AGENDA

COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CAC) MEETING

Tuesday, March 10, 2020
12:45 pm – 3:00 pm
Los Angeles County MTA
Plaza View, fourth floor
One Gateway Plaza

Time	*Item*	*Description/Presenter*	*Disposition*	*Pages*
	1.	Call to Order	Action	
7	2.	Introductions		
5	3.	Review & Approval of Minutes of February 11, 2020	Action	3-11
8	4.	General Public Comments	Information	
7	5.	Report from Board of Directors	Information	
15	6.	Customer Service Update – David Foster	Presentation	
20	7.	CAC Subcommittee Update – Matthew Avancena/Rycharde Martindale	Possible Action	12-20
10	8.	Operations Update – Faustino Salvador	Information	
5	9.	Member Communications	Information	
15	10.	Video Vignettes – Josh Southwick	Presentation	
12	11.	Proposed Fare Coupon Design – Josh Southwick	Presentation	
15	12.	Reservations Script – Mike Greenwood	Discussion	

10	13.	CAC Retreat - Matthew Avancena	Information
5	14.	New Business Raised Subsequent to the Posting of the Agenda	Information
1	15.	Adjournment	Action

Access Services does not discriminate based on disability. Accordingly, Access Services seeks to ensure that individuals with disabilities will have an equal opportunity to participate in the range of Access Services events and programs by providing appropriate auxiliary devices and services to facilitate communication. In determining the type of auxiliary devices and services for communication that will be provided, primary consideration is given to the request of the individual with disabilities. However, the final decision belongs to Access Services. To help ensure availability of those auxiliary devices and services you require, please make every effort to notify Access Services of your request at least three (3) business days (72 hours) prior to the meeting in which you wish to utilize those devices or services. You may do so by contacting (213) 270-6000.

Note: Access Services Community Advisory (CAC) meetings are held pursuant to the Ralph M. Brown Act [Cal. Gov. *Code §54950] and are open to the public. The public may view and obtain all written information supporting this agenda provided both initially and supplementally prior to the meeting at the agency's offices located at 3449 Santa Anita Avenue, El Monte, California and on its website at htt p:// acce ssla.or g. Documents, including Power Point handouts distributed to CAC by staff or CAC members at the meeting will simultaneously be made available to the public. Two opportunities are available for the public to address the CAC during a CAC meeting: (1) before a specific agendized item is debated and voted upon regarding that item and (2) general public comment. The exercise of the right to address the CAC is subject to restriction as to time and appropriate decorum. All persons wishing to make public comment must fill out a yellow Public Comment Form and submit it to the CAC secretary. Public comment is generally limited to three (3) minutes per speaker and the total time available for public comment may be limited at the discretion of the Chair. Persons whose speech is impaired such that they are unable to address the board at a normal rate of speed may request the accommodation of a limited amount of additional time from the Chair but only by checking the appropriate box on the Public Comment Form. Granting such an accommodation is in the discretion of the Chair.*

The CAC will not and cannot respond during the meeting to matters raised under general public comment. Pursuant to provisions of the Brown Act governing these proceedings, no discussion or action may be taken on these matters unless they are listed on the agenda, or unless certain emergency or special circumstances exist. However, the CAC may direct staff to investigate and/or schedule certain matters for consideration at a future CAC Meeting.

"Alternative accessible formats are available upon request."

MINUTES
Community Advisory Committee (CAC) Meeting
February 11, 2020
2:00 pm - 4:00 pm

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Dina Garcia called the meeting to order at 2:06 p.m.

INTRODUCTIONS

CAC Members Present: Dina Garcia, Chair; Vice-Chair; Kurt Baldwin, Maria Aroch, Yael Hagen, Gordon Cardona, Jesse Padilla, Wendy Cabil, Rachele Goeman, Michael Conrad and Terri Lantz.

CAC Members Not Present: Michael Arrigo, Tina Foafoa, Liz Lyons, Marie-France Francois, Olivia Almalel

Board Members Present: Martin Gombert

Access Services Staff Present: Matthew Avancena, Mike Greenwood, Eric Haack, Veronica Guzman-Vanmarcke, LaTisha Wilson, Art Chacon, Susanna Cadenas, Megan Mumby, Gabriel Andaya, Brian Selwyn, F Scott Jewell, Hector Rodriguez, David Chia, Alex Chrisman, Kimberlie Nimori.

