**AGENDA**

**COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CAC) MEETING**

Tuesday, July 9, 2019  
1:00 pm - 3:00 pm  
Los Angeles County MTA  
Union Station room, third Floor  
One Gateway Plaza

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description/Presenter</th>
<th>Disposition</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Call to Order</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Introductions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Review &amp; Approval of Minutes of June 11, 2019</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>3-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.</td>
<td>General Public Comments</td>
<td>Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Report from Board of Directors/Theresa De Vera</td>
<td>Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Website Update/Bill Tsuei</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Member Communications</td>
<td>Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Customer Satisfaction Survey/Eric Haack</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>14-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>9.</td>
<td>CAC Subcommittee Update/Mike Greenwood</td>
<td>Information</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Operations Update/Fayma Ishaq</td>
<td>Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.</td>
<td>New Business Raised Subsequent to the Posting of the Agenda</td>
<td>Possible Action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Adjournment</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Access Services does not discriminate based on 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 devices and services to facilitate communication. In determining the type of auxiliary devices and services for communication that will be provided, primary consideration is given to the request of the individual with disabilities. However, the final decision belongs to Access Services. To help ensure availability of those auxiliary devices 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 devices or services. You may do so by contacting (213) 270-6000.

Note: Access Services Community Advisory (CAC) 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 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 CAC by staff or CAC members at the meeting will simultaneously be made available to the public. Two opportunities are available for the public to address the CAC during a CAC meeting: (1) before a specific agendized item is debated and voted upon regarding that item and (2) general public comment. The exercise of the right to address the CAC is subject to restriction as to time and appropriate decorum. All persons wishing to make public comment must fill out a yellow Public Comment Form and submit it to the CAC secretary. 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 Chair. Persons whose speech is impaired such that they are unable to address the board at a normal rate of speed may request the 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 in the discretion of the Chair.

The CAC 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 CAC may direct staff to investigate and/or schedule certain matters for consideration at a future CAC Meeting.

"Alternative accessible formats are available upon request."
CALL TO ORDER

Chair Maria Aroch called the meeting to order at 1:03 p.m. She clarified the rules on speaking in the appropriate order and only when called on according to the bylaws.

INTRODUCTIONS

CAC Members Present: Maria Aroch, Chair; Michael Arrigo, Vice-Chair; Kurt Baldwin, Marie-France Francois, Wendy Cabil, Yael Hagen, Gordon Cardona, Liz Lyons, Olivia Almalel and Tina Foafoa.

CAC Members Not Present: Rachele Goeman, Michael Conrad, Dina Garcia, Jesse Padilla and Terri Lantz.

Board Members Present: Martin Gombert

Access Services Staff Present: Matthew Avancena, Mike Greenwood, Eric Haack, Veronica Guzman-Vanmarcke, LaTisha Wilson, Art Chacon, Kevin Andoaga, Randy Johnson, Faustino Salvador, Brian Selwyn, David Chia, Rogelio Gomez, Rycharde Martingdale.

Guests Present: Jesse Ortiz (MV Transportation), Beatriz Lara (MV Transportation), Aurora Delgado (California Transit), William Zuke (QSS), Cleo Ray (Rider), Tonni Hemphill (Rider), Jaqueline Sanchez (San Gabriel Transit), Annette Arreola (Alta Resources), Wilma Ballew (Rider & QSS member), Angie Smith (Rider), Katherine George Chu (LA County Disabilities Commission), Michael Sher (Rider), Victor Garate (Global Paratransit), Liliana Mariona (Eligibility Center).

REVIEW & APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Chair Aroch asked for a motion to approve the May 14, 2019 minutes.

Motion: Member Hagen
Seconded: Member Baldwin
Motion: Passed
Member Comments:

Member Hagen stated that in the May 14, 2019 minutes she said, “people with more verbal skills would have more of an advantage than people with less communication skills”. She wants this amended in the minutes.

Member Cabil asked if Member Hagen’s comment was not actually Member Lantz comment. She asked if this was not actually the text on page four. Ms. Cabil read off Mrs. Lantz page four comment and Mrs. Hagen responded this was not the comment she was referring too.

Member Baldwin asked Member Hagen if she was referring the comment on page 7, 5TH paragraph, on communication.

