

access

PERFORMANCE MONITORING COMMITTEE

Monday, October 19, 2020

11:00 a.m.

Webinar

Committee Members: D. Barnes, Chair
A. Del Castillo
L. Burner

	<u>DISPOSITION</u>
1. CALL TO ORDER	ACTION
2. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT	INFORMATION
3. CONSIDERATION TO AWARD CONSTRUCTION PROJECT MANAGEMENT SERVICES CONTRACT (AS-4136) (page 5)	ACTION
4. CONSIDERATION TO APPROVE RENEWAL OF AGENCY INSURANCE POLICIES (page 14)	ACTION
5. CONSIDERATION TO APPROVE EXTENSION OF TERM AND INCREASE OF FUNDS - TAP CARD PRODUCTION MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING (page 16)	ACTION
6. COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS (page 18)	ACTION
7. PERFORMANCE UPDATE	INFORMATION
8. CHIEF OPERATIONS OFFICER REPORT	INFORMATION
9. ADJOURNMENT	ACTION

Access Services does not discriminate on the basis of disability. Accordingly, Access Services seeks to ensure that individuals with disabilities will have an equal opportunity to participate in the range of Access Services events and programs by providing

appropriate auxiliary aids and services for communications. Primary consideration is given to the request of individuals with disabilities. However, the final decision belongs to Access Services. To help ensure the availability of any auxiliary aids and services you require, please make every effort to notify Access Services of your request at least three (3) business days (72 hours) prior to the meeting in which you wish to utilize those aids or services. You may do so by contacting (213) 270-6000.

Note: Access Services Board committee meetings are held pursuant to the Ralph M. Brown Act [Cal. Gov. Code §54950] and are open to the public. The public may view and obtain all written information supporting this agenda provided to the Board committee both initially and supplementally prior to the meeting at the agency's offices located at 3449 Santa Anita Avenue, El Monte, California and on its website at <http://accessla.org>. Documents, including Power Point handouts distributed to the Board committee members by staff or Board committee members at the meeting, will simultaneously be made available to the public. Three opportunities are available for the public to address the Board committee during a Board committee meeting: (1) before closed session regarding matters to be discussed in closed session, (2) before a specific agenda item is debated and voted upon regarding that item and (3) general public comment. The exercise of the right to address the Board committee is subject to restriction as to time and appropriate decorum. All persons wishing to make public comment must fill out a goldenrod Public Comment Form and submit it to the Secretary of the Board. Public comment is generally limited to three (3) minutes per speaker and the total time available for public comment may be limited at the discretion of the Chairperson. Persons whose speech is impaired such that they are unable to address the Board at a normal rate of speed may request an accommodation of a limited amount of additional time from the Chair but only by checking the appropriate box on the Public Comment Form. Granting such an accommodation is at the discretion of the Chair. The Board committee will not and cannot respond during the meeting to matters raised under general public comment. Pursuant to provisions of the Brown Act governing these proceedings, no discussion or action may be taken on these matters unless they are listed on the agenda, or unless certain emergency or special circumstances exist. However, the Board committee may direct staff to investigate and/or schedule certain matters for consideration at a future Board committee meeting and the staff may respond to all public comments in writing prior to the next Board committee meeting.

Alternative accessible formats are available upon request.

*NOTE

NOTICE OF ALTERNATIVE PUBLIC COMMENT PROCEDURES

Pursuant to temporary revised Brown Act requirements, Board committee members will be participating via webinar. The public may submit written comments on any item

on the agenda - 1) through email by addressing it to - board@accessla.org or 2) via US Postal mail by addressing it to - Access Services Board Comments, PO Box 5728, El Monte CA 91734. Please include your name, item number and comments in the correspondence. Comments must be submitted/received no later than 9:00 am on Monday, October 19, 2020 so they can be read into the record as appropriate.

