

**ACCESS SERVICES
BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING
MONDAY, MARCH 17, 2008
Closed Session: 12:00 - 1:00 P.M.
General Session: 1:00 - 3:00 P.M.
Los Angeles County MTA
One Gateway Plaza, 3rd Floor
729 Vignes Street, Los Angeles CA 90012**

MISSION STATEMENT

***Access Services promotes access to all modes of transportation
And provides quality ADA paratransit service
on behalf of public transit agencies in Los Angeles County.***

	<u>DISPOSITION</u>
1. CALL TO ORDER	ACTION
2. PUBLIC COMMENT WITH RESPECT TO CLOSED SESSION ITEMS	
3. CLOSED SESSION	DISCUSSION/ POSSIBLE ACTION
A) CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL: CAL. GOV. CODE §54956.9	
I. <u>Existing Litigation:</u> Gov. Code §54956.9 (a)	
(a) Shawana Rodriguez v. All Yellow, Global, Access Services	
(b) United Independent Transit Services v. Access Services	
II. <u>Anticipated Litigation:</u> Gov. Code §54956.9 (b)	
(i) Significant exposure to litigation pursuant to subdivision (b) of Gov. Code §54956.9	
(ii) Initiation of Litigation pursuant to subdivision (c) of Gov. Code §54956.9	
B) CALIFORNIA GOV. CODE §54957 – PERSONNEL ISSUES	
4. SUPERIOR SERVICE AWARDS	PRESENTATION
5. REVIEW & APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE BOARD MEETINGS OF FEBRAURY 25, 2008 (page 4) [Staff Recommendation: Approve]	ACTION [Vote Required: majority of quorum by voice vote]
6. REPORT FROM EX-OFFICIO BOARD MEMBERS	INFORMATION

- | | | |
|-----|---|--|
| 7. | GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT | INFORMATION |
| 8. | CONSENT CALENDAR
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Approval of ASI-2016 - Simon and Company Contract Extension (page 15) b. Authorization of ASI-1465 - Pacific Interpreters Contract Extension (page 17) c. Award of ASI-2483 - Telecommunications Consulting and Services Contract (page 19) d. Amendment of ASI-2100 - Information Technology Consulting & Services (RIDER 360) (page 21) <p style="margin-left: 40px;">[Staff Recommendation: Approve Consent Calendar]</p> | ACTION
[Vote Required: majority of quorum by roll call] |
| 9. | RATIFICATION OF AMENDMENT ASI-1597 – ON-SITE VEHICLE INSPECTION CONTRACT (page 23)
<p style="margin-left: 40px;">[Staff Recommendation: Ratify the Board approval of (i) an extension of Contract No. ASI-1597 On-Site Vehicle Inspection Contract with Vehicle Technical Consultants for a period of one year, November 1, 2008 through October 31, 2009, and (ii) increase the total not-to-exceed contract amount by \$35,000.00 to \$95,000.00 in lieu of \$60,000.00.]</p> | ACTION
[Vote Required: majority of quorum by voice vote] |
| 10. | RATIFICATION OF AMENDMENT ASI-2043 – THIRD PARTY VEHICLE INSPECTION AUDIT CONTRACT (page 24)
<p style="margin-left: 40px;">[Staff Recommendation: Ratify the Board approval of an increase in the total not-to-exceed amount by \$45,000.00 to \$115,000.00 in lieu of \$70,000.00 for Contact No. ASI-2043 Third Party Vehicle Inspection Audit Contract with Vehicle Technical Consultants (VTC).</p> | ACTION
[Vote Required: majority of quorum by voice vote] |
| 11. | AWARD OF ASI-2439 – ELIGIBILITY DETERMINATION SERVICES CONTRACTOR (page 25)
<p style="margin-left: 40px;">[Staff Recommendation: Authorize staff to execute a three-year contract with seven one-year options, for eligibility determination services beginning July 1, 2008 (start-up beginning April 1, 2008) with <i>C.A.R.E. Evaluators, LLC</i> in an amount not to exceed \$6,145,841 for the base three-year period.]</p> | ACTION
[Vote Required: majority of quorum by roll call] |
| 12. | BOARD MEMBER COMMUNICATION | INFORMATION |
| 13. | EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S REPORT | INFORMATION |
| 14. | NEW BUSINESS SUBSEQUENT TO THE POSTING OF THE AGENDA | DISCUSSION/
POSSIBLE 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 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 supplementally prior to the meeting at the agency's offices located at 707 Wilshire Blvd., 9th Floor, Los Angeles California and on its website at <http://asila.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 agenda 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.

**MINUTES
ACCESS SERVICES
BOARD MEETING
JANUARY 14, 2008**

CALL TO ORDER

The Access Services Board of Directors meeting convened at 12:10 p.m. on Monday, February 25, 2008, in the 3rd Floor Board Room of the Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) Building located at One Gateway Plaza in the City of Los Angeles. The presiding Board Member was Dolores Nason, Chairperson. Board Members present included: Jan Heidt, Treasurer, Joyce Rooney, Secretary, Teddie-Joy Remhild, Michael Greenwood, Hugh Hallenberg, Theresa De Vera, Jano Baghdanian, Ex Officio's Shawn Solomon, Joseph Stitcher and Jim Jones, Access Services Legal Counsel. Director Doran Barnes was not in attendance.

Access Services' staff members present included: Shelly Verrinder, Donna Cisco, Kristine Helin, Andre Colaiace, David Foster, Matthew Avancena, F Scott Jewell, Joe King, Lance Sweitzer, Steve Wrenn, Arun Prem, Erik Washington, Sean Frye, Steve Chang, Yvette Richardson, Dan Jordan, Geetu Banerjee, Kandy Kuo, Brian Selwyn, Nicole Leiva, and Luis Pacheco.

PUBLIC COMMENT WITH RESPECT TO CLOSED SESSION ITEMS

No public comments were heard regarding the closed session items.

CLOSED SESSION REPORT

The Board met in Closed Session and reconvened the general portion of the meeting at 1:02 p.m. at which time Shawn Solomon, Chair of the CAC, and Joseph Stitcher, Chair of TPAC joined the general session. Chairperson Nason asked Mr. Jones, Access Services Legal Counsel, to brief the audience on the outcome of the closed session.

Mr. Jones reported that the Board discussed the following existing litigation as set forth in the agenda: Shawana Rodriguez vs. All Yellow Cab, Global Paratransit, and Access Services. As previously reported a settlement had been reached but not yet finalized. A full report will be provided as soon as the agreement has been signed and approved by the courts. The Board also discussed the status of United Independent Transit Services vs. Access Services. No reportable action was taken by the Board with respect to this matter.

Mr. Jones explained the right for public comment and how it could be exercised. He mentioned the general 3 minute limitation on public comment and that anyone who by reason of a specific disability which prevented them from speaking with normal rapidity and who wished to request an accommodation should so indicate on the speaker request form so that the Chairperson could consider and potentially grant additional time to make their statement.

