



Minutes

DATE

September 30, 2020

Revised October 1, 2020

AGENDA ITEM 4

Joint Meeting of
Transit Management Committee
and
Rail Management Committee
Wednesday, September 2, 2020
Via Webex/Phone
11:00 a.m.

Transit Management Committee Participants

Erik Strunk, City of Peoria, **Chair** (phone)
Mario Paniagua for Ed Zuercher, City of Phoenix, **Vice Chair** (phone)
Gina Montes, City of Avondale (phone)
Roger Klingler, City of Buckeye (phone)
Josh Wright, City of Chandler (phone)
Autumn Grooms for Crystal Dyches, City of El Mirage
David Trimble for Grady Miller, Town of Fountain Hills (phone)
Mary Goodman, Town of Gilbert (phone)
Kevin Phelps, City of Glendale (phone)
Julie Arendall, City of Goodyear (phone)
Reed Kempton, Maricopa County (phone)
Chris Brady, City of Mesa (phone)
Bruce Gardner, Town of Queen Creek (phone)
Mark Melnchenko, City of Scottsdale (phone)
David Kohlbeck, City of Surprise (phone)
Steven Methvin, City of Tempe (phone)

Members Not Present

City of Tolleson
Aubree Perry, ADOT

Rail Management Committee Participants

Chris Brady, City of Mesa (**Chair**) (phone)
Mario Paniagua for Ed Zuercher, City of Phoenix, (**Vice Chair**) (phone)
Josh Wright, City of Chandler (phone)
Steven Methvin, City of Tempe (phone)

Chair Strunk called the meeting to order at 11:04 a.m.



Just a general reminder to everyone as we go through the meeting. You can certainly use the chat room for comments and we'll be sure to recognize that. And if you could too mute the microphone if you're not speaking or asking a question that will kind of keep things moving forward. And also I understand this is the first time we are broadcasting this on, YouTube.

1. Public Comment

Written public comment submitted by Blue Crowley.

I have been trying to input into the system and address both the public comment and the action items over the last few meetings, but I have not been getting my packets in time. In fact, one packet came within two minutes of the end of, I believe, it was the Management Committee meeting. But that's one.

When the Board has been going into Executive Session over the last two times, the first being the Waymo contract, after we did that, I didn't know at the time that their areas that they were going to be serving wasn't even going to be getting to the light rail and that when they did the study session for the electeds they didn't even have anything for them when they were explaining what they were doing that referred to their contract with us. So, how was that an actual briefing when they couldn't even relate to what they had gotten done and accomplished with what they had.

The second was the new contract for Mr. Smith. I'm supposed to be able to address that so when that item did come up and because I don't know what (indiscernible) until after the fact. I have in the past and before asked which one is his master because it sure isn't both committees. And when I see most of the things going for rail, I need an advocate that's running the bus and advocating for us and all of the funds that are there. Or as he once said, that when he was driving home from work and he was going to look over and see a, either a light rail vehicle or a rapid bus, I wanted to know why he wouldn't be on it instead since that's what we're trying to do is get people out of their either chauffeur driven or single occupant vehicles.

On to the third thing, with the Committee and with what you're doing, it has been that I needed to have somebody get in touch with me before you were there so that I could have had that written comment written into the minutes rather than as an afterthought that some of you may or may not read.

I also don't understand why other than for Mr. Smith's convenience that when it is public comment with technology being what it is, all I need to do is take mine off mute and be able to comment into the meeting. I know that I wasn't able to see things on my phone, but all right. Thanks.



2. Chief Executive Officer's Report

Mr. Smith provided an update on the following items:

- ✓ Northwest Extension Phase II – FTA \$50.6 million budget allocation
- ✓ S. Central/Downtown Hub Extension – LONP

3. COVID-19 Update

Chair Strunk said this item is for information only. I'll turn it over to Mr. Smith if you have any comments.

Mr. Smith said we do not have an update today. Nothing's changed significantly since the last time we reported so I'll just say things, knock on wood, are continuing to look good. We have no significant disruptions to bus service, paratransit service, rail service or construction activities related to COVID activities so that is a very good thing. We've dodged the bullet and hope to continue to do so.

Mr. Chair said very good. Thank you. Do any of the committee members have questions on COVID-19?

4. Minutes

Chair Strunk said the minutes from the August 5, 2020 joint meeting are presented for approval.

IT WAS MOVED BY ROGER KLINGLER, SECONDED BY JULIE ARENDALL AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED TO APPROVE THE AUGUST 5, 2020 JOINT TMC/RMC MEETING MINUTES.

