disability Issues (CODI). They would provide an indirect method to gather information about needed improvements within the public right-of-way. In general, these methods typically are low-budget efforts, but depend upon the public to report ADA deficiencies along pedestrian facilities in unincorporated Pima County.

- Website to Input Concerns/Complaints – A website could be sponsored and maintained by PCDOT, PAG, or a third-party, who would then coordinate the information with the appropriate PCDOT division before it was posted on-line. Information on this website
could be provided to advise users of PCDOT pedestrian facilities about ADA accessibility issues and construction alerts that discuss temporary accessibility issues. This website could be similar to the “see-click-fix” website, which is available for the public to report potholes, graffiti, litter, and other public infrastructure issues.¹

- Dedicated Telephone Service – A telephone service maintained by PCDOT, PAG or a third-party employee would receive telephone calls from the public related to pedestrian facility ADA needs in unincorporated Pima County. The staff would be trained to receive concerns/complaints and respond to the public on behalf of PCDOT.

- Designated Persons Provided with Cell Phones or Other Reporting Technology – PCDOT could provide cell phones or other reporting technologies to select individuals who regularly use pedestrian facilities. These persons could then provide PCDOT with on-site documentation of ADA needs through a phone call, e-mail or text.

- Roadway Improvement Project Open Houses – PCDOT should consider including ADA displays and Request for Action cards at its project open houses. This would be a low cost means of emphasizing ADA and collecting information on the locations of ADA needs on PCDOT pedestrian facilities in unincorporated Pima County. It would also highlight the new effort by PCDOT to better address pedestrian facility ADA needs.

**Grievance Procedure**

Grievance procedures are required to provide individuals with disabilities a way to address non-complying sidewalks or curb access ramps if typical complaint procedures have failed to correct the problem and the individual believes that he/she is being discriminated against. Citizens are encouraged to identify locations where there are physical barriers or a lack of ADA accessible pedestrian facilities. PCDOT is responsible for responding to and addressing citizen complaints regarding sidewalks and curb access ramps.

It should be noted that Pima County has a current grievance procedure for employees to report programs, communication facilities, transportation infrastructure or other accommodations that are not compliant with ADA Title I (Employment) accessibility requirements. Employees can submit an ADA grievance form to the Pima County Human Resource Department to document their complaints. The procedure and the form are included in the Appendix.

A sample of a grievance procedure associated with ADA Title II requirements from the State of Minnesota is provided in the appendix to this chapter.

Pima County staff may wish to develop a grievance procedure related to ADA Title II requirements to report discrimination in the provision of services (including those provided within the public rights-of-way), programs and activities by Pima County. The staff of the Pima County Attorney’s Office should review any proposed grievance procedure to ensure that it is reasonable and satisfies the federal requirements related to ADA and civil rights discrimination.

¹ On www.see-click-fix.com/tucson, citizens post notes about potholes, graffiti, malfunctioning signals, which are directed to cooperating public agencies and departments.
**ADA Training Sessions for PCDOT Staff and Others**

Various members of the PCDOT staff should receive ADA training in order to expand their skills and awareness in this subject area so that improvements can be made in the design, construction, operation, permitting and maintenance of pedestrian facilities in unincorporated Pima County. Some of the members of the PCDOT staff (permanent and interns) should be trained for the previously discussed inventory effort as well as database development and maintenance. The ADA Transition Plan Program Manager should work with the Division Managers of several PCDOT divisions to develop a training curriculum and establish a training schedule. PCDOT should develop a curriculum and/or arrange to train its staff and the staffs of its consultants/contractors on relevant ADA subjects. This training could be conducted in a workshop setting.

The proposed training program should address applicable laws which determine when and if ADA-compliant facilities must be provided, identifying pedestrian facility ADA needs in unincorporated Pima County and evaluating and/or revising PCDOT design standards and specifications. The trainees should include PCDOT staff, its roadway contractors, and its design consultants. The staff of the U. S. Access Board currently does provide training sessions at no cost for labor and they may be asked to conduct one or more training sessions in Tucson. The Pima County Bicycle and Pedestrian Program arranged and funded one of these training courses in Tucson two years ago.