SUPERIOR SERVICE AWARDS

Ms. Margie Morales, a Community Relations Manager from Southland Transit Inc. and Vahik Keshishyan an Independent Contractor/Owner Driver with Tri-City Cab, an affiliate of San Gabriel Transit were both recipients of Superior Service Awards for the month of February 2008.

REVIEW & APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM THE BOARD MEETING OF JANUARY 14, 2008

Director Remhild stated that there were many grammatical and spelling errors in the minutes. She asked that the minutes be proof read in the future to avoid these errors.

Motion: Director Baghdanian moved approval of the January 14, 2008 meeting minutes as corrected.

Second: Director Heidt seconded the motion.

Discussion: None.

Vote: Via Voice Vote.

In Favor: Directors Remhild, Rooney, Greenwood, Heidt, Baghdanian, Hallenberg, and De Vera.

Opposed: None.

Abstention: None.

Pass/Fail: The motion carried.

REPORT FROM EX-OFFICIO BOARD MEMBERS

Shawn Solomon, Chair of the Community Advisory Committee, submitted his report. Access Services Senior Administrative Assistant, Kristine Helin read his report to the Board. Mr. Solomon stated in his report that Sharron Gamble was unable to attend the CAC meeting but asked that staff read her farewell letter to the CAC. Other staff members made announcements regarding the newsletter and the new reservation call routing process that would be available later in the month.

Mr. Solomon also included his sub-committee reports. He reported that Chin-Ho Liao provided a report on a presentation at a Senior Citizen Center. Ken Metz, the Chair of the Service Animal Sub-committee, was unable to attend the CAC meeting, so Access Services Project Administrator, David Foster provided his report. It included a brief update on the selection procurement and deployment of vehicle mats. Mr. Solomon indicated that several mats had been purchased and the trial had begun.

The Shared Ride Sub-committee reported no progress since last month. Staff organized a Town Hall meeting with the FTA, CAC members and riders to help with defining the issue. He also mentioned that one of the CAC's 2008 goals was to create a new committee to reach out to political representatives for additional funding for Access Services. He reported that the results of the discussion were that the sub-committee should coordinate efforts with the Board of Directors. He concluded his report by stating that the Metro Inspector General's audit presentation was lengthy and created a lot of discussion. It was clear that further discussions would be required between the Board of Directors, CAC and Access Services staff.

Joseph Sticher, Chair of the Transportation Professionals Advisory Committee, reported that the committee met on Monday, February 14, 2008 and their agenda was packed with information. Access Services staff member Matthew Avancena reminded all the members to participate in the ride experience program and that their Access Services identification cards were going to expire soon so there was a limited amount of time to take their rides and provide their report. Mr. Avancena also presented the draft summary of findings that were presented to the Board of Directors regarding the Board, CAC and TPAC relationships. He added that they also received a report on the Metro Office of Inspector General Audit. The committee was pleased to see that the results were generally positive in terms of rider satisfaction with the eligibility and functional testing process.

Staff also provided a presentation on the 2009/2013 Capital Plan, and as operators living with the rules of AQMD, they were pleased to see that there was a plan to purchase alternate fueled paratransit vehicles. There was work being done on the implementation of the Medicaid and EMT brokerage issue, as well as, the TAP and Universal Fare System (UFS) program and plans to procure updated centralized reservation and scheduling software. Mr. Stitcher concluded his report by stating that the committee was reminded of the 2008 Brown Act amendments related to the dissemination of information to the Board, CAC, TPAC and the public.

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

Ms. Sandy Varga stated that she noticed that starting from the point when she attended a MTA Board meeting in December 2007; she suddenly started receiving very bad service, including the day of the Board meeting when it took three hours to get a back up ride. She added that after speaking to a staff member, she started receiving better service and had not been picked up late again.

Ms. Varga also mentioned that with the new phone system and with Southland Transit, she had been receiving very bad service by being picked up late and while making reservations she was being hung up on. She added that since the new phone system was installed she had only made two to three reservations and it has gone a little better. She concluded her comment by stating that since the telephone system was currently being worked on they should just do away with the ETA line and let the riders know if their call was outside the 20 minutes window, they should call the Operations Monitoring Center (OMC).

Ms. Abbie Vincent stated that she had been a rider for over 12 years and had served on several sub-committees with Access Services staff. She stated that she was very concerned with the new scheduling policy utilized primarily by Southland Transit and San Gabriel Transit. She stated that pick-up times had very little to do with the time requested and nothing at all to do with the time available. She added that historically if a rider called and asked for a time and that time was not available the rider would receive a time close to the time requested. Now the word negotiation seemed to have no meaning at all and random times were offered. The rider would have a 1 in 24 chance of receiving the time they requested.

Ms. Vincent stated that this made the system unreliable because the rider would not know until the day before they made their trip whether they were receiving their ride or not. She concluded by stating that bus riders never experience this problem, so on this basis alone it would be considered discrimination because riders are given times that are either too late to arrive at their destination on time or too early having to leave before their business was completed. Ms. Vincent stated that she really hoped that this policy would be reconsidered.

Mr. Ken Metz informed the Board that he had in his possession a couple of the mats that the Service Animal Sub-committee was looking to purchase for the Access Services vehicles. He indicated that at the December 2007 CAC meeting they discussed and voted to request that the Board allocate up to \$8,000.00 for mats. He explained that the thinner rubberized mat, he was told by a friend, could be purchased at a discount for \$2.00 to \$3.00 each. The heavier mat, purchased at Home Depot, was 2 ft x 24 inches and cost \$4.00, with no discount. Mr. Metz stated that these types of mats could be used to prevent the service animals from sliding around on the floors of the vehicles. Mr. Metz added that the advantage of the heavier mat was that it kept the service animal from sliding around on the floor and it would keep the heat away from the dog that comes up from the flooring, especially during the summer months.

Mr. Metz concluded his comment by stating that the Service Animal Sub-committee members were experiencing problems periodically with capacity and that too many individuals and service animals were being put in sedans and minivans. He also concurred with Ms. Vincent's comment regarding the

issue of negotiation because when there is negotiation between a rider and a computer the rider really does not have a chance. He also stated that he felt that the word negotiation was a two way street and he really hoped that staff would change the way some of these negotiations were being conducted.

Chairperson Nason stated that as far as the subject of the mats for the service animals, the issue was still being discussed by the CAC and hopefully the mat samples would be available for the CAC to view. Mr. Metz replied that he planned on attending the CAC meeting and to have the mats available. The pilot program would be starting sometime next week.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Director Hallenberg pulled item 8-a (Amendment of ASI-1597 On-site Vehicle Inspection Contract) and item 8-b (Amendment of ASI-2043 Third Party Vehicle Inspection Audit Contract). Director Heidt pulled item 8-c (Amendment of ASI-2082 State Advocacy Contract), for purposes of discussion.

Motion: Director Remhild moved approval of items 8-d (Amendment of ASI-1444 ADA Paratransit Demand Forecasting) and 8-e (Approval to Purchase 20 Expansion Vehicles for Paratransit Service) on the consent calendar.

Second: Director Rooney seconded the motion.

Discussion: None.

Roll Call: Chairperson, Nason asked for a roll call.