Guests Present: William Zuke (Rider and OSS member), Wilma Ballew (Rider & OSS member), Sergio Uribe (InterVision), Annette Arriola (Alta), Roberto Montalvo (Global Paratransit), Jacqueline Sanchez (San Gabriel Transit), Aurora Delgado (California Transit), Fayma Ishaq (Metro), Jesse Ortiz (MV Transportation), Elizabeth Wills (Access Rider), Albert Contreras (QSS), Gabriela (Provider).

REVIEW & APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Chair Dina Garcia asked for a motion to approve the January 14, 2020 minutes.

Motion: Member Hagen
Seconded: Member Padilla
Abstention: Members Cabil & Hagen
Motion: Passed

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Elizabeth Wills made a public comment by stating that she requested a ride for her and her husband to a golf course in San Dimas. She was told the drop off was 9/10 of a mile from the golf course. The entrance of the gold course is hilly and she was trying to make it to a wedding reception 15 minutes away. She was able to find a driver who could drive her husband's van to get to the wedding reception. She wanted to know if she should have called Access the day before to find out if this address was accessible by Access. LaTisha Wilson was assigned to meet with her to discuss the issue.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS REPORT

Board Director, Martin Gombert, provided a brief summary of the January and February Board of Director's meetings. He stated that the following items were discussed at the meeting:

Hector Rodriguez presented on a $12 million additional funding request to Metro, for the year of 2020, since the ridership has significantly increased this fiscal year. It has increased up to 5% in some areas and is causing them to exceed the budget;

He was happy to announce the Parents with Disabilities Program funding for $3 million a year was approved. There is an expansion of the program to all regions and they have a commitment from Metro to fund at least that amount of money;

A lot of issues were raised with regards to the Parents with Disabilities program but they are very glad that it passed.

TNCs FOR BACK UP TRIPS

Director of Administration, F Scott Jewell, gave a presentation on TNCs and back up trips. He discussed the potential use of TNCs such as Lyft and Uber. He is soliciting comments and feedback before they proceed and take this back to the Board of Directors.

MEMBER DISCUSSION

Member Lantz made a comment regarding the backup trips. She was wondering why there was such a big spike in August. She was also wondering if it was the same in the Southern Region. F Scott Jewell responded that San Gabriel Transit was having software issues and they were not able to dispatch rides so this had an impact on the rides for that month. As far as the Southern region, it was a combination of that and the trips dropped down to about 40-50 trips a month. They saw a decline in service in terms of usage.

Member Lantz stated that she has yet to see an Uber pick up a rider from her job site. She has tried to have a friend of hers test it out and has not had luck getting a wheelchair van be sent to her. F Scott responded that they only use the backup

providers if they are able to meet the needs of the rider. Possibly the reason they are using contractors instead is because they are better equipped.

Member Goeman is concerned with Uber drivers because she had a lot of problems with her dog. They have refused to pick her up or leave when they see her with her dog. She is wondering how they are going to be guaranteed that they will be picked up if the rider has a service animal. F Scott stated that was the reason he was there, to get feedback about those sort of situations. If these situations happened they need to be reported to the OMC and they will be sure to provide another vehicle to the rider. They would evaluate this program for a six month period to see if anyone with a service animal or some other mobility device is being refused a ride.

Member Hagen stated that in the Northern region they experienced the same thing with regards to the Uber rides. She is concerned about situations where somebody was ambulatory and can be picked up in five or ten minutes but somebody using a wheelchair will take at least two hours to be picked up on a regular basis. The providers are not taking the time to really look and see what is available and what they can do to help. They need to utilize supervisors for times where somebody needs a backup trip and they need to be picked up. She is also concerned about who is paying for these back up trips.

F Scott Jewell responded that in terms of backup trips it depends on the situation. Access itself obviously pays for all the transportation although there are some mechanism in the contracts for them to recoup some of the backup trip costs. It depends on a case by case scenario to determine where that falls. He doesn't have that specific information but he is sure Hector Rodriguez could answer that. They can certainly follow up with that information. In terms of the time, that's something else that they will be looking at ifthey do move forward with this program to determine if it is an equitable way for backup trips.

Member Cabii thanked F Scott for his presentation and asked if this was the first time they were having a presentation on this topic. F Scott responded that in terms of TNCs, it was. Member Cabii stated that she would like some clarity on the backup trips reason, if he could provide a scenario so that they can understand how it's being defined.

F Scott Jewell responded that a backup is needed if the provider made a mistake in the booking of a trip. For example, if they gave the rider a certain time but that wasn't the time the provider understood and OMC makes that determination whether it's a provider error and would then dispatch a backup for that trip. If a provider were to no show somebody incorrectly and say we can't go back to pick them up, the OMC would dispatch a backup trip in that case to get the person where they need to go and so on. It really depends on the circumstances.

