AGENDA
TRANSPORTATION PROFESSIONALS ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TPAC) MEETING

Thursday, January 15, 2015
9:30 a.m. - 11:30 a.m.
Access Services Headquarters
3449 Santa Anita Avenue
3rd Floor Conference Room
El Monte CA, 91731

TPAC MISSION STATEMENT
Through our diversity and expertise in the transportation industry, the Transportation Professionals Advisory Committee provides the Access Board our perspective, advice, and advocacy with an understanding of the community, environment, and regulations.

TPAC promotes innovative, cost effective and high quality specialized transportation solutions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
<th>Disposition</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Call to Order</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Introductions</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>December 11, 2014</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>3-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting Minutes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>General Public Comment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chair/Public</td>
<td>Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 to facilitate communication. In determining the type of auxiliary aids 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 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: ASI board 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 both initially and supplementary prior to the meeting at the agency’s offices located at 3449 Santa Anita Avenue 3rd Floor, El Monte, California and on its website at http://accessla.org. Documents, including Power Point handouts distributed to Board Members by staff or Board members at the meeting will simultaneously be made available to the public. Three opportunities are available for the public to address the board during a board meeting: (1) before closed session regarding matters to be discussed in closed session, (2) before a specific agendized item is debated and voted upon regarding that item and (3) general public comment. The exercise of the right to address the board 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 Secretary to 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 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 Board of Directors 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 may direct staff to investigate and/or schedule certain matters for consideration at a future Board of Directors Meeting and the staff will respond to all public comment in writing prior to the next board meeting.
TRANSPORTATION PROFESSIONALS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES FOR THURSDAY, December 11, 2014

CALL TO ORDER
Vice Chairperson Kathryn Engel called the meeting to order at 9:36 a.m.

INTRODUCTIONS
TPAC members and alternates in attendance: Ashley Koger, Darren Uhl Gracie Davis, Jess Segovia, Jesse Valdez, Kathryn Engel, LaShawn Gillespie Valerie Gibson, Benjamin Alcazar, Dana Pynn.

TPAC Members absent: David Feinberg, Diane Amaya, Evelyn Galindo, Jose Medrano.

Guest: Marlene Grossman, Move LA; Laurie Crane, Move LA; Helen Tran, Neighborhood Legal Services; Giovanna Grogreve, Metro.


CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT
No Chairpersons report at this time.

Approve October 16, 2014 Meeting Minutes

Motion: Vice Chair Engel requested a motion to approve the October 16, 2014 minutes.
First: Ms. Pynn
Second: Ms. Davis
Vote: The minutes will be approved with any necessary changes.

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT
No General Public Comment heard at this time.

REPORT FROM BOARD OF DIRECTORS
No report was given at this time.
REVISIONS TO ACCESS’ NO SHOW/CANCELLATION POLICY

Jack Garate, Operations Administrator presented the revised No Show/Cancellation Policy. The intent of the change is to be reasonable and liberal. The comparative change is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current No Show Policy</th>
<th>Proposed No Show Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Six (6) or more no-shows in a 60 day period maybe suspended</td>
<td>Five (5) or more no shows or late cancellations maybe subject to suspension if the no shows equate and or exceed 10% of their overall trips during one calendar month.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Suspension Policy</th>
<th>Proposed Suspension Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 days after the first occurrence</td>
<td>15 days after the first occurrence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 days after the second occurrence</td>
<td>30 days for every occurrence thereafter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 days after the third occurrence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 days after the fourth occurrence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Subscription Trip Cancellation Policy</th>
<th>Proposed Subscription Trip Cancellation Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subscription trips cancelled after 10:00 p.m. the night before as a no-show</td>
<td>Subscription trips cancelled less than two (2) hours from the schedule pick-up time shall be regarded as a no-show.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Motion: Vice Chair Engel requested a motion to approve staff recommendation for proposed No Show/Cancellation Policy
First: Mr. Valdez
Second: Ms. Davis
Vote: Motion passes as proposed.