**Develop Monitoring Process for Implemented ADA Improvements**

The monitoring of implemented ADA improvement projects is a fundamental component of the ongoing ADA Transition Plan program and should have its own database. Steps will need to be taken to collect and document the following types of ADA pedestrian facility improvements, including their locations and completion dates.

A. Along roadway segments where sidewalks currently exist
   1. New curb access ramps constructed at individual locations where curb access ramps previously did not exist
   2. Existing noncompliant curb access ramps reconstructed or improved to become ADA compliant
   3. Physical barriers eliminated from sidewalk pathways (includes traffic signal and street light poles, traffic sign posts, and utility poles/pedestals)
   4. Segments of sidewalk constructed to fill in short gaps in otherwise continuous sidewalks
   5. Spot sidewalk widening to bring segments with noncompliant sidewalks up to ADA compliance
   6. Appropriate crossing opportunities where feasible and necessary

B. Along roadway segments that are being totally reconstructed
   1. New segments of ADA compliant sidewalks
   2. New ADA compliant curb access ramps
   3. Appropriate crossing opportunities where feasible and necessary
C. Along new collector and local street segments
   1. New segments of ADA compliant sidewalks
   2. New ADA compliant curb access ramps
   3. Appropriate crossing opportunities where feasible and necessary
D. At intersections that are being reconstructed
   1. New segments of ADA compliant sidewalks
   2. New ADA compliant curb access ramps
E. At traffic signal and HAWK pedestrian flasher installations
   1. Pedestrian push button station equipment and/or location modified to become ADA compliant
   2. New curb access ramps constructed at individual locations where curb access ramps previously did not exist
   3. Existing noncompliant curb access ramps reconstructed or improved to become ADA compliant

**Development of a Quarterly Status Report Template**

A quarterly status report is recommended as part of the ADA Transition Plan program. This 90 day “Report Card” for the program will keep the PCDOT staff focused on completing the annual program workload. An example of a quarterly status report from the City of Oakland, California is provided in the appendix to this chapter.
SECTION 7 - APPENDIX A
PIMA COUNTY ADA GRIEVANCE FORM

PIMA COUNTY HUMAN RESOURCES DEPARTMENT
EMPLOYMENT RIGHTS DIVISION
150 W. Congress, 4th Floor
Tucson, AZ 85701
(520) 740-2728 Fax: (520) 740-8253

AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT (ADA) GRIEVANCE FORM

Pima County has adopted an internal grievance procedure providing for prompt and equitable resolution of complaints alleging any action prohibited by Federal and State Law. Public Law #101-336 states in part, that "no otherwise qualified disabled individual shall, solely by reason of such disability, be excluded from the participation, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination in programs or activities sponsored by a public entity." This law prohibits discrimination in the areas of accessibility, communication, accommodation and employment. Title I (Employment) complaints shall be handled by Human Resources, utilizing the Pima County Discrimination Grievance Form.

All complaints should be addressed to:

Pima County Human Resources Department
Employment Rights Division
Attention: ADA Coordinator
150 W. Congress, 4th Floor
Tucson, AZ 85701

1. Except for allegations of employment discrimination involving terms or conditions of employment, or harassment, all ADA complaints will be reviewed under these procedures. (Allegations of employment discrimination will be processed pursuant to Merit System Rule 13.3)

2. The Mediation process will be utilized prior to formal investigations of the complaint. If mediation is unsuccessful, an investigation, as may be appropriate, shall follow. This procedure affords all interested persons and their representatives an opportunity to submit relevant evidence regarding the complaint and provide for a prompt response.

3. A written determination and appropriate resolution, if any, shall be issued and a copy forwarded to the complainant and the department.

4. The complainant may request a reconsideration of the claim in instances where he/she is dissatisfied with the resolution by checking the appropriate box and forwarding the grievance for to the ADA Coordinator. An ADA Review Panel, comprised of medical and administrative personnel, will review the complaint and issue a written determination of its findings. If the complainant is still dissatisfied, he/she may request in writing a final review and determination from the County Administrator.