Member Baldwin stated that it would probably not be considered legal for ambulatory people to get their ride, right away and someone who needed an accessible vehicle or someone that wasn't comfortable with a driver that wasn't drug and background tested to have to wait a longer time for a backup vehicle. Access needs to make sure that there's equivalency in how the service is going to work. He likes the idea of using the TNCs but doesn't like the fact that there it is mischaracterized as a non-ADA trip. Paratransit and transit in general likes to think that paratransit is an ADA service, but the ADA is a bigger law than that. A subpart B of title 2 involves all conveyances and California has a very strong law, the UNRAH act, that states that all conveyances of all types whatsoever, do not have to be wheelchair accessible, but they have to follow all the other laws. When Rachele Goeman brings up her issue of being denied a ride because she has a service animal, that's a violation of her civil rights under the ADA. They might want to think about that as these are issues that will come up. Drug testing and the alcohol and drug program will be part of it because of the nature of their employment and the accessibility provisions that are being put in place under California law.

Member Goeman stated that as a visually impaired person, those drivers will not get out and approach. She's been left twice because the drivers will not exit their vehicle. She would like to be reassured that these situations will not happen. When using Lyft privately it currently does not happen. F Scott Jewell responded that this was going to be part of the experience that they are going to evaluate and how these trips are dispatched. The providers have a direct interface with how they connect with Uber to be able to dispatch and provide information to the driver, specifically to the location of the rider and what needs to be done. Hopefully that will address this issue that they have the right information in order to locate the person they're picking up. These are issues they are going to have to work through because the drivers for the TNCs are getting all the training that the regular drivers do.

Member Hagen stated that she was all for options and she thinks options are always good. When someone legitimately books a reservation with Access Services and that trip goes awry because of an issue that's beyond the rider's control she has no problem with the rider being asked options they prefer. As long as they are not picked up quicker depending on the option, they need to have policies in place for the providers to fix the problems in a timely manner. If it's not she doesn't see that it's a premium service. They can't make the TNCs go through a background check and as long as the rider has that information when making those decisions so they know what they're getting in to.

Member Lantz asked if they would be having a contract with those providers. F Scott responded that the contract is not directly with Uber or Lyft but with American Logistics who is an existing backup provider that dispatches the taxis. They also have an arrangement with Uber and Access would use them through American Logistics. Depending on what will be most advantageous for the rider, they will let the rider know what the choices are, and move forward from there.

Member Lantz asked if a rider were to choose an Uber or Lyft, would Access then provide the driver with the same information the Access drivers receive. **F** Scott Jewell responded that an OMC agent would relay all the information related to that rider and transmit it to American Logistics who would then pass **it** on to Uber.

Member Hagen asked if it was cheaper to just have additional road supervisors in every region for these kinds of situations. American Logistics is not known for their stellar service at least not in non-emergency and MediCal transportation programs. F Scott stated that it is more advantageous to take benefit of services or resources that are already there that have the potential to assist in these type of trips.

Member Conrad asked who they should complain to if there is an issue with a rude driver or if they have any complaints. F Scott responded that it should always be reported to Access Services so that they can take appropriate action.

MID YEAR BUDGET/RIDERSHIP

Hector Rodriguez, Deputy Executive Director for Access, gave a presentation on the Mid-Year Budget/Ridership the supplemental request for funding to Metro for FY20 and the second part of it is the FY21 rough draft budget. There is a legal obligation for the regional planning agency in this case it's Metro, as the regional planning agency to fund paratransit service to the expected level of demand. The final numbers will be provided to Metro by early March and then they will present this to the Board in April.

MEMBER COMMENTS

Member Baldwin had some questions regarding the miscalculated projection and why did they got **it** so wrong. Hector Rodriguez explained that lacked data, great service delivery and inaccurate economy projections all had an impact on the results.

Member Baldwin wonders how they calculate the projections because they can draw a straight line and **it** keeps going up. Hector Rodriguez responded that with exception of the past two years it did not. Member Baldwin stated that was because of poor service. He also asked if Metro will pressure Access to make sure they don't overestimate and keep it as low as possible. Hector Rodriguez stated that they do have pressure from Metro to make sure that the forecasts for expenditures are as close as possible to actual expenditures.

Member Cabil asked if this budget entails the whole region and outside of her, who lives in Antelope Valley, who else advocates for them. She wants to know what new discussion about any software updates. Hector Rodriguez responded that the reality is that switching software is about half a million dollars with the contract expiring in about 18 months. For them to convert takes about a year, but they can probably push it to seven, eight months. That means they have about eight months in which to capitalize

on half a million dollar expenditures, which is a huge expense. They're trying to do the best they can right now and Access inserted KPIs in the contracts.

