access

AGENDA

COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CAC) MEETING

Tuesday, October 8, 2019
12:45 pm – 3:00 pm
Los Angeles County MTA
Union Station Room, Third Floor
One Gateway Plaza

Time	*Item*	*Description/Presenter*	*Disposition*	*Pages*
	1.	Call to Order	Action	
10	2.	Introductions		
5	3.	Review & Approval of Minutes of September 10, 2019	Action	3-17
15	4.	General Public Comments	Information	
15	5.	Officer Elections/Rycharde Martindale	Action	18-19
15	6.	Medi-Cal Transportation Campaign/Matthew Avancena	Presentation	20-21
10	7.	CAC Subcommittee Update/Matthew Avancena	Possible Action	22-26
5	8.	Conference Room availability for November/Matthew Avancena	Possible Action	
15	9.	Member Communications	Information	
15	10.	Video Vignettes/Josh Southwick	Information	
15	11.	Reservation Hold Messages/Mike Greenwood	Information	
10	12.	Operations Update/Alex Chrisman	Information	

5	13.	New Business Raised Subsequent to the Posting of the Agenda	Information
2	14.	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
September 10, 2019
12:45 pm - 3:00 pm

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Maria Aroch called the meeting to order at 12:45 p.m.

INTRODUCTIONS

CAC Members Present: Maria Aroch, Chair; Michael Arrigo, Vice-Chair; Kurt Baldwin, Tina Foafoa, Dina Garcia, Yael Hagen, Liz Lyons, Olivia Almalel, Jesse Padilla, Wendy Cabil, Gordon Cardona and Terri Lantz.

CAC Members Not Present: Rachele Goeman, Michael Conrad and Marie-France Francois

Board Members Present: None

Access Services Staff Present: Matthew Avancena, Mike Greenwood, Veronica Guzman-Vanmarcke, LaTisha Wilson, Art Chacon, Brian Selwyn, David Chia, Kimberlie Nimori, Faustino Salvador, Onnika Payne, Rycharde Martindale, Rogelio Gomez, Geoffrey Okamoto, Jessica Volanos, Eric Haack.

Guests Present: William Zuke (Rider & OSS member), Mike Fricke (California Transit), Wilma Ballew (Rider & OSS member), Angie Smith (Rider), Luis Garcia (Global Paratransit), Dolores Flores (Rider), Katherine George Chu (LA County Disabilities Commission), Annette Arriola (Alta), Marisol Guerrero, Michael Sher (Rider), Deaka McClain (Rider) Karen Alvarez, Adriana Hermosillo (Wayfinder Family Services), Rudy Contreras (SCRS), Hector Ochoa (SCRS), Eric Andretti (ISE), Daisy Mercado, Archer Cohen.

REVIEW & APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Chair Aroch asked for a motion to approve the September 10, 2019 minutes.

Motion: Member Baldwin
Second: Member Lantz
Abstain: Member Cabil, Member Hagen
Motion: Passed

MEMBER COMMENTS:

Member Baldwin requested a correction to be made on Page 9, fifth paragraph of the September minutes. He wanted to clarify that he was talking about the Antelope Valley and not the San Fernando Valley or the San Gabriel Valley. Veronica will make the proper adjustments.

Member Lantz had a couple of minor corrections on her comment on voting, in the September minutes. The electronic poll pass is not "put in" but scanned in. It's similar to when you go to the market and they scan a barcode. She would like this corrected and has another minor one but she will email Veronica Guzman-Vanmarcke.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

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

Adriana Hermosillo made a public comment by stating that she works at Wayfinder Family Services as an Orientation and Mobility Specialist and she helps visually impaired adults obtain service with Access. Recently, when she called to schedule an evaluation, the person on the phone told herthat they don't guarantee assistance from the vehicle into the Evaluation Center. If her student, who is blind and new to the area, could not get independently from the vehicle to the evaluation center and navigate inside the center, they would need to provide a PCA for her. This was new information to her. She has helped many people sign up for Access and has never heard of this before. She wanted clarification on the policy for people who need assistance at the Evaluation Center. Secondly, in the Rider Guide, it states that one guest can ride with a person, but additional guests can also ride if there is space in the vehicle. She wanted clarification on that as well, because there are people who make reservations, and in the end, they are turned away. Geoffrey Okamoto was assigned to meet with her to discuss the issue.

Michael Sher made a public comment by stating that something that needs to be clarified in the Rider's Guide is safety. There are certain areas that Access cannot pull in/pull up to in people's driveways and they need to clarify that for the riders. Especially for those that live in the areas that pose a safety risk. Secondly, when he comes to these meetings and two members start bickering about a certain topic, it's a waste of his time and he feels at some point that the Chair needs to intervene. Eric Haack was assigned to meet with him to discuss the issue.