5. ERP Consultant - Plante Moran Contract Change Order

Chair Strunk said Mr. Smith.

Mr. Smith said Chair, I'll turn it over to Paul Hodgins who can explain what this item is. Paul.

Mr. Hodgins said thank you, Mr. Smith, Mr. Chair, members of the TMC/RMC. We are asking for a change order for Plante Moran. They've been our consultant through this process for nearly two years. They helped us through our needs assessment, the RFP development, and the vendor evaluation and selection.

Initially, the 4th phase of the installation and implementation, we had envisioned Plante Moran doing more implementation oversight, helping us to manage and monitor risks.



We had intended to have Paula Novacek, our controller, as kind of the project director and then hire a project manager, a full-time project manager on contract to really do the day-to-day work. So, over the last few months we've looked through dozens of project manager resumes, interviewed a few, and just really never found the person that we thought was qualified that we were looking for. In addition, in early June, Paula actually passed away from an autoimmune disorder so we lost our project director.

So, kind of working with Plante Moran on helping us to fill the gaps in both those areas, we developed this concept of the project management office where they were bringing a project director -- -- allow us to renegotiate this 4th phase and what Plante Moran's role would be based on the selected vendor. We think that because they have been with us now for almost two years, they understand the project. They understand our requirements. They understand the vendor that this is the best solution for us to fill some of the gaps that we have in the project management area.

So, the change order is for just under \$645,000 which would bring the total Plante Moran contract to just under \$1.5 million. They will be with us. This is enough funding to last through the end of the project which right now is estimated to be around March 2022.

With that, we would -- we are recommending that the Management Committees forward to the Board of Directors authority to execute this change order. I'd be happy to take any questions.

Chair Strunk said are there any questions of Mr. Hodgins or this item?

Mr. Paniagua said one question that I have has to do with the positions that the contractor will be replacing, the project manager and the project director. Are you intending -- what are you intending to do with those positions?

Mr. Hodgins said well, the project manager was always intended to be on a contract basis. We just hadn't originally intended to have it through Plante Moran so this is -- it's a just a shift from an independent contract project manager to having Plante Moran do that. We are recruiting to fill the controller position. Don't know yet when we will find the right candidate to fill that or if they will have the same type of implementation experience that Paula had so, ultimately, that will believe filled, but we think that using the project director with Plante Moran is really best for the project right now.

Mr. Paniagua said okay. Thank you, Paul. And so, I guess, the other question would be were you also intending to bring on the subject matter experts to -- on a separate contract as part of this? Or was that addition that was identified only for Plante Moran to do?



Mr. Hodgins said we were going to use mainly our own staff as subject matter experts and then hire some backfill to ensure we didn't have any gaps. So, this will allow us to use subject matter experts from Plante Moran who have been through implementations before so they have a little bit of experience there and not rely as heavily on our staff and, hopefully, minimize the amount of backfill.

Mr. Paniagua said okay. So, was this level of funding budgeted?

Mr. Hodgins said yes. Yeah. We have the funding budgeted in fiscal '21. Obviously, this carries over into fiscal '22 and that will be worked out through the budget process that we are kicking off shortly.

Mr. Paniagua said okay. Thank you, Paul.

Chair Strunk said are there any other questions of the Committee on this item? All right. Seeing none. This is an action item so I'd like to request a motion and a second to forward to the Board authorizations for the CEO to execute a contract change order in the amount of \$644,850. Is there a motion?

IT WAS MOVED BY KEVIN PHELPS, SECONDED BY REED KEMPTON AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED TO FORWARD TO THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS FOR THE CEO TO EXECUTE A CONTRACT CHANGE ORDER IN THE AMOUNT OF \$644,850.

6. Broadway Curve: Transit Impact and Mitigation Strategies and Opportunities

Chair Strunk said hopefully, everyone has had a chance to read the background information. There is a big construction project, improvement project planned and I know -- it looks like Valley Metro has stepped up to explore ways to hopefully move traffic at no additional costs short of grants and whatnot and I'd like Mr. Smith to kind of walk us through that. Scott.

Mr. Smith said thank you, Mr. Chair and I appreciate the set up there and a couple things I want to emphasize.

First of all, this is a big project and it will have huge impact. Not only on east Valley and the southeast Valley, but on the whole flow of traffic in the whole eastern part of the metro Phoenix and it will impact, obviously, auto traffic, moving of people from east to west, west to east, everything. And it also, it's a long term project and as part of this we have been meeting with ADOT staff, City of Phoenix staff, other cities, Tempe, Mesa and other southeast Valley staff to discuss what this impact might be and one of the things that came out is that ADOT talked about in their peer reviews and everything that they will go over pretty quickly, is that transit is not only an impacted, but it's also potentially part of the solution.