Member Padilla asked if they could hire more drivers and more fleet with this new budget to cover the growth in riders. Hector Rodriguez responded that Metro approves the funding, not the budget and the Access Board of Directors approves the budget. They currently have six contractors and they are the ones responsible for hiring the drivers and making sure there's enough fleet available to deliver service. We only provide to our contractors a total of 777 vehicles County wide. That number has not changed since 2014 and the vehicles are only replaced after 250,000 miles but they only have 777 vehicles. Having said that, they know that the contractors cannot accommodate more vehicles and those are some issues that they will need to plan for as an agency for the future.

Member Hagen wanted to clarify that when he mentioned the Northern region earlier he was talking about the Antelope Valley and not the San Fernando Valley. Hector Rodriguez responded that was correct and he gets confused.

Member Lantz stated as a CAC Member these issues are important to them and the riders and is wondering if Access can let someone know at Access to keep them informed when these issues are coming up. These types of issues that she and others, would like to advocate for. Hector Rodriguez stated he understood and he knows it's important to Access as well to be informed on issues like these.

STRATEGIC PLAN

Eric Haack, Strategic Planner, presented a Strategic Plan for the next five years for Access Services. He explained it was created to establish a five year horizon, this is going to be a plan that's going to go out to 2025 to identify some present day challenges. Hector Rodriguez has already identified a few ofthem and also some things that are anticipated that we might see in the years ahead.

MEMBER COMMENTS

Member Baldwin stated that he had not seen what Metro was planning in their NextGen yet but it doesn't seem that they are planning pulling back on service. They seem to have routes that will change headways and frequency, which reassures him. If Metro does expand their service area through micro transit, how does Access **fit** in to that? He wants to recommend that if Metro uses micro transit to expand the service area fixed route that Access should follow that expansion of the fixed route system. He also recommended the Valley for expansion since **it** is very affordable.

Member Padilla envisioned Access's technology to be improved, with less stranding and expanding satellite offices. Eric Haack explained that the vision that staff would be very similar, similar structure with the six contractors but perhaps at different locations,

perhaps at larger locations, perhaps at Access controlled locations or Access owned/leased locations. The administrative facility would probably be one location as well and perhaps not in El Monte.

Member Hagen asked about a possible reconfiguration of regions. Eric Haack stated that was not in the discussion but maybe on a unified platform that would be very similar dispatch or reservation wise from the Customer Service perspective. Member Hagen also stated that the CAC subcommittee on Operations has looked at some very important issues in a deeper level and have come up with some great recommendations that could be helpful. They are close to being finalized.

Member Lantz stated that she hopes that if Access is considering moving their offices they would consider having **it** as central as possible in LA County. ADA accessibility also includes the path of travel and parking and she hopes Access takes this in consideration when looking at this issue.

Member Cabii asked a question concerning the fixed route expansion. Is it a policy that they need to follow the current way **it** is being followed or is **it** up for discussion? Member Baldwin answered that it is in the ADA and there were two options given, choice of three quarters of a mile of the fixed route or a mile and a half of the fixed route. In Los Angeles County, they chose three quarters of a mile on the fixed route. He believes there is going to be an experiment in the Antelope Valley to expand that, but there's been discussion about that. However, ultimately it would be the Board of Directors that would make a decision based on funding and so on. He thinks if the fixed route system is going to expand by using micro transit systems, then Access should consider the service area based on this expanded fixed route despite what the law specifies.

Member Hagen stated that educating riders and drivers in order to better inform them on Access. Eric Haack stated that this is already in discussion and how to better distribute and share this information. Member Hagen stated that historically but not currently, Access has been known to withhold pertinent Access information. She also stated that there were talks about doing little video vignettes for the drivers to be able to refresh their ability to know how to tie down more difficult mobility devices or be able to find a location that's hard to find and so forth.

CAC SUBCOMMITTEE UPDATE

Member Baldwin mentioned he was a little remiss in acknowledging the subcommittee's work on bylaws. He stated that it was a group effort and everyone's input was included and the revisions will go to the Board in the near future for approval. They are also not going to call **it** the Bylaws/Operations subcommittee anymore but the Operations subcommittee. It was only Member Hagen and he in attendance for the last conference call and Chair Garcia joined them afterwards but they didn't feel comfortable not having complete attendance of the subcommittee to make real

decisions. They went over what he reported the month before last about the things they were going to formalize into recommendations regarding how they see some improvements in the riders' experience and the contractors' efficiency. He will be drafting a final draft recommendation of the recommendations that they are going to make to the Board at the next meeting, so he encourages all the subcommittee members to join on the call. He encouraged Member Padilla to join the meetings, so that they can get those preliminary recommendations finalized and presented to you for further discussion and approval. They also had a short discussion on the stand signs at the end of the meeting.