The public may also participate via the Zoom webinar link, or by teleconference. Please review the procedures to do so as follows -

How to Provide Public Comment in a Board Meeting via Zoom

Online

1. Click the Zoom link for the meeting you wish to join. Meeting information can be found at: https://accessla.org/news_and_events/agendas.html. Make sure to use a current, up-to-date browser: Chrome 30+, Firefox 27+, Microsoft Edge 12+, or Safari 7+. Certain functionality may be disabled in older browsers including Internet Explorer. You may also use this direct link - <https://zoom.us/j/94054916395>
2. Enter an email address and your name. Your name will be visible online while you are speaking.
3. When the Committee Chair calls for the item on which you wish to speak, click on "raise hand." Speakers will be notified shortly before they are called to speak. Mute all other audio before speaking. Using multiple devices can cause an audio feedback.
4. Please note that the "Chat" feature is not enabled during the meeting for general public attendees. If you cannot use the "raise hand" feature, then please submit a written comment as outlined above.
5. When called, please limit your remarks to three minutes. An audio signal will sound at the three-minute mark and the Chair will have the discretion to mute you at any point after that. After the comment has been given, the microphone for the speaker's Zoom profile will be muted.

Note: Members of the public will not be shown on video.

By phone

1. Call the Zoom phone number and enter the webinar ID for the meeting you wish to join. Meeting information can be found at: https://accessla.org/news_and_events/agendas.html
2. You can also call in using the following information -
3. Dial (for higher quality, dial a number based on your current location):
US: +1 669 900 6833 or +1 346 248 7799 or +1 253 215 8782 or +1 929 205 6099 or +1 301 715 8592 or +1 312 626 6799 or 833 548 0282 (Toll Free) or 877 853 5247 (Toll Free) or 888 788 0099 (Toll Free) or 833 548 0276 (Toll Free)

Webinar ID: 940 5491 6395

4. When the Committee Chair calls for the item on which you wish to speak, press *9 to raise a hand. Speakers will be notified shortly before they are called to speak. Speakers will be called by the last four digits of their phone number. Please note that phone numbers in their entirety will be visible online while speakers are speaking.
5. If you cannot use the "raise hand" feature, please submit a written comment as outlined above.
6. When called, please state your name and limit your remarks to three minutes. An audio signal will sound at the three-minute mark and the Chair will have the discretion to mute you at any point after that. After the comment has been given, the microphone for the speaker's Zoom profile will be muted.

OCTOBER 12, 2020

TO: BOARD OF DIRECTORS

**FROM: F SCOTT JEWELL, DIRECTOR OF ADMINISTRATION
BRIAN SELWYN, MANAGER OF PROCUREMENT AND CONTRACT
ADMINISTRATION**

**RE: CONSIDERATION TO AWARD CONSTRUCTION PROJECT
MANAGEMENT SERVICES CONTRACT (AS-4136)**

ISSUE:

Board approval is required to exercise the award of a construction project management services contract.

RECOMMENDATION:

Authorize staff to execute Contract No. AS-4136 with Griffin Structures, Inc. in an amount not-to-exceed \$625,000, for a period of up to three years, beginning in January 2021.

IMPACT ON BUDGET:

The contract total of \$625,000 is inclusive of development, services and support over the term of the contract. Costs for the first six months of work are allocated from the current fiscal year budget. Remaining costs will be requested and budgeted accordingly for the remainder of the contract term. In the event that a property is acquired (through lease or purchase) which contains an existing facility suitable for renovation (vs. a new build), the cost would be \$290,000. The funding for this project comes from local funds (Proposition C 40% Discretionary fund).

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:

The Board may choose not to award the contract. This alternative is not recommended as the work to be undertaken by the firm under consideration herein serves as a key first step in Access' plan to own or lease property from which our service contractors can operate, thus mitigating the need for proposers to find their own property as a prerequisite to being deemed responsive to our paratransit service RFPs.

EFFECT OF APPROVAL OF STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

If this staff recommendation is approved by the Board, staff would be authorized, but not required, to negotiate and enter into a written contract upon terms and conditions no less favorable to Access than those proposed herein. Access would not be legally bound to the contract herein proposed unless and until it is incorporated into a formal written agreement executed by all parties thereto and approved as to form by this entity's legal counsel.