TRIENNIAL REVIEW UPDATE: ORIGIN TO DESTINATION

Andre Colaiace, Deputy Executive Director, Planning and Governmental Affairs presented an overview of the Federal Transit Administration’s finding with respect to Origin to Destination.
Mr. Colaiace shared with the committee that Access is committed to implementing the Origin-to-Destination (OTD) service and will formulate an Ad Hoc regional working group. The goal for the Ad Hoc working group is to review other agencies OTD policies and from the research arrive at a recommendation that outlines the service.

Mr. Colaiace also shared that Access will continue to work with HDR Engineering to calculate projected costs to implement and maintain the service. The approved policy will be used as a resource in calculating the costs of Origin-to-Destination service. The cost projections for Origin-to-Destination will be included in Access’ annual budget request to METRO.

Vice Chair Engel requested volunteers to participate in the TPAC Ad Hoc Committee for Origin-to-Destination. Gracie Davis, Jess Segovia and Valerie Gibson volunteered.

**TRIENNIAL REVIEW UPDATE : FARES**

Andre Colaiace presented an overview of the Federal Transit Administration’s finding with respect to Access Fares. Access is a coordinated system with a coordinated fare that has been in place for nearly 20 years.

Mr. Colaiace shared the recent findings that Access charges more than twice the fixed route fare for comparable trips on their system. Access was forced to review fare options.

In an effort to resolve the fare finding, Access requested member agency input on resolving the fare finding with one of the three options presented.

- Move to a dynamic fare system in which fares for each trip will be calculated using the trip planner on www.metro.net or www.go511.com. The Access fare maybe double the lowest fare quoted. Trips cannot be provided by fixed route services may be denied.
Given that the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) regulations encourage a coordinated paratransit plan but do not address a coordinated paratransit fare, direct staff to seek legislative or regulatory change to allow for a coordinated fare when operating under a coordinated plan.

- Require all member agencies to have a minimum base fare or adopt a unified fare structure in order to set a compliant regional fare for ADA paratransit service.

The FTA findings and options will be presented at the upcoming member agency information session.

**MOVE LA: MEASURE R SALES TAX**

Marlene Grossman of Move LA, presented the collaborative efforts of community partners that include government, public and private agencies to support transportation funding through a ballot measure.

Move LA is continuing its campaign through education and outreach to hear transit expansion ideas from various stakeholders in the community. Move LA’s goal is to have Measure R2 as an official ballot measure in the 2016 election.

**CTSA CLASSES**

Evie Palicz, Manager of Training and Development announced upcoming Professional Development Workshop opportunities offered by Access Services. Ms. Palicz encouraged committee members and attendees to review the classes and to share the information with their respective agencies. Ms. Palicz also shared the details about the Jerry Walker Commitment to Quality Service Award, encouraged committee members and attendees to consider nominating a candidate for the award.
New Business Subsequent to the Posting of the Agenda
Ms. Davis suggested since there are multiple issues to be discussed, such as Origin-to-Destination and fare findings, it is imperative to schedule ad hoc meetings in the coming months.

Vice-Chair Kathryn Engel convened a special subcommittee to research Origin-to-Destination policies.

ADJOURNMENT
Motion: Vice Chair Engel requested a motion to adjourn.
First: Mr. Segovia
Second: Ms. Davis
Vote: Meeting was adjourned at 11:30 a.m.
TO: TRANSPORTATION PROFESSIONALS ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TPAC)

FROM: MATTHEW AVANCENA, MANAGER, PLANNING AND COORDINATION
      ALFREDO TORALES, PROJECT ADMINISTRATOR

RE: TPAC SUBCOMMITTEE ON ORIGIN TO DESTINATION

ISSUE:

Currently, Access Services and 10 Access Services member agencies (Gardena Bus Lines, Long Beach Transit, Beach Cities Transit, Torrance Transit, Santa Monica’s Big Blue Bus, Antelope Valley Transit Authority, Santa Clarita Transit, Culver City Bus, Foothill Transit, and Metro) have received a FTA finding that Access is not providing Origin to Destination service.

TPAC members formed a subcommittee to collect information on origin-to-destination policies from other agencies across the country to advise Access on best practices for consideration.