MEMBER DISCUSSION

Member Goeman asked when the next subcommittee meeting was and Member Baldwin responded it had not yet been scheduled.

MEMBER COMMUNICATION

Member Padilla can't wait to see what the vision is for the next five years to better improve the service and make sure the budget and funding gets approved because he remembers that feeling of seeing an Access vehicle picking you up and feeling so relieved.

Member Cabil wished everyone a happy Black History month. In the Antelope Valley they are getting ready for local elections and May is Mental Health Awareness Month she will definitely be bringing some resources. They are also hosting a wonderful creative event again, inviting artists throughout the community.

Member Aroch thanked everyone that presented and wished everyone a Happy Valentine's day.

Member Conrad had an incident in Glendale where all the drivers' tablets went out and they stopped all the vehicles. He was able to get a hold of Alex Chrisman and he helped them out but there was no reason for the drivers to stop giving rides when they have access to a GPS.

Member Goeman stated that the Southern region can never find Metro and she is always stressing out when they are heading there. The signs are too small and the drivers can't see them. All the drivers should get a map to Metro.

Member Terri reminded everyone to vote in the upcoming election and visit one of the many vote centers open for 11 days. Another thing for anyone who has MediCal, Medicare or Medicaid, is that there are proposed cuts to all Medicaid and MediCal. She also announced that she left UCP and is working part time and Disability Rights California.

Chair Garcia wanted to remind everyone that this month is the Abilities Expo. The Abilities Expo is February 21st to the 23rd at the L.A. Convention Center. She also wished everyone a very nice Valentine's Day.

OPERATIONS PERFORMANCE UPDATE

Megan Mumby, Project Administrator, presented the Operations Performance Report for the month of January 2020. Unfortunately, the numbers are still being tabulated for that month so they will be presented in next month's meeting:

The January highlights included:

Access staff attended the accessibility advisory committee meeting in Santa Clarita, this meeting takes place bimonthly in the city of Santa Clarita and addresses events, questions, and concerns regarding transportation in Santa Clarita;

Three members of Antelope Valley region contractor's staff were awarded the Superior Service Award for going above and beyond to transport riders during the Tick Fire in October 2019;

They have our annual 100% credential audit. They do this in all six of our regions. They started in the Antelope Valley region. Every active driver's file is reviewed;

They welcomed two new staff members to the Operations team, Garret and Amanda are the new operation service monitors. And so far this fiscal year is very strong, holding strong at 91%, our complaint rate is only 2.4 and the standard is 4.0.

CAC MEETING ROOM UPDATE

Matthew Avancena stated that next month's meeting will be on the 4th floor at 12:45pm. Veronica Guzman-Vanmarcke will be sending an update to all CAC Members to remind them. Going forward the meetings for March and April will be on the fourth floor and September of 2020 will be on the fourth floor. He also acknowledged Fayma Ishaq from Metro for her hard work in securing the meeting rooms for the Access meetings.

NEW BUSINESS RAISED

No new business.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Garcia asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting.
Motion: Member Goeman
Second: Member Baldwin

The meeting adjourned at 3:48 p.m.

ITEM 7

MARCH 10, 2020

TO: **ACCESS COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

FROM: **R. P. MARTINDALE-ESSINGTON, ADA COORDINATOR FOR CUSTOMER RELATIONS**

RE: **CAC GOALS SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT ON ESTABLISHMENT OF A SAME-DAY PREMIUM SERVICE**

ISSUE:

At its 2019 workshop, the CAC tasked its Standing subcommittee, the OSS, with devising the outline of establishing a premium Same-Day service. The OSS was instructed to come up with a plan and then to report its findings to the CAC Goals Subcommittee. After reviewing this report, the Goals Subcommittee would then bring the matter to the full CAC for discussion and possible action. Here then is the plan which was devised by the OSS.

BACKGROUND:

Resulting from the March 2019 Retreat and follow-up subcommittee meetings, the CAC asked the OSS to look at several issues and on a continuing basis, report back to the CAC with responses to: **(1)** the WMR APP; (2) parameters for the definition and development of a Same-Day trip/ride service; and the appointment of a CAC/OSS Liaison position. Item **1** has been reported to the CAC through periodic updates presented at the CAC meetings. Item 3 has been tabled by the CAC awaiting future action. This report addresses Item 2.