Member Cabil stated that she also had some suggestions for amendments on the minutes. She made some grammatical corrections on page four and five. She also made suggestions on changing words to better express certain commentary by different riders and members. Ms. Cabil requested that the stranding definition be included in the amendment since there would be some readers that would not understand the context. Matthew Avancena, Director Planning and Coordination, stated that there was a presentation handed out and that was sufficient. Ms. Cabil mentioned that if someone was looking at the minutes without having attended the meeting, if would be helpful to provide a definition of the term for better understanding. Ms. Cabil would also like a phrase amended at the bottom of page seven. These amendments will be made by Veronica Guzman-Vanmarcke.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Veronica Guzman-Vanmarcke, Access Administrative Assistant, read the yellow public comment form for the meeting attendees who wished to make a public comment.

Angie Smith made a public comment by stating that she is addressing some ongoing issues that she has had with the Western and Northern Region. Rogelio Gomez, Manager of Operations, is helping her and she appreciates Access for what they have been doing and the changes they have made.

Katherine George Chu made a public comment by providing feedback on a phone call that her autistic son had received concerning the Access survey. With the information that Access already has on her son and because of the complicated transportation process that he is involved in, they offered him an alternate route. Her son mentioned to Access that what they offered is not actually an option as well as the offer for mobility training. The point of her commentary was that the survey that Access did with her son was not fruitful. It didn’t make sense according to his needs and she wanted to give feedback on this.

Tonni Hemphill made a public comment by stating that she had a complaint with the
difficulties she encounters when booking her ride to be picked up in the evening. She was told that they don’t book any rides after 10:35pm and furthermore, one of the drivers then informed her that they can’t even call in. She spoke to Rogelio Gomez and he suggested she mention it’s a class that ends late. She doesn’t understand the difference this makes because if she needs a pickup, then it should not matter. She is has also had belligerent drivers who don’t want to help her put her items in the trunk and yell at her. She questions the kind of training the drivers are receiving. LaTisha Wilson was assigned to speak to Ms. Hemphill on this issue.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS REPORT

Board member Martin Gombert provided a brief summary of the May 13, 2019 Board of Director’s meeting. He was able to visit the Braille Institute with Mike Greenwood, Access’ COO, and it was a great experience. His goal is to visit another one of the busier pickup locations each month. He stated that the following items were discussed at the meeting:

- Contract modifications for Global Paratransit and Keolis
- New and updated version of the Rider 360 portal
- An overview of the FY119/FY20 Budget

Member Discussion:

Member Lyons asked Mr. Gombert if he was going to Olive View and she recommended that he wait until the new transfer times are set up and see how it is working.

Member Cabil asked who assigned Director Gombert and he responded that this was something he decided to do of his own accord. She asked if he could ask other Board member to join him in future visits and he said he would do so.

PARENTS WITH DISABILITIES UPDATE

Erick Haack, Strategic Planner, gave a presentation on the Parents with Disabilities pilot. His intern, Kevin Andoaga, began the first half of the presentation by explaining the grant that was awarded back in 2010 to Access Services towards the Parents with Disabilities program. He explained how this would be a service that would help parents who were using paratransit for childcare purposes. Some key points of the presentation:

- Parents with Disabilities executed trips, 29,102 with a recent increase to 30,000
- YTD 2018 there have been 6,144 trips
- Average trips per month 511
- Same day trips for emergencies and social activities
- Approval of one year extension of the program through June 30, 2020

Members Discussion:

Vice-Chair Arrigo recalls when the program began and he understands how this program has helped increase children’s attendance in school. He was wondering when the other
five geographical areas of service would be receiving the Parents with Disabilities program. Eric Haack responded that the intent was to study the pilot and hopefully be able to extend the benefits through the six regions with that model. Mr. Arrigo also requested to see the marketing materials and Eric responded that he would provide them.

Member Francois asked the number of children that have benefited from this program and if it is possible for managed care insurance to potentially partner with Access since some of these riders fall on the non-emergency visits. Eric Haack replied that there are about 44 total customers that are eligible for this program but will provide a more detailed report to her later.

Member Hagen stated that as a participant of this program she is extremely grateful for the Parents with Disabilities program that has changed the lives of her and her family. She appreciates all the energy that Access has put into the program.