RECOMMENDATION:

The TPAC Subcommittee recommends using the following principles, based on MTS San Diego’s origin-to-destination policy, as a foundation for developing Access’ origin-to-destination policy and for use by the Ad Hoc Working Group on Origin-to-Destination:

1. Primary Service:
   a. Access is a curb-to-curb service offering origin-to-destination service option for customers who request it.

2. When origin-to-destination request is made:
   a. At the time of reservation;
   b. Request not made at reservations, will be accommodated as best as possible
   c. No eligibility component at this time
3. Driver and Vehicle Requirements
   a. Driver must maintain visual sight of vehicle at all times
   b. Driver cannot exceed 60 or 100 ft. from vehicle
   c. Drivers will remain on ground level / 1st floor of building; driver may walk up a few steps, such as a porch, to assist passenger (as deemed safe by Driver)
   d. Driver requires a safe and accessible path of travel
   e. Driver will not enter any private residences

4. Assisting passengers
   a. Drivers will assist with packages as long as meeting current Access package policy
   b. Drivers will assist manual wheelchairs beyond the curb, if requested, if safe an accessible path of travel

5. Changing origin-to-destination to curb-to-curb, due to unforeseen factors
   a. Unsafe parking, or unsafe, inaccessible path beyond the curb
   b. Driver will assist the customer to the point where the path is no longer accessible or safe.
   c. Driver cannot maintain visual contact with vehicle
   d. Driver must always contact dispatch before making change to service

Further issues to discuss in the future:
- Cost and Productivity Implications
- Luggage policy (specific to airports, cruise ship docks, train/bus stations)
- Tinted windows vs clear windows
- Eligibility assessment
- Provide all door-to-door in pilot program
- Losing sight of vehicle if needing to go around the corner (vehicle must be safely parked and be empty)
BACKGROUND:

At the December 11, 2014, TPAC Meeting, TPAC members Jess Segovia (Metro), Valerie Gibson (City of Pasadena), and Gracie Davis (OCTA) formed a subcommittee to collect information on origin-to-destination policies from other agencies.

Subcommittee Accomplishments

- Subcommittee established at December 2014 TPAC Meeting
- 1st conference call between the TPAC subcommittee and Access staff to review information collected took place on Monday, December 22, 2014.
- A matrix was developed to identify the components of the origin to destination policies by agency (see attached)
- 2nd conference call between the TPAC subcommittee and Access staff to review information and make a recommendation took place on Tuesday, January 06, 2015.
- The recommendation formed by the TPAC subcommittee was to use San Diego’s (MTS) origin to destination policy as a foundation for Access to develop its own policy.
- The recommendation is being forwarded to the Ad Hoc Working Group on Origin-to-Destination for consideration in developing a policy recommendation.
JANUARY 15, 2015

TO: TRANSPORTATION PROFESSIONALS ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TPAC)

FROM: ANDRE COLAIACE, DEPUTY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF PLANNING AND GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS
ALFREDO TORALES, PROJECT ADMINISTRATOR

RE: REVIEW OF TRIENNIAL FINDING ACTION PLAN: ORIGIN TO DESTINATION

ISSUE:

Every year, the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) conducts Triennial Reviews of certain transit agencies who receive federal funds to ensure they are complying with various federal laws and regulations. During the 2013 and 2014 Triennial Review cycles and, in the case of Access, the 2013 State Management Review cycle, the FTA found that Access did not provide “Origin to Destination” service to its customers. While Access has always operated a curb-to-curb, paratransit system, the FTA maintains that service must be provided beyond the curb for passengers whose disabilities may require such assistance in order to reach their destination or leave their point of origin.

Currently, Access Services and 10 Access Services member agencies (Gardena Bus Lines, Long Beach Transit, Beach Cities Transit, Torrance Transit, Santa Monica’s Big Blue Bus, Antelope Valley Transit Authority, Santa Clarita Transit, Culver City Bus, Foothill Transit, and Metro) have received a FTA finding that Access is not providing Origin to Destination service.

RECOMMENDATION:

- Review the attached Origin to Destination implementation timeline including major milestones and to forward the milestones to the Federal Transit Administration.