A reoccurring item has appeared since May of 2019 in every OSS meeting agenda entitled: "Recommendations for the Definition and Development of Same-Day Ride/Trips." Though Access Services is not seeking to actively restore Same-Day service, per the CAC Goals Subcommittee's instructions, the OSS is asked to provide what such a framework should look like. During the ongoing Same-Day discussion, the OSS began work on four elements:

(1) Potential fares/distances;
(2) Eligibility criteria;
(3) Cancelation and No-Show penalties; and
(4) Customer Service and complaint resolutions.

The OSS, at its August 2019 meeting, provided valuable ideas on the first of the four points which included:

- Swift responsiveness of pick-ups within a 15-minute call request;
- Same-Day service would probably serve those on some sort of prioritized basis at a graduated cost;
- Metro's Via pilot program, where a hailing ride component is being tested to support fixed-route service, was mentioned as a mechanism that could support Same-Day service;
- A brokered system might work best as this is the model practiced in other areas;
- A revised Same-Day service might provide Will-Call service for patients whose treatments continue past their scheduled pick-up times;
- A framework should consider who would qualify for it, what would the purpose of the service be, and, what restrictions would have to be implemented;
- A funding mechanism such as Go-Fund-Me could be used to pay for such a service.

When the meeting ended, OSS members were provided with supplementary background material to study and were asked to submit their ideas to the OSS Facilitator by e-mail, phone or letter regarding their contributions to the other three elements. Once all comments were collected, a written report would be prepared for the CAC Goals Subcommittee.

At the October meeting, the OSS continued discussion on the second element, Eligibility Criteria. Ideas generated during the discussion included:

- Existing fare systems vs. a premium fare service;
- How best to handle capacity pressures;
- Does the need exist, given other services, for an ADA Same-Day service program.
- "There Ain't No Such Thing As A Free Lunch!"

<u>RECOMMENDATION</u>:

The CAC Goals Subcommittee is asked to receive and review this report. Next, it is recommended that the Subcommittee bring this matter to the full CAC for discussion and further action. Lastly, to assist the Goals Subcommittee, it is recommended that it read the supplementary background material provided to the OSS.

ITEM 7

MARCH 10, 2020

TO: **CAC**

FROM: **MATTHEW AVANCENA, DIRECTOR, PLANNING AND COORDINATION**

SUBJECT: **CAC SUBCOMMITTEE UPDATE- MARCH 2020**

BACKGROUND:

On Tuesday March 12, Access' Community Advisory Committee (CAC) held their first Goals Retreat at the Los Angeles River and Gardens. The CAC Goals Retreat, facilitated by current CAC member and former Access Board member Kurt Baldwin, focused on a number of areas.

One of the areas CAC members wanted to discuss was the interrelationship of the Access Board, the Community Advisory Committee (CAC) and the Quality Services Subcommittee (QSS). The CAC is one oftwo advisory committees created by the Board to advise them on policy matters while the OSS was created by the CAC to monitor the service quality of Access' paratransit services.

On March 21, the CAC Goals Retreat subcommittee comprised of Kurt Baldwin, Yael Hagen, Terri Lantz, Maria Aroch, Tina Foafoa and Access staff, Matthew Avancena held a follow-up conference call to discuss next steps. More specifically, the subcommittee members discussed the suggested goals that came out of the retreat and discussed ways by which the CAC could take action by either creating a subcommittee(s), deferring the issue to the OSS and/or tasking the CAC to take up the issue at future meetings.

At the April 9 CAC meeting, the CAC took action and formed subcommittees and tasked the OSS and the full CAC committee to work on various issues. The subcommittees are asfollows:

1. **Bylaws/Process subcommittee** - this subcommittee will be tasked to review issues such as:

- CAC attendance/participation process
- Public participation
- Meeting duration

- CAC agendas and standing items (and its order in the agenda).
- Volunteers for a OSS Liaison

2. Operations Subcommittee -this subcommittee will be tasked to review issues such as:

- Missed trips and No shows
- How to avoid long rides
- Routing and miss-matched rides
- Improve stand signs and improve identification e.g. geo locating
- Clear communication to riders and drivers regarding locations
- Expanding locations at key venues

Discussion topics be included in upcoming agendas:

- How to improve negotiation of pick up time.
- How to improve provider and rider training.
- The script for the on hold information.
- The video vignettes

OSS Tasks/Projects - The OSS has been tasked with the following issues

- Develop recommendations on what a same day trip would look like; enhancing services or a premium service could be a brokerage model on how to be able to offer same day trip services.
- Expanding the functionality of the where's my ride app.