BACKGROUND:

Access sought to engage the services of a qualified Construction Project Management Firm that will take the lead in the solicitation, selection and management of the design and construction or renovation of Access' operating facilities in Los Angeles County. It is the intent of Access to award one contract for construction management services and a subsequent contract for the design and construction or renovation of the aforementioned operating facility.

On June 29, 2020, Access issued Request for Proposals (RFP) No. AS-4136 to select a construction project management consultant with the experience to oversee the construction and renovation of transportation operating facilities.

Access issued two addenda, providing answers to proposer questions. By the August 7, 2020 deadline, Access received proposals from the following eight firms:

1. Azure Development (Azure)
2. Construction Management Partners Group, Inc. (CMPG)
3. Cumming Management Group, Inc. (Cumming)
4. Griffin Structures, Inc. (Griffin)
5. Jones Lang LaSalle, Inc. (JLL)
6. Skanska USA Building Inc. (Skanska)
7. Swinerton Builders (Swinerton)
8. The LeFlore Group/Desert Paradise (TLG)

All proposals submitted were deemed responsive and the proposers responsible. As part of their proposals, the proposers (both prime contractors and subcontractors) were also asked to provide information regarding their status as a disadvantaged business, indicating whether they were certified in one or more the following categories: Small Business Enterprise, Women Business Enterprise, Disadvantaged Business Enterprise, Minority Business Enterprise, Disabled Veterans Business Enterprise, or other. Three of the eight proposers (including proposed sub-contractors) reported being certified in one or more of the aforementioned categories.

An evaluation panel was convened and a comprehensive technical evaluation followed. The evaluation panel consisted of four Access staff, from the following

departments: Administration, Finance, Government Affairs and Outreach, and Operations.

The proposals were evaluated based on the following criteria and associated weights:

<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Max. Points</u>
1. Firm/Staff Qualifications	15
2. Program Understanding	10
3. Technical Approach	40
4. Project Management Approach	20
5. Cost	15
<hr/>	
TOTAL	100

During the period from August 12, 2020 through September 28, 2020, the evaluation committee conducted its independent evaluation of the proposals received. Proposals from CMPG, Griffin, JLL, Skanska and Swinerton were determined to be within the competitive range, based on the evaluation of the four technical scoring criteria delineated in the subject RFP. These five firms were interviewed by the evaluation team on August 25th and August 26th via Zoom.

Requests for a "Best and Final Offer" (BAFO) were then released. On August 28th (BAFO I) and then again on September 10th (BAFO II) the five firms in the competitive range were asked to provide clarification regarding how each would address certain elements of the project should they be awarded a contract. They were also asked to submit two cost proposals, one based on the scenario that Access would acquire a property upon which an existing facility would be renovated and the second based on the scenario that Access would acquire a property on which a new facility would be built. For BAFO II, proposers were asked to confirm that the services proposed would apply to either the Southern region or another Access service region. All confirmed that they did. Only one proposer submitted a new cost proposal as part of the final BAFO, with small changes from the cost proposal submitted in BAFO I.

Scoring for cost for those in the competitive range was broken up into two sub-categories, reflecting the two aforementioned design/construction scenarios. Based on the evaluation criteria and the BAFOs submitted, Griffin ranked the highest following final evaluations. A summary of scores for both the first and final evaluation rounds is set forth below.

**First Round Scoring:
Evaluation Following Submission of Proposals to Establish a Competitive Range (Per
Technical Score)**

Evaluation Criteria (Max. Pts.)	Azure	CMPG	Cumming	Griffin	JLL	Skanska	Swinerton	TLG
Firm/Staff Qualifications and Experience (15 pts.)	9.75	9.94	12.11	13.50	12.53	13.88	11.59	11.81
Program Understanding (10 pts.)	6.88	7.50	7.25	8.50	8.50	8.45	8.58	7.75
Technical Approach (40 pts.)	26.50	32.50	31.50	33.50	34.50	31.80	31.30	28.50
Project Management Approach (20 pts.)	11.25	16.00	13.00	16.40	18.00	14.75	14.50	14.25
Technical Score (85 pts.)	54.38	65.94	63.86	71.90	73.53	68.88	65.96	62.31
Cost Score* (15 pts.)	15.00	2.92	3.69	2.03	2.47	1.60	3.12	4.75