In Favor: Directors Rooney, Heidt, Remhild, Greenwood, Hallenberg, Baghdanian, and De Vera.

Opposed: None.

Abstention: None.

Pass/Fail: The motion carried.

Item 8-a Amendment of ASI-1597 On-site Vehicle Inspection Contract, item 8-b Amendment of ASI-2043 Third Party Vehicle Inspection Audit Contract

Director Hallenberg stated that he had some concerns in terms of the alternatives considered. He asked why staff rejected the alternative of putting the contract out to bid.

Access Services Manager of Procurement and Contracts, Brian Selwyn replied that the contractor agreed to extend the contract for one year at no additional charge. The contract had option years available and staff was pleased with the contractor performance so staff is recommending an extension.

Director Hallenberg asked if the contract went out to bid, did staff feel that the successful bidder would come back with a higher fee. Ms. Verrinder replied that staff bids a base term on a contract with option years and in this case staff was asking the Board to authorize an option year. Ms. Verrinder added that because there was still time on the contract, the contractor had been doing a good job and the contractor agreed to extend at no additional cost, staff was asking the Board to authorize the option year contained in the existing contract

Director Hallenberg asked if items 8-a and 8-b were combined in any way because they involved the same contractor. Mr. Selwyn replied that Access Services had the same contractor for items 8-a and 8-b but there were two separate Request for Proposals (RFP) issued. One in November 2005 for item 8-a and one in February 2006 for 8-b. Director Hallenberg also mentioned that staff was also requesting a \$45,000.00 increase on item 8-b.

Mr. Selwyn confirmed that an increase was being requested and the primary reason was because the contract that staff was discussing involved inspection of vehicles at the contractors. Vehicle inspections are required when new vehicles are purchased and when a contract is rebid.

Director Hallenberg stated that he still did not understand what the items had to do with a new contractor in the Valley region. Ms. Verrinder replied that these were two different contract items. The first contract item 8-a was for when a contract was ending, even if it was with the exact same contractor, Access Services must conduct an audit of the vehicles to ensure that the vehicles are at the specifications indicated in the contract minus normal wear and tear. This is done by a third party contractor because any deficiencies would be the responsibility of the existing contractor.

Ms. Verrinder also explained that item 8-b was a contractor to assist staff with on-going audits of the existing fleet. Access Services owns approximately 580 vehicles and 20 percent of those vehicles are continually audited on a random basis. Access Services staff performed the audits along with a third party contractor. Ms. Verrinder stated that there had been more vehicle inspections done by the contractor than previously estimated, so money needs to be added to the contract. This was an administrative change and had nothing to do with the budget, only with the do not exceed amount of the contract.

Item 8-a Amendment of ASI-1597 On-site Vehicle Inspection Contract

Motion: Director Hallenberg moved approval of item 8-a on the consent calendar.

Second: Director Remhild seconded the motion.

Discussion: None.

Roll Call: Chairperson, Nason asked for a roll call.

In Favor: Directors Heidt, Remhild, Greenwood, Hallenberg, Baghdanian, De Vera and Rooney.

Opposed: None.

Abstention: None.

Pass/Fail: The motion carried.

Item 8-b Amendment of ASI-2043 Third Party Vehicle Inspection Audit Contract

Motion: Director Hallenberg moved approval of item 8-b on the consent calendar.

Second: Director Heidt seconded the motion.

Discussion: None.

Roll Call: Chairperson, Nason asked for a roll call.

In Favor: Directors Remhild, Greenwood, Hallenberg, Baghdanian, De Vera, Rooney and Heidt.

Opposed: None.

Abstention: None.

Pass/Fail: The motion carried.

Item 8-c Amendment of ASI-2082 State Advocacy Contract

Director Heidt asked where the CALTRANS building was located. Mr. Colaiace replied that he did not have the exact address, but it was on Spring Street in downtown Los Angeles.

Motion: Director Heidt moved approval of item 8-c on the consent calendar.
Second: Director Remhild seconded the motion.
Discussion: None.
Roll Call: Chairperson, Nason asked for a roll call.
In Favor: Directors Greenwood, Hallenberg, Baghdanian, De Vera, Rooney, Heidt and Remhild.
Opposed: None.
Abstention: None.
Pass/Fail: The motion carried.

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT - CONTINUED

Chairperson Nason stated that during the general public comment portion of today's meeting Ms. Donna Pomerantz's public comment form was accidentally overlooked. She apologized and stated that the Board would now give her the opportunity to make public comment.

Ms. Donna Pomerantz announced her intention to resign from the Community Advisory Committee. She stated that transportation was near and dear to her heart but she felt that she could no longer do the work that she loved within the constraints of the systematic culture. She also stated that she attended the workshop this morning and was pleased with some items and more distressed with others. She stated that she planned to continue to be around in the community because this was her community and near and dear to her. She also stated that she would be the first person to state publicly that if it were not for ADA paratransit there were a number of things that she would not be able to do.

Ms. Pomerantz stated that her concern was the implementation of the policies. She stated that she would still be around as a resource for anyone that would seek her.

Chairperson Nason thanked Ms. Pomerantz for serving on the CAC and hoped to see her at future meetings.

METRO OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL AUDIT OF ACCESS SERVICES – FINAL REPORT

Access Services Director of Strategic Planning Mr. Arun Prem provided a brief overview of the Metro Office of Inspector General's audit and introduced Mr. Michael de Castro, Principal from Thompson, Cobb, Bazilio & Associates, PC and Mr. Jack Shigetomi, Metro Deputy Inspector General Audits who provided more detailed information regarding the audit.

Questions &

Clarification: Director Rooney asked what the average survey response statistics were. Mr. Shigetomi replied that they had a consultant that specialized in surveys and bench marking and the goal was for at least 400 responses to have a statistically valid return. They received 748 responses from the eligibility survey and 823 responses from the rider survey. He stated that they were very confident with the survey results.

Director Remhild asked if the surveys were in writing. Mr. Shigetomi replied, "yes." She also asked if they conducted any oral interviews, and if so, did they take the responses into consideration.

Mr. Shigetomi replied that they conducted oral interviews prior to engaging TCBA to develop the scope for the audit. He also mentioned that when they were asked by the Mayor's office to conduct the audit, they received 4 or 5 written letters that were either

sent to the Mayor's office or to the City Department on Disability. He stated that they interviewed all the individuals that wrote letters and a few other individuals that were past Board members or members of the Community Advisory Committee.

He also added that they asked each of the individuals about their concerns and if they could quantify their complaints with a list or letters they had received but no one submitted quantification, so the written survey was used. He also added that individuals that received the written survey and were unable to fill it out were surveyed over the telephone and alternative formats and languages were also accommodated.

Director Hallenberg asked if there were any comments made regarding functional testing and the fare box simulation compared to the real world. Mr. de Castro replied that the scope of the audit was to determine whether or not CARE's eligibility process was in compliance with ADA. He added that they did not assess whether or not the actual functional test mirrored reality. Whether the actual testing performed by the CARE Evaluators mirrored reality was not part of the scope.