5. Human Resources shall maintain all files and records relating to the complaint(s) filed.

6. The right of a person to a prompt and equitable resolution of the complaint filed hereunder shall not be impaired by the person's pursuit of other remedies, such as the filing of an ADA complaint with the responsible federal department or agency. Use of this grievance procedure is not a prerequisite to the pursuit of other remedies.

7. These procedures shall not be construed to protect the substantive rights of interested persons to meet appropriate due process standards and to assure that Pima County Government complies with the ADA and associated regulations.
INSTRUCTIONS FOR GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE

Complete this form and submit to the Pima County ADA Program Coordinator (ADA Coordinator) at the above address.

Name of Complainant: ____________________________________________

Home Address: ________________________ Zip Code: __________

Home Phone: ______________ Work Phone: ______________ Today’s Date: __________

A. BASIS OF COMPLAINT      (Check all that apply)

Programs ☐ Communications ☐
Accessibility ☐ Transportation ☐
Accommodations ☐
Other ☐

B. SUMMARY OF COMPLAINT

(Explain why you believe a violation of the ADA has occurred. Additional pages or relevant documentation may be attached.)

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

C. REMEDY REQUESTED

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

Complainant Signature ___________________________ Date __________

Curtis Lueck & Associates
Tucson, Arizona
APPENDIX B

(FROM Minnesota DOT ADA Transition Plan)

HOW TO FILE A GRIEVANCE

The procedure to file a grievance is as follows:

1. A formal written grievance should be filed on ADA Grievance Form. An oral grievance can be filed by contacting ADA Title II Coordinator. The oral grievance will be reduced to writing by ADA Coordinator utilizing ADA Grievance Form. Additionally, individuals filing a grievance are not required to file a grievance with Mn/DOT, but may instead exercise their right to file a grievance with the Department of Justice.

   - The name, address, and telephone number of the person filing the grievance.
   - The name, address, and telephone number of the person alleging ADA violation, if other than the person filing the grievance.
   - A description and location of the alleged violation and the remedy sought.
   - Information regarding whether a complaint has been filed with the Department of Justice or other federal or state civil rights agency or court.
   - If a complaint has been filed, the name of the agency or court where the complaint was filed, and the date the complaint was filed.

2. The grievance will be either responded to or acknowledged within 10 working days of receipt. If the grievance filed does not concern a Mn/DOT facility, it will be forwarded to the appropriate agency and the grievant will be notified.

3. Within 60 calendar days of receipt, the ADA Title II Coordinator will conduct the investigation necessary to determine the validity of the alleged violation. If appropriate, ADA Title II Coordinator will arrange to meet with the grievant to discuss the matter and attempt to reach a resolution of the grievance. Any resolution of the grievance will be documented in Mn/DOT’s ADA Grievance File.

4. If a resolution of the grievance is not reached, a written determination as to the validity of the complaint and description of the resolution, if appropriate, shall be issued by ADA Title II Coordinator and a copy forwarded to the grievant no later than 90 days from the date of Mn/DOT’s receipt of the grievance.

5. The grievant may appeal the written determination. The request for reconsideration shall be in writing and filed with the Minnesota Department of Transportation Ombudsman within 30 days after the ADA Title II Coordinator’s determination has been mailed to the grievant. Mn/DOT’s Ombudsman shall
review the request for reconsideration and make a final determination within 90 days from the filing of the request for reconsideration.

6. If the grievant is dissatisfied with Mn/DOT’s handling of the grievance at any stage of the process or does not wish to file a grievance through the Mn/DOT’s ADA Grievance Procedure, the grievant may file a complaint directly with the United States Department of Justice or other appropriate state or federal agency. The resolution of any specific grievance will require consideration of varying circumstances, such as the specific nature of the disability; the nature of the access to services, programs, or facilities at issue and the essential eligibility requirements for participation; the health and safety of others; and the degree to which an accommodation would constitute a fundamental alteration to the program, service, or facility, or cause an undue hardship to Mn/DOT. Accordingly, the resolution by Mn/DOT of any one grievance does not constitute a precedent upon which Mn/DOT is bound or upon which other complaining parties may rely.