That led our staff to start working on just some ideas. Doing some brainstorming and I want to reemphasize what Eric talked about, this is not a proposal for a specific program. These are ideas and that might, maybe, perhaps be implemented if at the time all the cities so involved and ADOT and MAG decided that this was something that was viable, feasible, and could be funded with additional funds. We have no, I want to make clear that we have no plans to move funds or to affect any other service. We don't have money to pay for this now nor would we shift service just to handle this. But we need to go through this process of brainstorming so that everyone is aware of both the impact of the project and some potential ideas we might have to mitigate those impacts.

Kristin Myers, MAG and Marty Ziech, Valley Metro, provided a presentation which included the following:

- ✓ Broadway Curve Project Summary
- ✓ Current Contract Provisions for Closures
- ✓ Peer Review of Traffic Mitigation for Freeway Construction Using Public Transit & Transportation Demand Management
- ✓ Key Takeaways
- ✓ Valley Metro Assumptions
- ✓ Decisions on Potential Mitigation Strategies
- ✓ Impacted Routes
- ✓ Leveraging Transit, Alternative Travel Options
- ✓ Rail Park and Ride Available Capacity
- ✓ Increase Rail System Capacity
- ✓ Increase Rail System Speeds
- ✓ Express/RAPID Park and Ride Available Capacity
- ✓ Modeling Ridership on Express RAPID Routes
- ✓ Commute Solutions Overview
- ✓ Vanpool
- ✓ Messaging and Marketing
- ✓ Wrap Up

Mr. Paniagua said thank you so much. I actually, no questions, I just wanted to make a comment about how appreciative I am and the City of Phoenix is for this effort on such a hugely impacting project. I appreciate the proactive and thoughtful approach being taken here and I know MAG is also taking that same philosophy of being very proactive and thoughtful and trying to get ahead of some of these issues, learning some lessons from previous projects, learning lessons for other jurisdictions that we can bring home here to make things just a little bit easier. So, just wanted to express my kudos to the team and thank everyone. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chair Strunk said thank you. Very nice comments. Does anyone else have any comments?



Mr. Methvin said thank you. So, I also to want thank Kristin and Marty and Abby and Miriya. Your presentation was excellent and it was real easy to follow for, you know, some of us who are not always transit experts so thank you very much for that. I really appreciate the fact that you're looking to address the impacts on our local service. In Tempe, we're struggling somewhat because we have to make some reductions in our local service because of the economy. So, I appreciate the fact that there won't be an ask of the cities to fund this service.

My one concern and it's probably more of the long term -- I don't if anybody else hears bells and maybe it's just me, but it sounds like there is someone who is sort of shaking something. No? Okay. It might just be me, but it just stopped.

My only concern would be as we look to increase the frequency of light rail and increase the frequency of the express buses and, again, I understand that it's not going to be funded by the cities, that our ridership at one point, we don't have a plan in place on how we will keep those increased frequencies in effect once the project stops. That we would then, you know, be pulling that back and I think that that always has a negative impact on our ridership when we, you know, we create greater frequencies and then we pull them back and then, you know, later we do something. And I know we've had to adjust those over time. Are we thinking yet and that's long term I get it, but are we thinking yet on how we will, you know, address that? As opposed to, the Broadway curve project ended and now we're pulling back those frequencies? I'm not sure who would answer that, but I'll start with you, Mr. Smith.

Mr. Ziech said I can answer that. Essentially, yes. That is certainly something that still needs to be discussed and that is definitely a concern that we have as an agency as well and something that we need to certainly pursue as we move with the project. A couple quick just kind of side notes from internal discussions that we've had on this.

Essentially, by the time that the Broadway curve construction would be wrapping up would be around the time that the Prop 400 extension would come in so likely we would be seeing a different just funding environment to begin with, hopefully, in our favor. And then alternatively as well something that happened in all of the different projects that MAG had been studying in its peer review was that one of the best parts of what those cities had done was, essentially, as the construction happened they were constantly reviewing all of their mitigation measures to see if they were effective or not. And if they were not effective they would remove them and take that that funding and put it towards elsewhere.

So, I know that on the MAG side and, Kristin, if you would like it speak to this, please do as well. I know that that was something that they were really looking into as a potential way to ensure that we're doing the best possible mitigation we can. And then in terms of the aftereffects, certainly that is a conversation that will need to continue.