Director Hallenberg stated that he was sure the issue had been brought up before the assessment was conducted. He asked if they had considered the issue at all. Mr. de Castro stated that CARE provided a detailed walkthrough of the functional testing process so that they would have a good understanding of the process. Director Hallenberg asked if they had an opportunity to go on a bus with a motorized wheelchair to see if what it was actually like. Mr. de Castro replied, "no."

Director Remhild stated that there were 16 recommendations made in the report, she asked what their plan was to follow up to ensure that they were taken into consideration and implemented. Mr. Shigetomi replied that they currently don't have any definite plans on following up but the IG's Office conducts follow ups on prior audits based on random selection. This audit could be a candidate for follow up. Mr. Shigetomi informed the Board that the IG's Office does not publish a follow up list until one or two years after the audit had been published to give time to implement recommendations.

Director Heidt asked Mr. Shigetomi, how much did the audit cost and who paid for it. Mr. Shigetomi replied that the audit cost \$101,250.00 and it was being paid for out of the Office of Inspector General's budget.

Public Comment on Item 9 (Metro Office of Inspector General Audit of Access Service – Final Report

Mr. Ruben Gonzalez stated that he was present on behalf of CARE Evaluators. He stated that they were very supportive of the audit, excited but not surprised because they always believed that an objective review of their operations would find that they were in compliance with the ADA standards and in implementing the policies set forth by Access Services. He stated that they were also excited to find out that 80% of the riders surveyed found that the quality of their service was good to excellent and that the appeals process had a higher level sustainability, which showed that on the front end the determinations that they made were on point.

However, they believed that there was always room to improve, especially when it comes to customer service. As an example of that, for the past several months comment cards were provided by CARE to each applicant during the eligibility process. Mr. Gonzalez submitted a binder with copies of the comment cards from the riders to provide real time information on the quality of service.

Ms. Donna Pomerantz stated that she felt that it was imperative that each and every Board member as well as community members read each and every document because there were things that were not in

the 65 page summary document that was in the larger document. She added that it was their responsibility to read it in its entirety. She stated that she had several concerns with the policies and how they were implemented. She felt that it was one of the largest issues, when the audit was going to take place she was one of the CAC members that was interviewed along with other members that were afraid to be named. Ms. Pomerantz stated that they did bring a number of the concerns Director Hallenberg mentioned but once she found out what the scope was, she knew that Access Services and their providers would be found in compliance with the ADA regulations but the larger concerns were with the implementation of the policies.

Ms. Pomerantz stated that she would like to see the total ridership broken down by percentage with different disabilities such as visually impaired, seniors, deaf and physical disabilities. She added that she would also like to see the percentages of those surveyed and their disability group but not their names.

Ms. Sandy Varga stated that she read the entire audit report. She also added that she was a finance professional in the entertainment field for thirty years and also conducted audits and if she conducted an audit using the statistics in this report, she would not have worked again. As she read the report she stated that she found the information impossible to believe from her experience. She stated that she was an active patient and she was constantly at medical locations where there were many Access Services riders and she had never heard anywhere near the percentage of positive comments regarding Access Services, that was why she found it difficult to understand the findings. Ms. Varga stated that she was not one of the individuals that was interviewed although she met the criteria and was re-evaluated and had more than ten rides during that period.

Ms. Verrinder stated that the Access Services Board of Directors as a whole was responsible for ensuring compliance with the ADA regulations. In addition, the audit made a number of different recommendations, many of which were not policy related or items that require Board approval. She stated that there was one item that discussed modifying the recertification process of Access Services and currently Access Services requires that all recertifying applicants had to be seen for an in person evaluation.

Ms. Verrinder indicated that at the end of September or October all of Access Services existing riders would have gone through the recertification process and the functional data that was needed to conduct the evaluation would have been obtained. The audit recommendation was for staff to move forward with some form of a tiered recertification process and that would require Board approval as a change to the existing paratransit plan. Ms. Verrinder also mentioned that staff was moving forward with making the recommended modification to the paratransit plan which would required staff to solicitation of advice and input from all of its Member Agencies. She added that the eligibility contract was out for bid and based upon the audit recommendations staff added an option to the eligibility Request for Proposal (RFP) that takes into account a modification of the recertification process.

Ms. Verrinder also stated that in the early stages of the audit process the Board was sent a letter from Mr. Jack Shigetomi from the IG's Office that recommended that staff wholeheartedly agreed with, that the Board needed to be the deciding factor on recommendations and staff needed to provide the Board periodically with the status of each open recommendation. The IG's recommendations were, if staff was not going to implement or felt that they should not implement one of the recommendations or an audit finding, that the Board be the final decision to close it out. Staff agrees with these recommendations

Ms. Verrinder concluded her comment by stating that staff would be providing the Board, at least quarterly, with status reports on recommendations and if it was the staff's intention not to implement a recommendation, then the Board would have to approve that formally. Ms. Verrinder stated that over

the next few months the Board should expect items to come to the Board for approval and next month there might be an item to modify the paratransit plan.

Chairperson Nason reminded the Board that this was an information item only. She thanked Mr. de Castro and Mr. Shigetomi from the Inspector Generals Office and Mr. Arun Prem for their presentation.

AWARD OF ASI-2439 TRAVEL TRAINING SERVICE CONTRACT

Access Services Director of Governmental Services, Mr. Andre Colaiace provided a brief presentation on the award of the ASI-2439 Travel Training Service Contract.

Questions &

Clarification: Director Remhild asked when an individual signs up to attend this program, how much time was involved in the process. Mr. Colaiace replied that it would depend on the individual involved and how many trainings they would need to complete. A training period could be just one day.

Director Heidt stated that the item in the Board agenda stated that R&D would actively recruit individuals with disabilities to act as travel trainers. Director Heidt asked if there was a possibility that there might be individuals that completed the travel training that could act as mentors informally to other riders. Mr. Colaiace agreed that she had a great idea and would bring the issue up with the R&D representatives.

Public Comment on Item 10 (Award of ASI-2439 Travel Training Service Contract)

Mr. Lee Glaze started off by stating that he had been receiving inadequate service from Southland Transit. He stated that this past Friday he had to go to Cedars Sinai to see his doctor and it was raining. He called Southland Transit to see if the driver would possibly pick him up inside the parking area instead of outside by stand 4, he was told “no” it was not possible. He stated that he called the OMC and talked to Audrey Cervantes, who he stated was a total asset to Access Services, along with Juan Jimenez, Paul Johns and all of the girls in the OMC. He explained his situation and stated that his wheelchair would get ruined if he had to wait out in the rain, but he was told once again that they could not do it. He asked her to call someone that could make it possible, so she called Sean Frye. Mr. Glaze stated that he could not rave enough about Mr. Frye and Joy Moore the receptionist at Access Services.

Mr. Glaze stated that he was finally picked up inside the parking area. He also added that 99 percent of the vehicles at Southland Transit bottom out and when an individual has severe lumbar problems and a vehicle hits a speed bump, it was really painful. He added that he had experienced a similar problem a few months ago and was in excruciating pain and Manuel Ramos, a supervisor at Global Paratransit, took care of the situation. He recommended that the vehicles with suspension problems never leave the yard without the mechanic looking at them first. Mr. Glaze concluded his comment by stating that the new phone system was difficult to use because he was not sure what area or region he lived in. He requested that staff make it a little easier to use.