**Where a proposer submitted two cost proposals (based on two scenarios discussed above), the Cost Score reflects the higher cost proposal.*

**Final Round Scoring:
Evaluate Proposals in Competitive Range Following Receipt of Final BAFO**

Evaluation Criteria (Max. Pts.)	CMPG	Griffin	JLL	Skanska	Swinerton
Firm/Staff Qualifications and (15 pts.)	11.44	13.50	10.50	12.38	12.56
Program Understanding (10 pts.)	7.75	8.75	7.63	8.25	7.75
Technical Approach (40 pts.)	31.50	35.00	30.00	30.50	32.00
Project Management Approach (20 pts.)	16.00	18.25	14.75	15.75	16.25
Technical Score (85 pts.)	66.69	75.50	62.88	66.88	68.56
Cost: Manage a Renovation* (7.5 pts.)	5.60	5.58	7.50	2.32	4.11
Cost: Manage a New Build* (7.5 pts.)	7.28	6.28	7.50	2.63	4.98
Total Score (100 pts.)	79.57	87.37	77.88	71.82	77.65

*For the cost criterion for the final round of scoring, a maximum of fifteen points was awarded, with the firm who proposed the lowest cost to manage the renovation of an existing facility earning 7.5 points and the firm who proposed the lowest cost to manage the construction of a new facility earning 7.5 points.

The Access Finance Department staff determined the recommended Contractor to be financially qualified to fulfill the terms of the subject RFP.

COST ANALYSIS

The recommended Contractor's cost has been determined to be fair and reasonable based upon an evaluation of the independent cost estimate (ICE), competition, technical analysis, fact-finding, negotiations, and best and final offers. Costs, including BAFOs from the five firms in the competitive range, are set forth below.

Proposer	Originally Proposed Cost*	BAFO II: Manage Renovation	BAFO II: Manage New Build
1. Azure	\$90,750.00	N/A	N/A
2. CMPG	\$466,800.00	\$289,180	\$539,355
3. Cumming	\$369,225.60	N/A	N/A
4. Griffin	\$672,000.00	\$290,000	\$625,000
5. JLL	\$551,008.50	\$215,929	\$523,458
6. Skanska	\$851,520.00	\$698,072	\$1,495,580
7. Swinerton	\$436,830.40	\$394,289	\$788,914
8.TLG	\$286,476.00	N/A	N/A

*Where proposer submitted two cost proposals in their original proposal (based on two scenarios discussed above), the higher cost is listed in the second column of the table.

A breakdown of Griffin's proposed deliverables and cost, under the two building scenarios, is set forth below:

NEW BUILD:

SOLICITATION AND SELECTION OF VENDOR AND CONSTRUCTION PROJECT MANAGEMENT

PHASE	DELIVERABLE	HOURS	FIXED COST
DESIGN		1,066	\$181,000
	Program Validation		
	Bid and Award Services - Design		
	Design Coordination		
	Constructability Review		
	Cost Estimating Services		
	Bid and Award Services - Facility and Property Improvements		
	Bid and Award Services - Other Vendors		
ON-SITE CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT		2,336	\$423,190
	Pre-Construction Meeting		
	Contract Administration		
	Submittal Coordination		
	Weekly Meetings		
	Quality Assurance		
	Document Control		
	RFI Coordination		
	Issues Resolution		
	Identification of Non-Conforming Work		
	Schedule Oversight		

	Change Order Review and Recommendations		
	Contractor Pay Applications		
	Coordination of Special Inspections and Testing		
	Project Reporting		
	Utility Coordination		
	Commissioning		
	Punch List Coordination		
	Owner Training		
	AS-Built Documents and Operation Manuals		
	Notice of Substantial Completion		
	Final Cost Accounting		
REIMBURSABLE COSTS			\$20,810
	Insurance (\$4,810)		
	Misc. Office Supplies (\$4,000)		
	Submittal Exchange - Cloud Based Document Control System (\$12,000)		
TOTAL COST		3,402	\$625,000