Luis Garcia from Global Paratransit made a public comment by introducing Deaka McClain and giving some background information on how Global has recently been collaborating with her. Deaka has been assisting them to train the drivers with a focus on sensitivity and empathy.

Deaka McClain made a public comment by stating that Victor Garate, the Deputy

General Manager of Global, asked her to come and share her story. Victor asked her to provide a sensitivity training for drivers, dispatchers and call takers towards people with disabilities and it has been very successful. It has been very well received so she would like to continue. Global is her home, so she will start with them first but she would like to be able to do the same training for all the other regions. She is available for the other regions once she is done with Global Paratransit. Her number is (562) 841- 1124.

Dolores Flores made a public comment by stating that she was trying to get transportation for a pickup and was given options that were two to three hours difference. She wanted to go to an event that was from 10:00am to 1:00pm and they proposed to pick her up at 11:00am, which meant she would arrive late to her event or the second option was a 4:00am pickup. She also has a son with anxiety and he cannot sit in place for hours. This triggers his anxiety, so she is having trouble and she is not successfully booking her transportation. There needs to be a better booking option because the times offered are unreasonable and ridiculous. Latisha Wilson was assigned to meet with her to discuss the issue.

CAC CONFLICT OF INTEREST FORM

Chair Aroch stated that as the CAC Chair of Access Services, it is one of her primary responsibilities to ensure that the committee body is lead with integrity and transparency to the best of her ability. To that end, the committee and other non-related Access Committee meetings, the Parents with Disabilities Program has been a hot topic of discussion. She needs to ensure that as an advisory body to the Board of Directors of Access Services, everyone does not knowingly have a conflict of interest with this program or any other business that they discuss previously, now or in the future. The way they do business, how they advocate and how they make decisions in this committee must be in the best interest of all Access riders. Additionally, the members of the committee have received the CAC Manual and although the files need to be updated periodically, the issue of conflict of interest is governed by law and is in the CAC manual that everybody received when they started as a CAC member. They also received the ethical do's and don'ts for CAC members.

Member Baldwin stated that according to the Bylaws as previously read by Veronica Guzman-Vanmarcke, the public comments must be read prior to the discussion. Since they do not follow the Bylaws very much anyhow, they would not do what was indicated.

Chair Aroch asked the members to do the discussion first before the public comments. Member Baldwin stated that as mentioned before they should first do the public comments and then the member discussion. Chair Aroch agreed and asked for the public comments to be read.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Rudy Contreras, Chief Executive of SCRS, made a public comment by stating that they are one ofthe 28 Centers for Independent Living that represents the State of California. The center represents five counties. SCRS recently became aware of Parents with Disabilities Program and that it was a program that was introduced to the CAC on June 12 of 2012. This program was actually introduced by a direct beneficiary of the program who is now at a current member of the CAC. Due to this advisory committee having direct influence to state funds and contacting the Office of the Attorney General, there is a direct conflict of interest due to this individual being a beneficiary of the project, which is a direct violation of government code section eight seven 100 section 10 90.

Katherine George Chu with the LA County Commission on Disabilities stated that in regards to conflict of interest she understand that the CAC is not making actual decisions and is just taking information to the Board. Under conflict of interest, they are saying that they will not be making decisions where they are benefiting from a service. When you are looking at a very small cell of riders in L.A County, that conflict of interest grows because you are looking at a few individuals. If you have one of those few individuals making suggestions and you don't have the other side of an argument, then the outcome will be greater for themselves because they are biased. She understands that if it comes down to financial gain, you don't have to sign the same paperwork that others sign. They are not talking about all of L.A. County but about 45 individuals and out of that, 18 riders that are benefiting from one specific program. That is where they are getting some sort of benefit. They are gaining a benefit because they have not addressed those who are in another part of South L.A who are not receiving that same service.

MEMBER COMMENTS

Member Lantz responded to Katherine George Chu's comment that there was a difference between Boards and serving on Boards, which do make the decisions that she is talking about. Serving on a community advisory committee, is a huge difference. After reading the conflict of interest form, she asked somebody from the MTA if they have ever found it necessary to do this for a committee and they said no.

Chair Aroch responded that she doesn't understand why it is such a big issue to get the CAC members to sign the conflict of interest form. It is easy to sign and if there is no conflict of interest then it should not be a problem to sign it.

Member Lantz stated that there is no issue but because another item not related to this issue is being discussed as well, she does not understand the connection. She would like them to stick to one item at a time.