Motion: Director Hallenberg moved approval of item 10 (Award of ASI-2439 Travel Training Service Contract).

Second: Director Heidt seconded the motion.

Vote: Via Voice Vote.

In Favor: Directors Hallenberg, Baghdanian, De Vera, Rooney, Heidt, Remhild and Greenwood.

Opposed: None.

Abstention: None.

Pass/Fail: The motion carried.

2008 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Access Services Director of Strategic Planning, Mr. Arun Prem introduced Andre Darmanin of SCAG who provided a brief overview on item 11- 2008 Regional Transportation Plan.

Questions &

Clarification: Director Rooney asked since the Governor was taking money away from the public transportation account, and the presentation mentioned the constrained plan, does the plan assume that those dollars would be available or not.

Mr. Darmanin replied with the constrained plan assumed that the money was there but they do not know what was going to happen because the budget revisions would not be coming out for a few months. They may have to redo some numbers when the plan comes out but for now they accounted for what has been taken out from the state.

Director Rooney stated in regards to the new revenue sources, how the region can have any faith that those dollars would be available just for transportation in the future if they can not rely on it now. Mr. Darmanin replied that was why we were in a deficit situation. Some of the projects have been forwarded to the strategic plan and once funding becomes available from the state or federal government or by increasing local taxes or gas taxes those funds would become available and the projects would be moved to the constrained plan.

Director Heidt asked why San Diego was not part of SCAG. Mr. Darmanin replied that was a question that they received all the time. He added that they chose to be their own metropolitan planning agency and it had been like that for a while.

Director Heidt also asked, with all the money that had been put into the Alameda Corridor, why hasn't the high speed rail issue been placed on the state ballot as was promised. Mr. Darmanin replied that would be something that would need to be addressed by the California High Speed Rail Authority because SCAG only had an advisory role on the project. He stated that the California High Speed Rail Authority planned to put something on the ballot in November 2008.

Director Heidt stated that a lot of money was put into the Alameda Corridor and was working now. Mr. Darmanin replied "yes" it was working, a lot of trains were moved from the streets to the Alameda Corridor.

Director Remhild asked what the timeline was for both these plans to be met. Mr. Darmanin replied the year 2035.

Chairperson Nason reminded the Board that this was an information item only. She thanked Mr. Darmanin for his presentation.

BOARD MEMBER COMMUNICATION

Director Remhild stated that she was very involved outside of Access Services conducting trainings in the community for employment of individuals with disabilities under the MediCal 250 percent program. She stated that they had a Bill in the legislature, ABA51 that would improve the program to allow more individuals to benefit from it and for people with disabilities to go to work and to earn 250

percent of the federal poverty level which could be as much as \$54,000.00 a year with full coverage of MediCal on a premium buy-in basis according to their income. She stated that this is the second year that the Bill has been introduced. Last year it was vetoed by the Governor. This year the language was corrected and the Bill has now passed, the assembly is going to the senate.

Director Remhild stated that she was very pleased that Access Services staff and Mr. Andre Colaiace agreed to write a letter of support for this bill to the Governor and the state senate. She concluded her comment by thanking staff and Mr. Colaiace.

Director De Vera stated that the month of February made her one year anniversary as a Board member and it was her pleasure serving on the Board which has not been easy trying to balance school, work and being on a city commission and also being an Access Services rider. She also stated that she will be graduating with her Masters in May 2008. She concluded by stating that she empathized with all of the riders and her reason for serving on the Board was to make the service better for the riders. She also added that she could be found at all the Board meetings, CAC meetings and the City Commission meetings. She thanked Chairperson Nason, Ms. Verrinder and Mr. Jim Jones for taking her under their wing.

Chairperson Nason announced that the next Access Services Board meeting was rescheduled one week early to Monday, March 17, 2008.

Directors Baghdanian and Remhild informed Chairperson Nason that they would not be able to attend the meeting in March due to other commitments.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS' REPORT

Access Service Executive Director Ms. Shelly Verrinder thanked the Board for their commitment to a full day of Access Services today.

NEW BUSINESS SUBSEQUENT TO THE POSTING OF THE AGENDA

No new business was heard subsequent to the posting of the agenda.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion: Director Hallenberg moved to adjourn the meeting.

Second: Director Heidt seconded the motion.

Vote: Via Voice Vote.

Pass/Fail: All were in favor and the meeting adjourned at 3:15 p.m.

Approval

Joyce Rooney, Secretary

Date

MARCH 7, 2008

TO: BOARD OF DIRECTORS

FROM: BRIAN SELWYN, MANAGER OF PROCUREMENT AND CONTRACTS

**RE: APPROVAL OF ASI-2016 - SIMON AND COMPANY CONTRACT
EXTENSION**

ISSUE:

Board approval is being requested to authorize an extension and an increase in funds for the contract with Simon & Company (ASI-2016) for Federal advocacy services.

RECOMMENDATION

Authorize the extension of contract ASI-2016 with Simon & Company, for Federal advocacy services, for the third option year - October 1, 2008 through September 30, 2009.

The monthly retainer will increase by 3.5%, from \$3,120.00 to \$3,229.00, with an additional \$3,229.00 expense per year for travel and other overheads; the one year contract total would be \$41,977.00 and the total contract not-to-exceed will increase from \$121,120.00 to \$163,097.00.

IMPACT ON BUDGET

The Federal advocacy services contract expenses were included in the FY 2008 budget and, if the extension is approved, will be included in the FY 2009 budget.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

Staff is pleased with the performance of Simon & Company and has not considered other alternatives at this time.

EFFECT OF APPROVAL OF STAFF RECOMMENDATION

If this staff recommendation is approved by the board, the staff will be authorized, but not required, to negotiate and enter into a written contract with Simon & Company, Inc for consulting services on terms that are no less favorable to Access Services than those proposed above. Access Services would not be legally bound to this contract unless 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

Staff has been pleased with the work of Simon & Company over the last two years.

- The firm's biggest achievement thus far was helping Access Services receive its first federal earmark. The \$735,000 earmark ASI received in the 2008 appropriations process will be used to help integrate ASI into the regional Transit Access Pass smart card program. The ultimate goal is to allow Access customers to pay fare on fixed-route and Access Services using a single smart card. Staff is in the process of obligating the funds and they should be available for expenditure by the summer.
- This past February, Simon & Company worked with Access staff to prepare and lobby for our FY 09 appropriations request of \$1.5 million to help fund a mobility resource center (which would include eligibility and other agency functions) that is owned and operated by Access Services.
- Simon and Company has also been successful in helping Access Services raise its profile in Washington, DC. In addition to setting up meeting with a number of Congressional offices, Mr. Simon has also set up meetings with key Federal Transit Administration (FTA) officials including Mr. Jim Simpson, the head of the FTA, and his deputy, Ms. Sherry Little.
- Mr. Simon continued to facilitate meetings with USDOT staff. This has resulted in a better working relationship with the Department and helped continue the dialogue on various ADA issues. These discussions led to positive events, including an agreement by FTA Office of Civil Rights staff to hold a recent meeting in Los Angeles to discuss various ADA transit issues with ASI staff and customers.