File Maintenance

Mn/DOT’s ADA Coordinator shall maintain ADA grievance files for a period of three years.
INTRODUCTION

This report provides detailed information about City of Oakland curb ramp activities for the period beginning July 1, 2009 and ending December 31, 2009. The report provides updates on implementation of the City’s ADA Curb Ramp Transition Plan and construction / reconstruction of curb ramps by the City and others. The Community and Economic Development Agency (CEDA), Design and Construction Services Division (DCSD), currently administers City curb ramp programs. The City ADA Coordinator and Mayor’s Commission on Persons with Disabilities (MCPD) provide oversight and guidance for City ADA Title II compliance activities, including curb ramp programs.

BACKGROUND

ADA Title II regulations stipulate that when structural changes to facilities are necessary to achieve program accessibility, a public entity that employs 50 or more persons must develop, within six months of January 26, 1992, a transition plan setting forth the steps necessary to complete such changes. That plan is to identify physical obstacles in the public entity’s facilities that limit the accessibility of its programs or activities to individuals with disabilities; describe in detail the methods that will be used to make the facilities accessible; specify the schedule for taking the steps necessary to achieve compliance; and indicate the official responsible for implementation of the plan. In January 1999, the City prepared its transition plan with respect to buildings and facilities.

If a public entity has responsibility or authority over streets, roads, or walkways, then its ADA transition plan must include a schedule for providing curb ramps or other sloped areas where pedestrian walks cross curbs, giving priority to walkways serving entities covered by the ADA, including State and local government offices and facilities, transportation, places of public accommodation, and employers, followed by walkways serving other areas [28 C.F.R. § 35.150(d)(2)].
The 1996 Buildings and Facilities Transition Plan included curb ramp needs for off-street facilities and priorities for curb ramp installation at existing street corners. The Buildings and Facilities Transition Plan incorporated by reference a citywide curb ramp survey completed in 1994. Another citywide curb ramp survey was completed in 2002. The City operated robust curb ramp programs from 1996 to 2007 but no formal changes were made to the 1996 Plan. Pursuant to Fairfield v. Oakland (2007), the ADA Programs Division developed a separate ADA Curb Ramp Transition Plan to formalize long-standing curb ramp policies, practices and procedures and to adopt new ones as necessary to substantially comply with federal mandates.

Soon after passage of the ADA, the City recognized that it would take some time to complete a curb ramp transition plan, which requires construction of ramps at over 17,500 locations (street corners). In Fiscal Year 1990-91, the City launched the On-Call Curb Ramp Program to ensure access for people with disabilities living and working in Oakland during the lengthy transition period. The Program is currently funded by the City’s general fund and state gas tax funds.

The On-Call Curb Ramp Program constructs curb ramps on an individual basis in response to requests from qualified persons with disabilities. Generally, requests come from residents with disabilities who wish to get to from their home or work place to transportation, school, medical facilities or other areas to accommodate their activities of daily living. This program installed approximately 1,021 curb ramps from 1991 to 2009 (July).

Under the Curb Ramp Transition Plan, the City conducts curb ramp infill activities using a corridor-based approach. The following location (land use) priorities for curb ramp infill activities are based upon U.S. Department of Justice ADA Title II Regulations, the City of Oakland General Plan (1998), and best practices of other jurisdictions:

Tier 1: Transit streets and centers
Tier 2: Public facilities
Tier 3: Privately-owned public accommodations
Tier 4: Locations that do not fall into any of the above groups but are within 100 feet of a sidewalk route.
Tier 5: Locations that do not fall into any of the above groups and are greater than 100 feet from a sidewalk route. These locations are neither counted as ‘possible locations’ nor scheduled for improvement.

The City conducts various other capital improvement programs under which curb ramps are constructed or reconstructed, such as streetscape, street resurfacing, and sidewalk repair projects. Curb ramp construction and reconstruction is also completed through private improvements inspected by City staff.

Under its ADA Curb Ramp Transition Plan, the City of Oakland commits to install 500 curb ramps, and anticipates that others will install 150 curb ramps, on an average annual basis. In Fiscal Year 2008-09, the combined total number of curb ramps constructed by the City and by others was 566. It is anticipated that the combined total for FY 2009-10 will be 935.
STATUS REPORTS

Curb Ramp Transition Plan

The Right of Way Access Coordinator has drafted curb ramp scoping, design and construction standards that will be applicable to all public right of way improvements under the City’s jurisdiction, including work performed by the City and by others (private developers, utility companies, etc.). The ROW Access Coordinator will bring the draft curb ramp standards forward to the MCPD for review in March 2010. Once finalized, these standards will be posted on the City website.