Chair Aroch stated that every CAC member has received the CAC Manual with the conflict of interest form, which is on page 16. She would like everyone to look at his or her manual.

Member Baldwin stated that they don't have a clear policy on conflicts of interest. When he was on the Board of Directors, it was well established what a conflict of interest was because it had to do with financial conflicts. Where somebody might have, a brother-in-law that works for a company that carries out a service and they don't want to make a decision on that because that's a direct financial conflict of interest. They would state the conflict and then the Board would decide as to whether they felt if it would be inappropriate for that Board member to vote on that subject and then make a decision for that person to recuse himself or herself. This advisory committee makes no decisions, they are strictly advisory. They seek out people to serve on the committee that have a personal stake in how the service is provided. They also have people that have a professional stake in being on the committee. He is a Systems Advocacy Supervisor for his center and one of the things that centers are supposed to do is advocate for equal opportunity for people with disabilities. He has a professional interest in being on the committee, but that's what they want. He wants to make sure that people understand they do have a financial conflict of interest, they should make it known but if they are just a user of the system, that's who they want to give input into this process.

Member Lantz shares Member Baldwin's op1n1on. She currently serves on four committees with LA County and she has never been asked to sign a conflict of interest form. They are only on an advisory capacity and there's probably a conflict of interest in everybody in the room because everyone cares. Either they are riders or have worked with riders. She has 48 years invested in transportation issues and she has worked 46 of those at United Cerebral Palsy. She is passionate about it because it makes a difference in the life of every single rider. She hopes that those who serve on an advisory committee would be passionate about what they're doing. She believes that if they were talking about voting on an issue and it involved money of any kind, most people would recuse themselves.

Member Padilla stated that he is a former rider and an advocate for Access. Unless there is a stakeholder financial state, then there is not a conflict of interest. He is passionate about working with Access and he believes they all are passionate it. He is supports issues like Access to Work, the Standing Order Trips, Transfers and the Free Fare program.

Member Lyons stated that she thinks they should sign, in her opinion because she has signed it before when serving on other boards and it was not an issue. She has seen issues of conflict of interests on other Boards before, even where a Board member had a conflict of interest but didn't want to recuse himself.

Chair Aroch clarified that this conflict of interest issue is not about money but about preferential treatment. The people in the program with Parents with Disabilities have a same day reservation preference and have a 20-minute wait time. They pay only one dollar per ride and that means the cost is $55 dollars for each rider versus the $35 dollars for a regular rider. This preferential treatment is not supported by the ADA and more importantly this program is taking funds from the regular transportation for people with disabilities and these kids riding do not have disabilities.

Member Baldwin pointed out the discussion is about the conflict of interest not the parent with disabilities program. Chair Aroch stated that they were both connected.

Matthew Avancena stated that he would have legal counsel look at the conflict of interest form and formulate a legal opinion to see what should be done with this form. He can check what the necessity of this form is and if they would even need it.

Member Baldwin stated that it would be helpful if there was a policy attached to this. Matthew Avancena responded that this would be done and that they could discuss this in a future agenda. Chair Aroch requested it be tabled until the October meeting but Matthew Avancena said they would need more time to be able to discuss it with their legal counsel so it will have to be brought up in the November meeting, or later.

Member Lantz asked if they can clarify what they mean by conflict of interest. Chair Aroch stated that she insists that each member received a manual when they joined the CAC and they need to refer back to it.

Member Lyons stated that she doesn't mind signing the form and doesn't understand what the big deal is. She also doesn't understand why she would pay a higher fare than some riders. She has a friend that has a daughter in junior high and she lives in an area that the Parents with Disabilities program is not offered and she pays full price too. She does not believe this is fair.

PARENTS WITH DISABILITIES PROGRAM

Eric Haack gave a presentation on the program overview ofthe Parents with Disabilities program. He explained how the program was funded by a grant, which had the objective to provide transportation for Access riders who need to engage in childcare related activities such as school recreation, health care, and socialization activities. The proposed project would be a premium service designed to address a need that exists among access certified parents with school-aged children.

Chair Aroch had a couple of questions regarding the presentation. She told Eric Haack that this was not exactly what she had requested from him. She had requested more details to be discussed, for example, what the age limit of the kids would be.

Eric Haack stated that they have not designated a specific age of the children riding since the program was a pilot and they were gathering information to better adjust the program to the riders' needs.