MARCH 7, 2008

TO: BOARD OF DIRECTORS

FROM: BRIAN SELWYN, MANAGER OF PROCUREMENT AND CONTRACTS

**RE: AUTHORIZATION OF ASI-1465 - PACIFIC INTERPRETERS CONTRACT
EXTENSION**

ISSUE:

Board approval is being requested to increase funds and extend the terms of the foreign language interpretation services contract with Pacific Interpreters (ASI-1465).

RECOMMENDATION:

Authorize an increase in the total not-to-exceed amount by \$20,550.00 to \$100,550.00 in lieu of \$80,000.00 and an extension in the period of performance for one year, from August 1, 2008 through July 31, 2009.

IMPACT ON BUDGET:

This action is consistent with Access Services' proposed budget for FY2009.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:

As the vendor has proposed a *lower* rate for extending the third contract option year (a reduction in the billing rate from \$1.19 per minute to \$1.15 per minute), staff feels that it would be in Access Services' best interest to exercise the third option year of the contract.

EFFECT OF APPROVAL OF STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

If this staff recommendation is approved by the board, the staff would be authorized, but not required, to exercise the existing option to extend the written contract with Pacific Interpreters for foreign language translation services upon terms and conditions no less favorable to Access Services than those currently contained in that contract. Access Services would not be legally bound to the contract unless 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:

Since February 2001 Access Services has provided foreign language translation services for callers both to the Customer Service number and the Reservations numbers. These services are provided via a three-way conference call initiated by the provider call-taker (or customer service agent) and between the caller and the interpreter. The existing contract was awarded through a competitive bid process in 2003. Subject to mutual agreement between ASI and the Contractor, the contract allows for option years, of which this would be the third, beyond the initial three year base contract term.

MARCH 7, 2008

TO: BOARD OF DIRECTORS

FROM: BRIAN SELWYN, MANAGER OF PROCUREMENT AND CONTRACTS

RE: AWARD OF ASI-2483 - TELECOMMUNICATION CONSULTING AND SERVICES CONTRACT

ISSUE:

Board approval is requested for the selection of a contractor to provide consulting services related to Access Services telecommunications network.

RECOMMENDATION:

Authorize staff to execute a three-year contract with two one-year options, for telecommunications consulting and services beginning May 1, 2008 with *The RTP Group* in an amount not to exceed \$380,000.00 for the base three-year period.

IMPACT ON BUDGET:

This action is consistent with the fiscal year 2007-2008 budget and will be budgeted accordingly in future fiscal years.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:

The previous contract for these services exhausted its allowable option years hence requiring that a competitive bid process be undertaken.

EFFECT OF APPROVAL OF STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

If this staff recommendation is approved by the board, the staff will be authorized, but not required, to negotiate and enter into a contract with the RTP Group as a telecommunications consulting and services contractor under terms that are no less favorable to Access Services than those proposed above. Access Services would not be legally bound to this contract unless 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:

The telecommunications consulting and services contract covers a range of tasks that ensures the stability of Access Services' telecommunications network. These tasks include capacity planning, network optimization, and prefix updating of the toll-free 800 phone network as well as crisis/troubleshooting and consulting services.

The Request for Proposals (RFP) was issued on January 3, 2008 with a due date of February 21, 2008 and advertised in local publications. A total of ten (10) firms were provided this bid proposal. Only one (1) firm responded, the RTP Group.

The RTP Group has been providing telecommunications maintenance services for ASI since 1994, and to date, its performance has been exemplary. Nadi Ayromlou from RTP the primary contact with Access Services since 1994 has consistently provided highly responsive and superior service to ensure that the Access Paratransit telecommunication network functions reliably. She has been available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week to solve problems. The RTP Group was awarded the previous contract in January 2003.

Per site charges and prefix updating services represent a 3.8% increase over the previous rates. The hourly pricing represents a 8.9% increase over the previous rates. These increases are deemed reasonable because they are based on rates that are over five years old. All new rates will be in effect for the new three-year base term of the contract.

MARCH 7, 2008

TO: BOARD OF DIRECTORS
FROM: BRIAN SELWYN, MANAGER OF PROCUREMENT AND CONTRACTS
**RE: AMENDMENT OF ASI-2100 – INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY
CONSULTING & SERVICES (RIDER 360)**

ISSUE:

Board approval is being requested to authorize an increase in funds for the information technology consulting and services contract with PDSA, Inc. (ASI-2100: Rider360).

RECOMMENDATION:

Authorize an increase in the total not-to-exceed contract amount by \$200,000.00 to \$750,000.00 in lieu of \$550,000.00.

IMPACT ON BUDGET:

This action is consistent with Access Services' proposed budget for FY2008 and will be budgeted accordingly for FY2009.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:

As this is part of the transitional development of a key infrastructure project and there is one year left on the current contract term staff has deemed it is in ASI's best interest to increase funds at this time.

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 amend the written contract with PDSA, Inc. for information technology and consulting services on terms and conditions no less favorable to Access Services than those proposed above. Access Services would not be legally bound to the contract unless 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:

In April 2006 PDSA, Inc. was awarded an information technology consulting and services contract to develop an integrated data system that would provide a single application to retrieve data on an Access rider. This project, now known as Rider360, included at its beginning an extensive discovery and prioritization process that specifically detailed the scope and costs for the subsequent development and implementation. This process has allowed staff to authorize key phases that would coincide with the authorized not-to-exceed amount of the contract.

To date staff has implemented the first two identified phases of Rider360. The first phase involved both the functional and data development of Eligibility and Trip data as well as Risk Management integration. The second phase involved the complaint data integration as well as the implementation of the “ticketing” application. These two phases, as well as the discovery portion of the project, have nearly exhausted the available funds for this project.

Although the implemented Rider360 is in itself fully functional other phases have been identified that staff feels are of key importance towards enhancing the project. These include enabling the application for internet accessibility (i.e. allowing a rider to look up and print their own details via the internet), integrating other rider related databases (those that are used by a smaller group of staff), as well as addressing additional business needs that have been changed since the project began. The requested amount is a high estimate of the work that will be completed through the end of the base term of the contract (April 2009).

MARCH 7, 2008

TO: BOARD OF DIRECTORS

FROM: BRIAN SELWYN, MANAGER OF PROCUREMENTS AND CONTRACTS

RE: RATIFICATION OF AMENDMENT ASI-1597 – ON-SITE VEHICLE INSPECTION CONTRACT

ISSUE:

The Board approved an amendment to ASI-1597 On-Site Vehicle Inspection Contract at the February 2008 Board Meeting. During the discussion on the item questions were asked of staff, the responses to which were partially and inadvertently inaccurate.

RECOMMENDATION:

Ratify the approval of (i) an extension of Contract No. ASI-1597 On-Site Vehicle Inspection Contract with Vehicle Technical Consultants for a period of one year, November 1, 2008 through October 31, 2009, and (ii) increase the total not-to-exceed contract amount by \$35,000.00 to \$95,000.00 in lieu of \$60,000.00.