Curb Ramp Construction Activity

Table 1: On-Call Curb Ramps Constructed

Thirty (30) curb ramps were constructed under the current On-Call Curb Ramp Contract (C316310) from July 1, 2009 through December 31, 2009.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complaint location</th>
<th>Ramp No.</th>
<th>Date Received</th>
<th>Date Completed</th>
<th>No. of Ramps</th>
<th>Contract Number</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trestle Glen Road/Wesley Way</td>
<td>H1718</td>
<td>6/25/09</td>
<td>7/1/09</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C269110</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trestle Glen Road/Wesley Way</td>
<td>H1717</td>
<td>6/25/09</td>
<td>7/1/09</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C242312</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd/ Harrison</td>
<td>9/23/09</td>
<td>10/27/09</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>C316310</td>
<td>11,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd/ Webster</td>
<td>9/23/09</td>
<td>10/27/09</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>C316310</td>
<td>12,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd/ Broadway</td>
<td>9/23/09</td>
<td>10/27/09</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>C316310</td>
<td>4,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3258 Lakeshore E-side</td>
<td>10/6/09</td>
<td>10/30/09</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C316310</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3255 Lakeshore</td>
<td>10/6/09</td>
<td>10/30/09</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C316310</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeshore/Trestle Glen Road</td>
<td>H1716</td>
<td>10/6/09</td>
<td>10/30/09</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C316310</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeshore/Longridge</td>
<td>H1494</td>
<td>10/6/09</td>
<td>10/30/09</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C316310</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piedmont/Yosemite</td>
<td>C576</td>
<td>10/6/09</td>
<td>10/30/09</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C316310</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piedmont/Glensden</td>
<td>C526</td>
<td>10/6/09</td>
<td>10/30/09</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C316310</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piedmont/Pleasant Valley Rd.</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/6/09</td>
<td>10/30/09</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>C316310</td>
<td>4,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telegraph/49th St</td>
<td>10/6/09</td>
<td>10/30/09</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C316310</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total On-Call Ramps</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$37,200</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request Date</td>
<td>Ramp Number</td>
<td>Ramp ID</td>
<td>STREET 1</td>
<td>STREET 2</td>
<td>No. of Ramps</td>
<td>Cost Est.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/22/09</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>A421</td>
<td>8th Street</td>
<td>MADISON ST</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/02/09</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>A418</td>
<td>8th ST</td>
<td>MADISON ST</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/02/09</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>A602</td>
<td>9th ST</td>
<td>MADISON ST</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/02/09</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>A416</td>
<td>8th ST</td>
<td>MADISON ST</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/02/09</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>A603</td>
<td>9th ST</td>
<td>MADISON ST</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/02/09</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>A605</td>
<td>9th ST</td>
<td>MADISON ST</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/02/09</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>C480</td>
<td>49th ST</td>
<td>WEBSTER ST</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/09/09</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>C477</td>
<td>49th ST</td>
<td>WEBSTER ST</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/10/09</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>C478</td>
<td>49th ST</td>
<td>WEBSTER ST</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/14/09</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>C479</td>
<td>49th ST</td>
<td>WEBSTER ST</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/14/09</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>C2038</td>
<td>FOREST ST</td>
<td>SHAFTER ST</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/14/09</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>C2030</td>
<td>FOREST ST</td>
<td>SHAFTER ST</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/14/09</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>C2112</td>
<td>HUDSON ST</td>