Ms. Myers said thank you, Marty, Mr. Chairman, members of the committee. Thank you, Mr. Methvin for your comments and your questions. Just to tee off a little bit on what Marty just said, during our peer review we did, we looked at some freeway projects, one in Denver, one out in Los Angeles. The one of note in Los Angeles was that they had really anticipated that they would see a high ridership if they closed down the freeway on their system and threw a bunch of money into that. Unfortunately, they did not see the ridership. They actually saw a decline during the weekend closure that they did have.

So, what they were able to do was kind of look at a different way to utilize that money and what they found was putting it towards a, they have a rail line out there, some free passes. They really worked more on the TDM side so they had that flexibility. We also found that with other projects that went four to five years. You just never know what kind of means and methods that the constructors are going to do and so you want to be a little bit nimble.

We at MAG are still working closely with ADOT because we haven't gotten through the proposals yet. We don't quite know what the construction phasing looks like and once we start to see that roll out, we'll actually have a better opportunity to maybe have more of those robust strategy discussions on what if and how do we anticipate some of these changes during construction. I hope that helps.

Mr. Methvin said it does. Thank you, Kristin. And thank you, Marty. I just -- I have one request. So, over the next few weeks as we're starting to fine tune the proposal, I would just ask that Valley Metro and the whole team meet with our Tempe staff and perhaps other cities to better -- will look like because I think there might be an opportunity if we work closely together as I know we do, we might be able to find some sliver lining here so thank you very much. Great presentation.

Mr. Chair said thank you, Steven. Before we move on to the next item, any other comments on this one? Okay.

7. Travel, Expenditures and Solicitations

This item was presented for information.

8. Future Agenda Items Request and Update on Current Events

None.



Ms. Dillon said We'd like to recognize Dave Kohlbeck. This is his last meeting. He is retiring, I believe, at the end of next week. So, congratulations to David and thank you for your participation here at Valley Metro and improving public transit throughout the Valley. Happy retirement, Dave.

Mr. Kohlbeck said thank you. And thank all of you. It's been a pleasure to serve both RTAG and the TMC cities here. And, actually, as a follow up, I wanted to thank Valley Metro. We had Tom Young out last night with our Council for a work session and he did an excellent job giving them an update on paratransit services, Ride Choice for the future. Thank you again.

Chair Strunk said thank you, Dave and best wishes in your next endeavor.

The meeting is concluded.

With no further discussion the meeting adjourned at 11:46 a.m.



Minutes

September 30, 2020
REVISED October 1, 2020

AGENDA ITEM 2

Transit Management Committee
Wednesday, September 5, 2020
Via Webex/Phone
11:00 a.m.

Transit Management Committee Participants

Erik Strunk, City of Peoria, **Chair** (phone)
Mario Paniagua for Ed Zuercher, City of Phoenix, **Vice Chair** (phone)
Gina Montes, City of Avondale (phone)
Roger Klingler, City of Buckeye (phone)
Josh Wright, City of Chandler (phone)
Autumn Grooms for Crystal Dyches, City of El Mirage
David Trimble for Grady Miller, Town of Fountain Hills (phone)
Mary Goodman, Town of Gilbert (phone)
Kevin Phelps, City of Glendale (phone)
Julie Arendall, City of Goodyear (phone)
Reed Kempton, Maricopa County (phone)
Chris Brady, City of Mesa (phone)
Bruce Gardner, Town of Queen Creek (phone)
Mark Melnchenko, City of Scottsdale (phone)
David Kohlbeck, City of Surprise (phone)
Steven Methvin, City of Tempe (phone)

Members Not Present

City of Tolleson
Aubree Perry, ADOT

Chair Strunk called the meeting to order at 11:47 a.m.

1. **Public Comment**

Written public comment submitted by Blue Crowley.

The action items that I wanted to comment on.



The first one is the scheduled service purchase agreement. That would be 3C on the consent and I find that why is it that we need to pay out \$100,000 to these people to help with scheduling and to get it done. And after they had gotten the first part done that you had learned what they were doing and how to do it or is it just easier for the system to pay rather than do some of the things it's supposed to be doing?

And on the action Item number 4. This new contract with the operators for fare inspection and security services. That fare inspection is not on the bus. That fare inspection is what the rail is doing and why they're not paying for all of this is beyond me other than that little building out in Mesa that is a part of the RPTA. As I said, just money, it appears coming out of the bus part of the equation and it needs to be coming out of the rail.