BACKGROUND:

During the discussion regarding this item, staff indicated that this contract was to provide vehicle inspections when a contract was ending to ensure that the vehicle condition was consistent with the contract language, minus normal wear and tear. This statement was not accurate for this particular contract and this contract is to meet the state and federal requirements for vehicle inspections at the factory.

The board action approved one of the option years contained in the existing contract and added additional funds to the contract value that are needed to conduct factory vehicle inspections from November 1, 2008 to October 31, 2009.

Vehicle Technical Consultants (VTC), the contractor for ASI-1547, has two different contracts with Access Services for vehicle inspections. The first is the contract in question for factory inspections and the second is for local inspections that are conducted randomly or near the termination of an existing contract. During the discussion staff discussed the second contract for local inspections versus the appropriate contract for factory inspections.

MARCH 7, 2008

TO: BOARD OF DIRECTORS

FROM: BRIAN SELWYN, MANAGER OF PROCUREMENT AND CONTRACTS

RE: RATIFICATION OF AMENDMENT ASI-2043 – THIRD PARTY VEHICLE INSPECTION AUDIT CONTRACT

ISSUE:

The Board approved an amendment to Contract ASI-2043 Third Party Vehicle Inspection Audit at the February 2008 Board Meeting. During the discussion on the item questions were asked of staff, the responses to which were partially and inadvertently inaccurate.

RECOMMENDATION:

Ratify the Board approval of an increase in the total not-to-exceed amount by \$45,000.00 to \$115,000.00 in lieu of \$70,000.00 for Contact No. ASI-2043 Third Party Vehicle Inspection Audit Contract with Vehicle Technical Consultants (VTC).

BACKGROUND:

During the discussion on this item, staff indicated that this contract was to provide on going random inspections on 20% of the Access Paratransit vehicle fleet. ASI-2043 specifies two different types of vehicle inspections. One type was as mentioned, random vehicle inspections on active Access Paratransit certified vehicles. At least 20% of the fleet is inspected annually by either an ASI staff member from the Fleet Maintenance Department or a qualified staff member from the contractor VTC. The other vehicle inspections provided for under ASI-2043 are for inspections on Access Services owned vehicles when a contract is ending and/or transitioning to another contractor. These third party inspections are to ensure that the vehicles have been maintained according to the standards of the contract and that they meet the minimum criteria for contract termination, minus normal wear and tear, as specified in the contract.

Contract ASI-2043 is active and this initial term does not expire until January 31, 2009. When this contract was awarded staff did not anticipate that the current contract for the Valley Region would be ending in 2008. Staff had made the assumption that the option year(s) contained in that contract would be executed. Regardless of who is the successful bidder for the Valley Region, because the current contract is ending, all of the ASI owned vehicles must be inspected to ensure that they meet the contract standards. As such, this item requested that additional funds be added to the total contract value to cover the cost of the Valley Region contract transition vehicle inspections.

MARCH 7, 2008

TO: BOARD OF DIRECTORS

FROM: JOE KING, DIRECTOR OF CONTRACT SERVICES

RE: AWARD OF ASI-2439 – ELIGIBILITY DETERMINATION SERVICES CONTRACTOR

ISSUE:

Board approval is requested for the selection of a contractor to provide eligibility determination services beginning July 1, 2008.

RECOMMENDATION:

Authorize staff to execute a three-year contract with seven one-year options for eligibility determination services beginning July 1, 2008 (start-up beginning April 1, 2008) with *C.A.R.E. Evaluators, LLC* in an amount not to exceed \$6,145,841 for the base three-year period. Contingent upon a change in the ASI Paratransit Plan modifying the recertification process, staff will seek Board authorization to amend this contract to include an alternative recertification model (discussed below; Model II). Payment terms of the contract, under both Model I and Model II, will be a fixed monthly fee plus a fixed variable rate per individual evaluated. The rates for the two models are as follows:

MODEL I

<u>Contract Year</u>	<u>Fixed Monthly Fee</u>	<u>Rate per Evaluation</u>
Start-Up	\$271,317	
1	\$103,447	\$19.75
2	\$107,460	\$20.05
3	\$111,929	\$20.23
4 (Option)	\$116,061	\$21.05
5 (Option)	\$120,786	\$21.82
6 (Option)	\$125,091	\$22.67
7 (Option)	\$130,290	\$23.46
8 (Option)	\$135,164	\$24.43
9 (Option)	\$139,132	\$24.91
10 (Option)	\$142,782	\$25.22

MODEL II

<u>Contract Year</u>	<u>Fixed Monthly Fee</u>	<u>Rate per In-Person Evaluation</u>	<u>Rate per Document Review</u>
Start-Up	\$271,317		
1	\$103,447	\$19.75	\$10.08
2	\$107,460	\$21.91	\$10.71
3	\$111,929	\$22.51	\$10.99
4 (Option)	\$116,061	\$23.45	\$11.26
5 (Option)	\$120,786	\$24.16	\$11.51
6 (Option)	\$125,091	\$25.08	\$11.75
7 (Option)	\$130,290	\$25.93	\$11.98
8 (Option)	\$135,164	\$27.02	\$12.21
9 (Option)	\$139,132	\$28.18	\$12.28
10 (Option)	\$142,782	\$29.42	\$12.39

IMPACT ON BUDGET:

This action is consistent with the budget estimates for the applicable years.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:

Based on the Board of Directors' request that ASI issue an RFP for Eligibility Services in December of 2007, no other alternatives were considered.

EFFECT OF APPROVAL OF STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

If this staff recommendation is approved by the Board, the staff will be authorized, but not required, to negotiate and enter into a contract with C.A.R.E. Evaluators, LLC as an eligibility determination services contractor under terms that are no less favorable to Access Services than those proposed above. Access Services would not be legally bound to this contract unless 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:

C.A.R.E. Evaluators, LLC presented a comprehensive response to the Request for Proposals (RFP) to provide eligibility determination services for Access Services. Building on their current operating

model, and drawing on their experience performing functional evaluations for Access Services since July 2004, C.A.R.E. is offering program enhancements to meet the requirements of this RFP.

An evaluation committee consisting of four individuals, carefully selected for their understanding of the paratransit eligibility process, reviewed, rated, and commented on the submitted proposals. The group included a member of the ASI staff and a local transportation professional. In order to insure a balanced panel with appropriate expertise, two individuals from outside of California were enlisted; an ADA Eligibility Coordinator, working for a major metropolitan transportation agency, and a nationally recognized expert in transportation services for people with disabilities from a non-profit advocacy group.

The following represents the areas of review considered by the panel with specific quotes from panel members.

Qualifications and Availability of Proposed Staff

The RFP requires that the eligibility contractor insure that the staff is competent, well trained and that each staff person meets the minimum qualifications for the position, as outlined in the Scope of Work. C.A.R.E. has assembled a staff with a wide breadth of knowledge and experience. In addition, C.A.R.E. has proposed a plan to encourage the Transit Evaluators to work together when an applicant has multiple disabilities or a less common disability.