Public Comment

Katherine George Chu, from the LA County Commission on Disabilities, made a public comment by stating that this pilot program was brought to the LA County Commission on Disabilities last year when it was time to re-up for funding. Most of the commissioners were not pleased that they were coming to the commission when money was running out to have it extended for another year. This summer it will be extended for yet another year, making it a seven-year pilot program. She is unsure why Access is spending $375,000 on 44 rider participants that are signed up but it is only about 22 families using the program. Mr. Haack stated that the program is actually being used by 18 families. Mrs. Chu responded that she hopes this is brought up again to the Commission and she commented that it was hard for her to see someone from the CAC directly benefiting from this pilot program.

Member Cabil stated that the CAC should probably examine the numbers more closely concerning the Parents with Disabilities program because she does not feel that all the correct information has been given to them. A breakdown of the numbers would be appreciated.

Member Lyons stated that if only 18 people have been using the service these past seven years, then it is costing a bit too much. She doesn’t feel this is fair. She likes that Access is exploring new ways to expand this program to other people through the phone survey questionnaire.

Member Hagen stated that there are actually more than 18 participants. Regardless of the number, the reason for that amount is because the grant did not allow for more participation. The pilot was created to try to figure out if there was a need for this service and they did find out that there was and that it was bigger than they thought. The goal of this program is to expand it to the rest of the county. As far as the cost goes, it’s not as clear cut as it’s being made out since these rides are being taken by Access riders. The cost of each trip is the same as the cost of an Access trip, and a little bit more because of the additional services that are being provided. The cost per trip
is not that much more actually, because these trips would have been taken regardless if the program existed. This program makes it safer for everybody who rides with their child because the parents are able to be with the child so it’s a lot safer for the drivers and the riders, when you have those types of situations. The total budget and the amount of money spent on the trips is consequently coming from Measure M money and considering the benefits for all of the riders, needs to be taken into consideration. She asks that they understand that these trips reflect her daily life. She would not be able to have a child that has perfect attendance, who loves school and it’s because she was made comfortable being able to go to school in a way that’s not stressful. She fights for this program and so do many other riders the community. Today it is for them but tomorrow it might be for you.

Member Cabil stated that she appreciates all the clarity that Member Hagen shed on this program. She knows that some conclusions may be drawn when the correct information is not provided. She wonders why it has taking seven years to realize the beneficial impact this program can have on the whole county. Ms. Hagen stated this was taking much longer because the former management has changed.

Member Lyons stated that if Ms. Hagen said she would take the Access ride with her daughter regardless of the program then why do they need it. Why can’t the riders just pay the regular fees and use the program money for other things in the budget.

OPERATIONS PERFORMANCE UPDATE

Faustino Salvador, Project Administrator, presented the Operations Performance Report for the months of April and May 2019.

The April highlights included:
- Regional Project Administrator attended a Transition to Independence Event in Lancaster;
- Access collaborated with customers to shoot a mobility device training video;
- Ops staff and Board member attended a tour of the Rancho los Amigos facility;
- Safety and security Audits were conducted at the yards of California Transit and Global Paratransit in collaboration with the LA Sherriff’s department.

The May highlights included:
- Where’s my ride is now available in the Santa Clarita region;
- Board of Directors extended the Southern and Eastern Region contracts for one more year;
- Access executive management met with the California Public Utilities Commission to discuss wheelchair accessible services like Uber and Lyft;
- Board of Directors approved the Rider 360 Version 2.0 contract.

Members Discussion:

Member Lyons asked Faustino Salvador to repeat where the coupons could be purchased and he responded at the Antelope Valley Headquarters.
Member Cabil asked for concerning the Senator Scott Wilk at the Independence event. Member Baldwin replied that he would be able give her additional information after the meeting if she would like.

Member Francois asked if the Access-to-work on time performance are for shared rides and Mr. Salvador replied they were.

Member Baldwin made a comment stating that AVTA headquarters is not really a destination for most people, but they have two transit centers, one in Palmdale and one in Lancaster that is more common. He asked if one of those would not be a better option for selling coupons. Faustino Salvador responded that he would look into that.