And on developing the paratransit systems on the northwest and the east side, item 5. For the last how many years have we tried to be getting a unified service and make all of it all the same? What is the problem? I know that it's 28 little parts, but why isn't it what it should be?

Also, I appreciate that we have Fountain Hills now sitting at the table. Back when we wrote the Prop 400 things, it had Union Hills at one of the places that needed to get circulators and connectors. So, how much are you people now doing that being that they're at the table? Are we trying to advance those parts that were in it?

Whenever I look at your attempts to upgrade service and such, why aren't you adhering to partly the thing that we put together and get some of those routes in rather than just kick it down the road. You know, the grid pattern is all there, all 28 communities have connectivity, but it's the bus.

2. Minutes

Chair Strunk said minutes from September 2, 2020, meeting presented for approval. Are there any corrections on questions regarding the minutes?

IT WAS MOVED BY JULIE ARENDALL, SECONDED BY DAVID KOHLBECK AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED TO APPROVE THE SEPTEMBER 2, 2020 TMC MINUTES.

3. Consent Agenda

Chair Strunk said we have a series of items on the consent agenda and if you will I'd like to call on Mr. Smith to discuss any of those any of our committee members may



have questions on so why don't we try it that way. Are there any questions on any of the consent agenda items today? Okay. I'm not hearing any.

So what I'd like to do is entertain a motion to approve and also receive a second the consent agenda items for September 2nd and we can read through each of them, but if not necessary, is there on motion to do that?

IT WAS MOVED BY REED KEMPTON, SECONDED BY MARIO PANIAGUA AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED TO FORWARD THE CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS TO THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS FOR APPROVAL.

4. Authorization to Issue a Joint Agency Competitive Solicitation for Fare Inspection and Security Services (FISS)

Chair Strunk said Mr. Smith please provide the background.

Mr. Smith said it is and there is nothing really fancy about it. Just sort of a reminder because this has come up in previous meetings. The reason this is on the agenda is because this is an RFP that we would like to issue for security services that cover both rail and one facility, the Mesa facility, bus facility for the RPTA. It's on the RPTA agenda because under our bylaws or our (indiscernible) we have to come before the Board before we issue an RFP above a certain amount for RPTA. That is not a requirement for Valley Metro Rail. We don't have to get Board approval to issue an RFP on Valley Metro Rail. So the reason why this is on the RPTA agenda or the TMC agenda is because of the portion, the small portion, and I think it's outlined in the memo, that relates to the security services in the -- at the Mesa bus facility and so that's the reason why it's here.

So, this is simply to issue an RFP, this is not a proposal or anything. If you have any questions about specifics, Adrian Reese is ready to answer those questions. I just wanted to tell you why this is on the agenda and what's it's for.

Chair Strunk said does anyone have any questions related to this item? It's an action item. Any questions of Ms. Ruiz, Mr. Smith? Okay. I'm not hearing any. So with that I'll entertain a motion and a second to forward this to the Board for approval. Is there a motion and a second?

IT WAS MOVED BY MARIO PANIAGUA, SECONDED BY BRUCE GARDNER AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED TO FORWARD TO THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS AUTHORIZATION FOR THE CEO TO DEVELOP A SCOPE OF WORK AND ISSUE A



COMPETITIVE SOLICITATION FOR A TOTAL CONTRACT TERM OF FIVE YEARS (THREE-YEAR BASE CONTRACT PLUS TWO ONE-YEAR RENEWAL OPTIONS) TO PROVIDE FARE INSPECTION AND SECURITY SERVICES FOR VALLEY METRO'S EXISTING RAIL OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE FACILITIES.

5. Authorization to Develop and Issue a Request for Proposals (RFP) for Operation of Regional Paratransit, Including East Valley and Northwest Valley Services

Mr. Chair said this is also a fairly, significant item too and Mr. Smith will walk us through it. But Mr. Smith, my preliminary understanding of this is this is also kind of a procedural issue in the issuance of an RFP related to regional paratransit and you're in the process of assembling that RFP and all I'll let you kind of walk us through that. Mr. Smith said well, thank you. Actually, it is a procedural and we may want to look at some of this, but, once again, yeah, with the RFP what our administrative and our bylaws say is we can't begin the process of an RFP until we get Board approval to start that and so we're starting early on this. This is -- we have nothing. We haven't even defined scope on some of these things or defined anything. This will be a long process.