IMPACT ON BUDGET:

Unknown at this time. After consulting with other transit agencies around the country, staff believes that previous cost projections as developed by HDR are too speculative and the region would benefit from a more in-depth study of the costs of this service. Given that other transit agencies have made the transition
from a pure curb-to-curb system to an “origin to destination” system, there is now enough data to come to a reasonably accurate cost estimate. However, given the Agency's goal to implement this service by July 1, 2015 HDR may only be able to give an estimate for our initial funding request for FY 15-16.

**BACKGROUND:**

Since 2005, Metro staff has been in general agreement with Access staff that Origin to Destination Service and other so-called “reasonable modifications” are not required under the ADA and its regulations. This agreement continued up until last year when Access was informed that Metro’s thinking on this issue had changed and that staff was recommending that Access provide Origin to Destination service.

Given this, it is necessary for the region to once again have a dialogue regarding curb-to-curb versus origin-to-destination (or door-to-door) and then follow a public participation process. The last time the region discussed significant changes to Access’ service model was in 2002 and 2003 when it was decided to move from a same day service model to a next day service model. At that time, an ad hoc group, similar to the one proposed, was created and staff believes it was a constructive way for all the stakeholders to come to an agreement on how to make major changes to the Los Angeles County paratransit system.
PROPOSED ORIGIN TO DESTINATION IMPLEMENTATION MILESTONES

JANUARY 2015
- Access Board Chair appoints members of the Ad Hoc Working Group
- Ad Hoc Working Group meets to draft policy recommendation on Origin to Destination Policy
- Community Meetings in every region for community outreach
- Receive feedback at QSS, CAC, TPAC Meetings

FEBRUARY 2015
- Final policy recommendation developed by Ad Hoc Working Group
- Present Policy Recommendation to FTA
- Retain HDR Engineering, Inc. to develop short and long-term cost projections

MARCH 2015
- Public Hearing on Policy Recommendation
- Present Policy Recommendation at CAC and TPAC Meetings
- Present Policy Recommendation at Board of Directors Meeting for Approval

APRIL 2015
- Present an amendment to the Los Angeles County Coordinated Paratransit Plan to the membership of Access.
- Submit a request for funding to the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro)
- Review and Modify Insurance Requirements for Providing Origin to Destination Service for next fiscal year

MAY 2015
- Training of Eligibility and Service Providers Begins
- Initiate revision of Access publications and website
- Amend Eligibility and Service Provider Contracts to include Origin to Destination Service
- Finalize FY16 Budget

JUNE 2015
- Finalize Training of Eligibility and Service Providers

JULY 2015
- Implement Origin to Destination Service
JANUARY 15, 2015

TO: TRANSPORTATION PROFESSIONALS ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TPAC)

FROM: ANDRE COLAIACE, DEPUTY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF PLANNING AND GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS
       ALFREDO TORALES, PROJECT ADMINISTRATOR

RE: REVIEW OF TRIENNIAL FINDING ACTION PLAN: ACCESS FARES

ISSUE:

Every year, the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) conducts Triennial Reviews of certain transit agencies who receive federal funds to ensure they are complying with various federal laws and regulations. During the 2014 Triennial Review cycle, some Access member agencies received an FTA finding that Access Services charges more than twice the fixed route fare for comparable trips on their system.

RECOMMENDATION:

Review the following action plan:

- Analyze and propose a dynamic fare system that will meet FTA requirements and be fare revenue neutral. A final recommendation for the proposed dynamic fare system, including cost estimates and a timeline for implementation, should be brought back to the Board at its May 2015 meeting.

- Implement a comprehensive outreach plan (milestones attached) to inform stakeholders and solicit feedback about a proposed dynamic fare system.

- Concurrently, implement a plan to seek legislative or regulatory changes to allow for a coordinated fare when operating under a coordinated plan. At a minimum, authorize staff to petition the United States Department of Transportation for a rulemaking that would amend applicable regulations to allow coordinated paratransit systems like Access to have a coordinated fare.
IMPACT ON BUDGET:

Staff is proposing that any fare plan be fare revenue neutral. Costs related to software programming are still unknown at this time but an estimate will be included in our FY 15/16 budget request. The primary costs associated with the program would be to integrate the dynamic fare system (metro.net) into each contractor’s reservation software.