**PREPARATION OF TRANSFER TRIP EXPANSION**

Mike Greenwood, Chief Operations Officer, presented a brief update on the preparation of transfer trip expansion to take place on July 1, 2019. Staff have been busy putting together some promotional pieces, which he will describe and hand one out after the end of his presentation. The mailers are post card size, double-sided pieces of information that were sent out on June 7, 2019 to 750 riders who have taken at least one transfer trip since July 1, 2018.

**Members Discussion:**

Member Baldwin stated that he could suggest some alternate routes to take if there are ever any road issues or to avoid the mountain roads. Mike Greenwood said he would appreciate any suggestions.

Member Hagen asked how the time was calculated when there was a transfer. If there is an 8pm transfer time then what would be the pick up time. Mike Greenwood suggested one of the contractors respond to this question. Betty Lara from MV Transportation, responded by explaining that this is calculated by using the MTA travel time. They calculate it with the knowledge that this is a shared ride plus the 20 minutes on time window, which is already included. If they are running late then they communicate this with the contractor so that they get the leeway to arrive and make sure the connection is not missed.
MEMBER COMMUNICATION

Vice-Chair Arrigo thanked Mike Greenwood and everyone involved in the Transfer Trip program. He stated that his comment was for the Parents with Disabilities Program. Yael Hagen attended the meeting, when it first appeared on the agenda because she was a big supporter of this item. She went through the most common route to be appointed to this committee. There was no bias in appointing her to the CAC. Ms. Hagen is very well informed because she is an advocate for the Parents with Disabilities program.

Member Baldwin stated that there was a concern about the budget and that concern comes down to a person being fearful that something might be taken away but he always tries to encourage people that he works with that the size of the pie is not fixed, it can get bigger. Just because someone is benefiting from the budget does not mean that not everybody can benefit from it. He is more concerned about the substitution of 40% discretionary Prop C money last year with 24 million of Measure M money without an expansion of services. Also, this year of the 12 million of Measure M, they're using almost 10 million on improving service and telling the contractor, that if they don't meet the KPIs, they are going to fine them.

Member Almalel stated that when Customer Service needs to investigate an issue do they research the history of it because she recently she had a creepy driver that she wrote up a complaint about. She felt the driver needed social awareness training. Some weeks later, she got the same driver and he locked her out of the vehicle in 55 degree weather while refusing to transport her and called the road supervisor. The driver did not want to take her and they had to wait for the road supervisor for a three-mile trip in the valley. She is wondering if they are evaluating the driver assigned or the driver that actually transported her. The road supervisor and the driver will always vouch for each other and she is wondering how far down she has to go to find out the actual details.

Member Cabil stated that there were some informational flyers on events happening in the Antelope Valley that she picked up on Sexual Assault Awareness, a Multicultural Symposium, some safety tips for Fourth of July from the LA County Fire department, some information on dog safety and a Palmdale Neighborhood Services and Housing rights information. She has those flyers available for anyone who would like to take a look.

CAC GOALS RETREAT SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Matthew Avancena, Director of Planning and Coordination, asked Member Baldwin and Member Hagen to discuss steps to be taken concerning the results of the recent subcommittee meetings for April, May and June. Member Baldwin spoke about the June meeting and the discussion in which Mike Greenwood explained what trips look like and how much time they take. Over 70% of those trips are less than an hour and just under 3% are more than two hours. The committee asked for more information on these type
of trips. Mike Greenwood will be providing more data specifically on the trips that last more than two hours. Most of them are outside of the contract service area. They will try to see if there is a way they can minimize travel time for those riders and define what that means. They also discussed the issue of stranding and the context of missed trips and mismatched trips. This concludes the update of the Operation subcommittee meeting.

Member Hagen discussed the other issues that were discussed at the subcommittee meeting. She explained the outline for the report of Board of Directors given by the CAC Chair and also about the QSS report given to the CAC. She explained that there would be four columns which would include the item, a short synopsis of the item, a short synopsis of the discussion and if there was any action taken. This would keep the information consistent and organized for the person reporting on the meetings. They also discussed the availability of the meeting room and will be reporting more information on that. Lastly, the CAC bylaws were discussed and the areas that they need to take a closer look into such as members’ attendance and the selection process. Member Baldwin added that they also discussed the description of responsibilities of the CAC members, the Chair and Vice-Chair. He clarified that they spoke about participation of the members and not so much the attendance.