I'll turn it over to Jim Hillyard who can give some more detail because there was some misunderstanding at the RTAG that maybe we are in the middle of the process or that we had moved ahead without staff. You know, this is literally, we're at the starting line and just getting approval to start the race and this will be sort of a marathon. So, Jim, if you want to discuss this briefly and give some more detail as to why we're starting at this time and what's involved.

Mr. Hillyard said absolutely. Thank you, Scott, members, as Scott mentioned, we're seeking permission to begin the development of the RFP and its scope of work 11 months prior to the date at which we would anticipate issuing it precisely so we can engage city staff at the level they would like to be involved in developing this solicitation. In fact, we have our first meeting along those lines next Tuesday where we have invited both the paratransit partners and the RTAG members to a joint meeting with our Chief of Procurement to talk through and, hopefully, arrive at consensus on the process by which we will engage cities in the development of this RFP.

We anticipate at this point there being sort of three major levels of engagement. We would like to have work sessions with as many cities as possible to talk through the broad structure of the RFP. So, for example, one of the motivating factors in re-soliciting this contract rather than exercising a current contractual option to extend the current contract is we've been seeing great success with the Ride Choice program.



Ride Choice and paratransit both operate, essentially, independently right now. They have their own customer service call centers. They have their own scheduling functions. And when a customer calls paratransit, they get paratransit services even if Ride Choice could serve them at a more cost-effective fashion. And so, one of the things I think we've agreed at the RTAG and ATS partners level is that we should merge those functions. We should eliminate the duplication in customer service and we should have, I'll say, sort of service neutral scheduling that would allow the customer service function to identify which of those two services can best meet the needs of a particular customer in the most cost effective way and to make that suggestion.

The structure of our contracts right now don't allow that to happen. There may be other places that we can bring these services together to increase efficiency and customer service. And we want to be able to have those conversations in a group setting with the cities at a relatively high level and then we'll take that feedback and have a smaller team that's a mix of Valley Metro and city staff develop the specific scope of work. And then we'll have proposals evaluated by evaluation committee members which will include both Valley Metro and city staff.

So, we'll have those three different levels of engagement that cities can participate in from a higher, more conceptual level down to the actual words of the scope of work, and then finally the evaluation of proposals. So, we're baking in a lot of extra time to ensure the maximum possible participation across the board in the development of this scope of work as we recognize the importance that it has to the region. And so, with that if there's any specific questions, I'd certainly be happy to answer them.

Chair Strunk said great. Thank you for that. Are there any questions of the Committee related to this item?

Mr. Brady said thank you for that. I think that's important. I think there is some concern overall that we have got to figure out how to kind of merge the -- you spoke directly to it, but we have got to figure out from a customer's perspective this kind of one stop opportunity, right, to engage and, you know, paratransit, Ride Choice. So, I think that's a paramount objective and I appreciate you articulating that. But it does feel like because they have been separate right, for some time, how to bring those together. I think that is such an important part of the customer experience that I appreciate what you described as the outreach. I think what I would say is that we really, I don't know, I guess, I'm trying to understand from your perspective is, do you believe that at the end of the day you are going to actually have a specific plan? Or is that just going to be an objective or goal of the RFP? I'm trying to understand your, where you're getting to on that and how that's going to be executed. Because I would just say, I think this is such



an important part for our customers in Mesa and I'm sure for the rest of the region. I guess, we would really like to see the outcome of these discussions a plan maybe simultaneous or right before we're actually doing the RFP just to make sure we're going to be able to execute this objective.

So, share with me kind of what you think your timing is? And how that relates to the timing of the release of the RFP?

Mr. Hillyard said certainly. Thanks for that question, Mr. Brady. So, to your first point, yeah. I think there's consensus already that the scope of work needs to be developed to create a single scheduling and customer service function for both paratransit and Ride Choice. I think there's no disagreement about that. We also had that opportunity validated by some independent benchmarking that we had Censure conduct for us and so, that I think is unquestioned.

There are still some structural questions that I think we as a region have to work through and that's why these work groups will be so important. So, for example, one of the challenges that we have right now is Ride Choice having enough wheelchair accessible vehicles for customers. One way one could solve for that problem, is to not only merge the scheduling and customer service function, but to have a single entity providing paratransit and Ride Choice so that Ride Choice customers could use paratransit vehicles when they are not otherwise, you know, in -- paratransit services.

The flip side of that is there could be, conversely, there could be real advantage in continuing to have two different entities operate Ride Choice versus paratransit because you're now creating some quality and some price competition between those operators for our business during the course of the contract.