SUBCOMMITTEE UPDATE:

The following is a summary of the Operations and Bylaws/Process subcommittee conference calls courtesy of subcommittee Chair Kurt Baldwin:

Subject: Summary of Subcommittee/Operations Meeting May 9, 2019

Of the four issues to make recommendations the subcommittee is tasked with; improved routing and avoid miss-matched rides, expand and improve the stand sign program, minimize missed trips and no shows and, to avoid unreasonably long rides we decided to start with developing a recommendation on avoiding unreasonably long rides.

We discussed what data is available and how to define the problem. We speculated that there may be a variety of issues at play from time of day, to whether the vehicle leaves the contract service area or not, etc. We also discussed getting data on the riders

experience regarding the time spent taking the trip. This would be starting with the negotiated pick up time to the time of getting off the vehicle at the destination.

Our next meeting will be on June 5th at 2pm and Mike agreed to look into what data can be useful forwarding our discussion and will gather data on rides that last more than two hours, including time of day and whether the destination is inside the contract services area or outside. In addition, how can information be aggregated to look at the riders experience in length of travel time.

Subject: Summary of the June 20, 2019 Operations and Bylaws/process subcommittees

In attendance were CAC subcommittee Chairs Hagen and Baldwin, Access staff Mike Greenwood, Matthew Avancena, and Susanna Cadenas

Due to the absence of most subcommittee members, we did not work to develop recommendations, rather for the Operations subcommittee we reviewed the refined data provided by Mike Greenwood and made additional requests for data on long rides. For the Bylaws/process subcommittee we discussed CAC meeting time length and the method to look at potential changes to the bylaws.

Subject: Subcommittee summaries for July 2019

Operations Subcommittee

Members in attendance; Kurt Baldwin, Terri Lantz, Yael Hagen, and CAC Chair Maria Aroch, and assigned Access staff Mike Greenwood

Absent; Wendy Cabil, Dina Garcia, Tina Foafoa

Others in attendance; Michael Conrad, Rachele Goeman, Matthew Avancena, Rycharde Martindale-Essington, Rogelio Gomez, Melissa Mungia, Susanna Cadenas

Mike explained the data that was provided to the subcommittee by first describing the methodology used to determine ratios of location to location distance compared to actual miles traveled from origin to destination. Graphs were provided by Melissa to show how routing can create a **1** to 1 ratio along with examples of higher ratios including a poorly planned routing that produced higher ratios including a 7 to **1** ratio. Mike also explained the graph showing the breakdown of rides over 2 hours and the difference between the ride being a share ride or not, from the April data. The data seems to indicate that it is far less likely a rider will experience a trip time of over two hours when the trip is not a share ride.

Our discussion included other ideas to avoid overly long trips including greater utilization of road supervisors or standby capacity to avoid rerouting other vehicles already dispatched.

Bylaws Subcommittee

Members in attendance - Yael Hagen, CAC Chair Maria Aroch, Terri Lantz, Michael Conrad, Kurt Baldwin and assigned ACCESS staff Matthew Avancena
Absent; Tina Foafoa

Others in attendance; Rachele Goeman, Rycharde Martindale-Essington, Susanna Cadenas

We discussed meeting length, we have been informed that 3PM is the latest we have use of the room due to the cafeteria needing to remove refreshments and close. We discussed starting 15 minutes early at 12:45 and agreed by consensus that we would recommend that to the full CAC at our next meeting in August. We discussed how to add additional clarity to the bylaws starting with the CAC membership selection and subcommittee membership selection sections that we decided to focus on at our last meeting. Kurt will include the suggested additions of the subcommittee in our working draft.

Operations/Bylaws Subcommittee September 26, 2019 Meeting Summary

Members in attendance: CAC Chair Maria Aroch, Michael Conrad, Terri Lantz, Yael Hagen, Michael Arrigo, Dina Garcia, Kurt Baldwin and assigned Access staff Matthew Avancena and Mike Greenwood

Absent: Wendy Cabil

Others in attendance: Rycharde Martindale-Essington and Susanna Cadenas

Mike Greenwood led us through definitions of "no-shows", "missed trips" and a proposed definition for "miss-matched" trips. The subcommittee is attempting to identify recommendations in these areas in order to improve overall routing and dispatch and avoiding poorly planned routes that are unreasonably long.