Member Baldwin asked for a motion to approve the outline of the report proposed by the CAC Subcommittee.

Motion: Member Baldwin
Seconded: Member Francois
Opposed: Member Lyons
Motion: Passed

There were two possible options presented for a way to report for the Board of Directors meeting. The first was an outline with boxes describing each item and providing four points with a brief description of each item. The second option was more of a paragraph format with the same four points included.

Member Lyons stated that the first outline of the report presented to her will not work for her. Member Baldwin responded that if there is a special need on how information needs to be presented to them, then all they need to do is ask and it will be given to them in the appropriate format.

Chair Aroch stated that she would like the second option presented because in the manner that it is constructed, it is easier for her to read and to communicate the information. Since she is the one giving the report, she would prefer this format.

Member Francois asked if it was possible to include several lines inside the boxes to facilitate the description of the items. If the issue was the difficulty of reading the information this could facilitate it.
Chair Aroch responded that the second format is more convenient for her because all she has to do is read it and it has the same exact information in it that is needed which is the four points of organization per item.

Member Baldwin clarified that he doesn’t think the way it is formatted really matters. He states that the actual content of what is reported follows the guidelines and always includes the four key elements previously discussed as follows, the item, a short synopsis of the item, essence of the discussion and if there was any action taken.

QSS MEETING REPORT

Rycharde Martindale, ADA Coordinator, gave a report on the May 16, 2019 QSS meeting. Some quick highlights are as follows:

- On line booking update;
- Recommendations for future improvements to the functionality of the “Where’s My Ride” app;
- Recommendations for the definition and development of Same Day ride/trips; and appointment of a QSS/CAC Liaison.

Some of the possible volunteers to provide the QSS report at the CAC meetings, in a rotating capacity include: Liz Lyons, Ronald Harris, and Wilma Ballew.

Member Discussion:

Member Hagen stated that she would like to table the decision on who will be providing the QSS report to the CAC at this time since it is still in discussion for future subcommittee meetings. She asked if they need to make a motion to table this discussion but since there was no motion made, then it is not necessary.

Member Baldwin stated that the discussion of reporting from the QSS to the CAC be postponed until further notice since they are still in the process of figuring out the logistics of it in their subcommittee discussions.

CUSTOMER SATISFACTION SURVEY

Eric Haack, Strategic Planner, discussed the Customer Satisfaction Survey by presenting nine topics that were suggested by TPAC and CAC as recommended additions to the survey. They are as follows:

- The question to ask if the rider had Medicare or not as that might apply to different funding sources;
- Where’s my Ride questions with respect to their experience with the app;
- The comfort of the vehicle and what applies to the cleanliness;
- Trip length, whether or not the trips were too long;
- Seat belt extensions or safety concerning these devices;
- Overall impression of Access;
- Experience of riders going back to the last three trips;
- Demographic information such as requesting gender identity;
- The issue of stranding

**Member Discussion:**

Member Lyons asked if there would be a short version of the survey for those riders that do not want to do the long survey. Eric Haack responded that this is something they can discuss with the survey company. There might be an issue with statistical validity if there are two types of surveys. Another option could be to offer a shorter version of the survey in the near future.

Member Hagen stated that question concerning how many years they have used Access would get more information if they spaced it out more by five years. There is a bigger difference between someone who use the service in the last five years and someone who has used the service in the last 20 years. Someone riding for five years is still considered a fairly new rider. Spacing it out for one year doesn't give them a lot of information but spacing them out in five years gives a better idea.

Member Francois asked if they want to find out specifically if they have Medicare or actual Medical Insurance coverage. Eric Haack responded that the reason they ask about Medicare is that this could be a potential source of funding or reimbursement for Access.

Member Cabil stated that she hears many issues from her peers and strangers concerning the evaluation process because often they are dissatisfied and disappointed. She is also concerned that those with mental health issues, in what is considered an invisible illness, are not given the same attention regarding the evaluation process when she first applied she was denied and she didn’t know anything about an appeal process. When she did reapply, she had some physical challenges that were starting to surface. She wants the eligibility process and the appeals to both be covered in the survey questions.