And so there's key structural decisions like that one operator or two that have pros and cons that we think we need to talk through with all cities, hopefully arrive at consensus on, and then incorporate that into the scope of work that will ultimately be issued. And those kinds of decisions, I think, have not been made. We really need to sort of think them through as a region and arrive at what we think will make the most sense from both a cost effectiveness and a customer service perspective.

Mr. Brady said yeah. That's wonderful and I appreciate your diligence in that. I think to your point, this is such a critical conversation and, you know, kind of making this evaluation about whether this can be done or not. I guess, to me it would be very helpful after you've gone through this process could -- does the timing work that you could bring that back to this group just to kind of give us -- report out the conclusion or



the, you know, kind of after your due diligence, you know what is the strategy before we go to the next step? Because you're touching all right points. I'm just really anxious just to hear what the conclusion is before we go too far. Does that make sense?

Mr. Hillyard said it certainly does and I'm sure that we could bring back to TMC/RMC sort of like what emerges from these workshops with the cities in terms of sort of that broader structure. If we were to get -- if TMC/RMC want to look at the specific language of the scope of work, we would need to work with our procurement office and potentially do that in the context of an executive session or some other venue that would protect the confidentiality of the scope of work prior to issue because of course, you know, that maintains the integrity of the procurement. But I'm sure in either case, we could work with TMC and work with our procurement office to come up with a way to share those key points and ensure that there's consensus across the cities.

Mr. Brady said yeah. All I'm asking for is maybe return back here and just report out what the RFP -- how the RFP is going to try to accomplish these objectives? And you've come to a conclusion that it can be done or is it, you know, a different idea? That's all I'm asking for. I think it's just good to have the assurance that we think we want to head in this direction and how we are going to try to accomplish that through this solicitation process.

Mr. Hillyard said absolutely. Thank you.

Chair Strunk said excellent comments. Are there any other suggestions? Or comments in general on this particular item?

Unidentified Speaker said if I could Mr. Chair, I just would echo what Mr. Brady just shared. I thought that that was excellent feedback and I know Gilbert would appreciate the same.

Mr. Chair said absolutely, yes. And I can -- I'm going to take off my chair hat real quickly and speak from Peoria's perspective. We would appreciate that too. There's a lot of local -- with paratransit. Some of us have separate systems in place. This is regional and that conversation, that touch-in with this group I think would be well founded.

Okay. Are there any other comments?

Mr. Paniagua said just wanted to make a comment really to make folks aware that Phoenix is going to be issuing a solicitation for our own paratransit service new contract



at approximately the same time. So, we're looking at about a year from now issuing an RFP and then starting a new contract July 1st of 2022. And we've done some investigating to see whether that would -- into the industry to see whether that would cause any issues and we don't believe it will at all and we've had discussions with Valley Metro staff about that as well. But I just wanted to make sure that this Committee was aware that we were going to be doing that. Thank you.

Chair Strunk said Mr. Chair said thank you for sharing that. Any other comments? Good discussion. Good points. Okay. This is an action item so in order to forward this on, the development of the RFP, giving the CEO authorization to do that to the Board, I need a motion and a second to move this along.

Mr. Brady said so, I would make the motion to approve this item to move forward with an RFP with the stipulation that, before we go out the door with the RFP, we come back and have this discussion about this kind of experience for the customer?

My motion is to move forward of the authorization of the RFP, but stipulating that before it's actually goes out on the street that we come back and have a discussion about how we can improve the customer service with, you know, one-stop experience for our customers (indiscernible) coordinating. I don't know if that's helpful, but that's the best I can do.

Mr. Smith said we understand.

Chair Strunk said any comments on that? I think we get where we're going. We will amend the motion, I guess, as appropriate. We will note that and that will be the context of it and we will bring this back before it's formally issued.

IT WAS MOVED BY CHRIS BRADY, SECONDED BY MARY GOODMAN AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED TO FORWARD TO THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS AUTHORIZATION FOR THE CEO TO DEVELOP AND ISSUE A FEDERALLY COMPLIANT RFP FOR A TOTAL TERM OF TEN YEARS (FIVE-YEAR BASE CONTRACT PLUS FIVE ONE-YEAR RENEWAL OPTIONS) TO PROVIDE PARATRANSIT IN THE EAST VALLEY, NORTHWEST VALLEY AND FOR REGIONAL TRIPS AND TO EXTEND TRANSDEV'S CURRENT CONTRACT 120 DAYS SO THAT ANY TRANSITIONS BETWEEN CONTRACTORS OCCURS OCTOBER 1 RATHER THAN JULY 1, 2022.