Chair Aroch stated that this was in fact no longer a pilot program since it has been going for 7 years and is now being funded by Access funds. She asked him not to call it a pilot anymore. She said that she was glad she was discussing this program because an age limit has not been decided and there are many issues to address.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Rudy Contreras made a public comment by stating that the Access Board of Directors voted to approve the Parents with Disabilities Program and this had a price tag of $870,000 dollars for 3 years. This project is now over 6 years old with a much higher cost than originally projected. During these initial discussions, there was concern at the time that this project will be violating the ADA regulations, but due to the freedom grant being awarded to fund this program at the time, this allowed for Access to create a premium service and not an ADA mandated service. He stated that the Parents with Disabilities Program is no longer being funded by the freedom grant since the funds expired. He added that Access continues to fund this program now with taxpayer dollars and under section 37.131 ofthe department oftransportation ADA regulations, it states that service restrictions or priorities must not be imposed based on trip purpose. This means that Access Services is in clear violation of the ADA, as it is providing a priority premium service, solely on the basis of the trip purpose as it relates to the Parents with Disabilities project. Unless Access services offers the same service to all communities within L.A. County, it must immediately withdraw all funding to the current program and discontinue the premium service until it can fund this service to all of our communities equally. Regardless of whether Access is working to resolve this violation, he is hoping that the CAC will be able to make some form of motion that brings this issue to the attention of the Access Board of Directors, and that the current project cease immediately until the service is open to all L.A. County Access riders.

Hector Ochoa with SCRS made a public comment by stating that although he still doesn't understand the full scope of this program, he is concerned with how long it's taken to address this issue. He understands the need for the program but the question here is not the need for this program. It is a need just as the Access to Work program or whatever other programs Access might offer. When you limit it to seven years for a certain region then that is a problem. When he talks about the Access to Work program, it is still not publicly known. The way Access promotes or share this information is also a concern. He is not an Access rider, but his brother is, and he could have benefited from this program, but he does not because he just learned of it. Concerning the Parents with Disabilities program; to know that those public dollars are being used to fund this program, that's a problem. It seems like the oversight and management of this pilot was very poorly executed or overseen. Someone needs to take responsibility for this and be accountable for how long this pilot has gone. By that,

he means Access Services who has allowed it to carry on this far. Whether it's today or soon, Access needs to make some critical decisions as to what they are going to do regarding this particular program. Concerning the conflict of interest connected to this program, it does not just have to be about money. If there is any gain to be had from this program, from a particular people, that in itself, is a conflict.

Katherine George Chu made a public comment by stating that she understands these are public comments and she is not going to get an answer, she wants it to go on record. When the program ridership statistics were presented, they did not address the difference in the numbers between 2014 and 2019. There seems to have been a surge in 2016, then it rather evened out, and then it's sort of climbing again. She doesn't know if that can be addressed but Access will have to go to the Commission so if they want to address it then, that's fine as well. She also submitted some questions but she will just going to go ahead and read them because maybe some of these things can be touched on. Since LAUSD is benefiting from this program, those students should be able to take a school bus, and LAUSD should be paying for them. She wonders why Access is paying for those students and why LAUSD is not contributing to that cost. Some of that money can be diverted to other programs as Commissioner Ochoa said, so what would the difference in the cost per trip via school bus trip transit be, compared to an Access cost per trip. This would not include the cost of the parent but they would like to know how much of this cost would LAUSD be able to cover. To clarify, because this program was designed for school drop off and pick up, was this program running through the summer months. It was mentioned that it's also used for recreation, so does the Parents with Disability program end in June and then pick up again in September? She asked if the Parents with Disabilities program is active during the summer months and if there is a change in the cost during the summer months.

Wilma Ballew made a public comment after the member discussion stating that she knows someone that is autistic that has needed transportation and is currently 21 years old graduating from high school. She asks if it would be fair to cut him off although he still needs the aid. There are certain situations where someone might need help and it would be unfair to take that help away from them. She asks people to think about this when they are discussing the program.

MEMBER DISCUSSION

Member Baldwin stated he was glad to hear the program is going to be expanded to the rest of the County, and he expressed his appreciation to the L.A. County Commission for keeping the heat on in this regard. He may not agree with how the heat is presented, but he appreciates it. One of the things that draws him to this program in particular, is that he had an opportunity in the late nineties, to work for an organization called DREDF, Disability Rights Education and Defense Fund. This organization is responsible for getting the ADA passed, along with a lot of other organizations and the civil rights movement in general. One of the things they were working on was the institutional discrimination that happened in family courts. Many

marriages do not survive when one of the spouses becomes disabled. In the family courts, about a hundred percent of the time the children, the sole custody is given to the able-bodied parent. The court's reasoning behind that is that the disabled parent may not be able to respond to those childcare needs that were described. This program being unique in the United States and important that L.A. is spearheading it, chips away at that institutional discrimination.