Eric Haack asked for clarification if she wanted an overview of the customer experience of that through this survey, then he believes he understands. Member Cabil responded that she would like the stats of those who have had it and then were denied and also labeled under different categories such as age and physical or mental disability. Member Baldwin stated that he has those stats and will provide them to Ms. Cabil.

Member Baldwin wanted to follow up with what Member Francois was asking concerning the Medicare Coverage question. He wanted to point out that transportation is not covered by Medicare. During the coordinated care initiative both Medicare and Medi-Cal were required to provide an extra level of transportation. He doesn’t see the insurance companies adding transportation to their coverage. Maybe Eric can add a question concerning insurance and medical groups instead, questions about health care
providers.

Member Cardona asked if this could be posted on the website. Eric Haack thanked him for that suggestion.

Vice-Chair Arrigo thanked Eric for this survey and asked if it was possible to have a self-addressed stamped envelope attached to the survey or maybe the drivers could hand them out as well. This can increase rider participation in the survey. As a Medi-Cal patient, he has now been offered transportation and he will be reporting on how it works once he uses it.

Member Almalel wanted to add the question about the procedure process in contacting the OMC. There should be a question to ask if they even know what that acronym means. Many riders might not know what it is or that it is even an option to contact them if they need a ride.

Member Hagen wanted to clarify what Member Almalel was stating concerning the OMC by suggesting that they put a phone number that might jar people’s memories as to where they call. In the question about Medi-Cal and Medicare, there will be multiple answers so there needs to be the ability to record multiple answers so this is something that the survey company needs to be aware of.

Member Francois stated that there might be locals that were not aware that they can call the OMC and this question might be answered with bias. Eric Haack understands that if someone who has had an experience with this would be able to give an answer versus someone who has never experienced it.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Aroch asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting.

**Motion:** Member Lyons

**Second:** Member Francois

The meeting adjourned at 3:06 pm
TO: COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
FROM: ERIC HAACK, STRATEGIC PLANNER  
RE: ACCESS SERVICES 2019 CUSTOMER SATISFACTION TELEPHONE SURVEY

ISSUE:
Access Services intends to conduct a Customer Satisfaction Survey in the summer or fall of 2019. Prior to beginning this survey, Access staff are seeking input from the Community Advisory Committee (CAC) members and Transportation Professionals Advisory Committee (TPAC).

On Thursday, March 14, 2019, the TPAC membership provided input on the survey and Access staff received comments from the CAC on Tuesday, May 14, 2019 and Tuesday, June 11, 2019.

This memo summarizes those items sought for consideration in the 2019 Access Customer Satisfaction Survey as well as proposed text of the questions to be asked.

TOPICS SOUGHT FOR DISCUSSION AND PROPOSED QUESTION LANGUAGE:

On the pages that follow, are the topics discussed by the TPAC and CAC committees with respect to incorporating additional topics into the Customer Satisfaction Survey script. Each raised topic is followed by the proposed question language or discussion as to why it may not be included in this particular 2019 Customer Satisfaction Survey.

CAC membership input is sought to determine if Access staff has accurately captured the intent expressed for including new elements in the survey script.
1) Is the respondent Medicare eligible? The TPAC committee raised this question, however, the CAC put greater specificity on how the question could be phrased.

62b. How do you receive health care? Or what type of health insurance do you have?
   1. Medicare
   2. Medi-CAL
   3. Private Health Insurance
   4. None
   5. Other (Write down customer’s response)

2) Eligibility Appeals Process - Provide questions for customers to discuss their satisfaction with the Eligibility Appeals process, if they did participate in such. Also, include information on the overall Eligibility Process that Access conducts.

   Eligibility experiences have not been covered in previous Customer Satisfaction Surveys. Perhaps this would be a good topic for a separate Eligibility Survey covering the eligibility process and appeals process.

3) Where’s My Ride Mobile Application Experience - Provide questions for customers to discuss whether they have used the app; do they like or dislike it; do they have any issues with the application?

51a. Have you used Access’ Mobile App, Where’s My Ride, which helps you determine how soon your van will arrive for a scheduled pick-up?