<td>BOYD AVE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/14/09</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>C2122</td>
<td>COLLEGE AVE</td>
<td>MANILLA AVE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/14/09</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>C2039</td>
<td>FOREST ST</td>
<td>SHAFTER ST</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/24/09</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>C2125</td>
<td>COLLEGE AVE</td>
<td>HUDSON ST</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/26/09</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>C2126</td>
<td>COLLEGE AVE</td>
<td>MANILLA AVE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/27/09</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>C2127</td>
<td>COLLEGE AVE</td>
<td>MANILLA AVE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/27/09</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>C2123</td>
<td>COLLEGE AVE</td>
<td>MANILLA AVE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/27/09</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>B780A</td>
<td>MANDEL PKW</td>
<td>16th ST</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/27/09</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>B597</td>
<td>28th ST</td>
<td>CHESTNUT ST</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/02/09</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>B355</td>
<td>28th ST</td>
<td>CHESTNUT ST</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/10/09</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>B354</td>
<td>28th ST</td>
<td>CHESTNUT ST</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/10/09</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>B595</td>
<td>28th ST</td>
<td>CHESTNUT ST</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/10/09</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>B594</td>
<td>28th ST</td>
<td>CHESTNUT ST</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/17/09</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>B352</td>
<td>28th ST</td>
<td>FILBERT ST</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/10/09</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>B592</td>
<td>28th ST</td>
<td>FILBERT ST</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/10/09</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>B591</td>
<td>28th ST</td>
<td>FILBERT ST</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/10/09</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>B353</td>
<td>28th ST</td>
<td>LINDEN ST</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/10/09</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>B593</td>
<td>28th ST</td>
<td>LINDEN ST</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/16/09</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>B594</td>
<td>28th ST</td>
<td>LINDEN ST</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/17/09</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>B350</td>
<td>28th ST</td>
<td>MYRTLE ST</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/18/09</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>B351</td>
<td>28th ST</td>
<td>MYRTLE ST</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/19/09</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>B589</td>
<td>28th ST</td>
<td>MYRTLE ST</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/19/09</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>B590</td>
<td>28th ST</td>
<td>MYRTLE ST</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/19/09</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>B362</td>
<td>28th ST</td>
<td>MYRTLE ST</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/19/09</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>B363</td>
<td>28th ST</td>
<td>MYRTLE ST</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/19/09</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>B601</td>
<td>28th ST</td>
<td>MYRTLE ST</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/19/09</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>B602</td>
<td>28th ST</td>
<td>MYRTLE ST</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request Date</td>
<td>Ramp Number</td>
<td>Ramp ID</td>
<td>STREET 1</td>
<td>STREET 2</td>
<td>No. of Ramps</td>
<td>Cost Est.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/20/09</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>B360</td>
<td>26th ST</td>
<td>FILBERT ST</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/20/09</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>B361</td>
<td>26th ST</td>
<td>FILBERT ST</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/20/09</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>B600</td>
<td>26th ST</td>
<td>FILBERT ST</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/20/09</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>B359</td>
<td>26th ST</td>
<td>LINDEN ST</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/20/09</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>B599</td>
<td>26th ST</td>
<td>LINDEN ST</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS**: 44 $86,000