6. Future Agenda Items and Request and Report on Current Events

None.

7. Next Meeting

Chair Strunk said that concludes this meeting. Our next meeting will be on Wednesday, October 7, 2020, at 10:00 a.m.



Thank you all for being here and we'll see you next month. Take care.

With no further discussion the meeting adjourned at 12:07 p.m.



Minutes

DATE

September 30, 2020

REVISED October 1, 2020

AGEDNA ITEM 2

Rail Management Committee
Wednesday, September 2, 2020
Webex/Phone
11:00 a.m.

Rail Management Committee Participants

Chris Brady, City of Mesa (**Chair**) (phone)

Mario Paniagua for Ed Zuercher, City of Phoenix (**Vice Chair**) (phone)

Josh Wright, City of Chandler (phone)

Steven Methvin, City of Tempe (phone)

Chair Brady called the meeting to order at 11:38 a.m.

1. Public Comment

Written comment submitted by Blue Crowley.

To the -- putting the rail through the moneys that the cities, Phoenix, is supposedly getting and going to be using on that northern route. As I've stated in the past, we didn't need to be going over the freeway because we didn't need to be putting it on the two-story level. Which I like that we're giving up a 250 park and ride lot and going to build a four-story facility and also are moving the bus part of the equation over.

I just still look at the -- you could have gone into the ACDC even when it's at flood stage we would be able to get the trains through and have brought the initial station to right there in the middle of Metrocenter. And, like you said, you're gonna be a part of the development that's coming up and a part of the selling point. Well, if you would have had the station right in the middle where the bus station was wouldn't that be access to more parts of the equation?

On to number two and the passthrough agreement, as I stated, it's not what it's supposed to be.

Other than that, I'll let you guys have the rest of this time. Have a pleasant.



2. Minutes

Chair Brady said minutes from the September 2, 2020, RMC meeting are presented for approval. Do you have a motion and a second?

IT WAS MOVED BY MARIO PANIAGUA, SECONDED BY ED ZUERCHER AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED TO APPROVE THE SEPTEMBER 2, 2020 RMC MEETING MINUTES.

3. Consent Agenda

Chair Brady said we'll move to consent agenda. The consent items are on your agenda. That would be 3A through 3C. Are there any Committee members who would like to remove any of these items from the consent agenda?

If not, I'll request a motion and a second to approve the consent agenda.

IT WAS MOVED BY MARIO PANIAGUA, SECONDED BY STEVEN METHVIN AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED TO FORWARD TO THE CONSENT AGENDA TO THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS.

4. Northwest Phase II Light Rail Extension: Updated Funding, Design and Construction Agreement with City of Phoenix.

Chair Brady said Mr. Smith.

Mr. Smith said thank you. I believe I'm on. Yeah. Just very quickly, this is, basically, a cash flow action. The federal funds in transit are all refundable or reimbursement funds. And so, we have to spend the money up front and then when the grant comes through, the federal money will then go to refund that. City of Phoenix has agreed to advance funds necessary to cover the cash flow until the federal grants are received. This is not an increase in the budget. Doesn't change total budget amounts or projected spend. It's merely making sure that we have cash flow available from the City of Phoenix waiting the full funding grant agreement reimbursements.

Chair Brady said very good. Thank you. It makes sense. All right. So, are there any questions for Mr. Smith on this item?

Mr. Paniagua said we really appreciate all the work that Valley Metro has done on this project and are very excited to be moving forward. I realize this is just a perfunctory item regarding the cash flow, but, symbolically, we are excited about how the project is moving ahead and the strong support we're getting at the federal level from the FTA.



IT WAS MOVED BY MARIO PANIAGUA, SECONDED BY STEVEN METHVIN AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED TO FORWARD TO THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS AUTHORIZATION FOR THE CEO TO AMEND THE EXISTING FUNDING, DESIGN, AND CONSTRUCTION AGREEMENT WITH THE CITY OF PHOENIX FOR THE NORTHWEST PHASE II LIGHT RAIL EXTENSION, AND FOR PHOENIX TO PROVIDE UP TO AN ADDITIONAL \$199 MILLION TO VALLEY METRO.

5. Future Agenda Items Request and Report on Current Events.

Mr. Chair said any requests for any future agenda items? If not.

6. Next Meeting.

The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, October 7, 2020 at 11:00 a.m.
Thank you all very much.

The meeting was adjourned.

With no further discussion, the meeting adjourned at 12:12 p.m.