RENOVATION OF EXISTING FACILITY:

SOLICITATION AND SELECTION OF VENDOR AND CONSTRUCTION PROJECT MANAGEMENT

PHASE	DELIVERABLE	HOURS	FIXED COST
1. DESIGN		836	\$143,210
	Program Validation		
	Bid and Award Services - Design		
	Design Coordination		
	Constructability Review		
	Cost Estimating Services		
	Scheduling Services		
	Bid and Award Services - Facility and Property Improvements		
	Bid and Award Services - Other Vendors		
2. ON-SITE CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT		1,580	\$134,880
	Pre-Construction Meeting		
	Contract Administration		
	Submittal Coordination		
	Weekly Meetings		
	Quality Assurance		
	Document Control		
	RFI Coordination		
	Issues Resolution		
	Identification of Non-Conforming Work		
	Schedule Oversight		
	Change Order Review and Recommendations		
	Contractor Pay Applications		

	Coordination of Special Inspections & Testing		
	Project Reporting		
	Utility Coordination		
	Commissioning		
	Punch List Coordination		
	Owner Training		
	AS-Built Documents and Operation Manuals		
	Notice of Substantial Completion		
	Final Cost Accounting		
3. REIMBURSABLE COSTS			\$20,810
	Insurance (\$2,210)		
	Misc. Office Supplies (\$2,700)		
	Submittal Exchange - Cloud Based Document Control System (\$7,000)		
TOTAL COST		2,416	\$290,000

RECOMMENDED CONTRACTOR

Headquartered in Irvine, Griffin has nearly forty years of experience in the field of building/site design and construction management, working on a multitude of projects similar to the one now under consideration. The firm has also been involved in the planning and implementation of fueling applications, including CNG fueling stations, on several of their projects. Their knowledge and experience in this area could prove significant given the likelihood that Access will require that future new facilities include a CNG fueling station on-site. Working with Griffin on this project is HL Construction Management, an SBE-certified firm, who will provide Cost Estimator services under either of the two building scenarios.

The company has worked on operations and maintenance facilities throughout California, managing the design and/or construction of, for example, operations and maintenance yards in the cities of Anaheim, Tustin, Westminster, Stanton, Walnut Creek, and Carlsbad. As part of this work, Griffin has had to navigate the types of challenges that arise on most renovations and new builds. Two such examples are provided below.

Working with the City of Westminster, from 2014-2016, Griffin was tasked with doing a needs assessment in order to find ways to improve the functionality of an existing property (40,000 sq. ft., \$20M project budget). Faced with an aging infrastructure and code violations throughout the property, it proposed and managed a mix of new construction, renovation and re-purposing of existing buildings in order to deliver what the City requested. Team responsibility included program and construction management and coordination of civil, geotechnical, and environmental surveys. Work was completed while maintenance operations continued to run on-site without major disruption.

From 2016-2018, Griffin provided CPM services for the City of Anaheim's Anaheim Transportation Network (ATN) Operations and Maintenance Yard (3.7 acres, \$18M project budget). The firm provided a space needs analysis with the aim of potentially relocating ATN headquarters. The study involved addressing ATN's operational practices, alternatives of space usage, and the analytics of space needs computation. After determining ATN's space needs, the team developed a conceptual site plan and a related statement of probable costs to move ATN's four-acre site to a new site, redevelop the new site and build a new headquarters.

Proposed staff, consisting of a Construction Project Manager, Project Executive, Principal in Charge, Constructability Review Specialist, Cost Estimator, and Program Validation Expert, have over 100 years of combined experience in the field. The Construction Project Manager, with more than 25 years of experience in the field, will be the lead on the project, devoting nearly 3,000 hours for a new build and nearly 1,500 hours for a renovation of an existing facility.

OCTOBER 12, 2020

TO: BOARD OF DIRECTORS

FROM: HECTOR RODRIGUEZ, DEPUTY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

RE: CONSIDERATION TO APPROVE RENEWAL OF AGENCY INSURANCE POLICIES

ISSUE:

Board approval is requested to purchase various Agency insurance policies for the policy year beginning November 1, 2020.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approve the purchase of various Agency insurance policies, including property, general liability, executive management liability and workers' compensation insurance for a not-to-exceed amount of \$700,000.