Member Lantz stated that when this program was first mentioned, there were many members that questioned why it was only offered in one area. She is glad to hear that the program will now be county wide and she believes everyone that has championed this program should be applauded. She sees a high ratio of single parents with perhaps more than one child, and sometimes one with a disability. She wanted some clarification that if there is a parent with a disability going to an Access meeting and obviously are not with their child, they're paying the same as anybody else who's in the room who rides Access.

Eric Haack responded that the discounted fees only applied to rides that the parent is taking with the child to either take them or pick them up from school.

Member Lyons stated that the L.A. school district have fantastic buses and she does not understand why they do not use those buses to transport their children. She has friends that wonder why they can't ride with their child who has a disability and their child is in junior high school. She believes that legally the L.A. County School District says they could get free service until their 21 years, not 18. She used to work for Valley College and they used to come and use the program and the L.A. School District paid them and paid Valley College, so it's 21.

Member Cabil stated that she is concerned about Antelope Valley because they are constantly running into barriers. They are already behind with their software and she just wonders if all the I's will be dotted and the T's be crossed. She would like to be a part of the development for Antelope Valley. She is already a part of the Department of Mental Health subcommittee that is focusing on the needs of other disabilities and they are in the process of developing capacity-building projects, where they can assess the needs of the different aid service areas in the county. She definitely wants to collaborate with that subcommittee to help meet the needs adequately in Antelope Valley.

Chair Aroch asked how many months a year this service is operation. Eric Haack responded that the service is year round and the age limit of a child is 18 years old.

Chair Aroch asked to clarify that the age limit is 18 years old. She asked how old the child has to be to join the program. Would it be 5 to 18 years old? Mr. Haack stated that the child could be younger. There is no minimum age because the parent joins the program not the child. The child has no means of transportation regardless if they are younger or in middle school. The transportation options that are available to parents

are fewer in this case where the parent has a disability. This program was created to see whom it would help, whether the child was younger or older.

Member Padilla is happy that this program will be expanded to the rest of the county and is wondering if the ¾ mile of bus service will make a difference on service to the parents. If certain bus services change will this affect those parents and Eric Haack responded that this would in fact affect all riders.

Member Lantz wanted to clarify that she used to work with many school districts and before there was transportation for most children but now things have changed and many schools do not transport them anymore. If you are a parent with a disability, who has a child with a disability in the L.A. Unified School District and legally that child is entitled to services through their schooling, through their 21st year. The parents who can't get on a public bus have no other viable option and that changed her way of thinking about this program. She supports this program as long as it is the same throughout the county.

Member Baldwin stated that with the possibility that some bus routes are going to be eliminated. Metro is doing the Next Gen study, and if they do retreat from some areas, they're going to fill them back in with micro transit. He would like Access to consider that as part of the fixed route. If the micro transit is going out there and it's part of the fixed route, then that's the area that Access should serve.

Chair Aroch brought this issue to the agenda because this program just serves people who go to school. This program doesn't take people to the doctor or to work the same day. This premium service is offered for this program and there is no limit. In addition, the age limit of 18 is too high. She would like this committee to make different qualifications. She is not recommending closing this program. She is happy that it will soon be countywide. However, they need to advise the Board and they need to advocate for all the riders. One of the goals she wants to bring on the table are those changes they need to make because she feels that 18 years is too old.

Member Cabil would rather the Chair not make conclusions on what ages are valid or not until they know specifically, the percentage of the ages that are in need of this service. She prefers they get some facts first.

Chair Aroch responded that she could get that. She would like to be able to compare to other programs working in other schools. She feels that this program is more of a VIP service and not a premium service because it runs the entire year.

Vice-Chair Arrigo expressed he was glad the program would be soon extended to the rest ofthe County.

Chair Aroch asked Eric Haack if he could provide the ages and pertinent details of everyone participating in the Parents with Disabilities program. Eric Haack stated he would be able to provide some of the information but not all because based on the small study that establishes what the age is Countywide.

CAC OFFICER NOMINATION COMMITTEE

Rycharde Martindale, ADA Coordinator, explained that according to the Bylaws, he needs to get volunteers so that they may proceed to the process of picking the new Chair and Vice-Chair for the CAC. There were not enough people to sit in the committee last year so he hopes to get enough volunteers this time. He asks for volunteers that are not going to run for these two posts, to be on the committee.

Member Cabil asked what the deadline is for choosing a committee. Rycharde Martindale responded that the deadline for volunteers is asap and then he will have the volunteers' start the process and they would proceed with the election process next month. Ms. Cabil asked if they needed to meet in person and Mr. Martindale stated that they would more than likely to do a conference call.