   51a-1. Do you like or dislike the Where’s My Ride mobile app?
         1. Yes
         2. No

   51a-2. Have you had any issues with the Where’s My Ride App that you would like to share?
         1. No
         2. If Yes, type verbatim respondent’s issue:
         99. (Refused) (Do not read)
4) Comfort of the Vehicle - The 2017 survey has questions related to the (a) appearance, (b) comfort, and (c) cleanliness of the vehicle a customer traveled in. It is intended that these questions will remain in the 2019 survey.

Please tell me whether you were … very satisfied … somewhat satisfied … neither satisfied nor dissatisfied … somewhat dissatisfied … or very dissatisfied with …?

(ROTATE AND READ QUESTIONS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Very Smt</th>
<th>Smt</th>
<th>Neither Smt</th>
<th>Dissat</th>
<th>Dissat</th>
<th>Ref</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. The appearance of the vehicle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. The comfort of the vehicle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. The cleanliness of the vehicle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. Did you have any difficulty or problems getting into or out of the vehicle?
   1. Yes
   2. No

5) Trip Length - Ask if the customers feel if their trips take the right amount of time, or are too long. Question 3 of the 2017 survey asked about a customer’s travel time on Access. That question will remain in the 2019 survey, but an additional question can be added, if desired.

3. Compared to taking the bus, would you say the travel time for your most recent trip with Access was …? (READ CHOICES)
   1. Shorter than taking the bus
   2. About the same as taking the bus
   3. Longer than taking the bus
   99. Don’t know/Don’t Remember (DO NOT READ)

6) Seat Belt Extension / Posey Belt - Ask a question of whether drivers have offered seat belt extensions to customers who desire it.

I would seek clarification of the sought-after objective of this question. Perhaps a question could be included specifically did a customer feel “safe” during their trip and then, if the answer is “no”, there could be a follow-up question of why did the customer not feel safe.

7) Ask on More than the “Last Trip” taken on Access, but instead ask about “Last 3 trips” or “overall opinion of Access.” -

The 2017 survey included questions on a customers most recent (last) trip using Access (questions 3 through 22). Additional questions have been added allowing the customer to discuss their overall opinion of Access (questions 23 through 25).
8) Include in Demographic Questions transgender information as an option.

62.a Would you identify yourself as one of the following categories (READ CHOICES)
1. Gay
2. Lesbian
3. Transgender
98. or something else

9) Experience with Stranding by Access - Ask questions of (a) whether a customer has been stranded and (b) whether they were able to schedule a back-up trip through Access. Questions 33 through 36 of the 2017 survey relate to a customer requesting a back-up trip from the Operations Monitoring Center, but maybe more detail is sought on this topic.

33. Have you ever called Access Operations Monitoring Center (OMC) because you needed to reschedule a trip or due to a missing a trip that left you stranded?
   1. Yes (ASK Q.34)
   2. No (SKIP TO Q.37)

10) Revise the language of how long have you been an Access customer? Not limit it to only “five or more” years.

1. Approximately how long have you been using Access Paratransit? (READ CHOICES)
   1. Less than one year (CONTINUE)
   3. One year to less than two years (CONTINUE)
   4. Two years to less than three years (CONTINUE)
   5. Three years to less than five years (CONTINUE)
   6. Five years to less than ten years (CONTINUE)
   7. Ten years to less than fifteen years (CONTINUE)
   8. Fifteen years or more (CONTINUE)
97. Don’t use Access (THANK AND TERMINATE)
99. Don’t know/Don’t Remember (CONTINUE)
JULY 9, 2019

TO: CAC
FROM: MATTHEW AVANCENA, DIRECTOR, PLANNING AND COORDINATION
SUBJECT: CAC SUBCOMMITTEE UPDATE

BACKGROUND:
The following is a summary of the June 20 Operations and Bylaws/Process subcommittee conference call:

In attendance were CAC subcommittee chairs Yael Hagen and Kurt Baldwin, Access staff Mike Greenwood, Matthew Avancena, Rogelio Gomez and Susanna Cadenas.

Due to the absence of most subcommittee members we did not work to develop recommendations, rather for the Operations subcommittee we reviewed the refined data provided by Mike Greenwood and made additional requests for data on long rides.

For the Bylaws/process subcommittee we discussed CAC meeting time length and the method to look at potential changes to the bylaws.