IMPACT ON BUDGET:

The approved budget for Fiscal Year 2020/21 includes the cost of these policies. The funding for these policies comes from local funds inclusive of Prop C 40% Discretionary funds and/or Measure M funds.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

No alternatives were considered. In order to protect the agency from liability, it is necessary to purchase these policies on an annual basis.

EFFECT OF APPROVAL OF STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

If this staff recommendation is approved by the Board, the staff would be authorized, but not required, to purchase the above policies at terms no less favorable to Access than those proposed above.

BACKGROUND:

SullivanCurtisMonroe (SCM), Access' insurance broker, is in the process of soliciting quotes for the various insurance policies. Upon Committee approval, staff will authorize SCM to purchase the policies with an effective date of no later than

November 1, 2020, and November 30, 2020 for the Workers' Compensation policy. Staff will bring this item to the December Board of Directors meeting for ratification.

OCTOBER 12, 2020

TO: BOARD OF DIRECTORS

FROM: F SCOTT JEWELL, DIRECTOR OF ADMINISTRATION

RE: CONSIDERATION TO EXTEND TERM AND INCREASE FUNDS - TAP CARD PRODUCTION MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING (MOU)

ISSUE:

Additional funding is required to continue the production of Access Rider ID/TAP cards under the existing MOU with Metro.

RECOMMENDATION:

Authorize an additional \$300,000 for the production and issuance of Access Rider ID/TAP cards for the period of February 1, 2021 - January 31, 2022.

IMPACT ON BUDGET:

This action will result in an increase in the previously approved contract amount of \$2,019,000 to \$2,319,000. The reimbursement agreement is based on a per card cost of \$4.50 plus shipping that is invoiced by Metro on a quarterly basis. There is no increase to the card cost for this extension. The funding for this agreement comes from Prop C Discretionary funds.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:

Regional production of TAP cards is handled by Metro for all TAP-participating transit operators in the county in order to maintain uniformity and security. Metro has competitively bid and negotiated the contracts for the production of the cards and is currently utilizing two companies for those services. Accordingly, no other alternatives were considered.

EFFECT OF APPROVAL OF STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

If this staff recommendation is approved by the Board, the staff would be authorized, but not required, to negotiate and extend the MOU with Metro for the production and issuance of Access Rider ID/TAP cards upon terms and conditions no less favorable to Access Services than those proposed above. Access Services would not be legally bound to the contract unless the terms are incorporated into a formal written agreement executed by all parties thereto and approved as to form by this entity's legal counsel.

BACKGROUND:

In September 2014, the Board authorized a number of changes to the Access Rider ID/TAP Card program which included an agreement with Metro for the production of the Access Rider ID/TAP card. In December 2019, the Board extended the agreement through January 2021. It is now necessary to increase funds and extend the term to continue production for another year through January 2022.

OCTOBER 12, 2020

TO: BOARD OF DIRECTORS

**FROM: MIKE GREENWOOD, CHIEF OPERATIONS OFFICER
MATTHEW AVANCENA, DIRECTOR, PLANNING AND COORDINATION**

**RE: COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CAC) SERVICE
RECOMMENDATIONS**

ISSUE:

Access' Community Advisory Committee formed the Operations Subcommittee to work on various issues that originated from the 2019 CAC Goals Retreat. Among those issues is the desire of the committee to recommend service enhancements to improve the rider experience.

RECOMMENDATION:

Receive and file.

IMPACT ON BUDGET:

Undetermined as staff is still evaluating potential fiscal impacts as detailed below. Budgetary approval will be sought from the Board if a cost to implement an enhancement exceeds \$75,000, which is currently the Executive Director's signature authority.

BACKGROUND:

On Tuesday March 12, 2019, the CAC held their first Goals Retreat at the Los Angeles River Center and Gardens. CAC member and former Access Board member Kurt Baldwin facilitated the retreat.