Member Baldwin stated that is has never been the job of the nominating committee to make any decisions, but only just to poll the members to ask who is interested and then present those to the CAC. They are already behind on working with the Bylaws, but as they are never followed anyway, it is of no consequence. The subcommittee can poll the members to find out who is interested, put that list together and have the election next month. If somebody misses getting their name in but they decide to run next month, they can nominate themselves from the floor at that time.

Rycharde Martindale stated that all the details Member Baldwin just gave are on the item and recommended everyone to look it over.

Vice-Chair Arrigo stated that the process is very simple. There just needs to be a phone call where people who are interested in running for the positions can be interviewed. However, those people cannot be a part of the nominating subcommittee.

Chair Aroch then asked who would be interested in serving on the nominating committee. Member Baldwin, Member Lantz and Member Cabil volunteered to serve on the nominating committee for the choosing of a new Chair and Vice-Chair of the CAC.

RESERVATION SCRIPT

Jessica Volanos, Operation Service Monitor, gave a presentation on the reservation script. She discussed the Access reservation script by explaining how it was developed with the goal of streamlining the reservation process, collecting all necessary trip information, as well as ensuring quality of call. The script allows the operation service monitors and herselfto audit based on some ofthe items that are detailed in the script.

MEMBER DISCUSSION:

Member Hagen stated she was glad that they are talking about taking some of the redundancy out of the script. She believes they need to spend a little more time on the script getting information, but making sure that people are comfortable not giving information that they don't want to give. For instance, the type of building they are going to, that it is optional. If someone wants to give that information because they want the driver to have a better time or better information to find them in a different location, that's their prerogative and absolutely they should. Otherwise, if they don't, then they shouldn't have to give that information. As far as mobility device, they need to mainstream how they call mobility devices, and no longer calling them medical devices. In the disabled community, the whole independent living movement, they have been trying for many years to move away from a medical model.

Member Lantz wanted to thank Jessica for coming and presenting this. It has been something that CAC has asked for, for a long time, and she credits Access for getting this together for them. One of the reasons that this is so important is that those who go out in the community and try to help train riders who may need this service and may not be able to get everything together on their own. There are many disabilities where there's a hesitation, because there's a natural reaction with certain disabilities, where it takes more time to be able to speak. Having this script available helps people to prepare for it, so that they are not surprised by the questions. They can anticipate what's coming. She has helped schedule rides for people with Access, and she thinks it's helpful even for her.

Member Almalel thanked Jessica for her presentation. She asks if there is additional script for the CSR's if a rider is traveling with a mobility device. If they go from one device to a different device that is not listed. Mrs. Volanos asked for clarification on if these devices are on the customers' eligibility at the time of the reservation. Member Almalel stated that if the rider just had a medical procedure where they cannot use their normal mobility device, does the script inform the rider that they need to be reevaluated for an additional device. Mrs. Volanos stated that the script doesn't directly touch on this issue but it is part of the CSR training.

Member Baldwin asked how information was solicited pertaining to a riders' pickup. Details about the location of the rider and where the vehicle would need to pick them up specifically because of a logistic detail. He asked if this is something the rider would have to provide this information on their own and if so, where is this provided. Mrs. Volanos responded that this information is added under the trip notes section.

Vice-Chair Arrigo stated that if a customer requests a pick up at UCLA or Dodger Stadium, or a large venue like that, does the CSR offer to invite the customer to go to the website to a certain page that they can view the stand location. Additionally, he would like Access to consider inviting them on a field trip to one of their reservation rooms, for them to observe them doing their work. Mrs. Volanos answered that they

typically have the stand information available so the CSR may have a conversation with the customer about specific stand to pick them up.

Member Lantz wanted to go back to what Member Almalel discussed concerning the mobility devices because if someone's power chair broke and is using a wheelchair then it is not usually that much of a problem. However, if **it** is the other way around then they have to get doctors and therapist to recommend them. It would be great if somehow they could get some clarification so that someone isn't prevented from booking a ride because they couldn't use the one chair that day. She hopes the providers can bring this up or talk about **it,** and maybe they can revisit this or have another presentation.

Member Hagen stated it's a good discussion to have. She has noticed an improvement, because **it** used to be that you would listen to the radio and would hear the dispatcher say, "You can't pick a passenger up, because they're supposed to have a power chair and they have a manual chair." She wonders if others have experienced an improvement in that. She has not heard that in a very long time, so she hopes that is being improved. Her question to the entire committee is to ask what they think is an appropriate word or way of referring to mobility devices, that is respectful. She thinks they need to change the script a little bit to allow more description of the travel. The notes section is limited in characters. This section is used for ride details including anything concerning service animals.