There is a direct correlation between transit fares and ridership (and the Access budget) which is often called “fare elasticity.” According to Access Services consulting firm, HDR Engineering, the fare elasticity for the overall Access system is -.26 which means a 1 percent increase in real fare (i.e. fare excluding inflation) is expected to result in a 0.26% decrease in ridership. Conversely, it could be expected that a decrease in the real fare would lead to an increase in ridership. HDR has also found that other variables, such as unemployment and gasoline prices, also affect ridership.

BACKGROUND:

Access Services’ coordinated fare, which has been in place for nearly 20 years, is widely supported by both our customers and those who operate our system because it is simple to understand and easy to implement. On August 1, 2006, Access staff sent a letter to the FTA in response to a similar 2005 Triennial statistical analysis of comparable fixed-route fares, has been reviewed numerous times and no deficiencies have been found.

It should be noted that even after Access’ most recent fare adjustment (which was implemented on July 1, 2014) that Access has some of the lowest paratransit fares in the country, particularly for trips less than 20 miles. The fares result in a cost recovery of approximately 6.2%.
Despite these facts, in a follow-up to the respective Triennial Review Final Reports in 2014, FTA’s Region IX office informed five Access Services member agencies (Torrance Transit, Santa Monica’s Big Blue Bus, Culver City Bus, Foothill Transit, and Metro) that the Federal Transit Administration’s (FTA) Office of Civil Rights determined that the fare structure for Access Services did not meet regulatory requirements. The Access base fare of $2.75 was found to be more than twice the member agency’s fixed route base fare and therefore resulted in a deficiency finding for the ADA review area. The finding for Metro related to fares charged by sub-recipients and was due to their role as the transportation-funding agency for Los Angeles County. As the funding agency, Metro has responsibilities to ensure that programs funded by Metro are compliant with ADA requirements.

**Current Fare Methodology**

Since 2005, in order to determine what the regional base fare is for Los Angeles County, Access staff has conducted a periodic statistical analysis of fares paid on fixed route service for comparable ADA complementary trips.

For example, in August, 2005, Access conducted a statistically-valid study of 675 randomly selected trips representing the four basin service regions from Access’s trip database. The sample data represents trips originating from the Eastern, Northern, Southern, and West-Central portions of the county. The sampled trips contained date, pick-up time, pick-up and drop-off address. Each sample Access trip was compared to the fixed route using Metro’s Trip Planner to determine the following:

- The number of transfers required on a fixed route trip
- Total fare amount paid on fixed route

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>MIN. FARE</th>
<th>MAX. FARE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New York City</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCESS (Los Angeles)</td>
<td>$2.75</td>
<td>$3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago CTA</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>$3.50</td>
<td>$6.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTA (Orange County)</td>
<td>$3.60</td>
<td>$3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>$4.50</td>
<td>$4.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Total travel time
- Total distance (miles)

The results were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sample Size (Total Trips)</th>
<th>% of Sample Size</th>
<th>Reg. Total Fare (Fixed Route)</th>
<th>2x Reg. Trip Cost</th>
<th>Avg. Travel Time (min)</th>
<th>Avg. Total Distance (miles)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 19.9 miles</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
<td>$1.80</td>
<td>$3.60</td>
<td>42.62</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 20 miles</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>$2.84</td>
<td>$5.68</td>
<td>116.93</td>
<td>28.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using this methodology, with an average fixed route fare of $1.80, the maximum Access fare could be $3.60 for trips up to 19.9 miles. For trips over 20 miles the average fixed route fare was $2.84 making the Access fare no greater than $5.68.

Since then, before staff considered any fare adjustment, a similar study was conducted to see what the regional fare was. In 2012, the study found that the regional fare should be no more than $4.94 for a trip under 19.9 miles and $8.31 for a trip over 20 miles. In November 2012, the following fare structure was approved and implemented:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LA Basin</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>January 1, 2013</th>
<th>July 1, 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 19.9 miles</td>
<td>$2.25</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 20 miles</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$3.25</td>
<td>$3.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff is currently conducting another study in light of Metro’s recent fare change.