PANEL COMMENTS:

As the incumbent, C.A.R.E. has shown exceptional quality of staffing to provide an outstanding product.

Quality and experience of staffing indicated in proposal exceeds RFP requirements. The proposed work plan makes managerial staff available to perform in-person transit functional evaluations during peak hours or when Transit Evaluator staffing is low, which is an excellent way to provide outstanding customer service while keeping management staff skills current in regards to evaluating customers.

The proposal and BAFO provided very specific work duties and responsibilities of transit evaluation and management/supervisory staff.

Proposer places an excellent amount of emphasis on recruiting new staff and retaining current staff to meet the needs outlined in the RFP.

Quality of Technical Approach

The functions associated with this contract include: the performance of in-person transit evaluations conducted by Contractor staff, operation of a call center to schedule appointments, a processing center to prepare and mail determinations and responsibility for the administrative functions to coordinate all levels of the contract requirements. In addition, the RFP requires that the contractor provide office space to be potentially used for travel training and mobility management. There is also a requirement that all space must be representative of a transit theme.

C.A.R.E. has proposed a facility with a strong transit theme. The facility will be completely built out with centralized heating and air conditioning. To provide that transit feel for the customer, C.A.R.E. is proposing to provide:

- A reception area to replicate a transit ticket window where the customer will be given a ticket upon check-in to indicate which bus they should board to wait for their evaluation.
- The initial waiting area will be onboard one of three fixed route buses located inside the facility. While waiting, customers will learn about the various accessibility features of a transit bus. This will present C.A.R.E. with its first opportunity to see how well the customer can maneuver inside a bus.
- Transit style benches will be placed throughout the facility and in the final waiting area where applicants wait for their transportation from the facility.
- The final waiting area will serve as a transit information center with staff available to answer customer questions and provide trip planning services.

The evaluation process itself is proposed to be enhanced based upon the experience of C.A.R.E. over the last four years. These enhancements will include:

- Observation of the customer onboard an actual bus prior to the interview.
- Establishment of an improved Transit Walk which, in turn, will include:
 - More testing on various surface types
 - Use of an actual traffic signal
 - Use of an actual signal actuator button
 - Use of a bus (third bus) to replicate boarding, positioning, and fare payment

C.A.R.E. has also proposed the creation of the C.A.R.E. Community Council comprised of customers who have gone through the evaluation process. This council will provide feedback on customer service issues and make recommendations to C.A.R.E. and Access Services, to improve the customer experience. C.A.R.E. will also continue the use of the customer comment card that is offered to every applicant participating in the process.

PANEL COMMENTS:

The proposed use of actual transit equipment will enhance the current model.

Environmental controls will enhance the experience of the customer.

Replicated the various barriers indicated in RFP.

The quality and level of detail in the proposal related to providing evaluation services outlined in the Scope of Work is excellent.

The proposed ticket counter and waiting room (an out-of-service bus) is unique, appealing and demonstrates the creative style of this company.

The company provided a comprehensive description of the evaluation form and the processes staff will use to complete the form.

The C.A.R.E. Community Council provides an additional opportunity for customers to provide feedback on the eligibility determination process.

Qualifications of the Proposer

C.A.R.E. has conducted functional Transit Evaluations in Los Angeles County since 1996, starting with appeals and moving on to initial determinations. C.A.R.E. also provides functional evaluations for the City of Santa Rosa and Orange County Transportation Authority. Letters of reference and follow up reference inquiries relative to C.A.R.E.'s qualifications to undertake this work were excellent.

PANEL COMMENTS

All experience has been with functional evaluations.

Customer satisfaction survey indicates a high level satisfaction.

Proposer presents an excellent level of experience undertaking similar projects and completing them successfully. The number of customer complaints compared to the number of evaluations conducted indicate a high level of customer satisfaction while participating in the assessment process. The numerous strong references signify a consistently exceptional amount of approval from other contractors who request similar work.

The written proposal, interview and BAFO were comprehensive and concise. Answers provided during the interview gave the company the opportunity to describe and defend, when warranted, their opinions and recommendations about best practices. Staff members had a strong point of view, appropriately confident and displayed the skills that are needed to provide Paratransit eligibility determination services that are by their very nature complex, costly and typically under great scrutiny by the disability community.

Cost Proposals

While C.A.R.E. proposed three year base cost (Model I) is 8.2% higher than that of ADA Ride's, the panel members felt that the proposal offered by C.A.R.E. justified the increase in price over the other bidder. Staff feels that the proposed budget offers ASI value while ensuring high quality service. The following table summarizes the respective vendors' final Cost Proposals for Models I and II, respectively:

Proposer	First Year Cost (Including Start/Up)	Second Year Cost	Third Year Cost	Total Three Year Cost
ADA Ride (Model I)	\$1,887,496.25	\$1,754,135.29	\$2,040,919.88	\$5,682,551.42
C.A.R.E. Evaluators (Model I)	\$2,141,274.00	\$1,957,549.00	\$2,047,018.00	\$6,145,841.00

ADA Ride (Model II)	\$1,674,309.69	\$1,553,886.75	\$1,773,273.88	\$5,001,470.32
C.A.R.E. Evaluators (Model II)	\$1,864,677.00	\$1,698,286.00	\$1,781,850.00	\$5,344,813.00

Model II

Access Services will be recommending a change to the Paratransit Plan with regards to the current recertification process which would create a tiered process. The Board will be asked to modify the existing Paratransit Plan after the member agencies have had the opportunity to review the change and a public hearing is held. Staff anticipates bringing the change to the Board at the May Board of Directors meeting. If approved, a revised recertification process may allow some riders to apply for recertification by completing a paper application for review. If the application indicates no significant changes in the applicant's ability to use fixed route transit since the previous in-person evaluation, recertification would be granted. This proposal requires a change to the Paratransit Plan. If this revision were approved, the Board will be asked to approve the alternate pricing structure (Model II) to be implemented at the rates stated above.

Evaluation of Proposals

Following a review of the proposals, interviews with key personnel and receipt of a preliminary and final *Best and Final Offer*, the evaluation committee members scored the proposals based on the criteria and point values stated in the RFP. The scoring is summarized as follows:

Eligibility Determination Services Proposer Score Sheet

Criteria	Weight of Criteria	Total Score	
		ADA Ride	C.A.R.E. Evaluators, LLC
Qualifications and Availability of Proposed Staff	25 Pts.	20.44	23.13
Quality of Technical Approach	25 Pts.	18.38	22.00
Qualifications of the Proposer	15 Pts.	9.79	13.88
Adequacy of Pay/Benefit Package	15 Pts.	13.50	13.50
Cost/Price Proposal	10 Pts.	9.00	7.00
Financial Qualifications of the Proposer	10 Pts.	9.00	8.00
Total Points	100 Pts.	80.10	87.50

Evaluation Committee Conclusion

Both proposers were deemed qualified to perform the required work. C.A.R.E. Evaluators, LLC received the highest evaluation score and is the recommended contractor for the eligibility determinations services contract.