Rogelio Gomez responded to Member Lantz's question concerning mobility devices and the changes at reservations. The reservations have been given instructions to book a reservation, regardless of the eligibility information of what type of mobility devices being used. Access Services has on the back end, done some audits to address that. In some situations where it becomes more difficult, is when a customer books a reservation under, say, manual wheelchair, but then the day of the ride, has a power chair. That changes the dynamics, and this is where the driver might say, "Well you know what, I was anticipating a manual wheelchair, and I have another a chair I have to pick up." and that's where that kind of comes into play.

Member Padilla asked if in the software the details of repeated rides are not already predetermined as it was before. In addition, they do not always necessarily ask for more information in these cases since the rides are taken regularly.

Member Cabil asked if they knew about the different software and asked if the Antelope Valley software has the capability of popping up. Mrs. Volanos stated it does not.

Member Lantz expressed that she was happy that this was discussed and that she would encourage people to let others know if they are changing their device to have the courtesy to let Access know.

CAC SUBCOMMITTEE UPDATE

Matthew Avancena wanted to preface this particular agenda item. He included this item so that the CAC members have a visual reminder of what CAC goals are being discussed on the subcommittee level. His intent is to have this as a standing item, going forward in each agenda. He will be doing this to append the item with the subcommittee summaries towards the end. If the item is read, it has the background on how the CAC goals came about in the goals retreat on March 12, and then subsequently they formed various subcommittees to address those goals retreat. One of those topics they discussed today, which is the reservation script, and then other topics that we will try to agendize in future CAC meetings would be the video vignettes, how to improve provider and rider training, and how to improve negotiation of pickup time. He then asked Member Baldwin to elaborate on this item.

Member Baldwin gave a summary of the last meeting on September 4. He wanted to ask the CAC a couple of things. One is that Mike Conrad had asked to be on the Bylaws subcommittee, but it never got into the minutes. It was after the fact and he does not know if it was corrected in subsequent minutes, but he wants to make sure that gets in the minutes and he's on that committee. He also knows that there are a couple of members that have expressed interest in joining the subcommittee but they are trying to keep it under a quorum so they don't have to do the public open meeting requirements. If there were somebody that feels like they would like to step off the committee that would allow other people that are interested to get on the committee, please inform him. Lastly, they wanted to break up from one sub-committee to the other. They discussed merging the Operations subcommittee with the Bylaws subcommittee. To give a brief summary on what they discussed; the unreasonably long trips, and they are not talking about what's comparable to fixed route but just about people having to be on the vehicle for too long. In the future, they are bringing together some of the other issues as far as missed trips and no-shows and mismatched trips. In the Bylaws subcommittee, they are not trying to change anything, they are just adding. For example, the membership application process was vague and there wasn't a lot of clarity. They have worked diligently at making sure that all the clarity is there. This way people know what happens to their application when they apply. There was a misinterpretation of the Bylaws where the subcommittees had a Chair, and Vice Chair that had to be picked by the CAC. They also clarified that the ad hoc subcommittees, like the one that they are involved with don't have to be subject to the open meeting laws. Next month they are looking at a selection of Chair by share, but adding some clarity in there as far as providing an orientation. After today's discussion about the conflict of interest, maybe they want to add something about CAC membership orientation, but definitely for the Chair and Vice Chair. They are looking at perhaps adding an additional officer position. They are in the process of rethinking the nominating subcommittee.

Member Hagen asked for a motion to approve that merging ofthe two subcommittees, the Operations and Bylaws subcommittees with Kurt Baldwin as the Chair.

Motion: Member Hagen
Second: Member Arrigo
Motion: Passed

Member Baldwin asked if they could quickly discuss the membership of the subcommittees because they cannot add anybody because then it becomes a quorum, and then we have to do Brown Act notification and have an open meeting. He is not against that, however, they can get the job done quicker within the subcommittees. Jesse Padilla and Michael Arrigo are the two people that have expressed an interest to be on the committee, but somebody has to drop off before they can be added.

Member Lantz asked if those members interested can come in as substitutes if one of the members cannot join one of the meetings.

Member Lantz asked for a motion to approve that there be substitutes for the subcommittees in case one of the participating members can't make the meeting.

Motion: Member Lantz
Second: Member Arrigo
Motion: Passed

OSS REPORT

Rycharde Martindale explained what the OSS did at its last meeting. They reviewed online booking, and had an ongoing discussion of definition and development of a same-day program. For further details, he recommends people refer to the attached item of the agenda.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Aroch made a motion to adjourn the meeting.