**Discussion of proposed options**

**Dynamic Fare System**

- Move to a dynamic fare system in which fares for each trip will be calculated using the trip planner on www.metro.net or www.go511.com. The Access fare may be double the lowest fare quoted. Trips that cannot be provided by fixed route services may be denied.

During the demonstration phase of Access in the mid-1990s, the Agency attempted to charge the exact fare for a comparable trip. This procedure was discarded because our customers disliked being charged different fares for
different trips. In addition, it proved almost impossible to maintain in practice. A simple one-way trip required an additional three to five minutes to schedule, and over half the time the trip planning computer could not find the address, which required manually making a determination that required ten to fifteen additional minutes.

Staff believes that, even with advances in technology, implementing a “dynamic fare process” would slow down the reservations process. Nevertheless, staff has been talking to various software vendors to see what their current capabilities are and what the costs would be to make changes to their software.

Other issues include:

- If Access decided to charge twice the fixed-route fare for each route booked based on the Metro trip planner, most customers, particularly those that booked longer, regional trips, could pay substantially more than the current fares.

- Access customers would be charged different fares even for an identical trip that occurs at a different time.

- Some regional trips cannot even be done on the fixed-route system. Would Access continue to perform these trips? How would the fare be determined?

- If there are no set fares, would Access customers still be able to use coupons or any other alternative means of payment?

Legislative/Regulatory Change

- Given that the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) regulations encourage a coordinated paratransit plan but do not address a coordinated paratransit fare, direct staff to seek legislative or regulatory changes to allow for a coordinated fare when operating under a coordinated plan.

The current regulations regarding a coordinated paratransit plan read as follows:

49 CFR 37.139 [Plan Contents] (for all plans the applicant must show:)

“(g) Efforts to coordinate service with other entities subject to the complementary paratransit requirements of this part which have overlapping or contiguous service areas or jurisdictions.” (see also 49 CFR 139(h)(4)(iii))
49 CFR 37.141 Requirements for Joint paratransit plan

“(a) Two or more entities with overlapping or contiguous service areas or jurisdictions may develop a joint plan providing for coordinated paratransit service. Joint plans shall identify participating entities and indicate their commitment to participate in the plan.”

49 CFR 37.147 Considerations during FTA review

“In reviewing each plan, at a minimum FTA will consider the following:

(f) the extent to which efforts were made to coordinate with other public entities with overlapping or contiguous services areas or jurisdictions.”

49 CFR Part 37, Appendix D Section 37.141

“The Department believes that, particularly in large, multi-provider regions, a coordinated regional paratransit plan and system are extremely important. Such coordination can do much to ensure that the most comprehensive transportation can be provided with the most efficient use of available resources. We recognize that the effort of putting together such a coordinated system can be a lengthy one. This section is intended to facilitate the process of forming such a coordinated system.”

It is apparent, particularly in Appendix D, that the Department wanted to encourage a coordinated system like Access. However, while the regulations are very specific about the maximum fare that can be charged in an ADA paratransit system, they are silent on how such a fare should be determined in a coordinated system.

A meeting between Access Services and Acting FTA Administrator Therese McMillan and her Executive Staff was held in Washington, DC on December 2nd, 2014 to discuss this issue. After Access made a presentation, the FTA said that, while they appreciated the complexity of the Los Angeles system, they felt that it was now possible for Access to implement a dynamic fare system. However, the FTA did understand that such a system could not be implemented by the original deadline of March 2015 and asked that Access give the FTA an implementation timeline by the March deadline. In that meeting, the FTA also noted that Access or the region could petition the Department of Transportation for a rulemaking to address this issue.
PROPOSED DYNAMIC FARE
PUBLIC PARTICIPATION IMPLEMENTATION MILESTONES

JANUARY-FEBRUARY 2015
• Staff to develop a proposed dynamic fare system

MARCH-APRIL 2015
• Forward proposal to FTA
• Conduct community meetings and hold a public hearing to receive feedback on proposal
• Work with software vendors on cost estimates and timeline