We discussed a best practice (that is not always fulfilled) to call a rider when the provider knows they will be a late four, (a little more than an hour late) as a possible area for improvement. The concern was that if the rider declines the trip at that point it would not be counted as a late 4 for KPI purposes. We were assured that missed trips are KPI similar to late four.

We discussed ways to improve the no show process to reinforce the policy at trainings and safety meetings of providers, that the callout is made, and only if the rider cannot proceed to the pickup location the no show is approved as well as assuring a level of reasonableness in the riders ability to proceed to the pickup location.

We also discussed the possibility of creating direct communication between the driver and rider, and some other technology to help riders connect with the pickup vehicle. We plan to seek more expertise on how that could be accomplished. Additionally, how to make the notes about the trip have more importance.

Our discussion about the definition of mismatched trips included that it was not just a capacity issue but also the order riders are scheduled to embark and disembark so riders do not needlessly have to get off and back on the vehicle and for those that need to transfer to a passenger seat from a mobility device.

We concluded this discussion with a short description of how routed trips can go bad and how drivers and dispatchers could avoid this.

We proceeded to our review ofthe Draft Bylaws recommendations discussing removal of members, election and duties of officers and orientation. We hope to have our recommendations to the full CAC after a couple more subcommittee meetings.

Subject: Subcommittee summaries for November 2019

Subcommittee members present; Yael Hagen, Kurt Baldwin, Dina Garcia, Maria Aroch, Terri Lantz, and assigned ACCESS staff present; Mike Greenwood

Others present; Rogelio Gomez, Susanna Cadenas, Rycharde Martindale Essington

We are in the process of narrowing our focus on proposed recommendations to improve; missed trips and no-shows, avoiding unnecessarily long rides, routing and miss-matched rides, and direct communication between drivers and riders.

We discussed promoting that when a road supervisor is available, road supervisors will pick up riders whose connections were missed due to provider error or stranding for other reasons, and take the rider to their destination to avoid diverting another vehicle to pick up the rider.

Explore requiring providers to contact a rider if the vehicle is going to arrive 30 minutes after scheduled pick up time. This must be reinforced at regular staff meetings. A rider should be offered the opportunity to decline the trip with no late cancellation penalty but must not be encouraged to cancel by the provider.

Requiring a dispatcher, in order to dismiss a driver on a scheduled pick up; the vehicle must dwell at the pick-up location for 5 minutes. During this dwell time the dispatcher

must contact the rider to see if they are ready to proceed to the pick-up location. Ready to proceed has been interpreted to mean "immediately proceed." Depending on the situation "ready to proceed" could include; being transferred into a mobility device or switching from a stationary medical device to a portable device, negotiating a location that is not familiar or complicated to navigate, or having alternate accessible routes of travel that are greater distances, and so on. Ready to proceed should be a flexible standard with the objective to connect the rider with the vehicle to complete the trip from origin to destination. (Or 10 minutes instead of 5 min?)

Develop methodology to be used to hold contractors accountable in efficiency of routing using ratios of location to location distance compared to actual miles traveled from origin to destination. (This could be like the information provided by Melissa to show how routing can create a 1 to 1 ratio, an efficient routing, to a poorly planned routing that produced higher ratios including 7 to 1 ratio. (or limit share rides over two hours) include report to CAC and encourage provider.)

Recommend comparable travel time to fixed route should include the wait time from the negotiated pick up time to the destination instead of from the time rider boards the vehicle and the vehicle departs.

Continue to explore creating direct communication between the driver and rider, and other technology to help riders connect with the pickup vehicle. We plan to seek more expertise on how that could be accomplished.

Make the notes the driver has about the trip have more importance. (It was suggested the dispatcher should verify the driver read the notes prior to determining a no-show and allowing the driver to proceed to next destination.)

The definition of mismatched trips should include, not just capacity issues, but also the order riders are scheduled to embark and disembark so riders do not needlessly have to get off and back on the vehicle and for those that need to transfer to a passenger seat from a mobility device.

The Bylaws discussion included defining the Chair's role in relationship to the Board of Directors and developing the CAC agenda, adjusting the language in Section 5 from a majority vote to requiring 51% of CAC present to elect officers and includes requiring enhanced orientation on Roberts Rules and Open Meeting requirements.

We also discussed how subcommittee's and Standing Subcommittees elect their own Chairperson and/or Vice Chairperson, How a Standing Committee reports to the CAC, and the order in which we take public comment on agenda items.

Subject: Subcommittee summaries for January 2020

Access staff and subcommittee members discussed the draft bylaws which was included in the January 2020 agenda packet.

There was no subcommittee meeting held in February 2020