Motion: Member Aroch
Second: Member Baldwin

The meeting adjourned at 3:00 pm

ITEM 5

OCTOBER 8, 2019

TO: **ACCESS COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

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

RE: **CAC OFFICER ELECTION**

ISSUE:

To comply with Article V: Officers, in the current CAC Bylaws, this is the list of announced candidates seeking the position of Chair and First Vice-Chair. Next, is the method of how the election will take place. As a reminder, in this process, a member can nominate themselves from the floor.

Candidates:

The announced candidates for Chair include: Maria Aroch, Tina Foafoa, and Dina Garcia. Announced candidates for First Vice-Chair include: Maria Aroch, Michael Arrigo, Michael Conrad, Tina Foafoa and Rachele Goeman.

Process of Election:

The CAC will elect each officer by a majority vote of all CAC members present by ballot. Here are the steps to follow:

- Candidates will either distribute their Statement to members or make a short statement describing why they want either the Chair or Vice-Chair positions;
- Ballots will be cast for Chair, then tallied, then the count will be announced for each candidate. The candidate having a majority vote of the CAC will be declared the winner. If no majority is gained or a tie occurs, another vote will be taken between the top two candidates until a winner emerges.
- Ballots will be cast for First Vice-Chair, then tallied, then the count will be announced for each candidate. The candidate having a majority vote of the CAC will be declared the winner. If no majority is gained or a tie occurs, another vote will be taken between the top two candidates until a winner emerges.
- The Chair and First Vice-Chair selections will then be submitted to the

Chair of the Access Services Board of Directors for final ratification and shall take their appointed seats at the next CAC meeting after Board ratification.

BACKGROUND:

At the September 10, 2019 CAC meeting, three volunteers were requested and selected to serve on the Officer's Nomination Subcommittee. The Subcommittee received nominations from those seeking the Chair and First Vice-Chair position. Next, Candidate Statements were requested from announced candidates to be presented on the day of the next CAC meeting. These statements will let members know about their qualifications and tell why they are running for office. All candidates, including those nominating themselves from the floor will be given a brief time, (3) minutes, to persuade CAC members about their particular candidacy.

RECOMMENDATION:

By a majority vote of those CAC members present at the October 8, 2019 meeting, select by ballot (and run-off if necessary, a Chair and First Vice-Chair for the 2019-2020 term).

ITEM 6

OCTOBER 8, 2019

TO: **COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

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

RE: **MEDI-CAL TRANSPORTATION EDUCATION CAMPAIGN**

ISSUE:

Receive information on Access's Medi-Cal transportation education campaign.

BACKGROUND:

The County-Based Medi-Cal Administrative Activities (CMAA) Program assists in the administration of the Medi-Cal Program by improving the availability and accessibility of Medi-Cal services to Medi-Cal eligible individuals and their families.

On April 16, 2018 Access came before the Board of Directors and presented a Medi-Cal item by which staff asked for approval to enter into a contract with the County of Los Angeles. Staff has entered into a contract with Los Angeles County, however shortly thereafter our efforts were halted by State Legislation that was created through AB 2394. The bill stipulated that Medi-Cal passengers that were enrolled in Managed Care Provider (MCP). Plans were required to utilize the transportation services of their MCP and that the MCP is legally required to provide these transportation services to their beneficiaries. Furthermore, the State of California put forth a Policy and Procedure Letter (PPL) clarifying this item. This change in the Medi-Cal Program noted above has had a large impact upon transit agencies that were billing under the existing reimbursement program.

MEDI-CHOICE PROGRAM

Staff has identified other ways of continuing in the Medi-Cal program and receive reimbursement funding. Staff was given approval by the County of Los Angeles to refer current passengers that utilize Access Services transportation to their MCPs which provide transportation to their beneficiaries free of charge. The program will be called MEDI-CHOICE.

One of our current contractors currently provides a referral service for Access by making calls to our passengers, and therefore the addition ofthe referral of passengers

to their MCPs may be an appropriate addition to their contract. The Eastern Los Angeles Regional Center (ELARC) currently provides a similar referral service to its clients as Access is proposing.

Access Passengers that have Medi-Cal will receive referral calls advising them of their options to utilize transportation services free of charge that is mandated to be provided under State Law by their MCP. An Access rider's use of transportation services through their MCP will not affect their eligibility to use Access Services.

ITEM 7

OCTOBER 8, 2019

TO: **CAC**

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

SUBJECT: **CAC SUBCOMMITTEE UPDATE - OCTOBER 2019**

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 information can be aggregated to look at the riders experience in length of travel time.

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

In attendance were CAC subcommittee Chairs Hagan 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, Rochelle 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; Rochelle 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 "mis-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.