MAY 2015
• Board consideration of proposed dynamic fare system with implementation timeline

JUNE 2015
• Present an amendment to the Los Angeles County Coordinated Paratransit Plan to the membership of Access.
JANUARY 15, 2015

TO: ACCESS TRANSPORTATION PROFESSIONALS ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TPAC)

FROM: JACK GARATE, OPERATIONS ADMINISTRATOR

RE: REVISIONS TO ACCESS SERVICES’ NO SHOW POLICY

ISSUE:

During the 2014 Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Triennial Review process, seven Los Angeles County transit agencies (Torrance Transit, Santa Monica’s Big Blue Bus, Antelope Valley Transit Authority, Santa Clarita, Culver City Bus, Foothill Transit and Los Angeles Metro) received a finding regarding Access Services’ no show and cancellation policies.

Staff presented these recommendations at the QSS meeting on November 13, 2014. Staff also presented and received approval of these recommendations at the CAC meeting on November 18, 2014 and at the TPAC meeting on December 11, 2014.

In addition, staff presented these recommendations at the Access Services’ Membership meeting on December 16, 2014. Staff informed the members that a follow-up presentation, not requiring approval, would be conducted at both the CAC and TPAC before it was presented to the Board of Directors for approval.
RECOMMENDATION:

1. Staff recommends the following changes to the no-show policy.

   - Customers who have 5 or more no-shows or late cancellations during any single month may be subject to suspension if those no shows exceed 10% of their overall scheduled monthly trips;

   - A 15-day suspension will be given for first offenders followed by a 30-day suspension for every occurrence thereafter;

   - Cancellations for subscription trips will be regarded as no-shows when a customer cancels less than two (2) hours from the scheduled pick-up time.

BACKGROUND

As discussed above, a number of Los Angeles County transit agencies received a finding that Access’ no show and late cancellation policies were not compliant with federal rules.

The finding is as follows:

Finding

Insufficient no-show policy
Access Services’ written no-show policy does not take into account frequency of travel prior to suspension. Further, the written policy, which calls for suspending passengers for 10 days after the first occurrence, 30 days for a second occurrence, 60 days for a third occurrence and 90 days for a fourth occurrence of no-shows, does not meet the reasonableness requirement of 49 CFR 37.125(h). Additionally, Access Services treats subscription trips canceled after 10:00pm the night before as no-shows; FTA permits cancellations to be regarded as no-shows only if they are made within one to two hours of the pickup time provided to the passenger.
In formulating a revised policy, staff surveyed a number of transit agencies around the country to see what their no show policies are.

Proposed revisions

Access’ proposed revisions are as follows:

Current no show policy

A customer who has six (6) or more no shows in a 60-day period may be suspended from using Access.

The current policy of notifying a customer after each no show and encouraging them to call staff to discuss will still be in place. The intent of this policy is still to educate customers in order to reduce no shows and conserve scarce regional transit dollars.

Proposed policy

Customers who have five (5) or more no-shows or late cancellations during any single month may be subject to suspension if those no shows exceed 10% of their overall scheduled monthly trips. For example, a customer who has 5 no-shows and has scheduled 10 trips during a month (which equates to a 50 percent no show rate) may be suspended from using Access. A customer who has 5 no shows and has scheduled 100 trips in a month (which equates to a 5% no show rate) will not be suspended from Access.

Current suspension policy

Access’ current policy calls for suspending passengers for 10 days after the first occurrence, 30 days for a second occurrence, 60 days for a third occurrence and 90 days for a fourth occurrence of no-shows.

Proposed suspension policy

A 15-day suspension will be given for first offenders followed by a 30-day
suspension for every occurrence thereafter.

**Current subscription trip cancellation policy**

Access Services treats subscription trips canceled after 10:00pm the night before as no-shows.

**Proposed subscription trip cancellation policy**

Cancellations for subscription trips will be regarded as no-shows when a customer cancels less than two (2) hours from the scheduled pick-up time.

A final version of the policy may be presented at the February 2015 Board of Director’s meeting.