On April 9, 2019, the CAC took action and formed subcommittees, tasking the Quality Service Subcommittee (QSS) and the full CAC to work on various issues. Two subcommittees were formed:

1. Bylaws/Process Subcommittee -tasked to review issues such as:

- CAC attendance/participation process

- Public participation
- Meeting duration
- CAC agendas and standing items (and its order in the agenda)
- Identifying volunteers to liaison between the CAC and QSS

2. Operations Subcommittee - tasked to review issues such as:

- Missed trips and no shows
- How to avoid long rides
- Routing and mis-matched rides
- Adding stand locations and improving stand identification
- Providing clear communication to riders and drivers regarding locations
- Expanding pick-up and drop-off locations at key venues

The operations subcommittee members have been meeting almost every month via conference call. In July 2020, the members concluded its work on recommendations to improve paratransit service and presented them at the August 11 CAC meeting. The CAC took action to accept the recommendations and forward them to the Access Board of Directors.

Accordingly, staff has evaluated these recommendations and their potential impacts and is providing an update for the Board to review. The table below details this analysis. Staff will continue to work with the CAC on any remaining open items.

Recommendation	Staff Analysis
<p>When a road supervisor is available, they should be used to pick up riders whose connections were missed due to contractor error or stranding for other reasons and take the rider to their destination. This is needed to avoid diverting another vehicle to pick up the rider and thereby breaking the efficiency of the diverted vehicles route.</p>	<p>This recommendation has been informally implemented and will need to be incorporated into future RFPs to formalize.</p>
<p>Develop a methodology to be used to hold contractors accountable in efficiency of routing using ratios of location-to-location distance compared to actual miles traveled from origin to destination. Include liquidated damages for poorly routed trips to future contracts.</p>	<p>A new measurement of routing efficiency has been developed and will be incorporated into Access' performance standards subject to Board Approval.</p>
<p>Contractor staff who finalize vehicle routing must consider the mobility needs of riders and avoid mismatching riders with routes. The definition of mismatched trips should include, not just a capacity issue (not fitting on the vehicle), but also the order riders are scheduled to embark and disembark so riders do not needlessly having to get off and back on the vehicle and for those that need to transfer to a passenger seat from a mobility device.</p>	<p>Recommendation could have productivity impacts on contractors and associated cost impacts to Access. This will be evaluated further.</p>
<p>Contractors must contact a rider if the vehicle is going to arrive 30 minutes after a scheduled pick up time. This must be reinforced at regular staff meetings. A rider should be offered the opportunity to decline the trip with no late cancellation penalty but must not be encouraged to cancel by the provider.</p>	<p>Recommendation is reasonable but details need to be finalized before the improvement is incorporated into policies and procedures.</p>

<p>Create direct communication between the driver and rider and/or other technology to help riders connect with the pickup vehicle.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhance telephone communication between the rider, dispatcher, and driver, possibly implementing direct driver-to-rider communication. • Geo-locate riders and vehicles using beacons and the Where's My Ride App • The Access website should add a resource page regarding consumer technology to assist in communication, way-finding, etc. 	<p>Some of these enhancements are being investigated; costs unknown at this time. But some improvement costs will be covered under Access' FTA Mobility for All Grant</p>
<p>Make the notes the driver has about the trip have extra importance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The dispatcher should verify the driver read the notes prior to determining a no-show and allowing the driver to proceed to the next destination. e.g., ask the driver to repeat back what the notes say before letting the vehicle go to the next stop. • The dispatcher should read the notes and accommodate any ESL needs, or as an ESL accommodation allow the onboard technology to read the notes in the drivers' language of choice. • Create a distinction between trip notes and a permanent note, create a field for notes that will always apply regarding the rider (Such as "must transfer to passenger seat but needs room for mobility device.") 	<p>The prominence of notes displayed on the vehicle's driver tablet will be investigated for improvement; the dispatcher's role in note compliance will also be investigated.</p>
<p>Comparable travel time to fixed route should include the wait time from the negotiated pick up time to the destination instead of from the time the rider boards the vehicle and the vehicle departs.</p>	<p>Access currently uses FTA-approved industry standards to measure comparability to fixed route travel time. No further action on this recommendation is planned.</p>