Additionally, the following four (4) Curb Ramps will be upgraded with domes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ramp ID</th>
<th>Street 1</th>
<th>Street 2</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C2120</td>
<td>College Avenue</td>
<td>Manila Avenue</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2121</td>
<td>College Avenue</td>
<td>Manila Avenue</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B357</td>
<td>26th ST</td>
<td>Chestnut ST</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B358</td>
<td>26th ST</td>
<td>Linden ST</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Cost** $5,400

**Table 3: Corridor Curb Ramp Improvements Completed**

Sixty nine (69) curb ramps were constructed under City right-of-way capital improvement programs during the period of July 1, 2009 to December 31, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract Number</th>
<th>Expected Number of Curb Ramps</th>
<th>Number of Curb Ramps Installed to Date</th>
<th>Percent of Project Complete</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C269110</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Sidewalk Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G339610</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C315010</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>San Pablo Ave Street Improvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS**: 69 69
### Table 4: Curb Ramps Constructed by Others

Fifty nine (59) curb ramps were constructed or reconstructed through private improvements inspected by City staff during the period beginning July 1, 2009 and ending December 31, 2009.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>CONTRACT NO</th>
<th>No. of Ramps</th>
<th>Date of Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Pablo/Castro Street/Martin Luther King Jr. Way</td>
<td>PG&amp;E 115KV</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12/23/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Luther King Jr. Way/Grand Avenue</td>
<td>PG&amp;E 115KV</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12/23/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Ave/Northgate/Telegraph Ave</td>
<td>PG&amp;E 115KV</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12/23/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telegraph/Grand Avenue/Valley St</td>
<td>PG&amp;E 115KV</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12/23/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Ave/Valley/Webster</td>
<td>PG&amp;E 115KV</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12/23/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Ave/Webster/Valdez St</td>
<td>PG&amp;E 115KV</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12/23/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valdez St/Harrison/Grand Ave</td>
<td>PG&amp;E 115KV</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12/23/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison St/Bay Place/Grand Ave</td>
<td>PG&amp;E 115KV</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12/23/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Ave/Bay Place</td>
<td>PG&amp;E 115KV</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12/23/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Ave/Park View Terrace</td>
<td>PG&amp;E 115KV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12/23/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Ave/Lenox Avenue</td>
<td>PG&amp;E 115KV</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12/23/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Avenue/Lee Street</td>
<td>PG&amp;E 115KV</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12/23/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Avenue/Perkins Street</td>
<td>PG&amp;E 115KV</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12/23/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Ave/Ellita Avenue</td>
<td>PG&amp;E 115KV</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12/23/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Avenue/Bellevue</td>
<td>PG&amp;E 115KV</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12/23/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Avenue/Euclid Avenue</td>
<td>PG&amp;E 115KV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12/23/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeshore &amp; MacArthur SE</td>
<td>PG&amp;E 115KV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9/20/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeshore &amp; MacArthur NE</td>
<td>PG&amp;E 115KV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9/20/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeshore &amp; MacArthur SW</td>
<td>PG&amp;E 115KV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9/20/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeshore &amp; MacArthur NW</td>
<td>PG&amp;E 115KV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9/20/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeshore &amp; MacArthur Median</td>
<td>PG&amp;E 115KV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9/20/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeshore &amp; MacArthur Median</td>
<td>PG&amp;E 115KV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9/20/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeshore &amp; MacArthur SE island</td>
<td>PG&amp;E 115KV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9/20/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeshore &amp; MacArthur SE island</td>
<td>PG&amp;E 115KV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9/20/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeshore &amp; MacArthur SE island</td>
<td>PG&amp;E 115KV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9/20/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5: Upcoming Corridor Curb Ramp Improvements

The current On-Call Curb Ramp contract (C316310) will result in construction of 260 curb ramps. The contract was awarded to AJW Construction and commenced in October 2009.

On October 19, 2009, the notice to commence a sidewalk repair contract (C317510) was issued to Rosas Brothers Construction. The contract will require construction of 90 curb ramps in residential areas.

The Notice to Proceed for a Federal Economic Stimulus Curb Ramp and Sidewalk Repair Contract (C376310) is currently in process. This project will include construction of 330 curb ramps along prioritized corridors.

It is anticipated that City street resurfacing will result in construction of 250 curb ramps in Fiscal year 2009-10.

There are two additional two sidewalk and curb ramp projects (C370610 and C370510) that are planned for FY 09-10. Bidding for these two projects is anticipated in May 2010. The projects will result in construction of approximately 305 new ramps.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number and Description</th>
<th>Number of Ramps</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>Schedule/Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C316310—On Call Curb Ramps</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>$390,000</td>
<td>Constructed started in October 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C317510—Curb Ramps in Residential Areas</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>162,000</td>
<td>Constructed started in October 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G376310—Stimulus for sidewalk and curb ramps in prioritized corridors</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>$495,000</td>
<td>Notice to proceed is in process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G339610—Five-year resurfacing street program</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>$176,000</td>
<td>Scheduled to start in summer 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G376410—Stimulus for Street Resurfacing (five year program)</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>$243,000</td>
<td>Scheduled to start fall 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C370610—Citywide sidewalk repair, residential &amp; prioritized corridors</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>$25,200</td>
<td>Bid anticipated in May 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C370510—Curb ramp construction, residential &amp; prioritized corridors</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>$422,400</td>
<td>Bid anticipated in May 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>1,235</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,913,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>